

Training—the extremists who can see no good in any ideals of education other than their own, have done much to injure their cause by assuming that their system of workshop training has the principal right to be called *Manual Training*, and, in fact, that no other department of manual activity—such as agriculture—has any right to the name; although, strange to say, they have spent much time in the endeavor to prove that the Manual Training school—*i.e.*, the new *Manual Training* school, should receive the credit of all the advantages derived from the study of drawing; this, too, in spite of the fact that, as everyone knows, drawing was on the school programme long before the workshop was thought of as an educational adjunct.

It is right, too, for the *opponents* of Manual Training—in its newer and more specialized sense—to remember that, in reality, the introduction of the work of the shop, or the elements of needlework or cooking, does not imply any change in educational principles. The teaching of drawing, of penmanship and of the bayonet exercise, can be regarded in no different way from that of the hammer, the saw or the turning-lathe. Were this fact kept in mind, there would be far less outcry against Manual Training than has occurred. Whether the principle of hand-training be right or wrong, we are already committed to it, and the question, this afternoon, is not whether Manual Training shall be taught, but rather to what extent it shall be taught, and whether we shall go so far as to teach that department of it which, by degrees, is attracting to itself the name Manual Training, *i.e.*, work in the shop.

I purpose, very briefly, to outline the advantage of shopwork as a subject of school study, and to indicate the extent to which it can safely be adopted. In limiting myself to shop-work I would beg leave to say that it would be a great pleasure for me to see introduced into our schools some other department of work in the interest of our girls and young women. A thorough course in needlework—in the widest acceptance of the term, and of cooking, and general housekeeping, culminating in interior decoration and house-furnishing, would, I am sure, be of the utmost gain to our girls, and would render it less necessary for parents wishing to give their girls a really good education, to take them away from our High Schools, where unfortunately, in spite of the strong determination of the teachers, everything is sacrificed to the interests of those who intend to enter the teaching profession. Were some such course instituted, far fewer of our girls would be attending schools outside the national system.

But the thought of this paper is concerned with the workshop. And, in stating what I consider valid reasons for the introduction of shop-work, I would by way of preliminary say that my own heart was won over to the department by its wonderful uplifting influence on neglected boys in that grandest of educational institutions in this Province, the Industrial School at Mimico. For four years it was my privilege to see very much of the wonderful transformation accomplished in the Victoria Industrial School. So surprising were the results that

I was led to conclude that the boys in that school are really more fortunate in some regards than their brothers in the ordinary city school. I perceived more and more clearly the educative influence of the carpentry, tailoring, farming and baking, till at last I became firmly persuaded that our boys and girls would everywhere learn more and learn better were they daily to give a part of their time to such work. It was with this persuasion that I consented to accept my present position in Woodstock College, which had committed itself to the establishment of a Manual Training Course. During the past year I have been a very careful observer of the effect of the work on our students at the college. It has been my good fortune to work among the boys, to see them taught, and to note in a quiet but very careful way their progress. I am bound to say that my estimate of the value of the course has continuously grown. There have, I think, been minor mistakes, but they are inevitable in what is new and will not occur next year. All in all, most excellent results have been obtained.

But some may argue at the very outset that, whether the results are good or not, it is not the business of the State to teach a trade. We hear too much nowadays in ridicule of "bread and butter" theories of education; for after all we cannot well get along without at least a little of the despised article. Say what we may, the first duty of a school is to put the child in the way of living, of living leisurely and enjoyably if possible, but at any rate of living. On what other ground is the boy taught spelling and figuring, the lad penmanship, the young man law or medicine, if it be not to put him in the way of living? For while it stands true that the best way to teach how to live may be not to deal in the school with the identical things that will surround the student in his later life, but to choose a course that may by discipline strengthen the mind, still, if such a course does not eventually render him capable of living, enjoying life and profiting from life, it has failed in its object.

For my own part I can never give the first place in an educational system to anything save the humanities. The study of literature, ancient and modern, the coming into contact with beautiful and ennobling thought, and the endeavor to cultivate the faculty of noble thinking and right living, must always, it seems to me, be the first and chief part of any system that rises above the beggarly elements. The training of the hand must ever fall below that of the mind which directs the hand, and the training of the intellectual faculties must in turn yield the first place to that of the emotions. Yet we must remember that certain studies must be taught because of the value of the skill acquired or information gained in their pursuit. In every system of education the work must be suited to the needs of the children. What a change would take place in our Public School programmes were it to become the general thing for our boys and girls to take a High School Course!

And as to teaching a trade, even if Manual Training really means the teaching of a trade, it is too late for the educationists of Ontario to object. It is now impossible to

turn back from the educational plow (at Guelph or anywhere else). We have already decided that it is right and wise to teach trades, or professions if you will, for there is no difference. Witness the new Department of Law in the University of Toronto, in which lectures are delivered at public expense on a purely technical subject. Should it be objected that these lectures have a general educative value, the same cannot be said of the Microscopy, or Midwifery of the Medical Department of the same University. Are young men not taught a trade when they are daily instructed how to cauterize a wound, to cultivate bacteria or cut a leg off short? Nor can it be argued that it is to the interest of the State to have good lawyers and good doctors. For if doctors, then horse-doctors, and much more dentists; if artists, then architects, then builders and carpenters; if mineralogists, then smelters and blacksmiths. The truth is that the State can do anything it wants to do, and if it desires to train a carpenter as well as an engineer; a barber, or butcher, or dentist, as well as a surgeon, who can find fault? And, apart from the rightness or wrongness of the principle, we are in Ontario firmly committed to trade teaching.

And why should the fact that a study proves directly useful in after life not be an argument in its favor rather than against it? And a training in shop-work does indeed put one into a position of power by its very practicalness. Who has not at times wondered in his heart whether he has not been imposed upon in the purchase of a book-case, or in the charges for a tile drain? Were our public men more experienced in the ordinary everyday things of life we should have better pavements, better sanitary arrangements, and better everything; while rogues and scoundrels would have less facility in overcharging for inferior work. The boy that takes a thorough course in shopwork is able when he leaves school to give an intelligent order to a mechanic, builder or architect, explain it by a drawing if necessary, and to feel himself at the same time able to defend himself against poor workmanship and poor material. It is not, after all, very strange that amongst the Jews every boy learned a trade, the thought being that it was a good thing to fall back on, and serve as a protection against unscrupulous men.

But manual training does not make a tradesman. While it is certainly true that a boy who takes a four-years' course in carpentry, wood-carving and turning, forging, machine-work and general construction will rapidly learn a trade, still this can be no more an objection than might be urged against the teaching of arithmetic on the ground that it is useful to the clerk in the dry goods store. However, the strong claim of Manual Training to recognition as a school subject, to a place on the school programme is based on its educative and disciplinary value.

For in the first place it trains the hand and eye and other physical faculties. Since we are physical creatures this is a very desirable thing. "A sound mind in a sound body" does not imply merely brawny muscles and well developed chest—the world is running wild to-day over athletics