

nature which he may be using in his work and to the material on which he works; if the teacher is to be an educative force, to me it is obvious that he can fulfil his mission only when he understands the nature of the frail tenement in which we dwell and the laws which govern its well-being, so that he may duly appreciate the child's physical nature and thus avoid the mistake frequently made of subjecting him to such physical conditions as would utterly preclude the possibility of mental effort; and further, he must make a careful study of the more precious part of man, that with which he is chiefly concerned in school,—the mind. Had the teachers of bygone times known anything of the nature of mind and the laws of its growth, there would have been fewer mistakes in the teaching world than there were. They would have known that we cannot teach *what* we like, but only what is within the child's apprehension, nor can we teach *how* we like, but only as *nature* will allow us. They would not have taught so much by rote and rule as they did, nor would they have trusted to a mere memorizing of words, and have called this giving and receiving an education. They would have known that to attempt to beat knowledge into the minds of their pupils, is subversive of the first principles of learning, dissipating and distracting their attention from the subject in hand, and violating nature's law, that the greater the number of subjects on which attention is attempted to be fixed, the less intense will it be on any one.

Now I regard it as self-evident that no one can minister to child need, can properly sway and influence him, can manage him so as to restrain and discipline but not repress his human nature, can provide the necessary exercises to stimulate all the mental activities of the child, can suit his subjects and adapt his mode of teaching to all ages and all stages of mental growth who has not an adequate comprehension of the activities of a child's mind. Hence at the very threshold of teaching as a profession—a science if you will—there must be instruction in the fundamental principles of pedagogic science, and such a knowledge of human nature should be exacted from all intending teachers as would show clearly that each has at least mastered the elements of psychology and physiology. It is clearly the duty of a Normal School to do this work skilfully and in doing it to illustrate as far as possible the principles therein laid down.

2. A knowledge of the science of education should be followed by its application to the methods of teaching the subjects of the Public School curriculum.

Here the Normal School master should show the rational application and bearing of the principles he has already discussed. He should show how best they can be applied and their ultimate bearing in the training and upbuilding of the child. It is here that the fundamental difference between the teachers of the old school and of the new shows itself. With the old "knowledge is power" and