

down in the calendars for the year 1902, but "La Joie Fait Peur," which is also prescribed for that year, has been omitted. One would like to know whether the work for 1902 is to go on and on for ever, year in and year out. If so, I for one am thankful that I am not on the treadmill of schoolroom work. If this work for 1902 is not to be repeated from year to year, what benefit is to accrue from the policy of binding the authors and grammar together ?

There must be some benefit intended to some one, for changes are not usually made merely for the sake of change. I am credibly informed that neither publishers nor editors gain in this instance, but that they actually lose. Considering the expenditure of money and brainpower involved, both parties have a right to fair remuneration, and this they are said not to be receiving.

The benefit does not accrue to the teacher, as can easily be seen from what has been already said. To them can come nothing but paralysis if the same programme is to be covered year after year without any variation. The benefit must be reaped by the pupils if by any one, the supposition being that the new plan is cheaper than the old one. Even here, however, it may be doubted whether it was wise to make the change.

The new "Grammar and Reader" costs a dollar and "La Joie Fait Peur" costs at least twenty-five cents. Over against this the old grammar used to cost seventy-five cents and the book of selected authors about the same. So small a saving to the pupil as a quarter of a dollar does not justify a change which is indefensible on any sound pedagogical grounds. Hence the change is not a wise one.

The book is too bulky to be used with any comfort and will therefore

go to pieces more quickly than a book of moderate and more convenient size, thus proving to be a greater source of expense than the old one. It will be handed down from generation to generation with its ragged leaves begrimed with much handling and soiled with the notes of its successive owners. Neatness and cleanliness are virtues that ought to be inculcated in the school room as elsewhere.

If the work prescribed for 1902 is to become the fixed programme for all time, changes will have to be made in the combined work from year to year and they will only make the book more expensive to pupils who have to read for examinations in subsequent years. Again, the argument in favor of economy falls to the ground.

What is needed is a grammar such as the editors have made—with not too many exercises, for every teacher ought to make his or her own exercises if there is to be freshness and life in the classroom. An elementary reader of about the same difficulty as the present one or the older one by the same editors is needed for junior classes. But for the higher grades something better than we have yet had is required. We are far behind England and the United States in the character of the books we place in the hands of our senior pupils who are studying languages.

Most of these pupils neither go to the Universities nor enter the already overcrowded ranks of the teaching profession. They need something to be a present help and a future guide to them. The High Schools and the Collegiate Institutes should be their Universities and should place them in such a position that they shall have a desire and be able to continue their studies in the languages by themselves after they