

the address, but in another column we give some extracts from it which will be found full of interest and instruction. Mr. Robertson, it must be remembered, is speaking of a system of education that is free and compulsory, and which is controlled by what many regard as a panacea for all educational evils—a Minister of Education. It would be amusing, if it had not also a serious side, to note the writer's opinion that, far as the Canadians have gone, the end is not yet. He says 'free books will come next in order, then free dinners, and then free clothing, and finally free pocket-money and free tickets for public lectures and entertainments.' But the main question that the writer asks is whether the free and compulsory educational system in Canada has resulted in improved morality? His answer is given unhesitatingly, and a terrible answer it is: 'The moral condition of our political atmosphere to-day is more corrupt than at any time in our political history.' . . . 'The old-fashioned honesty of our fathers and grandfathers has almost wholly disappeared in some parts of our land.' . . . 'Trickery—a low shrewdness which aims perpetually at overreaching one's neighbours, is so common as scarcely to call for observation.' These are the words not of a heated partisan, nor of one who speaks from mere hearsay but they represent the deliberately expressed opinion of a teacher speaking to teachers. These evils he does not attribute to the spread of education, but he boldly asserts that the educational system and the educational methods in Canada, while not the cause of crime, have not been preventatives. The real reason why education has been at best only a neutral force in moral improvement he considers to be the idea that the functions of the teacher begin and end with intellectual work, using the word

'intellectual' in its narrowest sense. We are unable to follow Mr. Robertson in the consideration of the various remedies he suggests for this state of things, but we cannot refrain from saying that his proposed remedies seem to us wholly inadequate."

---

IF NOT A PROFESSION—WHY?—The phrase "teachers' profession" is persistently used by many and as persistently objected to by others. What is the ground for objection? County Superintendent Bruce, of Topeka, puts it into plain words. After the statement that no lawyer or doctor would be allowed to practice on the short preparation of the teacher, he asks: "Where is the lawyer or dentist who used his profession as a stepping stone to any other occupation? But the teacher does this. The compensation of the common school teacher is inadequate to the needs of any profession. His rank and influence in society are too insignificant. The amount of pride he manifests in the elevation of the calling, is expressive of nothingness. His hours devoted to reading and study along the lines of his work are too few and too far between. The consultations with his brethren are too infrequent." These are plain words, but, to be honestly critical, are they not too true? It is not the amount of "reading," "study," and "consultation with the brethren," that is done by the commissioned officers of a regiment, that correctly gauges the opinions and efforts of the whole body of men composing the regiment. If there is not enough enthusiasm and inspiration in the educational leaders to spread over the whole body of teachers, and arouse the ambition to elevate the teachers' calling into a profession, then it is the inertness of the main body that will decide, in public opinion, against the fitness of the term "profession." The