

"What are the conditions which meet a teacher? which meet he taught? First of all, a mass of knowledge that no man, not even the chosen few, can master; a mass of knowledge that pushes all thought out of its area; there is no time to think. Thought is squeezed out of existence by the weight of other peoples' facts.

"All are to be taught.

"And knowledge is infinite.

"And life is short.

"And average brains are weak.

"And few have time to spare.

"And time is short, even to them.

"Teachers of Minnesota, what is to be done? How can this be dealt with? This is our problem.

"I answer boldly, first break down the KNOWLEDGE-IDOL. Smash up the idolatry of KNOWLEDGE. Frankly and fairly admit that the majority of mankind cannot get much knowledge; and that any attempt to make them get it is a manufacture of stupidity, a downward education."

Whereupon Mr. Hyde, a correspondent of *School Education*, comments as follows:

"The soundness of the above will be admitted by thoughtful teachers, yet how few teach as if they believed it! When the mass of teachers shall have faith to believe that geography means the culture of the imagination with reference to distance, direction, size, form, and not the mere memorizing of lists of cities and rivers; that mathematics means the training of the intellect to close analysis, and not the mere committing of rules, tables, and formulas; that the teaching of grammar,—English, Latin, Greek,—should have for its end the acquirement of ability to express one's own thoughts with ease, grace, and power, and not a mere knowledge of the rules of syntax and a proficiency in grammatical parsing and analysis; in short, that Education means,—not the gaining of knowledge,—certainly not the despising of knowledge,—but the culture, the training, the invigorating, the vivifying of the mental powers by means of knowledge; when teachers shall accept this as an article of their faith, and shall show their faith by their works, then we may look upon the New-Era as fully inaugurated, so far as intellectual education is concerned."

"FAIR PLAY" writes to the *Globe* to complain of the hardship of the rule which compels all High School Assistants to undergo a professional training at an Institute, irrespective of previous experience. The only exception made is in the cases of those who had been appointed previous to July, 1884, and even these could not change to another school than that in which they were originally employed without taking the training course. "Why," asks "Fair Play," "compel the struggling Assistant, who has had, say, a couple of years' experience in his last school, and has had, moreover, his teaching favorably reported on by the Inspector, in the event of changing, to go through the farce of a session at Toronto or Kingston? Experience, if it means anything at all, must, in the case of actual, responsible teaching, signify infinitely more than a brief mechanical process at any training institution." The conundrum would be a hard one to answer. Experience is unquestionably the chief thing considered in the case, and it is not easy to see why one or two years of actual and successful work in one High School should not count for at least as much as a much shorter term of so-called training in another.

THE *Schoolmaster* (London, Eng.) draws a touching picture of the unfortunate condition to which the assistant-masters in the schools are reduced by the regulation of the Board which prohibits them from inflicting corporal punishment: "These gentlemen, many of them men of great experience and skill, are placed between two fires. They are forbidden to give a rap with the cane, and their chiefs, upon whom the obnoxious duty is thrown, will not give it for them. The children are quick to discover the position, and the discipline of the class is at an end. Without good discipline the teacher is useless, and quickly has to leave his situation. If he disobey the Board rule dismissal stares him in the face, and if he keep it and lose his discipline, dismissal is equally his fate. The instinct of self-preservation bids him sail as near the wind as possible, and hence the constant complaints of breaches of the rules, summonses, assaults by parents and appearances at the police-court." Can it really be that teachers of great experience and skill are thus driven to despair, because they may not cane other people's children at will? Are all their cultivated powers unable to apply any other means of preserving discipline in their classes than the old rough-and-ready one? Can it be that the children in London schools are of so low a type that the fear of bodily pain, of physical violence, is the only available motive by which they can be ruled? If so, it is hard to say which is most to be pitied, masters or pupils.

WE cannot but be struck by the difference in tone, in this respect, between our English and American exchanges. In the latter, we find the subject of corporal punishment rarely mentioned. Their columns are filled with hints and suggestions as to the best mode, not so much of maintaining discipline as of teaching this and that, or of awakening attention, interest, enthusiasm, in their pupils. Their anxiety is to root out the old rote-work and task-work, and to substitute real thinking in the child-mind. One would infer that the old, old question of discipline and order had become well-nigh obsolete; that the generation had outgrown the *bête noir* that made the lives of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses a half-century ago wretched. Can it be that the teachers of the old world have yet to learn a lesson that has been mastered by those of the new—that British schoolmasters might do well to take a leaf from the book of American and Canadian teachers? The mere suggestion, we know, smacks of presumption and impudence, but what are we to think?

WE were lately reading somewhere a labored article in which the writer gave vent to the righteous indignation of his soul at the liberties those terrible Americans are taking with the Queen's English. A Yankee judge, on the bench, had actually used the word "rock" where "stone" was the proper term, and a Yankee divine, no less a personage than Dr. Talmage, had twice in the same sermon spoken of "worriments." *Per contra*, some Southern or Western journalist—what will not the modern newspaper man do?—has had the temerity to come out with a slashing defence of slang, reminding us how many strong and expressive words, now embedded and becoming