

rectness and completeness of recitation. This can only be fully perceived by the practiced and experienced. Many recitations appear tolerably good on the surface that will not bear rigid examination. It is by correctness of work that the Inspector judges of the thoroughness of the teacher. Any school will furnish examples of tolerable proficiency, but it is only in the hands of the *good* teacher that accuracy is found, which fully satisfies the careful examiner. In this way also the work of the careless teacher must generally crop out. At every turn it is perceived that there is some deficiency. There is a mistake here, or a slip there, or hesitation some where else, all indications that something more was wanted to make the work complete. And who is more chagrined many times than the teacher himself? How often have we heard a teacher say at the close of an examination that such and such a class didn't do half as well as he expected? And why? Simply from the fact of their not being properly grounded in their work. The structure was too hastily reared, or the foundation was not properly laid, hence these ugly gaps and fissures which proclaim so loudly the incompetency of the architect.

This want of accuracy is the great fault of Public School work. We know well that for all that exists the teacher is not entirely to blame. Irregularity of attendance has much to do with it. For this the Inspector is bound to make due allowance. But for what he knows the teacher can obviate, he must hold him responsible.

Did teachers only reflect how dangerous to the future welfare of his pupils this habit becomes, he would guard against it more sedulously. The careless habits formed at school, often display themselves in after life. Many misfortunes which overtake men in business, many of the accidents which are so distressing to the public, arise from imperfect calculations and work carelessly performed.

But while it is the duty of the Inspector to note defects, he should be most cautious in coming to conclusions. Many circumstances combine to retard the teacher's work and thwart his designs, and so just credit should be given for what is well done, or faithfully attempted. It should always be more pleasant to commend than to censure, and while not at all blind to defects he should not allow them to divert his attention from anything that was really meritorious.

---

## SCIENCE TEACHING.

BY WILLIAM TYTLER, ESQ., HEAD MASTER ST. MARY'S HIGH SCHOOL. READ AT THE PERTH CO. TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION, SEPT. 19TH, 1873, AND PUBLISHED IN THE "ONTARIO TEACHER" BY REQUEST.

(Continued from *January No.*)

In regard to the prescribed Text Book, Davidson's "Animal Kingdom," I may say that the author shows a considerable amount of ignorance of his subject. There can be no doubt that it is always a strong point against a text book, in fact against any book, when it is written by a man not practically and

extensively acquainted with the subject on which he pretends to give information, and instruct his readers. What Mr. Davidson's qualifications in this subject may be, I know not, although he claims to have had considerable experience in lecturing on subjects connected with Natural History to