

eration become responsible for the behavior of the students in the town. With their sub-proctors and bull dogs (human, not canine,) they parade the streets at various hours of the day, fining or rusticating any under-graduate caught misbehaving. Their power is absolutely autocratic, and its use necessarily renders them unpopular. Five shillings for being out after 8 p.m. without cap and gown, or for smoking in cap and gown, is the smallest fine; one of fifty pounds and a year's rustication was recently imposed by the Varsity officials for breaking into another college, demolishing the ledger and almost killing the porter. A delightful old Latin statute says: *Si quis procuratorem trucidarit*—if anyone has slain a proctor in discharge of his duty, the offender shall be fined five pound and permanently expelled—but I never heard of anyone bold enough to try the experiment. To be seen with any young lady whose name you cannot give or for whose character you cannot vouch, is, as Chaucer's Parson says, "horrible dedly sinne," usually involving rustication. Recently a proctor approached an under-graduate, who was walking with his sister, and taking him aside said: "Will you please introduce me to that young lady?" "No, sir," was the reply, "I only introduce my sister to gentlemen." Less fortunate was the man who, on being asked the same question, replied, "Ask her yourself; I only met her two minutes ago."

But after all, adventures with the "Proggins," practical jokes and visitations from drunken seniors, form a very small part of Oxford life. Work is a stern and ever present reality, and to nine out of ten the pursuit of folly is a very secondary affair. The right-minded reader has a true sense of perspective; the other class may be left to their own devices.—W.L.G.

COMMUNICATIONS.

To the Editor of the Journal:

DEAR SIR,—As many students of Queen's intend to follow the profession of teaching, and as an essential step to this, in our Province, is attendance at the School of Pedagogy, a few remarks on the school and on pedagogy by a graduate may not be uninteresting.

The avowed object of the school is to prepare teachers for their work; the real object to prevent teaching from being made a stepping-stone to other professions.

It is presumed—and the presumption is the *raison d'être* of the school—that special knowledge and technical training are required for teaching as for law, medicine and divinity.

To attack this presumption is to attack the whole system of normal and model schools, and to throw down the gauntlet to a host of eminent teachers, among them the Principal of McGill University, who has recently been reported as saying that "teaching is as much an exact science as any other." Still we must attack it, and we feel that our attack is supported by the silent example of our Alma Mater.

What is required of a tutor at Queen's except knowledge of his subject?

How many members of the Faculty of our University, or of any University in Canada or Britain, are graduates of training schools?

And yet we imagine that our Professors can teach, and that our tutors could efficiently teach their subjects in a high school.

Nor is it only in connection with academic studies that teaching is required—the foreman of a shop or factory, the master workman of a foundry, a head clerk or salesman, all these are teachers. Their aim is that those whom they teach shall acquire knowledge of their respective subjects, and they believe that such knowledge is the only requisite for the teacher.

But the Toronto educationists utterly repudiate the idea that knowledge is the end of learning. The present Director of Teachers' Institutes, who has always been in close touch with the Ontario Education Department, deliberately says, in the preface to *Historical Documents of Canada, 1891*: "The manner in which he acquires his information and arrives at his opinions is of far greater importance than the knowledge and the opinions themselves." And the School of Pedagogy shows its entire accord with this idea by its worship of "method" and disregard of knowledge. A favourite expression of the advocates of the system is that teaching is a science, not an art. Knowledge of subject to be taught, and of human nature, and habits of command, are nothing without the school training. Indeed, no difference in degree of fitness for teaching is acknowledged between an honour graduate of a University and the holder of a senior leaving certificate.

The school offers, or, to be more accurate, imposes upon its victims a training in the supposed science (not art) of school management, consisting of a few axioms of common sense and a great deal of unmeasured abuse of opponents of the system, and some hints, which may be useful, as to presentation of lessons. But even more ridiculous is the special knowledge it pretends to impart. This is contained in Psychology, which reveals and classifies the minds of the class (of course all minds and all classes are alike), collections of faculties to be trained by the omniscient teacher. As explained by