

bright pupil puts a question in history or science, or it may be in grammar or arithmetic, which the teacher is unable, on the spur of the moment, to answer. The danger is that, through fear of losing the respect and confidence of the school, whose eyes and ears are open, a guess is made, and announced as a matter of knowledge. In fact, we think we have heard young teachers sagely advised never to appear not to know what answer to give in such a case. The supposition is that a confession of ignorance will lower the standing of the teacher in the eyes of the school. Even were it necessarily so, this would surely be better than the virtual falsehood which is perpetrated when one pretends to know what he, in reality, does not know. But the danger is purely imaginary. Children soon learn that not even parents or teachers know everything. A frank admission of present ignorance will often increase the respect of pupils for the character of their teacher. It is an object lesson in candour and truthfulness. If, in addition, the teacher never fails, when possible, to find out and give the correct answer another day, another valuable lesson is imparted in regard to the true way of acquiring knowledge.

THE *'Varsity* has become the theme of a sharp and somewhat acrimonious discussion in the Toronto dailies. The head and front of its offending seem to be its too free admission of criticism, both editorial and in its correspondence columns, of persons and things connected with University College, and its giving too much scope for "free-thinking" articles. For our own part, we can see no valid objection to even anonymous criticism of the public methods and work of college professors, provided such criticism be free from personal slander and malicious insinuation. In the case of a professor, as of any other public man, it is mainly according to the amount of truth it contains that criticism hurts. It must be remembered that students have the best opportunities for judging the faithfulness and ability of professors, and we believe there is usually so much love of fair play, to say nothing of more personal feelings, in the great body of students as will make them resent, promptly and emphatically, any malicious attack upon those who stand, or have stood, to them in the relation of teachers. As to the matter of orthodoxy, we have great faith in the vitality of truth and its power to survive and flourish under the freest discussion. Moreover, we have reached a time when the right of free discussion will be insisted on. Outcries against it are worse than useless. So long as the editorial balance is fairly held and equal freedom given to both sides, the friends of orthodoxy should not fear.

A THOUGHTFUL writer in the *Journal of Education* says:—"Since we have narrowed the idea and sentiment of the word 'education' simply to mean mental training, we have lost sight, to some extent, of that broader signification which includes discipline of character, and the formation and regulation of habits and principles in the individual." This is, undoubtedly, the great defect in our much-vaunted Public School system. We are not sure, indeed, that there ever has existed a system

in which the work of education, in the broader signification referred to, was better done. The main contrast, so far as relates to the past, is between more and less of the mental training, especially in regard to the numbers to whom it was imparted. But none the less, the defect is great and patent in our present work, and one of the most important questions of the day is how to remedy it. A hopeful sign of the times is the attention that is being given to the matter. Every teacher can to some extent, though we fear, under the present machine and high-pressure conditions, only to a very limited extent, supply the deficiency in his own school.

ONE of the best tests of the discipline of a school is the extent to which the public sentiment of the pupils supports the teacher. In schools, as in larger and older communities, public opinion is the most potent force on the side of good government. Under the old regime, with which many of us were familiar in our school-days, the triumph of order, or disorder, was too often dependent upon the outcome of a perpetual contest between absolute authority, as represented by the teacher, and the spirit of resistance to what was regarded as tyranny in the school. Under such conditions, the position of the unhappy master was truly that of one "against a host," and it was little wonder that he soon lost all sympathy, if he ever had any, with childhood, and yielded most of his school hours to the dominion of ill-temper and caprice, thus enabling the boding tremblers to discern, too often, "the day's disasters in the morning's face." To many not past middle age there are few things more vivid, or more pathetic, in the memories of boyhood than the recollection of the anxiety with which they used, every morning and afternoon, to scan the master's countenance, as he entered the school-room, in order to discover whether he was in good or bad temper. We wonder if these old pictures have still their counterparts in any Ontario schools to-day. Both teacher and pupils are to be pitied in such a case.

It is to be hoped that a very different state of affairs is the rule to-day. A more excellent way has been found. The true teacher has learned to rely upon the sympathy and co-operation of the great body of his pupils. He has learned that confidence, to be genuine, must be mutual. He trusts his boys and girls, and they, in turn, trust him. Without announcing it, perhaps, in so many words, he creates the feeling that the maintenance of quiet and order is but a means, a necessary means, to an end, not as it used to appear, the great end itself. The school is henceforth ours, not mine. He is laboring for his pupils' good, and when this is done in sincerity, the pupils will not fail to feel and recognize it. In proportion as he is successful in stimulating mental activity, and ministering wisely to the child's innate thirst for knowledge, he may dismiss all anxiety about order in the school. The boy or girl who is intent on learning, who is intellectually wide-awake, will be the first to resent that which makes study difficult, or impossible. All the moral forces of the school are thus enlisted on the side of the teacher, because that is the side of reason