

AN English exchange gives an interesting description of the Colonial College and Training Farms, at Hollesley Bay, about two and a-half hours distant from London. The estate contains about 1,330 acres of pasture, arable land, heath and woods, and the College hires and farms, in addition, 500 acres of fine arable and pasture land adjoining. On the estate there are 1,600 sheep, mostly of the pure Suffolk breed, 100 bullocks, 50 cows and 60 horses. The institution, which was established in January, 1887, is intended to provide the intending colonist with suitable training, with advice as to his future career, and, so far as possible, with an introduction to it. A course of instruction is provided in field cultivation, the making and repair of agricultural implements, gardening, bee culture, forestry, tree planting, the care of horses, bullocks, sheep, swine and poultry, veterinary practice, riding, land surveying and levelling, engineers' and smiths' work, carpentry and ambulance work. At present there are about seventy pupils under instruction. Of course there has not been time as yet to test the practical value of the training there given in the actual experience of its pupils in the colonies. The conception seems a good one and it is evidently being well carried out. Yet those who know how different are the conditions of farming in most of the colonies from that in England may well have misgivings as to the practical success of the institution. In regard to Canada, for instance, no one who understands that difference in conditions can doubt that a course at the Guelph Agricultural College, or even a year or two on a well-managed farm, would be of far greater advantage to the intending immigrant than any preparation that could be given in England. The fact that he is so slow to unlearn what he knows about farming in the Old Country, and to adopt the simpler, cheaper and perhaps cruder methods of Canadians, is, no doubt, a fruitful cause of the disappointment and failure of many an immigrant. What a pity that the money expended at Hollesley could not be devoted to the training of the youths on the spot in the respective colonies to which they are to emigrate.

SINCE the close of the British parliamentary session some of the Government leaders have been making speeches at the Mansion House banquet and elsewhere. The two points of greatest immediate interest in British politics are, perhaps, those touching the African treaties and the embassy to the Vatican in connection with the affair in Malta. Mr. Balfour and other speakers on the Government side were very severe upon Mr. Gladstone, who pronounced the embassy of Sir Lintorn Simmons, and the consequent declaration of the Pope in regard to Protestant marriages in Malta, "a very great novelty in British history." The "novelty" may be questionable, as Mr. Balfour and others have retorted, in view of Sir George Errington's communications with the Vatican during Mr. Gladstone's own *regime*. The distinction drawn by Mr. Gladstone that Sir G. Errington "bore no diplomatic character whatever, but he undoubtedly conveyed and received information," is certainly too fine to satisfy a non-partisan in regard to the propriety of Mr. Gladstone's own procedure. But his Government critics conveniently forgot that as two wrongs do not make a right, Mr. Gladstone's blunder could not excuse a worse one on their part. The whole question seems to turn on the disputed point as to whether the British Government is under obligation to observe the canon law in Malta. Praising his uncle's foreign policy, Mr. Balfour congratulated his hearers on the fact that the uniting of the offices of Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary in one person left the latter free from the control of an official superior. Mr. Balfour seems to forget that while the plan may have its advantages so long as the Foreign Secretary's course is wise, it would have grave disadvantages should he commit a serious blunder. Lord Salisbury, himself, seems to have been in a jocular mood, in his Mansion House speech. He was particularly facetious in his references to the African agreement. We had been drawing lines, he said, upon maps where no human foot had ever trod, and giving mountains, lakes, and rivers to each other without knowing exactly where they were, and further giving and distributing territories which do not belong to us, but in fact belong to other people, and are not likely to be visited by any of our authorities for a long time. Then, becoming serious, he defended the agreements on the ground that they made for peace by removing the most probable and most dangerous causes of quarrel with friendly nations. "You must read between the lines," he said, "that we have by this means been evading a cause of quarrel between the nations of Europe, and contributing our quota to the glorious cause

of peace." The last sentence contains the justification of a treaty which will probably hand Lord Salisbury's name down in history as that of one of Great Britain's wisest statesmen, so far as his foreign administration is concerned, and which will be fruitful of results, let us hope good results, to Africa through all coming time.

NEW EDUCATIONAL METHODS.

SOME of the discussions which took place at the recent meeting of the Ontario Teachers' Association at Niagara-on-the-Lake are well adapted to bring to mind the great progress that has been made in public school education during the last fifty years. These eventful years, which have been so fruitful of change in most of our ways of thinking and doing, have wrought wonderful changes in both professional and popular views touching the aims and methods of the schools. It is true in the educational as in every other sphere of activity that change does not necessarily mean improvement. Yet no candid and thoughtful mind can doubt that many of the changes which have taken place, and are still taking place in educational ideas and methods, are changes in the right direction. Some of these are worthy of more attention than they have yet received.

