

tion completed, and settle down into humdrum teachers. This is the reason why the country is strewn with wrecks of pedagogues, who years ago were doing good work, but who have been forced to leave the profession to make way for younger, better qualified and more enthusiastic successors. The Minister of Education, observing these wrecks and the causes of them, instituted the reading course that every teacher might have a chart of his route and steer clear of the rocks of apathy and ignorance. Many teachers would sooner choose their own course of reading, and some doubtless think they could have made a better choice of books than has been made, but when we read the list over carefully, notice the many works almost necessary to be read by every teacher, and remember that a person's own choice will generally give too much attention and time to light reading, I think it is plain that there is advantage in taking the course prescribed. Besides, methodical reading is always to be preferred to desultory reading. The course has been divided into three parts. First, of course, comes Pedagogy as being most connected with our work. The great strides that have been made both in the theory and the practice of teaching during the last few years make it imperatively necessary for the teacher who would keep up with the times to study the newest and best thought of the day. What would be thought of the farmer who reaps his grain to-day with the sickle his great great-grandfather used, or of the mechanic whose tools are fashioned on the pattern of those used by Noah in building the Ark? What would be thought of the lawyer or doctor upon whose shelves the latest law decisions or latest discoveries in medicine were not to be found? Whatever might be thought, of one thing I am certain, the farmer would be sold out in less

than five years as a lesson to him for trying to compete with men assisted by all the reaping machinery inventive thought has devised during the last thirty years; the mechanic would be out of employment; the lawyer would lack clients, and the doctor patients. And yet this is exactly what some of us are doing: we are neglecting the newest thought and discoveries in psychology, teaching-principles and teaching-methods; our shelves are destitute of later educational works, and our tables of educational periodicals. While it is only of late years that the science of education has been studied and discussed, we are applying the same principles, the same methods, nay even the same forms that were used by our ancestors ages ago. And this is the reason why our schools are dull, our pupils apathetic, and our work disheartening. The method which to some remote, enthusiastic predecessor was replete with life has crystallized into a mere form, and you might as well try to resuscitate a corpse as to bring back into life and action this dead method. Principles, not methods, are what we should give our chief attention to, though, so long as we do not try simply to imitate the methods of others, we can by studying them, get good ideas that may help to strengthen and revive our own. We may scoff at the new education; we may deride its title of new, and assert that its main principles are as old as the hills; nay, we may even laugh to scorn the claim of its extreme supporters that Col. Parker is the apostle of all that is new and great and grand in modern education; but with all its crudities, imperfections and iconoclastic proclivities it has a life, an enthusiasm, and a force that have made it a power in the States, and that will effect a change in *our* teaching if Canada is to keep pace with her sister country.

And, after all, what are the main.