

petually reiterated newspaper paragraphs, in which the ratios of instructed to uninstructed convicts are so triumphantly stated, prove just nothing. Before any inference can be drawn, it must be shown that these instructed and uninstructed convicts come from two *equal* sections of society, alike 'in all other respects' but that of knowledge—similar in rank and occupation, having similar advantages, laboring under similar temptations. But this is not only not the truth; it is nothing like the truth. The many ignorant criminals belong to a most unfavorably circumstanced class; whilst the few educated ones are from a class comparatively favored. As things stand it would be equally logical to infer that crime arises from going without animal food, or from living in badly-ventilated rooms, or from wearing dirty shirts; for, were the inmates of a jail to be catechised, it would doubtless be found that the majority of them had been placed in those conditions. Ignorance and crime are not cause and effect; they are coincident results of the same cause. To be wholly untaught is to have moved amongst those whose incentives to wrong-doing are strongest; to be partially taught is to have been one of a class subject to less urgent temptations; to be well taught is to have lived almost beyond the reach of the usual motives for transgression. Ignorance, therefore (at least in the statistics referred to), simply indicates the presence of crime-producing influences, and can no more be called the cause of crime than the falling of the barometer can be called the cause of rain."

But while admitting that ignorance is only a factor in the great aggregate of crime producing causes, we cannot agree with Mr. Spencer when he asks:

"What imaginable connection is there between the learning that certain clusters of marks on paper stand for certain words, and the getting a higher sense of duty? What possible effect can acquirement of facility

in making written signs of sounds, have in strengthening the desire to do right? How does the knowledge of the multiplication table, or quickness in adding or dividing, so increase the sympathies as to restrain the tendency to trespass against fellow-creatures? In what way can the attainment of accuracy in spelling and parsing, etc., make the sentiment of justice more powerful than it was; or why from stores of geographical information, perseveringly gained, is their likely to come increased regard for truth?"

If Mr. Spencer's reasoning is right, then our whole system of Education is built upon a false foundation. The Legislature imposes taxes upon the property of all classes alike, whether directly interested in the school or not. And why? Because it is assumed that by the education of society those forces are evoked which tend to the improvement of the country, and the pecuniary as well as the social advantages of all classes indirectly.

But is it true that the ordinary school curriculum does not evolve any of those forces which, with perfect propriety, might not be called *moral forces*? Is their no connection between the discipline of mind necessary to the acquisition of such meagre knowledge as that to which Mr. Spencer refers, and that discipline of character essential to good citizenship? Who would not say that the boy, who during a term of years was subjected to the discipline of even an average school, and who was obliged to submit his will to the superior will of his teacher, had not formed those habits of obedience to law and order which placed him far above the boy who roamed through "lanes and hedges," unkempt, uncared for and undisciplined? It is quite possible that by any rule of logic you cannot establish a direct connection between the "multiplication table" and moral habits; but it is overlooking the true condition of affairs altogether, to assume that merely memorizing the multiplication table