

reports of the pupils themselves. Sometimes these report upon their own work or conduct, sometimes upon that of fellow-students, as in the comparison of slates and papers. This seems all right in itself, and should be attended with the best results. Theoretically there is nothing more healthful than to throw a pupil back upon his own sense of honour, to make him feel that he is trusted and thought incapable of a lie or any act of meanness. Yet just here is danger of great abuse and great evil. If the pupil's sense of honour is unhappily, not sufficient; if he falls into the habit of systematically cheating, for himself or others falsifying the record, the system becomes to him a source of infinite harm. In such cases boys and girls pervert that which should be a training in principles of justice and honour, into a training in fraud and falsehood. From facts and incidents which have from time to time come under our own observation, we fear this perversion is much more common than high-minded teachers suppose. They may forget to make due allowance for the defective moral training many children receive outside the school room. To say that there is nothing of higher importance than the development of a high sense of honour in the youth of the country is to express a great truth but feebly. There is scarcely anything else at all comparable to this in importance. No trouble, no anxious painstaking can be too great to secure it. Even high intelligence and great brain power should be held but as secondary. A word to the wise is sufficient. We commend this subject and these hints to the observation and anxious study of all concerned.

Special Articles.

AGRICULTURAL TRAINING.

In lecturing to Kent and Sussex farmers upon the purposes of the Science and Art Department in respect to instruction in agriculture, Mr. Buckmaster made the following remarks in the course of his speech: We are constantly hearing of the necessity of schools for teaching the scientific basis of our manufacturing industries, but what about agriculture—an industry which requires more varied scientific knowledge than any other industry, which is, in fact, the mother of every other industry, since the productions of nature are the material of art? Where are the technical schools and universities for teaching the scientific basis of farming? Every other industry requires some training or preparation, but there is a widespread public opinion that anybody can be a farmer—a liberal art that needs no pains or science, industry, or brain. A central department in Stuttgart superintends the agricultural education of Wurtemberg. The institutions for this purpose are an agricultural academy for young farmers, agricultural schools for peasants, schools for vine growers, schools for fowls, where domestic economy and the management of the dairy are taught; agricultural winter schools, voluntary agricultural progressive schools, adult evening schools, and meetings for reading papers and discussions, reading rooms, agricultural libraries, and special classes for various branches of agriculture. The farms on which these schools are placed receive moderate aid from the state. Wurtemberg is about the same area as Yorkshire, and here you have ninety-seven progressive schools of agriculture, and fifty-six agricultural reading rooms, with 2,400 members. . . . What science has done for

other industries it will also do for agriculture. Now, let us see what they are doing in France. In the country schools, instruction relating to farm work, the management of animals, the cultivation of a garden, the keeping of bees, the proper cultivation of fruit trees, enters largely into the ordinary teaching. . . . At the agricultural meeting in Paris last year the plan of a parish in Burgundy was made and exhibited by the parish schoolmaster, in which the nature of the surface soil and subsoil on the little plots round the cottages of the pupils were explained, and the pupils were taught the best methods of cultivating them. Why could not the same thing be done in our industrial agricultural schools?

TEACHERS WHO FAIL.

BY SUPT. E. U. AUMILLER, IN EDUCATIONAL NEWS.

It's very easy to criticise and to say harsh things about school teachers, but it's quite difficult to teach successfully.

If you should ever chance to find a community where all unite in praising their teacher, it will be worth your while to sit at that teacher's feet and learn the secret of his success.

The fact is, most teachers do not succeed. A great many shades of classification might be made between the really successful teacher and the one who utterly fails, but it were vain to attempt an enumeration.

However, there are several classes (large ones, too) who always did fail, and it is probable never will succeed. Prominent among them is the young inexperienced teacher—a boy sixteen to eighteen years old—who may have "book learning" enough to teach a certain school, but is sadly deficient in common sense, lacks the discretion as to *what* should be taught and developed, has little knowledge of the affairs of men or of human nature.

How can he succeed? Many a bright boy is thus sacrificed in order to please some one who has influence enough to obtain him a position.

The other extreme is the teacher who has had too much (?) experience, that is, the man who has taught so long that no one can suggest to him anything better than he already knows. This teacher is scrupulously observing the traditions of the olden time pedagogue. School boards are tired of him; so are the people. They give him a school out of respect, because, they say, "He was once a good teacher," and every year, it is thought, will be his last term, but he turns up each succeeding year, like the old Scotch lady for her "annuity."

Then, there is the *lazy, careless* teacher, who sees no reason for being so particular in everything. His ambition is to put in his time and draw his salary promptly. He can't succeed.

Also, there is a class of teachers whose "book" qualifications are too meagre. They are like continental money, marked for a certain amount per month, say forty dollars, while their intrinsic value is sixty-two and a half cents per diem, as master of a spade or shovel.

To classify a little closer we might speak of the whining, scolding teacher; the too-much-talk teacher; the weak, indcisive teacher; the rash, indiscreet teacher, and the teacher who takes a school near his home so that he may add a little salary to the income from his regular occupation or business.

Many teachers lose sight of their relation to patrons, besides being careless as to their conduct in public. One of Aesop's fables gives us the moral, "Familiarity breeds contempt." It may do so in certain cases, but when it does, one of two things is certain; either the teacher is not what he was looked upon as being, or the person with whom he associates is one whose familiarity the teacher should not court.