SEPTEMBER 11th, 1906.

THE NEW EDUCATION.

One of the most interesting subjects discussed at the Royal Society for some time past was that of "The New Education," on which Mr. J. A. Johnson, M.A., Principal of the Training College, read a paper at the meeting on September 11. There was a fairly large attendance, among those present being His Excellency the Governor (who presided), and Lady Edeline Strickland, accompanied by Mr. Geo. Browne, I.S.O., Private Secretary; the Minister of Education (Hon. W. B. Propsting, M.L.C.), Bishop Delany, Messrs. R. M. Johnston, I.S.O., G. E. Moore, M.H.A.

Mr. J. A. Johnson, M.A., who was received with applause, said

In addressing the Royal Society of Tasmania on education I am well aware that, while the subject must be of vast interest to all the members, many of the technicalities of the art and science of teaching which I shall touch upon will appeal only to those actively engaged in the work of teaching. Still, any aspect of this subject must find a response in the minds of all those who have the well-being of the State at heart; and, therefore, I feel no hesitation in addressing you on the subject in which I am myself most intensely interested, and to which all of you must have given much time and earnest thought.

The first thing to be said about the term "new education" is that the views current in the present day in regard to education are not new, but old—old as Plato: new in the sense, perhaps, that the world's thought about the meaning and scope of education is being cast in the mould of these later days, and shaped again to new issues and fairer ideals. The history of education is the record of a series of failures; the next generation will quietly brush aside the dust raised by the complacent reformers of today. But need we be discouraged when we view the small results of past effort as they appear, magnified by the powerful lenses of time and space? No; let us rejoice, rather, that our little systems have their day, and then cease to be—for the words of the poet about one good custom corrupting the world are especially true when applied to the work of the educator. Constant iteration will take the soul out of the newest methods, and the time will come when it must be necessary to replace them by newer and better.

When we look back on the progress of education during the last fifty years, we have much cause for congratulation and encouragement. The time is slowly passing away when the reproach can be brought against us, as a race, that whilst skilled men are required to train our horses it is a matter of no consequence to inquire into the qualifications of the person appointed to educate our children. States are beginning to recognise that the teacher who works on mind is as responsible a person in the Commonwealth as the physician who ministers to the body; and that no unlicensed practitioner should be allowed in the one sphere any more than quacks in the other. Departments are now less departmental, and more educational; teachers are no longer pedagogical machines, but are becoming more and more members of a learned profession, with the power of initiation and adaptability. The atmosphere of the school is tending gradually to conformity with that of a well-ordered home. The ascent of the ladder of knowledge is as difficult as of old; but there is a change in the method of reaching the top. In the past, the pupil was urged on from below—with the aid of a birch rod; now the master beckons him upwards, and the prospect towards which his eyes are directed is so serene and beatific that he feels it glorious to ascend. The teacher is viewed, not as a stern taskmaster, but as an elder brother, who is helping materially to create the best conditions for the realisation of the possibilities of life.

Contrast these ideals of primary education with those that have held sway within the memory of the present generation. In Britain, fifty years ago, a commission was appointed to inquire into the state of primary education, then in the hands, mostly, of private teachers. The report disclosed a most discreditable state of things to all concerned. The teachers were not only untrained, but also uneducated; the ranks of the profession—if profession it could be called—were recruited from all the failures in other paths of life, cripples and consumptives not being excluded. Many teachers, weak with the decrepitude of age, dragged out a miserable and hopeless existence, racked by the noise of pupils who learned nothing, to whom they were able to impart nothing. To such teachers was the education of nearly a third of the children of England entrusted. In 1861, a new era was introduced by the revised code of Robert Lowe, afterwards Lord Sherbrooke. "Payment by results" be-

came the ruling principle, and as a natural consequence H.M. Inspector played an important part in directing the education of the schools. The grant for the backward child had to be earned; the slow boy could not be neglected for the sake of his more brilliant classmate; the teacher became the slave of the managers, a mere grant-earning machine. As far as real education is concerned, education as we understand the term, this system failed to produce the results claimed by its advocates. It created a new word, cram—a word that stands for the negation of all real mental training. Mr. Lowe and his colleagues worked for ten years, firmly convinced that there is no such thing as a science of education. Under a regime of mechanical examinations there settled down on the elementary school a monotonous and lifeless uniformity. A subject that could not be examined, and attainment in which could not be tabulated in examination tables, was unfit to be included in the school curriculum. It is astonishing with what persistency the low ideals of the pernicious "payment-by-results" system have dominated primary education during the last forty years. The worst product of it is the 100-per-cent. teacher, the man whose horizon is bounded by examiners' fads, and who, by a wise process of elimination, manages to anticipate an inspector's questions.

