

beggarly ideal. It is an attempt to disarticulate where there are no joints, to isolate where there are no barriers. On the other hand, it is contended that a straining after correlation and unification of subjects lands the pupil in an atmosphere of mental haze. It appears, then, that in the work of practical teaching if we escape the Scylla of one-sidedness we become a prey to the Charybdis of many-sidedness. This is no mere abstract question; it is exemplified in concrete form in our schools every day. In some we have subject-worship with its attendant thoroughness; in others a thoughtful co-ordination of subjects with many awakenings of the slumbering powers of the young mind. In others, again, we have neither thoroughness nor comprehension, and we have grades unclassifiable, some leaning in the one direction and some in the other. A word of practical advice may be desirable here, even if it be culled from the common-places of school method. In the first place, teachers should bear in mind that every subject without exception should consciously and constantly be made a vehicle of instruction in the accurate use of the mother-tongue. Accuracy in spelling, for instance, should be insisted on, not as a means of satisfying an examiner, but as a means of ready and correct expression. Arithmetic, again, should not be regarded solely as the correct casting up of sums, but as a taking part by anticipation in the every-day concerns of life. So, too, instruction in elementary science that does not entail an occasional arithmetical calculation, a geographical reference here, and a practical application there is little else than a vain show. A reading-lesson that fails to give a new tone and tendency to a pupil's mind is absolutely poverty-stricken. Thoughtful teachers, however, will not rest content with a few empirical hints on a matter so vital to their profession. To such we recommend a little book on the Herbartian Psychology, by Adams, which goes straight to the heart of the problem. In this book, apart from its charming style, teachers will find, in addition to a clear statement of the principles underlying the question in hand, matter that may well afford inspiration for a lifetime.

It remains to say something of the new subject of handwork. As is usual with new school subjects, handwork to the enthusiast is a panacea, to the sceptic a nostrum. The subject has for many years occupied an important place in our infant departments in the form of kindergarten exercises. It is now taking definite shape in the upper classes also. During the past year there were taken up, in addition to the usual kindergarten, paper cutting and mounting, modelling in plasticine and (in one school) brushwork. The visit of the Department's technical Inspectors in June, and the special grant, with the consequent establishment of classes for the instruction of teachers, have tended to win for handwork a still more prominent position in our primary-school course. We are, indeed, within measurable distance of the time when such instruction will be universal. The theoretical justification for the new step is to be found in the growing recognition of the educational principle that, if the hand is to respond quickly, accurately, and delicately to visual impressions in the brain, practice in making the necessary co-ordinations must begin early. The economic justification is neatly put thus: "Instruction is productive when it increases the mental capacity, the intelligence, the powers of observation and of reasoning of every unit in the body politic." Handwork satisfies the required conditions, hence its inclusion in the primary-school curriculum. But, while our schools should throw open wide their doors to improvements suggested by new economic conceptions, we must be watchful lest the swing of the pendulum carry us to the point where too great an inroad will be made on the proved and potent qualities of a sound general education. We estimate that the absolute limit to the usefulness of this new subject will be attained by two hours' instruction per week. That would give something like five hundred lessons of an hour's duration to an average school course. The objection to our present course is its remoteness from practice; but, while handwork brings us one step nearer, it does not, and cannot, take the place of practice itself. In support of this statement we can quote testimony of the highest worth. Sir William Arrol, for instance, engineer of the Forth Bridge, speaking of technical education—and handwork is technical education in a generalised form—said recently that it is only when technical training and practical training run hand-in-hand that the former is of any use. His experience is not favourable to technical colleges. He had had dozens of students from such colleges, and not six of the lot had proved able to work for their wages. On the other hand, his greatest undertakings had been carried through by men who had never been inside a technical college. The ideal training for an industrial career, according to Sir William Arrol—and this is what we wish to emphasize—is a sound general training till the age of fifteen, thereafter apprenticeship to a trade, with attendance at an evening school or technical institute *pari passu*.

There is pressing need for a revision of the regulations affecting the pupil-teachers, those in force being totally out of keeping with many of the conditions now obtaining in our schools. If the educational standing of the district is to be maintained, this is a matter that will brook no delay. Now that the staffing of the schools has been so materially strengthened, it would be manifestly unwise and unfair to expect pupil-teachers to do as much actual teaching as has hitherto been required of them. The course of study, too, is in several respects out of harmony with the practical needs of the school; and there is the further consideration that hereafter no fees are to be paid for the instruction of pupil-teachers. In brief, in the interest of the pupil-teachers, in the interest of education, and in the interest of the community, the system needs revision through and through.

Mention of the pupil-teachers raises the larger issue as to the want of adequate provision in our district for the training of teachers. It appears to us that in fairness to the district one or other of two things should be done: the Department should either institute a system of scholarships by which our future teachers would be enabled to attend a training-college, or it should make a small grant towards the maintenance of training-classes which might very well be worked in connection with the local primary, secondary, and technical schools. This is a question that demands a speedy and equitable solution.