

Collegiate Institute, give amply sufficient data for our grading. What end *can* a final examination in Methods serve? What percentage of the candidate's worth as a teacher can it discover? If the art of teaching consisted in a written correspondence between teacher and pupil, the written plan would be no mean factor in estimating pedagogical acquirements; but where the living teacher is brought into personal contact with the pupils (who are generally very much alive), many incidents arise to destroy the even tenor of the plan, and it is just by his manner and method of meeting such difficulties that his power and value as a teacher may be determined. One man may go before a class with a plan that the most exacting critic would judge almost perfect and yet show a lamentable weakness in many or even all the fundamental requirements of a teacher; another may meet the same class, with a vastly inferior written plan, but armed and well prepared to meet each difficulty as it arises, and to guide the pupils toward the goal at which they aim. Which is the better teacher? Which would be marked as the better teacher by any extra-mural examiner who has never seen either candidate conduct a recitation? The man with the good *plan* is marked "Honors." The man with the good *qualifications* gets "Failed." Thus it is. Must it ever be thus?

\* \*

DURING last month notice of motion was given to amend the constitution of the Literary Society, one of the proposed changes being occasioned by the addition of two business managers to the staff of

the MONTHLY. The question, however, was left over for a committee to deal with next term, partly from a general aversion to discuss such "uninteresting" subjects, and partly because it was felt by a number that when changes were being made, they should go farther.

In the constitution as it now stands, the members of the MONTHLY staff are included in the list of officers of the Society. This is virtually contradicted by a subsequent clause excluding them from the Executive Committee, in spite of the fact that in general the officers of a Society constitute the Executive. Again there is a distinction drawn between the two, in the length of their respective terms of office.

We cannot see why the MONTHLY staff should be considered as officers of the Society when they do not perform the duties of the officers in any particular. Were they elected as a special committee, they would still be under the jurisdiction of the Society and the present defect in the constitution would be remedied. The clauses mentioned might read as follows :

"The Society shall appoint a staff for the MONTHLY, consisting of an editor-in-chief, three sub-editors, and two business managers, who shall hold office for the full college year."

"The officers of the Society shall consist of two Honorary Presidents, a Patron, a President, - - - and six Councillors, three ladies and three gentlemen."

"The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Society."

"The officers shall be elected twice in each college year (the terms being specified.)"