Another step in advance was made by the committee on education set up in 1871. Huxley was a member of it, and his presence was a sure indication that no effort would be spared to break away from the traditions of the past. He saw that the existing forms of education were the mere survivals of the needs of past ages, and that it was the duty of the committee to make provision in the school for modern modes of thought. Hence, Huxley moved for the formation of science and art classes in connection with public and elementary schools. In his address he put forward a strong plea for the introduction of lessons in physical science. "The country could not possibly commit a greater error than in establishing schools in which the direct applications of science and art were taught before those who entered the classes were grounded in the principles of physical science." He himself showed the way by establishing in his regular classes a system of science teaching, based upon laboratory work by the pupils. "It involved the verification of every fact by each student, and was a training in scientific method, even more than in scientific fact." There succeeded an age of activity in the direction indicated, the new education of the day being heralded by the publication of a series of science primers for schools; but the promoters forgot again the fact that the emphasis in education must be laid on the teacher, and not on schemes and regulations and text-books. The memorizing of the generalizations of these text-books was substituted in the schools for training in scientific method, as initiated by Huxley.

In these colonies we have passed through phases of a similar character. The untrained and uneducated teacher has been a barrier across the path of reform; the examination fiend has held us tight in his inexorable grip; we have substituted a semblance of knowledge, scientific and literary, for the reality of knowledge itself. Now we are passing through a transition stage; and we modestly indicate our aspirations by using such epithets as "real," "new." There can be little doubt that our primary schools are receiving a baptism of fire; and the changes taking place in the foundation stages must affect the secondary schools and the universities.

It is within the scope of this paper to discuss only the aspect of this movement as it bears upon primary work. In passing, however, we may note the gradual changes taking place in the ideals of University education—changes tending in the direction of making these institutions count for more in national well-being. Public opinion first called into being the University extension movement; and the same force compelled the recognition of provision for the higher education of women. These movements, together with the establishment of University colleges, with curricula suited to modern requirements, have had a most vital significance in the furtherance of our national ideals of education. The establishment of technical schools has developed the ideas of all-round education in another direction; and not only so, but has influenced to an appreciable extent primary instruction. The cry of these schools has been that their progress is hampered by the bookish nature of the elementary work; that in some subjects, drawing especially, the instruction is most inadequate, and that training in manual aptitudes has been almost entirely neglected. The necessity for co-ordination of work in these several stages demands a central controlling authority, for without it the several grades are likely to work on independent lines; each class of schools indifferent to the needs of those immediately above or below. Secondary education left to the chance of private enterprise, and technical schools working according to the whims of successive managers, must imply conditions inimical to any system of educational co-ordination. The pupil ought to pass as easily from primary to secondary school, and

from the latter to the University, as he does from one class to another under a system of absolute freedom of classification.