A quiet and in the main salutary revolution has been commenced, and is still going on in modes of management or "government" of both schools and colleges, especially the former. Perhaps the nature of this change, as well as the grounds on which it is based, may be best indicated by saying that discipline, which seemed formerly to be regarded in large measure as the end of school organization, is now being relegated to its proper place as simply a means to an end. Time was, within the memory of many a reader, when the one great effort of the district school-master, that to which his energies were mainly directed from opening to close of school, was the preservation of order, or rather, we should say, of quiet, which was in the minds of many synonymous with order. The merits of a school in those days were determined more by the completeness of the enforced hush than by any mental or moral test. To say that "you might hear a pin drop" in the school was often regarded by both masters and parents as the highest compliment that could be paid to the teacher. Of the method by which this quiet was attained it is unnecessary to say much. The mere mention of it will be sufficient to set many memories at work, and call up vivid pictures from the past of the daily round of struggles in which the Master, "himself against a host," as Sir Walter Scott has it, plied vigorously the various weapons of his warfare. Cane and ferule, taws and cat and the homely but effective birch were brought into ruthless and in some cases almost constant requisition, with more or less success, according to the strength and hardness of the teacher's own nature, and the greater or less restlessness, timidity or perversity of the unhappy urchins. It was an era in the mental history of many a pedagogue when the idea first dawned upon him that he was engaged in a hopeless struggle against nature, that his method was an attempt to abrogate the law of youthful life, that even order itself is not the true end of school management but merely its necessary condition. This idea once gained, the way was easy to the discovery of the simple principle that the natural and only effective way to secure order in any educational institution is to see to it that every boy and girl shall at each moment have something to do, and a motive, the highest and most effective possible in the given case, for doing it. It is one result of working out and obeying this law that it is now possible to find in many places large schools, often under the management of women physically incapable of applying the old persuasives to the big boys and girls under their control, which present from opening to close scenes of industry and orderly movement such as were scarcely dreamed of as possible by teachers of the old school, certainly not as attainable without the liberal application of the old methods. If such modern institutions neither secure nor seek the hush and stillness of the old time, they have that which is vastly better for their purpose, the hum of genuine and well directed activity. There was a good deal of real philosophy in the answer given not long since by a successful master to a visitor who expressed surprise at the absence of the absolute stillness he had expected to find, "This is a workshop, not a cemetery."

The contrast in the new methods of work as compared with the old is perhaps even greater than that in the methods of government. The nature of this change may be characterized as a substitution of training for teach-

ing. Time was when in many of the old schools the main aim of the teacher, next to that of preserving order, was to impart the greatest possible amount of information. To this end the pupil's memory was the one faculty which was brought into constant requisition. Had the facts thus learned been of a fundamental and broadening character, the process might have had a good deal of compensating advantage. But such, unhappily, was not the case. Hundreds of readers will, we dare say, recall with a shudder the hours and days, and aggregated months and years spent in conning by rote the driest of dry facts—some of them even, as they may have since discovered, of doubtful validity as well as of infinitesimal value—in the *minutiae* of geographical particulars, rules of arithmetic and grammar, historical dates, etc. It would be too much to hope that an end has come, even yet, to all useless drudgery of that kind in the schools, but a great change for the better has undoubtedly taken place. The true work of the schoolmaster is now pretty well understood to be, not the storing of the minds of his pupils with masses of indigestible facts, piled away like so much useless lumber, but the training of them to the command and use of their own powers, so that they may become reliable instruments for the discovery of such facts and truths as may be needful for them in any and every sphere of future life. That this is the only real education is now generally understood and admitted, though there is yet room for great varieties of opinion as to the best means of reaching the end, and great diversity of skill and talent in the use of the means approved of or available. The teacher who can most wisely and skilfully lead the pupil to put forth his own best efforts; to discover facts and draw inferences by observation and comparison; to ascend from the particular to the general and from the phenomena to the laws which govern them; to solve problems, deduce rules and evolve methods for himself instead of slavishly and mechanically following those laid down for him by the text-book, or the teacher, he it is and he alone who deserves a place in the ranks of the true educators of the day.

Something like the above may be set down as the ideal of educational work set forth by the leading educational authorities of the day. It would be idle to write or reason on the supposition that anything like this ideal has been attained by the average public school teacher in Ontario or elsewhere. It is nevertheless proper, we suppose, to estimate the teaching profession as we are accustomed to estimate other learned professions, not by the attainments of its average members, but by the laws and principles laid down by its leading exponents, and generally accepted by the rank and file. A good deal has indeed been said as to whether the work of teaching, as represented in the public and high schools, can properly be said to have attained the status of a learned profession. Truth compels us to admit that the great mass of our public school teachers can scarcely be regarded as learned men and women. But neither, for that matter, can the mass of our lawyers or doctors or preachers, be so regarded. If we define a profession as a calling which is capable of being based upon broad philosophical principles, and which requires for its best discharge the highest order of faculties, and the most thorough professional training, it would not, we think, be hard to show that there is no other occupation which possesses these marks in a more eminent degree than that of teaching. The great practical difficulty in the elevation of the teacher and his work is the low scale of remuneration which unfortunately prevails. This may be regarded as the result of two chief causes, first the inability of the supporters of very many of our schools to pay adequate salaries and second the prevalence of the very erroneous impression that high educational qualifications are not required for the work of elementary instruction. Perhaps we should have reversed the order and given the latter fact as the cause of the former. For our own part we are firmly convinced, and we have no doubt that most of our readers who have given thought to the subject will agree with us, that it would be of immense advantage to the country were the Government in a position to insist that every teacher in the land, no matter how elementary his work, should have had a complete university course, or its equivalent, in non-professional culture, and a thorough professional course in addition, as a preparation for his work. Were our schools, big and little, rural and civic, in the hands of such teachers for ten years, the advantage to the intelligence and progress of the whole country would be immense. The day when any such standard will be possible is far off, but the question is probably only one of time. A happy day will it be for