

be sure that courtesy and common sense will restrain the Episcopalian teacher from entering into an argument before Presbyterian pupils about the necessity of a diocesan bishop to the existence of a true church, or the Presbyterian teacher from propounding predestinarianism, or the Baptist teacher from insisting on immersion, or the Methodist teacher from desecrating on the value of the class meeting? Doubtless, there would be exceptions: some small minds would seize the opportunity of trying to make the little ones say "Shibboleth"; but the instances would be rare, and the evil-doers would be condemned by the public opinion of the profession. Besides, if a teacher should prove incorrigibly sectarian, the remedy, is close at hand.

Why, then, should not the Bible be in the hands of both teachers and scholars to be used every day? The "Scripture Readers" authorized are good; but the book containing them will not be in the hands of scholars; and every teacher knows the importance of having the eye as well as the ear exercised in order to secure that the contents of what is read shall be mastered. Besides, the "Regulations" prescribe that the selections "shall be read without comment or explanation." The teacher must not so much as tell the children from what book in the Bible the selection is taken! Nor is he at liberty to explain where Bethel was, or in whose reigns Isaiah prophesied, or what is the meaning of John the Baptist being "not worthy to unloose the shoe's latchet" of Jesus. In the name of common sense, why not? And further, why should not every teacher be permitted and encouraged to emphasize the *religious* lessons contained in the selections? Is it impossible to distinguish between teaching religion and teaching theology? We shall recur to this point.

ADMISSION TO HIGH SCHOOLS.

Is the upper limit of Public School work ability on the part of the scholar to pass the examination for admission to a High School? Is it to be assumed that, as soon as a pupil has attained to the standard for entrance to the High School, therefore, he should not be any longer in the Public School? If this is not so, how is it that we hear of examinations being held at points in different counties, other than at the High Schools? We should say that the tendency of such arrangement is to entice unduly young scholars to leave the primary and to go into the secondary school. It may be safe and proper to order that no child should leave school to engage in any industrial pursuit till he has a certificate of having passed the examination for admission to a High School. But to make arrangements to facilitate or induce scholars to leave the Public School is neither proper nor safe; and as such we regard the practice which is growing up amongst us. It is not necessary that we should point out the results which are sure to follow the adoption of the practice to which we have referred without some safe-guard: an increase of a class of teachers already too numerous, viz.: those holding permits and third-class certificates, lower salaries, general lowering of the standard of Public Schools. On the other hand, are High Schools to be restricted to pass pupils only? Is the father of a boy eleven or twelve years old to be told "your son has not passed the entrance examinations, and, therefore, he cannot be admitted" even if the father wishes his boy to be prepared for a university course? This is a question which is continually coming up for answer in our secondary schools. Is the master to be powerless in dealing with a case of this kind? The master is not at all as-