The movement in the last fifteen years towards the betterment of conditions of education during the years of plasticity has centred round the teacher himself. Every effort is being made to make him efficient, and, given such efficiency, all minor details of school organisation and management may well be left to his judgment. Dr. Butler, noting the effect of training on the primary school teachers of America, and comparing the tone of the schools under such men with that of secondary schools taught by untrained men, boldly asserts:—"Perhaps no secondary school or college in America can show teaching to compare, in mastery of scientific method and in technical skill, with the best teaching to be seen in many of the public elementary schools, particularly in the Western States. In consequence of this, we may safely assume that pupils fresh from the vigorous, intellectual, and moral growth of a well-conducted elementary school will turn aside with disgust from the machine methods and dull, uninspiring class-exercises of our average academy. The new educational life-blood is flowing most freely and vigorously in the veins of the elementary teacher." What, we ask, is the essential element of such training? The teacher is primarily dealing with mental processes and mental growth; hence it is essential that all his training should be based on accurate knowledge of the nature of such mental processes—in other words, his training must be grounded in psychology. Is reading, writing and arithmetic the objective of the schoolroom? No; if it were so, anybody could take a book in hand and hear lessons. But when we consider that the master's business is to train heads to think accurately, hearts to feel sympathetically, and hands to do what is right, the difficulties of his work become apparent. It is one of the most pleasing features of the recent advance in method that psychology, hitherto a battle-ground for the warring theories of useless philosophies, has become the most intensely interesting of all practical sciences in its application to the theory and practice of education. No teacher worthy the name can now neglect the study of such books as Lloyd Morgan's "Psychology for Teachers," James's "Talks to Teachers," and John Adams' "Herbartian Psychology." The study of the science of psychology has taught teachers to lay the emphasis on the development of the pupil and not on the learning of subjects. In the words of Adams, the master needs to know more about John than about Latin. As soon as teachers begin to examine their work from the point of view of psychological method, they lose faith in the formalisms of tradition. Necessity forces the duty upon them of adapting themselves to all the various aptitudes of the individual pupils in their classes. In other words, they are led to think not only of a class of children, but also of individual children, diverse in disposition, in aspiration, in attainment, in mental capabilities. The problem set before the teacher in this view of education is not at all an easy one to solve.

Under such a view as this can a schoolmaster's work be mean, cramping, narrowing? Is it not rather the most difficult, the most broadening, the most uplifting work a man can engage in? An archbishop was once asked, "What kind of a man is Edward Thring?" The archbishop was about to poke the fire. He paused, and, holding out the poker, said, "Why, he was this kind of a man. If he were poking a fire, he would make you believe that the one thing worth living for was to know how to poke a fire properly!" Read the life of the great master of Uppingham, and it leaves this impression on the reader that there is one supreme thing to do in the world, namely, the management and training of boys. Such work requires all the energy and enthusiasm of the best men; it requires nothing short of the devotion of one's whole manhood. There is nothing small, nothing narrowing in it. Those who speak of the narrowness of the schoolmaster's work have never been true teachers, have never seen such at work; they have never known the divine enthusiasm that glows in the minds of those who are shaping the life and the character of a nation's youth. Thring's leading principle was that the dullest and most uninteresting boy was as precious in his eyes as the most brilliant. "Give every boy due attention," said Ruskin, "but spend most time on the brilliant ones." Edward Thring would probably reverse that. At Eton he had seen boys massed in large classes, and all the teaching directed towards the brilliant ones intended for the honours of the University. This struck him as the greatest defect of the school. Small classes for the teacher, and not more than 30 boys under the care of one master in a boarding-house, were two of the principles he carried out with iron determination. To be successful, each class-master and each house-master must individualize. Boys must be taken as units, each with his separate distinctive life: not in masses as parts of a great educational machine. One of his maxims was: "The teacher deals with latent powers; he does not hammer in a given task."

Under one aspect a teacher's work is visible, and capable of some degree of classification; under the psychological

view it is unseen and incapable of estimation, but none the less real and lasting. For the schools a certain definite syllabus of work is prescribed; each year's course is limited by a "thus-far-and-no-less" mandate; an examination gauges the quantity of information assimilated by the learner from the year's instruction, and there the matter seems to end. But this course of instruction may be pursued year after year without, at the same time, doing much to build up the mental faculties, without due guidance of the emotional capacities, and even without any proper regulation of the active powers. But this training and this guidance and this regulation is, after all, real education, the result of which can be measured by no scale of graduated percentages. The true teacher is he who, in the course of imparting the knowledge prescribed, always keeps steadily in view the latter ideal of his work, namely, education as a means of perfecting mental growth and development. This is the side on which the Greeks of Plato's day laid most stress; it is the side the utilitarian of these modern days is in danger of neglecting. Amongst the youth of Athens the end of physical training was the perfection of manly beauty and the preservation of bodily health; so the object of mental training was knowledge for its own sake, and for the discipline of the mental powers In this hurrying age we seem in danger of mistaking the means for the end. Athletics is made an end in itself: to many the settled business of life, to others the one absorbing topic of conversation. In the mental department we have taken up the same false attitude. Fact crowds upon fact in chaotic disorder. Time is precious and the best teacher is he who can impart the greatest amount in the shortest time, no matter how the organism fares in the hurried process of packing. The education of thinking, feeling, and acting powers is kept in the background to give place to tangible and showy results. The "know thyself" of Socrates was the keynote of the ancient system; "know the examiner," has come to the front in a generation given up to competitive examinations.

