

I say daughters, because we must be just as "keen" on the fitting education of country girls as on that of country boys, and this is purely a question of education.

The argument of the generous-hearted countess is heard often enough in Canada these days, but only as coming from those who have never considered carefully what the true function of the Common School or Grammar School really is. The man or woman who wants agriculture and carpentering and shorthand and type-writing and cooking and bed-making taught in our schools has never distinguished between the school-training that becomes an abuse of the child's faculties and the training which leads to their fuller development. Pedagogy and the training for artizanship are two different things, and to mix them up directly would be to curtail the force in both that makes for race improvement. How did the Countess of Warwick ever find out that a certain class of boys were born to be ploughmen until the proper tests had been applied to them in legitimate school-work to prove that they were the "brainiest" of the boys of the parish? Would she really turn the Common School into a new providence that shall say what calling in life this boy shall take up and what duties the other will assume? Let her go to any of our "specialist" schools and see what the result has been, even when the effort has been made to emphasize the religious love of school-life by a rigidly frequent catechism training.

The following paragraph, taken from one of the leading educational periodicals of England, will show our readers how direct are the references in our contemporaries' columns to those whose desire it is to lead public opinion in the direction of their own misguided opinion. Were the editor of *The Journal of Education* writing for

a Canadian constituency, and were he to use such direct forms of speech towards any of our dignitaries, educational or otherwise, he would possibly have to run the gauntlet of misrepresentation, which Major Hewton, of Richmond, has lately been subjected to according to his own showing. The way of the reformer is hard, and the plain-speaking publicist has a thousand and one frictional points to encounter, which his relevancy of judgment does not calculate on meeting. But our London friend has always a fearless way of facing the music when a sound educational doctrine is being played upon; and yet his paper continues to be the most respectable of our exchanges. This is a specimen of how he puts things: "The Bishop of London is one of the most learned, and, without a doubt, the most versatile, Bishops on the Bench; and, if he does not adorn, he at least enlivens, everything he touches. Last month he addressed an assemblage of teachers at Sion College, and appeared in the new *role* of a teacher. The main doctrines he enforced were familiar to all teachers, however little they may be practised—the necessity of exciting the curiosity and cultivating the curiosity of a child—in brief, the fundamentals that every master of method insists upon from the very first. These doctrines had not been gained from any study of pedagogics, but by experience and plain mother-wit. He began, so he told his audience, as a teacher, absolutely ignorant of teaching, and all he had ever learned had been at the expense of those committed to his charge. The natural inference from these premises is surely: 'What a pity for my pupils, if not for myself, that I did not start at at the point where I have ended! Not so, Dr. Creighton. He concludes therefore, that 'Teaching is really an incommunicable art. It is a gift, like all other gifts.' We are not going to