

other words, speed and legibility are not of the same importance with all children. The standardization of marks is an excellent thing, provided standards do not become too fixed.

The Journal would be very pleased to have this problem discussed by its readers.

Expert Direction

In American and Canadian cities there is a growing feeling that the ordinary form of government is far from satisfactory. It is held that men who have not been trained for civic administration must of necessity make blunders. The cry is for government by experts.

In provincial and federal affairs the same demand is being made. Under our system of representative government, the head of a department need know practically nothing about the work for which he is responsible. A minister of mining may not know copper from brass, a minister of agriculture may not have so much as raised cabbages in his back yard. This would not be so bad if it were not so common for occupants of office to have assurance in inverse ratio to their knowledge. Zeal without knowledge leads to errors of all kinds. Safety lies in expert direction. This is as true of government of cities and countries as it is of the management of factories and trading corporations.

This was the argument of a teacher who took the ground that in matters of education only members of the profession have a right to express an opinion. "Why," he said, "in business in medicine, in law, no one's opinion is accepted for anything unless he can present his papers of qualification, but every jackass thinks he is an authority on education."

Our teacher was not quite sound in his argument. Everybody does know something about education, for everyone has been educated for better or worse, and everyone has in his own way

played the part of educator. Moreover, everyone has met with educated and uneducated men and has made comparisons that have more or less value. Indeed, the teacher as an educator in one special field may have failed to judge of education in the large. Teachers, indeed, sometimes have very narrow vision and very limited sympathies. They are experts if you like in handling classes and in methods of teaching, but they may know little of life and its values, and therefore may be anything but educators. To be an expert in education one must be broad enough to comprehend great issues, he must know society and its needs, and in a general way must know how these needs are to be supplied. Whether he is a good or poor "methodist" is of comparatively little importance.

The people whose opinion in education is worth something are the men and women who have had life experience—mothers who have had troublesome boys, fathers who have had useless boys, mothers and fathers who have known the joys and sorrows of parenthood, business men and professional men who have met all classes and conditions of people, social workers who have attempted to solve all manner of problems, and above all those who have mingled with little children and know them from the heart outward.

The men who can never be reliable experts in education are the mere theorist, the statistician, the man with only local knowledge and the man with narrow sympathies. Most unreliable of all is the man who "used to teach school," but who is now in one of the professions or powerful because of his wealth or position. A gentleman last week said this: "For twenty years I taught school, and my opinion on educational matters was never regarded seriously; but the minute I left teaching and took to store-keeping I was looked upon as an authority in all school matters."

Yet it is clear that education, as well as business of all kinds, to be success-