Notwithstanding these aspects of modern school life, there is much evidence that the stage of emancipation for the teacher is close at hand. The days have gone by when the charge can be laid against schoolmasters that, while the blacksmith may be deep in iron, and the shoemaker in leather, he alone of those who deal with mind is content to be ignorant of mind. The principles of psychology are permeating the whole process of his work, and influencing his methods in many important directions. It may still be argued:—Yes, the teachers know something of the groundwork of the science of education, but is it possible to make any use of this knowledge in the practical daily routine of the schoolroom? To those who are alive to the nature of recent changes in method and alteration in the point of objective in educational effort the answer is plain. Given increased skill, due to years of efficient training, and certain freedom in classification of pupils and arrangement of work, and marked changes are at once apparent in the buoyancy and general tone of the classrooms. Let us take one example. Recently, in New Zealand, the incubus of a rigid individual examination of pupils has been dispensed with. One result is, that inspectors have been relieved from the labour of much mechanical drudgery, and are able to give more time to assisting teachers in their methods. Then the teachers also, feeling themselves trusted, and given more responsibility than under the old regime, have responded with vigorous confidence. Reading between the lines of recent inspectors' reports we may summarise the results from the teachers' point of view as follows:—"Relieved from the responsibility and the overburdening anxiety of an impending examination, they move in a lighter and freer atmosphere, and are able to turn from the consideration of the necessity of getting their tale of bricks completed to that of the question how the lessons shall be laid before the children most effectively. They are more at liberty to study methods, and can make it their aim, not so much to ensure that a certain amount of knowledge shall be gained as that the instruction shall be given in the manner most conducive to its due assimilation." In other words, the teacher can rise above the drudgery of imparting information, and can make a brave attempt to overtake the higher part of his work—the quickening of the intellect, the purifying of the emotions, and the guidance of the nobler will.

Fortunately for the methods of the schoolroom the old faculty-psychology is now practically dead. This psychology produced such phrases as "training the reason," "cultivating the memory," "strengthening the imagination"; as if the mind consisted of separate compartments, each requiring a separate course of treatment. What was merely a logical analysis was exalted into a real one. Professor Findlay indicates the darkening of knowledge that took place under the disguise of such psychology applied to education:—"Milions of children have been set to learn spelling lists, because, among other grounds, this delightful employment will train the memory. Now, the most that can be said by a faculty-psychologist is that, by this exercise, the child will gain a faculty for acquiring similar lists of words hereafter, but he will gain no general faculty for recol-

lecting other matters." The Herbartian, with his theory of apperception, has put a new aspect on the work of the psychologist, as it bears upon the art of teaching. He has changed the methods of the teaching of science. The special work of science teaching, as far as the primary school is concerned, is to train the power of observation, and to insure care and accuracy in all measurements and calculations. To gain any advantage from such study, the learner must be placed more or less in the position of a discoverer. Accumulation of facts will not help him to gain the scientific spirit, any more than the memorising of mere vocables will give him a good memory. The psychologist shows that the teacher who is most successful in storing the child's mind with the greatest amount of information is also the most successful in removing any necessity for the child to think for himself. So, very careful attention and supervision must be given by the science teacher to train the pupil in accuracy, and in scientific method; not to demand the "getting up" of pages of book work.

