

sequel to it, "The Coming School," but I heard that it was serious and concluded that I hadn't time for it. We teachers have too much of the serious. What we want is something to make us laugh; and in vacation I always long to find a place where they have never heard of schools.

A bore of a "serious" teacher once said to me that the reason that men's businesses are better worked up than "the woman's profession" is because men put more energy and heart into their work. Well, perhaps they do. I know they *get* more for it. I might put all the energy and heart I have into *my* work, and there would be no more prospect of advancement for me than there is now, for in our city *not a woman is considered competent to conduct a full-graded school*. We are all of us, whether good, bad, or indifferent, subordinate to the men—and most of them are very much like my principal, who makes me cram in "historical dry-bones," in spite of myself and in spite of the superintendents. There are some "advanced" principals in the city, but there are ten times more "advanced" women, who can never hope to be principals. On the whole, I don't see why men *shouldn't* put more energy and heart into their business than women!

But that has nothing to do with the question. *Is my work mechanical?* I have no criterion to go by but the work of my own teachers, and I think I have improved on that a little. I never did a day's school-visiting in my life. *Shouldn't* have read any of Dr. Rice's papers, but that they appeared in a lay magazine and created such a sensation. I am certainly badly handicapped for answering his criticisms, and few of the teachers in our school are any better qualified. They can only say, "It's false," and "It's monstrous," etc., which I don't want to say until I can make my asseverations good. His examples of ignorance on the part of teachers are not overdrawn, I know. There are several in our school with barely scholarship enough to get a lowest grade certificate, who intend to content themselves with that as long as they teach, rather than do any extra studying; and I have heard many a double negative and a "done" for *did* and a "lay" for *lie* among them. By the way, these girls are all high school graduates! How is it that they learned grammar and do not know it? Perhaps they studied it as my pupils study history? I begin to see what the outcry against "mechanical teaching" may mean. But surely *I* am all right? I try to have my pupils understand everything that there is time to explain.

But mechanicalness is not all. Dr. Rice represents that in