

along with the principle of brotherhood in their hand to liberate the long imprisoned. The dogma is smashed into smithereens, but the truth remains, and no man, no individual is injured. The reform has been accomplished as an impersonal good turn done to society in general, and men and women come to recognize, perhaps with some inconvenience for a time, the beneficence of its trend. They judge of the reform as an impersonal force; and the true leader and the honest man are quite satisfied with the reward that knows no outer loud-mouthed hurrah. With the true reformer, prosperity and victory are to be found in the peace and comfort and joy that comes, when the war of a sound logic, as conducted by him, has had its own way.

But how different from this is the false leader with his attendant hero-worshipper. Between the true reformer and the self-seeking polemic there is the gulf between the brotherhood of men as an active principle for good, and the stereotyped sentiment that seeketh but its own. "How will this movement affect me and my affairs?" the latter is ever saying to himself. "Evil be thou my good, and so much more the worse, for the good that is not evil," his henchmen join in chorus, and so they combine to oppose, and happily for all of us combine also to explode. Their condemnation becomes a self-condemnation, as they continue to decry what they cannot overturn, until their moral sense becomes a mere rag, tattered and torn with the violence of their passion to do a hurt to their opponents. In a word the dogma-producing personality as a guidance to men in the way of reform, is as much an enervating force as is the sentiment that warps and makes a distortion of the soul, and as truly is it so as is the true reformer in a convention such as ours a power for

that improvement which benevolence is forever weaving out of the bowels of its own compassion for humanity.

In view of these general remarks, which some may wisely or unwisely take as a self-justification for my persevering attitude in favor of educational reform, I may as well now run away from the general to the particular in explanation of what I think would be of benefit to us as an association of teachers, as well as what would be a benefit to our province and possibly lead to the further unification of our Canadian confederacy. If, as has been said in Montreal here, the teacher who becomes an educational reformer has taken to walking on dangerous ground, let us join as teachers of the city and country, precarious as our ground may seem to some, and by sympathy and co-operation, and an advocacy of the right, assume the consequences of such a brotherhood until there are no consequences of a serious personal kind to assume.

And first in regard to our own immediate affairs, the organization of our association, it has been suggested by one of our most zealous members that our machinery has become somewhat cumbersome and complicated. The association itself has a voice that is heard only once a year, and for the most part from only one part of the province, and when it adjourns the Executive Committee rules in its stead. I can see no true cause for alarm in this, though perhaps it would be more beneficial to all sections of the province were the convention to be held in other places than Montreal more frequently than it has been of late years. In regard to the large representation on the Executive Committee, it has been urged that the expense of bringing so many members together is a strong argument against its continuance, as it is at present constituted. With our com-