To sum up the results of modern reform as far as the teaching is concerned it may be said that the aim now is rather educational than disciplinary. Children are to be taught to seek knowledge, to hunger and thirst after the unknown. The teacher is the guide who leads the way to the springs and groves of Parmussus. Character and development of life become the goal of effort; not the inspector's percentage table and the examiner's coloured pencil. We are seeking to avoid what Sir Oliver Lodge has characterised as the most soul-distressing product of the schools—the converting "of an intelligent or inquiring child into a dull and satiated professional schoolboy or schoolgirl." Perhaps the most encouraging sign of the times is the evident desire on the part of progressive Nations and States to cease to belittle and hinder the men and women who are charged with the training of their children.

So far, much has been said about the teacher and his art; let us not forget the child and his aptitudes. A great deal is written in these days about child-study—much that is very ridiculous and very useless. But the movement has done some good in leading the teacher to see tht his methods ought to seek and use the natural impulses of the restless little atoms in front of him. How observant children are! how inquisitive! What wonderful powers of reasoning they possess at times! And their very mistakes — what are they but windows through which we may peep into the working of their litle minds? Then, how easy it is to manage children, if only they are kept busy. Teachers who make use of this characteristic—teachers who show much skill in the invention and organisation of "busy-work" have no difficulty in maintaining discipline. Young children, on first entering our schools, exhibit these powers, if they come from homes where they have received due encouragement from their parents. The wise infant-mistress will not repress any spontaneity of the kind; she will skilfully make use of it. And what questions your little tots of four and five will ask? "Where is the wind when it does not blow?" asked a little fellow who could scarcely lisp the words he was using. And, again, when a severe rain storm was at its height: "Mother, has God turned on all the taps to-day?" "What is a policeman for?" asked the same child when walking down the street w.. his grandmother, noting the distinctive uniform. Among other things, he was told that his office was to keep people good A few days after he was being taken to a house to meet other children, and he was impressed with the necessity of correct behaviour: "Yes, grandma," he said, "I will be good; I will be as good as a policeman." He had logically reasoned that a man who kept people "good" ought to be a model of perfection himself!

Child-study has shown the value of such aptitudes and powers, and educationists do not fail to take the child along the path of least resistance. A happy combination of Kindergarten and Quincy methods has led to a revolution in infant-school teaching. Froebel's methods had serious limitations; hence the amount of mystical nonsense that gathered round the "gifts." But the modern adaptation is a transformation of the old, due partly to Colonel Parker, but mostly to the divine vitality of the hundreds of infant mistresses who are quietly and unostentatiously performing the noblest work in the profession. The blunderers of the past set immature pupil teachers to train the infant classes; it is part of the glory of the present that the best and most sympathetic women in the service are now secured for this work.

Take, by way of example, another aptitude of the young child—the power of observation. Will anyone deny that the bookish work of the past has been a potent means in smothering all the pupil's proclivities in this direction? A noteworthy feature of modern methods of education is the tendency to depart from the old book-learning ideal, and to cultivate and train on right lines those instinctive powers of observation already referred to. In the past the child has been too much of a passive entity. His active powers were exercised in crude attempts at drawing stiff inartistic forms

or in placing yards of unintelligible figures on a slate and then rubbing them off again. He reduced marvellous fractions to uncommon denominators, and spent much time in calculating when the hands of a clock would be together, while inwardly praying that the said hands would hurry on a little faster. While performing transmutations on thousands of pounds changed from one stock to another, the only objective reality he was ever likely to come in contact with was the question of the number of marbles he could buy for a penny. In other words his faculty of seeing and his faculty of interpreting were never exercised, but even subjected to positive check, by the school curriculum. The subjects under the new order that will change all this are geography and nature study. "Geography!" you exclaim. Visions of names, of heights of mountains and lengths of rivers, of capes and bays, swarm in the bewildered brains! How we agonised to learn the names of all these, to the accompaniment of a birch-rod! But now we take our pupils to the top of Geography Hill, which may be a spot in their own playground, and from that vantage point we commence our survey of this fair earth. Real rivers and mountains are substituted for marks on tattered wall-maps; where it is not possible to come in contact with actualities, pictures and lantern views are shown; models in clay or plasticine are made in the presence of the children and by the children. Geography and Nature study combined and co-ordinated will prove in the future the means of developing the observational powers to an appreciable degree. Redway puts this aspect very tersely when he says:—'The reading method might fi' a young man to be a private secretary; the discovery method fits him to be the employer of private secretaries. Anything that gives me self-power to discover and acquire knowledge is good; anything that gives the teacher self-knowledge in the place of a reading acquaintance is equally good. There is a wonderful strength that comes from the knowledge of contact; it is as solid gold compared with paper tinsel..'

