

concern, and which would mingle with all the conclusions of his increasing knowledge and the intellectual relations of his advancing years.

To conclude, it can be no abstract advantage, with the present political prospects of this country, and indeed of Europe, that any education should retain an exclusive or class character. The free and intimate association of men of different birth in professional occupations is accepted by our aristocracy with that good sense which enables them to maintain a social influence almost extinguished in European communities, and which is one of our best safeguards in the perplexities of the future. Any training which tends to keep up distinctions, whether real or fictitious, must injure that community of views and objects, which is so essential not only to personal comfort, but to advancement in any special avocation. We already hear the young ambitious Engineer or adventurous Colonist lamenting over his lost time and unemployed abilities, and speaking in no measured terms of reproach of what has been to him an inappropriate discipline, of which he so little appreciates the indirect and secondary advantages, that he regards the toils of his boyhood with unmitigated disgust. Is it impossible to make a satisfactory compromise between the just exigencies of our age and the honourable traditions of past generations—one more compromise in a country and among a people who wisely have made so many?

#### The Duty of Parents to Teachers.

To secure results in carrying on reforms and improvements in society, co-operation is essential to success. The humblest can effect in concert what the highest could not singly. In the education of youth, parents and guardians can greatly facilitate the arduous labour of the teachers. Good government in schools is more the result of careful training at home than of any efforts of the teacher. Children who behave well at home will generally deport themselves well abroad. Children should be taught at home respect for their teachers. They should be instructed that it is their duty to be orderly, well-behaved and prompt to obey what they are commanded to perform. If this be understood, the task of the teacher becomes materially lightened. If the pupil be taught that the rules of school must be implicitly complied with, and if the parents insist upon it that the child shall obey all reasonable demands made upon him by the teacher, then the pupil will be properly trained, and will be fitted to receive instruction. Parents are too apt to encourage their children in tale-bearing and criticism on the conduct and ability of their instructors. They are apt to take the views of their children rather than their own.

Parents should also make it a point to become acquainted with their teachers. By being intimate with each other, they can discuss the topics of educational interests in their own districts, and devise such measures as may be best calculated to succeed. The spirit of friendship begets that of frankness and confidence, and the teacher feeling that his efforts are appreciated, will labor not only more industriously, but much more effectively. We say to parents, therefore, you must sympathise with, and encourage your teachers. Cheer them on in their arduous work. Visit the school frequently, and let your children feel that you are interested in their improvement. Labor to create a good feeling between your children and their teacher, to build up a confidence in each other and to encourage all to do their best. By this means you will promote your own happiness and interest, and render efficient service in the cause of education and improvement.—*The York True Democrat.*

#### Examination Tests.

These tests largely determine the character of school instruction. If they are narrow and technical, the instruction will be narrow and technical; if they run in a groove, the instruction is grooved—and especially is this true where the results of exami-

nations are used to compare schools and teachers. Indeed, it may be stated as a general truth, that the instruction of a corps of pupils is not much wider or deeper than the tests by which it is measured. Teachers very soon see that their standing depends on their meeting these tests, and the result is that they work for the examination, giving their chief attention to those things which will be included in the tests. When I visited the schools of Philadelphia in 1866, I learned that one of the ward schools, having a lady principal (paid half wages, of course) had the highest standing of any other in the city. I visited the school, and was surprised at the text-bookish, technical character of the instruction. Mensuration was taught for several weeks; the events and dates of United States History were laboriously memorized. I was struck with the importance attached to these things, and asked for the reason. The teacher replied, "I understand your question. The standing of my school depends upon the per centage of correct answers my pupils give to the questions used in the annual examinations. These tests call for certain results, and I am preparing *my wares for the market*. I know I am not doing the work I ought to do, but my standing as a teacher depends upon my success in meeting these examinations." How many teachers are teaching not so well as they know how, but to meet the Superintendent's tests or the tests of the School Board?

Let me again ask whether examination tests are not too much adapted to the instruction? In some schools the questions are made to fit the known character of the teaching. When I taught in Cleveland, years ago, one of the grammar school principals and myself frequently subjected our classes to the same examinations. Instead forming our own questions, we took those used in the schools of Boston, and other cities, though many of the questions were not applicable to our instruction or books. If our classes reached from fifty to sixty per cent on such questions, we thought it better than an average of ninety per cent on questions specially adapted to our teaching. Our pupils were not flattered by high percentages, and the School Board and the people were not deceived. Mr. President, I have not taught for several years, but I believe there are no schools in Ohio in which the classes can stand ninety per cent and above, on any fair test. These high percentages are only reached by narrow tests and special cramming, and this, too, at the sacrifice of a broad and thorough culture.—*E. E. White at the Meeting of Ohio Superintendents.*

#### Teachers' Salaries.

The nineteenth century has not learned to spend liberally upon its teachers. Its view seems rather to be that of the shrewd town-clerk, of whom Carlyle relates, that when he was assisting in founding a seminary, and the question was asked, "How shall the teacher be maintained?" delivered this brief counsel: "—them, keep them poor." You remember, perhaps, the great Wolfe's advice to teachers: "Be always in good health and *know how to fast courageously.*"

The public, perhaps, thinks that a low diet is essential to clearness and activity of brain, and that teachers must be secured by poverty against temptations to self-indulgence by luxurious surroundings. Or, its idea may be akin to that which seems to prevail in my own native state of Connecticut, with reference to clergymen, where the salaries, I think, average about five hundred dollars per annum. The theory seems to be, that as the minister is working for the Lord he must look to the Lord for his pay. I am not speaking at random. To convince you of this it will be sufficient for me to mention one fact. The president of Harvard College receives \$3,000 a year (about one-half the salary of a sub-master at Eton), and the chief cook at the Parker House \$4,000.

I admit that the wretchedly insufficient salaries of teachers is a discouragement, but if any gentleman is disposed to make this an excuse for a superficial performance of his work, and for the