

province, in their aim to make of the present system more than it is, should arm themselves with the facts of the case, in order to find out whether we have been endeavouring to accomplish an impossibility, namely to build up an efficient system of elementary instruction on an insufficient foundation. The writer has frequently pointed out, in anything but a spirit of cavil, some of the fundamental defects upon which our system rests, and these have been further emphasized, as we have seen, at the late Convention. These fundamental defects are insufficient grants, inadequate supervision, and untrained teachers; and until the people come to their senses, and, instead of raising complaints against secondary matters, rise in their might and demand an increased subsidy for our elementary schools, an increase in the number of inspectors, and the utilizing of our Normal School in such a way as to place within a given period, say four or five years, all our schools in the hands of trained teachers, having due regard of course to the vested rights of our present teachers, all attempt at administering the present system will be more or less futile.

—Dr. Mowry has lately been examining the problem, "Do our Schools Meet the Demands of Practical Life?" and we lay his remarks on "What is Education?" before those of our readers who may be inclined to divide the subjects in the Course of Study into practical and "unpractical." The school-house, as he says, is the place where an education is obtained; the school teacher is the person who aids the pupils in securing an education. The object of the school is not that they may acquire information. It is not that they may secure knowledge. It is not that they may learn to read, write, and cipher; it is not primarily to store the mind with facts or principles which may be useful in after life. One may go to a commercial school and learn the art of book-keeping, and yet, possibly, not acquire thereby the principles of an education. If, however, he studies the science of book-keeping, and from it derives the method, he may in this way add to his true education. . . . The object of the schools is then not, primarily, to aid a boy or a girl in getting a living, in earning a livelihood. Hence the schools are not to teach trades, and even the most ardent advocates of Industrial Education in the public schools are understood to have receded already from the position that the schools should teach the elements of trades because they will prove useful to those learning them. To-day, the leading advocates of Industrial Training in connection with our public school system base their advocacy of it upon the educational power of Manual Training.