

higher education, as it developed in Rome, is not my subject. Suffice it to point out that the training by which the Romans who made Rome were formed, and that which produced the inhabitants of the imperial city, were not two parts of the same thing in different stages of development, but were two essentially and totally different things; that they answer to two principles, of which the one makes the individual pupil subservient to the general ends of education, the other places before itself as the end of education the development of the individual pupil. The former is of this earth, and aims at making the best of known conditions; the latter cannot tell whence it comes—no, nor whither it is going. —S E. HALL.

INTELLECTUAL WASTE.

JOHN DAVIDSON, M.A., HIGH SCHOOL, STRANRAER, SCOTLAND.

THAT the increasing complexity of our educational system is contributing to smoother working is at least doubtful. That the product which the educational mill is intended to turn out is being actually realized is also doubtful. And yet, what with palatial buildings, large and well-trained staffs, school boards, county superintendents, inspectors, educational codes, *et hoc genus omne*, the superficial observer may be pardoned for thinking that a finished product—a truly educated boy or girl—ought to be forthcoming. Amongst thinking people, however, outside the charmed circle of pedagogy, there is a feeling of dissatisfaction—a more or less intelligible consciousness that all is not right with the education of our public school children.

The *Times* voices this dissatisfaction, and reflects the opinion of not an unimportant section of people, when it declares that "the average

schoolboy has to forget most of what he has learned, or to relearn it in new forms and relations." This is a serious charge. We have heard it before. It is the opinion of the man in the street expressed epigrammatically. And the indictment is serious just because it is that of the man in the street. Who better than he knows what it is to live, and what is education but a training for living? But the testimony of the man in the street does not stand alone. Examine the reports of superintendents and you will find more than one wail over the profitless energy and the wasted time of our public school children. One inspector virtually says that in many cases the results of a study of history and geography are almost *nil*; another, that a former year's work in these subjects, and especially in history, disappears, whilst no training seems to have been got through the temporary acquisition. Similar though less severe complaints are made in regard to other branches of instruction. Although it would be illogical from one or two particular subjects to make any generalization in regard to each and every subject taught in school, yet such a criticism, coming from those who, on the whole, are well fitted to sympathetically appraise the value of the work in school, cannot fail to make even the most optimistic teacher pause, and ask whether, after all, the man in the street is not partly right.

In wholesale condemnation there is always an element of exaggeration. Without, therefore, going the whole way with our critic, the *Times*, every honest teacher will admit that intellectual waste is going on apace in our schools. Not that there is no progress of a kind, but that such progress is made at a considerable sacrifice. To tell truth, who knows better than the teacher of the existence of the useless grind and its resultant waste?