

of the Wellington Street firm. Hence the spiteful reference, which we reluctantly here notice, to this magazine in last month's issue of the *Journal*—a reference which, in its limping English, plainly came from the source of the orthographical chaos in a certain "Spelling Book" that some time ago received our attention. Hence, also, the pitiful misrepresentation, in the *Journal* for April, of what we had last month to say on the subject of a Headmaster's "renouncing the profession." The *Journal* would make it appear that our remarks on the indifferent status of the profession, and the regret we gave expression to at the general failure of the community to extend the proper meed of sympathy and encouragement to the teacher in his arduous work, were a consequence of some circumstances said to have occurred at Whitby, which, the *Journal* insinuates could not have been pleasing to us. To this slander we need but make the reply, that we were as ignorant as the child unborn of any and all circumstances connected with the appointment of the new master, to which the *Journal* alludes; and we may add, that if any intrigue took place, or if any clique-wirepulling was resorted to, in influencing the Board in making the new appointment, it does not astonish us that we should be in entire ignorance of the matter, and that Messrs. Gage and the *School Journal* should know all about it.

Our apologies are due to the new principal of the Institute in question, in our being compelled to make this frank statement, owing to the impertinence of the conductors of the *School Journal* in dragging us into discourteous notice in its columns. The late principal will also considerably excuse the liberty we necessarily had to take in making this personal allusion in our common defence. The *Journal's* own reference to him, he may not be able to control; but its malevolence falls to the ground when its object can point to the grand public and professional demonstration at Whitby, on the occasion of the recent leave-taking. The attack on ourselves we must bear as we may. Teachers have recently been made the objects of an

outrageous assault in an unexpected quarter. Editors of magazines, it would seem, thanks to the *School Journal*, are not now to be the only unstigmatized scoundrels.

MODERN TENDENCIES.—Is it not the tendency of our numerous conventions and institutes to lay too much stress on "fine handling" of material and too little on the "inspiration" which alone can give dignity to our work? When the same public sees yearly crowds of boys and girls passing from our schools into society and business with seemingly no impressions remaining on their characters from all the teachers through whose hands they have come—for the public cannot fail to see this—it must not be blamed for asking if the work of education has degenerated into "fine handling," while the "dignity of inspiration has vanished."—*Anna C. Brackett.*

A Spadina Avenue lady dropped in on her neighbour for an afternoon call. "How is your daughter?" she inquired. "Splendid. She has just got back from the Nominal School, where she ciphered clear through from ambition to chemical fractures, and then she took up pottery and jobbery, and he says she can speculate the internal calculations."

TEACHERS should do more studying of methods. Institutes are good, but institute instruction cannot take the place of hard study and hard thinking; it can only supplement them. The Institute ought to be to the teacher what the teacher is to the pupil, the helper. Thorough, careful preparation for the day's labour is just as essential to the teacher as it is to the pupil. To secure this preparation, which in time will amount to training, teachers ought to read more educational journals and study more educational books. There are teachers who have been teaching for years, who do not own a single book on education, who read no educational journals, and yet they wonder that they and their business are not held in a higher esteem. They don't deserve it.—*Educational Review.*