Another subject that has recently been introduced into the primary schools to meet the needs of child activities is handwork. Modelling in plastic substances and in cardboard, brushwork drawing, carton-work, and woodwork, are all splendid aids in directing the energies of children towards self-realisation of all the bodily and mental powers. Hand, eye, and brain are trained to operate in one self-acting unity. Teachers find that the two hours every week devoted to one or other of these forms of handwork are really two hours gained in buoyancy and mental reaction when the time comes round for the book-lessons again. Then, what a splendid training in accuracy and care the woodwork exercises are! When a boy tries to fit his lap-joint or his dovetail he finds that "near enough" is a bad maxim to work upon. "We don't send our girls to school to learn cooking," you say. No, perhaps not; but you would like them to be clean and orderly, and trained in all those habits that tend to make home sweet, and life enjoyable. There is another aspect of these innovations, an aspect that only teachers will notice. In school-life, sport often helps a dull boy to retain his self-respect among his companions. So with handwork. The boy at the foot of the class may be easily first at the bench. To the boy, one first is as good as another. In the past, effort has been directed too much to the training of head-workers only; handwork is making school-life endurable to those who can never be head-workers. Further, if a boy is to be a doctor or a lawyer, does he not require a sound guidance in careful accuracy? Surely, as much as, if not more than, the mechanic needs. The training in school-life should be general and not special; in growing children we must guard against over-specialisation, for it may mean interference with the natural order of development. Teachers find that handwork is resulting in habits of inquiry on the part of their pupils, and thus tends to make school-life less hard, less monotonous, and less a matter of antagonism. Such work in our primary schools will lead to a much higher level of national intelligence, and we know that a high average intelligence is the only safeguard of a democracy.

Time will permit only a passing reference to the efforts made to improve the surroundings of the pupils. School hygiene has come to stay; it demands close attention to all matters of health. Lighting, ventilation, seating accommodation, eye and ear-testing, examination of teeth come under its searching eye. Nor can we deal now with æsthetic considerations—the beautifying of the walls with works of art, the orderly arrangement of flower plots to fill the unused parts of the playground.

Only the fringe of this subject has been touched upon. Enough has been said to indicate that a great and momentous movement is at work all over the thinking world. Sad will be the fate of the State that does anything to cripple the advance of education in its midst. It must drop to the rear in the march of the nations. The best asset any country can possess is a thoughtful, observant, active, strong people. There are gold mines of wealth in our public schools, knew we but how to work them.

A new era is dawning for the teacher, an era of strenuous endeavour and tardy recognition. He dreams of work under better conditions, both for himself and his pupils. He hopes for schools that will meet all hygienic requirements; buildings and playgrounds and furniture all ministering to that quiet, restful, æsthetic atmosphere that should pervade all his work. For him the gates of art have opened a little way to give a vision of the perfection that recedes for ever and for ever as he advances—a perfection to which he aspires, but which he never attains. Nevertheless, he hopes to be numbered amongst the "high men" of Browning's lines—

"That low man seeks a little thing to do,
Sees it and does it:
That high man, with a great thing to pursue,
Dies ere he knows it."

Mr. Clemes said that, as the oldest teacher present, he would like to say a few words on the very able paper read by Mr Johnson. He remembered the system of primary education in England 50 years ago, referred to by the lecturer, having been in a private school at the time. They learned a great deal more in private schools then than was taught in any of the State-schools. Lowe's principle of payment by result made scarcely any difference to the private school teaching, but wholly to the Board-schools, which took the place of the National and British schools, the former conducted by the Church of England, while the latter were undenominational. Huxley's work dealt mainly with secondary schools. He was in Switzerland when the technical schools, borrowed from thence, were introduced into England. These were used by the manufacturers as a means of improving the technical skill of their work-people, which was clean against the idea of all true educationists, who desired to train, not plumbers and carpenters, but the science that underlay the art that was to be learned in the workshop. Referring to America, the speaker said that the primary school teachers there, especially in the west, were nearly all young women. And a great deal of the higher education in America was also in the hands of women. He hoped that the training-school was not going to enter into competition with the secondary schools. The time had not come to try and cripple the secondary schoolmasters. (Applause.)

