

The Department compelled the trustees to admit her, however. Another Board refused by a majority of six to one to meet the Inspector for a brief consultation on school matters when he was visiting their school: "They knew their own business." Dr. Richardson's work on Temperance was authorized as a reader in one place, on condition that it be "read without comment."

—The nomination of Gen. Garfield, from Ohio, gives that State the reputation of providing the presidents for the Union. Teachers in that State do not now regard it to be prudent to whip an Ohio boy, lest they be guilty of the sacrilege of punishing a future president of the United States, knowing that in their old age he might therefore refuse them the small boon of a post-office.

—A novel method of compelling a girl to stop talking was recently adopted in Southwark. A teacher, after trying various methods without any good result, at last got a piece of "sticking plaster" and forced it on the girl's mouth. It was an effective remedy, but the teacher was fined 9s. and costs for her action. The fine was made light because the teacher had previously been kind in her manner towards her pupils.

—The English law is so strict with reference to sending a pupil on the public examination day that the father of a pupil in Canterbury Road Board School was fined for not sending him on the closing day, June 16th.

Contributions and Correspondence.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS.

BY DAVID ALLISON, LL.D., SUP'T. EDUCATION, NOVA SCOTIA.

The diffusion of education is perhaps the most striking phenomenon of our age, distinguishing it more sharply and vividly than anything else from past epochs. It is not necessary to recur to the genesis of the movement, which has issued in so magnificent a result, nor to analyze the forces which have co-operated in its production. The battle has been fought and won. Men of intelligence and station can now be found with difficulty who will affirm that a state of ignorance is the normal and desirable condition of the masses. It is no longer denied by any reputable authority that all property is fairly liable, at least within certain limits, for the education of all. Those who still retain a degree of sympathy with the spirit of obsolete, or obsolescent, systems, and would like to do some sort of battle in their behalf, find themselves compelled to work with masked batteries from behind the convenient cover of the "three R's." These are the people who say (in deed, if not in word) if we must have a generally diffused education, let it be of a low order, of the most elementary type.

If the question be asked in what direction it is desirable that the current of educational reform or progress should now set, I must unhesitatingly answer, in the direction of an internal improvement of the schools. "Education for all" should now, as a watchword, be succeeded by "Education good enough for all." So long as it

can be said with any degree of truth that special schools, with no higher grade or pretensions than any given class of our free public schools, turn out, to use a rough phrase, better work than the latter, so long there is a reproach upon us, of which we should labor to clear ourselves. For myself, I believe that a claim of this kind is often put forth most unwarrantably. It is sometimes urged when there has been no comparison of really analogous work, and could be none. It is too frequently admitted on the *omne ignotum pro magnifico* principle. It is not often, I think, justified by fact. However this may be, our schools in their respective spheres and classes, should be prepared to do, each its own work, so that none can do the same work better, nor so well. They can reasonably be asked to vindicate their utility by reference not simply to their general function as educational instruments, but to the special quality of the education which they impart. Their products should be good as well as abundant.

It may be asked if this is not the consideration which now determines the educational policy of all countries sustaining a national system of education. Are not new securities for the efficient management of our schools almost daily taken? Do not legislative enactments and departmental instructions alike look towards, as it were, *binding* the teacher to the faithful performance of his duties? Nay, to go further back, is not the constant drift of effort towards the provision of more competent teachers? I answer these questions of course in the affirmative, as I note these indications with pleasure. The jealous care with which free communities guard their public institutions by legitimate precautions and oversight shows that these institutions are properly valued. "The good and faithful" teacher has nothing to fear from the most rigid inspection of his work. All that pressure extracts from "the slothful servant" of the public is "clear gain." But this is not my point. There is no service like willing service, and I wish to show that the position of teacher in the public schools is pre-eminently a position in which a man of elevated sentiments and proper moral habitudes is brought under the play of inspiring motives. He who feels that in the communion of his profession he is moulding the national character and determining the national destiny, does not, it seems to me, lack inspiration to high and honourable effort as compared with the favored teacher of a "select" school. In our adjustments and readjustments of educational machinery, made necessary from time to time by the principles of progress itself, let us aim to strengthen rather than weaken everything which tends to exalt his calling in the teacher's own estimation, to repress the sense of mere mechanical operation, and to present the teacher to himself as one who, whatever be the links which foster him to a general system, has a sphere to fill, and a work to do which afford ample scope for the peculiar forces resident in his own personality. On the realization of this ideal depends in part, in my opinion, the true progress of education.

FROM PESTALOZZI TO FROEBEL.

BY W. N. HALLMANN.

(Address delivered before the National Educational Association at Chautauqua, on the 16th of July, 1880.)

The connection between Pestalozzi and Froebel is so intimate, they are in several respects—although following wholly different methods—so nearly allied in principles and aims, that many still look upon Froebel as a mere modifier of Pestalozzi, and accuse one of his greatest creations—the kindergarten—of being only "a kind of object-teaching." This is not astonishing in superficially in-