

ultimate solution of the system of elementary national education, will agree that the teachers who have to give that education will take an increasingly important place in the body politic. They will have functions to perform, the importance of which it will be impossible to overrate, because, as somebody was saying the other day, the children are what teachers make them. It is therefore in the highest degree expedient that the teachers in the elementary schools should have a chance of something much better than the too narrow, the too technical, too mechanical education which is all that, in a great many cases at all events, is now within their reach. I think the courses of lectures which the university provides are exactly what the teachers of elementary schools are likely to profit by—I do not know how far they have any excess of leisure to follow these courses—and I am perfectly sure that it is placing within the reach of this class, whom we all regard with esteem and gratitude, the means of making themselves more useful to their pupils and far more self-respecting in their own intellectual lives.”—*The Schoolmaster*.

**CRITICISM.**—Teachers should stand by their fraternity. Physicians are loyal to their craft against all attacks; lawyers never admit any weaknesses in their guild so long as the professional methods are followed; clergymen are jealous of the prerogatives of the cloth. Is it so with teachers? We fear there is a false philosophy that would prompt the more active and progressive to criticise the weaker by ridiculing the members who are not up to their standard. We speak from extended observation when we say that we believe the quantity, quality and spirit of the work done by the teachers of America average as well as that of either of the professions. There is no larger percentage

of quacks in the school room than in the sick room; no greater average of non-brilliant, unsuccessful men in pedagogy than in law; no more teachers, as a rule, who decline to accept advance thought and new light among teachers than clergymen. Brilliant men and women are a scarce article in every profession, society and age. Our best institution is in danger of being a misfortune. In supervision is our great hope of advancement, but without due care this is liable to advertise the profession falsely. Supervision would be a good thing in law, medicine, or the ministry; but think of the effect of publishing, by report, institute, convention, or address, what an expert supervisor of doctors discovered in his investigation of patients, remedies and care. What a panic there would be if the same freedom of official criticism was indulged in in that profession that we are tempted to indulge in teaching. Let us have the most rigid examinations, the most faithful supervision; but let us speak personally, kindly, helpfully to the weak and heedless. Have you ever had a consultation of physicians in your family? Do you remember how they all came out from their conference and assured you that everything was going on all right, that the case had been understood and the treatment satisfactory? Did you not observe, however, that the attending physician immediately changed his remedies, radically varied the hygienic treatment? He had learned some things from his brother physician that you will never know, and it is better that you never should know. The peace of the world would be disturbed if every one knew the plain talk that is indulged in prior to that eminently comforting assurance that there is great satisfaction with the conduct of the case. Why cannot our pedagogical consultations be marked by somewhat of the same