

in the wrong. There is generally some wool to their cry, and though Dr. Mowry's definition of education is the only definition that can ever be accepted, yet as he says: "The definition, aim, and design of education as here given should not blind us to the fact that our free schools are public institutions, and hence depend upon popular vote and popular will. Whatever the majority of the voters wish put into the schools will be put into them. Whatever they wish left out will be left out. Moreover the instincts of the people are frequently more nearly right than their logic may be. So, doubtless, we shall find that many things for which a public clamor is created will be found, possibly, contrary to the reasons on which they base their demand, after all, right and best, and to be desired, even in accordance with the highest principles of psychology and pedagogy." And in trying to find a mean between the views of our educationists and the desires of the people, we have only to read what the *Sherbrooke Gazette* declares the people want. "What we contend for," says that journal, "is that instruction in all of our educational institutions should be devoted more than formerly to such subjects as will be found calculated to prove useful in future life; and when our youth can only give a limited time to study, their time should be spent on those branches they will find necessary in attending to their daily avocations hereafter—that is, a more practical education than theoretical—the latter being soon forgotten, not being required for practical, steady use."

—In such a statement of the case as the above, the question of the curriculum in our Superior Schools is directly impugned, while the condition of our elementary schools is for the moment separated as a distinct issue. Mr. Hubbard in his letter says, "if parents will persist in crowding their children, who ought to be in the elementary schools, into the classes of the Model Schools and Academies, they must not be surprised if they find them overworked." In other words, Mr. Hubbard blames the parents, and the *Gazette* blames the teachers, just as Judge Lynch has blamed the Protestant Committee and their administration of the law. It is more than a marvel that no one has thought to blame the School Commissioners, since they, as a general thing, are no less eager to accept a large grant than the Protestant Committee are willing to bestow one, or the teachers to earn it. As has been said, the people in a complaining mood are sure to find some scapegoat or other, on whom they may lay as a load the errors of their indignation. In this case, however, the blame, if blame there be, is altogether impersonal, and in our