

position on the child of studies for which he is neither physically or mentally equipped cannot but be followed by disastrous consequences. Not only is there energy wasted and time lost, but it is also certain that the development of self-control is not encouraged by putting the immature brain cells to such unnatural strain as will almost inevitably exhaust them. On the contrary, it is reasonable to suppose that injudicious forcing may have the effect of causing irretrievable injury in this respect.

Of even greater importance than the curriculum is the teacher. A rational system of education would require as high a standard for teachers of elementary classes as for those of the advanced classes. There is infinitely greater opportunity to influence for good or evil, the pupils in the primary department than those in the advanced grades. Much greater damage may possibly result to the very young child, from the imposition of unsuitable tasks, than to one whose brain cells are more fully developed, and consequently more stable and less easily overtaxed. And at that period of life when imitativeness is the characteristic of the child, when, in fact, education practically depends upon his imitativeness, it is of the utmost importance, from all points of view, that the teacher should combine every good quality. It is very necessary, also, that the teacher should have a very good idea of the psychology of childhood and should have intimate knowledge of the physiology of this period, as without this knowledge it is impossible for the character of the teaching to be suited to the capacity of the pupil.

And yet how very few of our primary school teachers have any such qualifications. As further argument that teaching in the primary years should be of the highest order, it is perhaps scarcely necessary to refer to the fact that much the larger number of pupils derive all their teaching from the lower grades, and that comparatively few come under the influence of the teacher of the higher grades.

Another fact which is commonly overlooked is that the restraining or inhibitory function is the last to develop, which, as Oppenheim points out, is "chronologically correct, for a restraining force has no reason for its existence until the energy which it is meant to restrain is really present." And yet this is a matter of no small importance, inasmuch as, however well intended, illtimed attempts to restrain children cannot meet with the desired response. Rather do they tend to make the child unhappy and irritable, and at the last are very likely to defeat the very end for which they were intended.

It is too much to expect (save in individual cases) to be able to get right to the child's home life and direct environment and the influences to which he is subjected there. Could we do so, a tremendous good might