

into the factory and counting-room. When, as a boy, his thoughts ought to be on romance and history and literature, it chains him to the tread-mill of some belittling routine. It so magnifies a paltry \$2 or \$3 a week that a boy who might one day earn \$1,000 or \$10,000 a year and direct great interests shall never rise above the merest drudgery. It deprives him of his normal development, of the capacity to see and enjoy that which is highest, truest and best in life.

Moreover, the community suffers. The evils arising from illiteracy, which are greater than we often realize, are insignificant in comparison with those which spring from incompetence and misdirection in high places. Trained and upright leadership is our greatest need—men of character and culture in every community and every walk of life. We often hear it said that boys are educated away from the industries which need them, and jokes are worn threadbare concerning the poor parson or lawyer who might have been a good shoemaker or trench digger. But the

assumption is ridiculously contrary to the fact. The crowding is all around the foot of the ladder. It is the ignorant workman, not the trained student, who is a drug in the market.

If a teacher by his lack of sympathy and personal helpfulness has led his pupils to dislike school and perchance to leave prematurely; if he has made his teaching so dry as to inspire no enthusiasm for literature and science and research, he has inflicted a wrong and failed in his work. He may have been a martinet of discipline and drill his pupils may show high averages and pass good examinations, but if his instruction has produced in them no love for study, no scholarly tastes, no aspirations for culture and refinement, it has been ineffective at a cardinal point. A true education will yield these elements of power, will gather into a steady flowing stream, the fitful impulses of youth, will harmonize the discordant elements of untrained nature and bring symmetry and strength into the ripened character.—*Education.*

THE STANDING OF SCHOOLMASTERS.

THE clever, if somewhat vulgar, Frenchman who calls himself Max O'Rell, has been complaining that when his English reviewers want to say something disagreeable about him or in deprecation of his work, they say he is a schoolmaster. Nettled by this, he tells us, through the *Daily Chronicle*, that Englishmen always speak with contempt of schoolmasters, and goes on to ask the reason. Various correspondents have tried to explain the fact, but none of their solutions seem very satisfactory. Equally unsatisfactory is the plan of meeting the charge by a direct denial

and by the declaration that Englishmen do not despise schoolmasters, and that schoolmasters here are as well thought of as in the rest of the world. It is no doubt true that a great many schoolmasters have been made Bishops, and that Bishops are Peers and the holders of offices better paid than those occupied by Ministers, Ambassadors, Generals, and Admirals; but this does not really disprove Max O'Rell's contention. In the first place, the schoolmasters who are made Bishops belong to a very narrow caste—that of the public-school masters—and are rather dis-