

teacher who has learned pedagogy to the teacher who has learned the subject he is going to teach."

It is of course quite easy for theorists to harp on the old string and to repeat the lesson which all of us have learned by this time, viz., that while "Knowledge is power," mere knowledge is not the whole of education. No doubt books are not everything; but we must get beyond that. Criticism in order to be valuable must be concrete and definite. In this connection the recent utterances of the President of Toronto University ought to receive very careful consideration. If we may judge from newspaper reports, President Loudon is by no means satisfied with the Ontario school system, and he formulates a distinct charge against the administration when he calls attention to the want of continuity between the elementary and the high schools of the province, and specifies the neglect of language teaching as something that must at once be remedied. By an interesting and instructive coincidence a paper appears in the current number of *The Canadian Educational Monthly*, written by the Deputy Minister of Education, Ontario, entitled: "The Conflict between Education and Knowledge." So far as the writer emphasizes the importance of the training of character and of due preparation for the actual needs of life, he is on safe, if somewhat familiar ground,—though one is inclined to wonder where home influences are allowed to come in, in a province where the university is blamed for debarring from matriculation a boy who fails in algebra, and yet accepting a candidate who makes the necessary 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ p. c., even though the latter may not possess "sufficient will power to abstain from the use of cigars." * But the Deputy Minister is surely far at sea when he tries to make out that there is a divergence between the subjects which modern universities require for entrance, and the subjects which ought to form the staple of a good general education. If it is a *regrettable* fact that "hun-

* "No student should be permitted to attend a University, if he has not shown during his three or four years' attendance at a high school the acquisition of certain powers of self-control. Why should not industry, neatness, courtesy be regarded as at least as important for matriculation as a knowledge of chemistry or the binomial theorem? The fact that character in a student does not count as sufficient evidence 'at' wrong ideals control educational systems."—In regard of all which it may be asked: "Has home training been abolished in Ontario"?