

and post up a few copies where all could read. If the idea were to be brought up in the Society and further developed it would probably meet with some consideration.

* *

THE MONTHLY ends its short career with this number. It has done its best to tell the students what they are doing and thinking about. It has been loyally supported by the college and encouraged even where it stumbled. The College Faculty has been always friendly and ready to assist. The editors have had no trouble in securing contributions from the brightest and best of our number. If their space had been less restricted they might have found room for much more material. The slight editorial notes have been of a scrappy nature, and no doubt, as a result, they have often a one-sided tone. No criticism of its utterances has been sent to this paper. It would have been gladly published.

Perhaps things have gone too smoothly with the *Monthly*. A few points however have occasioned some adverse criticism about the corridors. In the first place the "Side Scenes" may be mentioned as a constant source of difficulty for the editors. Passing that by as very unimportant, the *Monthly* wishes to say that it has no antipathy to Tennyson, as one or two have alleged. You may see the spots on the sun without denying its brightness. The reports of the Literary Society's meetings caused some talk. Some things no doubt found their way into those columns which the editors could wish omitted. But the *Monthly* has at any rate tried to adhere strictly to facts.

What was said in last issue on the inductive method seems to have been taken by some of our lecturers as tantamount to an attack upon their teaching and its results. Nothing of the sort was intended. Fair and open criticism of theories advanced in the amphitheatre will not be taken by reasonable men as equivalent to an arraignment of a lecturer's practical teaching ability. And nobody questions this paper's right to an opinion of its own, erroneous though it may be, on the work we are doing as students, many of us no longer in leading strings, but attempting to solve the problems of life for ourselves. Any glimmer of illustration from the class-room that may be detected in the article referred to, came from the writer's own sad experience, and not from his observation of older men's work. No doubt the tendency to an abuse of the induction method is stronger with the student of teaching than with the experienced teacher. The virtue of the master is often so exaggerated as to become the vice of the pupil. In a spirit of compunction, not of fault-finding was the article in question written.

It certainly would be absurd to make a general condemnation of induction in favor of an out and out deductive method. Good teaching should perhaps combine the two methods in proportions varying according to the subject and the class. This paper wished simply to protest against too great a preponderance of induction. In a short article it is impossible to cover a whole question even in sketchy fashion. All that can be done is to suggest thought by fastening upon some single aspect