

being carried out in our time. By the general consent of literary and learned people we may fairly hope that some improvements may be effected and the most grotesque anomalies removed. But the conservative instincts of the nation in matters like this are very strong; and I think it in the highest degree unlikely that for the sake of saving a little trouble to teachers, the nation will put itself to the inconvenience of adopting a new alphabet and making a break in the continuity of its own literary life.

So we may make up our minds that any effort to obtain a complete and scientific reform in the English alphabet will probably be futile; and that any other than a complete reform would hardly be worth contending for. It may go a little way to reconcile some of us to this conclusion, if we reflect that after all the anomalies and difficulties do not seem so great to a little child as to us. He accepts the spelling you teach him, on your authority, and he is very little impressed by its want of philosophic

precision. You spell the word *mat*, and as there are three distinct sounds represented by three distinct letters, which are tolerably uniform in their powers, the word satisfies you. And then you spell the word *through*, and you feel it to be unsatisfactory. The first word is spelt philosophically, the second is spelt unphilosophically. But to the child, though one is a little easier than the other, it is just as arbitrary. He receives them both on your authority. To him it is all alike mysterious. Neither his moral nor his phonetic sensibilities are wounded by unphilosophical spelling. You will have to tell him the one word twice over and the other only once. But when once thoroughly known, it is known for life and he will not be troubled by its anomalous character. Nay, he will never know that there is any anomaly in it, until in the fulness of time he is old enough to become a member of the Philological Society or the Spelling Reform Association, and to have his critical faculty called into action under its auspices.—*Central School Journal.*

PARENTS AND TEACHERS.

THE fact is conceded by those who properly understand or appreciate the laboriousness of a teacher's position that his remuneration is frequently incommensurate with the amount of work required of him, and no rightly thinking man will, I believe, dispute the assertion that so long as the teacher can command little more for his service than is paid to an ordinary labourer, just so long will the cause of education be retarded, and no one will have the right to complain if our schools are conducted in a negligent and unsatisfactory manner.

However, in an effort to correct the evils existing in our systems of in-

struction, there is something else to be considered besides dollars and cents.

The conscientious instructor, be he "college professor" or "country pedagogue," is not an automaton that drags listlessly through six hours of labour per day, after the fashion of a horse in a treadmill, contented merely to draw his salary and to retain his place; he is a man of noble principles, who realizes the responsibility of his position; his interests are identical with those of his pupils, and he will bend every energy for their advancement.

To such a man the business of teaching is fraught with many cares,