

“them separately. The monitors are selected from the best pupils; they receive the lesson from the master, and transmit it to their fellow pupils. Thus the sections of different stages of advancement go on together.

“*Advantages of the mutual mode of teaching over the simultaneous one.*— Each monitor having under him ten pupils, the teacher can without difficulty direct an ordinary school of 100 pupils, for he has, so to speak, but 10. There is no hiatus, no interruption in the labours of each class. *Inconvenience.* The monitors being pupils themselves, their teaching cannot equal that of the master in geography, arithmetic, the art of speaking with facility, &c.”

The simultaneous and mutual modes united, afford notable advantages over the preceding ones. The pupils are classed according to their exact capacity; they continue under the surveillance of the monitors. After the lesson, each monitor repeats this lesson to his respective section. The master himself examines and also questions each pupil and sees, with his own eyes. He devotes to this useful duty the half of the time of the duration of the classes.

Experience has shewn that this mode is the best. It is that followed by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, and which partly gives to their teaching an incontestable superiority. Under the present law, the choice of the mode of teaching is left to the School Commissioners, the greater part of whom, not knowing even the names of the different modes of teaching, leave all to the teachers, who in general are seldom more learned on this matter. There are some School Commissioners and parents who pretend to dictate to the master the mode of teaching that he ought to follow, and very naturally this mode is the individual one. It is within my knowledge that parents have withdrawn their children from schools directed by masters who followed the simultaneous and mutual modes, because, said they, they did not pay to have their children instructed by other children. To such foolish pretensions on the part of the school commissioners or the parents, there is no answer, as the only possible one would be a dissertation on the divers modes of teaching; a dissertation which the ignorance of such persons would render useless.

It is then necessary and even indispensable to the purposes of education, not to leave the mode of teaching to the arbitrary will of the School Commissioners. The choice being once made by the Legislature, every one would be compelled to submit to it.

Our law does not even define the different branches of study to be taught in the Elementary Schools or in the Model Schools. It leaves this important point to the School Commissioners. Very well; but if perchance nearly all the School Commissioners hardly know how to read and write; if even, as is the case in several places, not one of the five Commissioners knows how to read or sign his name, who will regulate the course of study? The law does not say. Indeed, it must be admitted, here is a power confided to parties very capable of making a judicious use of it, one which will prove advantageous to education! It is true that the law requires, since the 1st July, 1852, that the teachers shall know everything that can render them capable of teaching with success the branches of Elementary Education. But if the Commissioners wish to exempt from learning grammar or geography, the children whose education is confided to them; if they pretend nevertheless that they can do without all those things, *because their fathers and grandfathers who were ignorant of them, lived*, what can the master do? He must humbly bow his head before the intelligence of the scholastic sanhedrim, and obey, under pain of being turned out. Can we be astonished that, under such a state of things, public education makes no progress! We ought rather to wonder at seeing it make any at all.

4th CAUSE. *Variety of books in use in the schools.* The law has not regulated in an effective manner the choice of books to be used in the schools; hence