

ago, in illustration of an article by Mrs. Lynn Linton, in one of the weekly papers, which showed very happily the difference between the two girls. The picture was divided into two sections. In the one an old-fashioned girl, very gentle, sweet, and helpless in appearance, stood beside her mother, by whom she was being sheltered from contact with the outside world. She knew nothing, she was fearful of everything, her intelligence was undeveloped, her character unformed—and in that state she was expected to remain up till the time of her marriage, when she was required to blossom forth into a fully-formed woman, and take upon herself successfully the difficult and complicated duties of mistress of a household and mother of children, as if the necessary knowledge came by instinct. Such was the reason and logic of her day. No wonder in the result she became a subject for ridicule to those who had not heart enough to perceive that she was a subject for sorrow. In the other section of the picture a girl comes riding down the road alone on her bicycle, a slight strong figure, alive, alert, her superabundant vitality, her joy in life and action visible in her whole pose. One knew that she would steer her way through life, as she was steering her way through the traffic of the crowded street, with grace and skill, and arrive at last at her destination, her place of rest, the brighter and the better for all that she had encountered, accomplished and survived.

Which is the better part? The elderly woman of a passive generation who is out of sympathy with the active service of this, and sees only the dangers which undoubtedly surround our advance, holds up the ideal of the sheltered girl. She would have girls to continue delicate, supersensitive—leave them with every nerve exposed to suffer the jars and shocks of a world they cannot avoid, a world which was not arranged for their benefit, but only so as to make them suffer. Happily, it is for the girl herself to choose which she would

rather be, the gentle namby-pamby, of little consequence, never at ease, incapable of independent action, unfitted for liberty, a dependent and a parasite from the cradle to the grave, or that nobler girl who is not the less tender because she is self-reliant, nor the less womanly because she has the power to resent insult and imposition. A woman cannot be developed into a man, and, therefore, when a woman is strengthened she is strengthened in womanliness, which surely is a desirable consummation. But just as there were fine characters developed by the old inadequate system of education, so may there be much that is regrettable brought out as a result of the new and better method. What should be guarded against is letting go; let nothing go that is good.

A truism of culture insists that it is good to be gracious, gentle, loving, kind and true; these are qualities of noble womanhood which should be jealously guarded by women. But one of the great difficulties of education is that the same training results in quite opposite effects on different characters. What produces the happiest results on one temperament may be disastrous to another; ideas which make one girl a capable gentlewoman will make another a vulgar hoyden, and there is no help for it in the system. The same, broadly speaking, must be applied to all. There may be modifications to suit special cases, but the modifications must be managed by individuals at their own discretion. The different effects are probably due to personal equation, natural bent, something in the blood, but they are also due to the girl's own ideal of life, and to the influence of associates who are either helping her instructors or at war with them. It is a thankless task to find fault with others; but with ourselves or our work, when we find fault, the tonic property of the discipline helps us to bear it. Still, it goes against the grain to have to admit that our countrywomen are inferior in anything to the women of other nations; but it is well to be watchful, especially at the present