

ly bodies; the difference between planets and stars, the causes of eclipses and tides, the composition and ordinary properties of air and water, and the characteristics of soils; explanation of the simpler forces of nature, such as the lever, pulley, wheel, screw and wedge; also the ordinary rules which regulate health and knowledge of commoner objects."

While thus stating what he wanted introduced into English elementary schools, this English member of Parliament made a very lucid statement of what is taught in our own.

But it is not alone, nor even mainly, by putting the subject upon the public school programme that the aim of our public school system can be carried out, but by making it a prominent subject in the qualifications of teachers. Hence, it is to be regretted that our educational authorities have seen fit to make Natural Philosophy and Chemistry optional subjects in the non-professional examinations of second-class teachers. Doubtless this has been done as a matter of expediency to accommodate the work of training these teachers to the High-School programme, but this only shows that the entrusting of this work to High-Schools is not an unmixed benefit. However useful the alternative subjects, Latin, French, or German, may be to the students themselves, there is no doubt as to whether these or the natural science groups will be most useful in the school-room. It is true that the latter occupies a good deal of the students' time during their three months' professional training, but the work in the Normal School would be much more thorough if it were a completion of work begun in the Public School, and continued in the High-School. Let us hope that such considerations of expediency will be the exception, and not the rule, in managing our educational affairs: had the founders of

our school system been guided by them it would not be the glory it is to-day. The training of the young is far too important a matter to be controlled by the exigencies of the hour.

We have thus pointed out, in some detail, the aims of our school system in providing mental training for the rising generation, and it must be conceded that, so far as they go, they include all that is necessary for a liberal English education.

Mental training, however, is not all that our children need to become good men and women. It has been well said that the ability to read, write, and cypher, is no guarantee that the person who possesses these accomplishments will not steal. When the state pays a large sum for education it has a right to expect that it will have to pay a proportionately small sum for the prevention and punishment of crime. If this is not the case, then, in supporting education, it is paying too dear for its whistle. The gigantic robberies that have marked the last quarter of a century prove that no criminals are more dangerous than the educated ones; and it seems as if the community by training such as these were nourishing the serpent that will one day sting it. Is there no method by which the sting may be withdrawn before it becomes dangerous? The chief hope of doing this lies in the moral training the child is subject to at home and at school. Our concern is with the latter. A school is a state in miniature; children have there to exercise the self-restraint, in both the playground and the school-room, they must show as men and women, they are there taught the rights of property not only private but public, they have to learn to show a proper regard for the opinions and feelings of others. Truthfulness and honesty in word and deed are expected to be inculcated