

point out the danger of such comparisons. The tendency is certainly to make schools and teachers aim wholly and solely at shoving pupils through the examinations. To my mind, if the staff of that High School, which was so loudly praised, wish to prevent cramming, they should way-lay this false eulogizer and compel him to retract every statement on the subject, on penalty of a severe chastisement. For there is no doubt that every one is too apt to count heads rather than to look at the thoroughness of the work done. And anything which tends to increase this spirit is debasing and even actually sinful. For what our country needs to-day is not crammers but cram-proof teachers.

And this brings us to the point that thoroughness is seldom obtained by a single reading. We all know that that which is but once read is likely to be soon forgotten, and yet some one is sure to find fault if a pupil is taken over the same work twice or three times, and we are led to ask ourselves the question, Is review and repetition in the High School course necessary? We have not to think long in order to answer that satisfactorily. If we go to the World's Fair and take two hours in each building we will soon have seen it all; but how much will we remember when we get home. So in the field of studies. We may go over all the studies once, but what sort of an education have we when we have done it. It certainly follows that education means *time* and *repetition*. The question resolves itself into this—Shall we learn *much* or learn *well*? Shall we always strive to say and read something new? or shall we not hesitate to repeat the good which has been said and read a hundred times, it may be?

And in pupils, too, this cram system has reached alarming proportions. How frequently we hear pupils speak

of examinations as the chief end of their year's work! How we see them read over examination papers, in order that they may anticipate the style of question which will be propounded to them at the end of the year! How they dislike certain studies whose usefulness for educational purposes are unexcelled, but which they study simply because they have to. For instance, we know of a case where a pupil told a teacher that he wished to drop Latin and Algebra and Euclid and rhetoric and give his time to some *useful* study, as, for example, reading and figuring. The teacher asked him if he did not wish to drop geography, too. But the pupil said that geography was of infinite importance to a man. For supposing he wanted to go to Alaska or Borneo how would he find the road without a knowledge of geography. But, of course, the utter fallacy of such an education as that pupil wished for, from a psychological point of view, is very manifest. Very little argument is necessary in order to show the value of every subject on the High School course, and to show this value, in my opinion, is part of a teacher's work. Far too many pupils have utterly false ideas of the real end of education.

If a pupil passes an examination by small effort, we may be very sure that the practical result is even smaller. We have heard men boast that they prepared for an examination in a single evening or night, and many times have men barely scraped through and have shown themselves off as having taken distinguished courses. Sorry, indeed, would we be to entrust the education of the young to teachers of such mushroom growth. And that is what they are. For at present I can think of only one thing which came to maturity in a single night; and that is Jonah's gourd. But the lamentable part of that story is that