

Educational Weekly

VOL. IV.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 23RD, 1886.

Number 101.

The Educational Weekly,

Edited by T. ARNOLD HAULTAIN, M. A.

TERMS: Two Dollars per annum. Clubs of three, \$5.00. Clubs of five at \$1.60 each, or the five for \$8.00. Clubs of twenty at \$1.50 each, or the twenty for \$30.00.

PUBLISHED BY
THE GRIP PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO
TORONTO, CANADA.

JAMES V. WRIGHT, General Manager

TORONTO, DECEMBER 23, 1886.

THE protest against setting the people of this Province to fighting about religion, says the *Hamilton Evening Times*, is timely, no matter where it comes from. It is not wise, it is not patriotic to sow discord—to make men hate their neighbours—and the party which resorts to such election tactics ought to be taught the folly of it by a sharp lesson. A good many of the younger voters may not know anything about the old quarrels on the school question, and what a relief it was to both parties when it was thought that it had been settled forever.

THE following extract is from a speech by Hon. George Brown, delivered a couple of years after the passage of the Separate School Act, in the course of the debate on the Confederation scheme:—“I need hardly remind the House that I have always opposed and continue to oppose the system of sectarian education, so far as the public chest is concerned. I have never had any hesitation on that point. I have never been able to see why all the people of the Province, to what ever sect they may belong, should not send their children to the same Common Schools to receive the ordinary branches of instruction. I regard the parent and the pastor as the best religious instructors—and so long as the religious faith of the children is uninterfered with, and ample opportunity afforded to the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their flocks, I cannot conceive any sound objection to mixed schools.”

THE Toronto Public School Board, or some members of it, seem bent on keeping themselves before the public by strange and out-of-the-way proceedings. At its last meeting we learn that when the chairman, in following the order of business, asked if there were any enquiries, Mr. E. P. Roden, with a very solemn face and dignified mien, rose to ask if the chairman agreed with the opinion expressed in the *Globe* of that morning that he (the chairman) was the only redeeming feature of the board. Mr. McMurrich ignored the question for a time, but Mr. Roden pressed for an answer, and another trustee expressed the belief that the chairman could have no reasonable objection to reply. Mr. McMurrich took the matter very seriously, and said that in all his experience as a member of the Public School Board he had never heard such a question addressed to the chairman. “He considered it an insult and refused to answer.” This is the report of a daily newspaper. The cause of education will not be much furthered by such puerile (to use the most euphemistic adjective possible) doings.

MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD, speaking to a mass meeting of teachers at Westminster, lately, said:—You have a very strong association—the Elementary Teachers’ Union. Some people would say it was too strong. I do not think so—(hear, hear)—but I wish it would concentrate its strength in one object in the first place and let other objects be until this is gained. Insist on having a Minister for Education. (Cheers.) I know the Duke of Richmond told the House of Lords that, as Lord President, he was Minister of Education—(laughter)—but really the Duke of Richmond’s sense of humour must have been slumbering when he told the House of Lords that, a man is not Minister of Education by taking the name, but by doing the functions. (Cheers.) To do the functions he must put his mind to the subject of education; and so long as Lord Presidents are what they are, and education is what it is,

a Lord President will not be a man who puts his mind to the subject of education. A Vice President is not—on the Lord President’s own showing—and cannot be Minister for Education. He cannot, therefore, be made responsible for mistakes and neglects. Now, what we want in a Minister of Education is this—a centre where we can fix the responsibility. Insist therefore—as you, the chief sufferers by mistakes and neglects in the management of education, have a right to insist—insist on having a Minister for Education.

“A PARENT” writes to *the Mail* as follows:—Taxpayers generally, and parents in particular, should bear in mind at the coming election of school trustees, that the Board of Health some time ago notified the Public School Board that, on account of the many complaints made and the danger to the health of our rising generation, it was imperative that the deadly and obnoxious cesspool system should be at once abolished and a thorough sanitary system be substituted therefor in our public schools. For some unexplained reason no notice has been taken of this command, further than a formal endorsement of the desirability of the proposed reform. The importance of this question cannot easily be exaggerated, and it appears to me that it is the duty of all parents to make it a test question at the polls, and that no person should receive support as a school trustee who will not pledge himself to give it his immediate attention. As a parent and one who has suffered by this system, I appeal to all other parents who may be canvassed in the coming elections to exact promises from candidates that it shall be stamped out. The writer draws attention to a very important subject—one of even more importance in the country than in the city perhaps. To the suggestion of “a parent” might be added that in the country, trustees would do well to look to the position of the well, and the quality of the water supplied to the pupils.