Dr. Delany said the drift of Mr. Johnson's paper was quite in harmony with what he desired for the education of the children—that the teachers should be specially trained, and that they should enter into the attitude of the child. The formation of character, which was one of the main elements of the new education, could not be successfully carried out on basis so unstable as the emotions, but must be grounded on the conscience, an all-important element which was not attended to by the Greeks. Mr. Johnson had made the happy remark that the school should follow the home. An eminent Frenchman had said that the school could give instruction, but was powerless to give education, which could only be obtained in the home. If that were true, as he was inclined to believe it was, it was important that the school teacher should occupy the place of parent to the child, and thus the continuity between the home and the school life of the child should not be broken. (Applause.)

Mr. R. Smith, headmaster of the Battery Point State-school, said that his attention had first been called to the newer developments in education seven or eight years ago by letters from America, placed in his hands by the late Sir Edward Braddon, asking children here to correspond with children in America on natural history and other subjects. A correspondence thereupon ensued between the children here and there, which had been of great advantage to both sides, and had been the means of dispelling a great deal of ignorance about the different countries between which the correspondence was conducted. He gave a striking illustration to show the value of a suggestion by Mr. Johnson to teach different subjects—mental and manual, for instance—so as to reach all sorts of minds. One of the boys attending his school had been completely given up by the teachers as utterly hopeless and incapable till the band was introduced, when he was the very first to attain proficiency, and from that time an entire change for the better took place in his life. (Applause.)

Hon. Herbert Nicholls, M.H.A., ex-Minister of Education, said that Mr. Johnson's lecture struck him as sounding the drum which was to signalise the freedom of one very much wronged individual—the child with a character. The child who could reason out a problem of Euclid but could not memorise it had been the victim of previous systems. Henceforth, he was glad to know, that the character of the child would be recognised as the important thing to be studied. Australian and Tasmanian children did not lack individuality and originality, and if they were allowed to develop in their own way, they would have a far more vigorous and intelligent community in the future than they had ever had in the past. (Applause.)

Hon. W. B. Propsting, M.L.C., Minister of Education, said if Mr. Johnson's paper enabled the bulk of the people to realise what the new education meant a great deal would have been achieved. It meant that in the future children were not to be treated as machines to carry

away as the result of their schooling a mass of undigested information of very little use, but as intelligent human beings to be given a mental experience, which would enable them to develop all their faculties, so as to be able, when they left school, to confront the varied problems of life in a satisfactory manner. The aim of the paper had been apparently mistaken by Mr. Clemes. It was not an advocacy of the control of the whole of education by the Government. For his own part, he would be delighted if the whole of the educational work of the State could be undertaken by private enterprise, so long as it was efficiently done. Private enterprise was doing, and had done, a very large and important part in this and the other States, but a large number of parents could not afford to pay for a private education, and so the State stepped in, and undertook the work. And the State was endeavouring to see that the children were given the very best possible education that could be provided. Ten per cent., perhaps 20 per cent., of a child's life, and that the most important period, was spent in school. It was handed over to some master to train, and the State had determined that for so vitally important a work the teacher should be trained. That was the reason why they had started the training school, and in Mr. Johnson, he felt sure, they had the right man in the right place. In a democracy such as theirs, the people governed the country, and it was therefore of the utmost importance that the people should be educated. This was being done by the State. After relating an anecdote to show the value of Sloyd teaching, Mr. Propsting concluded by thanking Mr. Johnson for the very able paper he had read.

His Excellency said it was a very great pleasure to him to see around him those engaged in education work in Tasmania, the prominent instructors in private schools, the prominent masters of secondary schools,two Ministers of Education,and other leaders of thought. He felt the Royal Society was performing a useful work in affording an occasion upon which these questions could be discussed in a scientific light. The touchstone of Mr. Johnson's fascinating paper might be found, he thought, in one of the earliest remarks in it, that the new education was not new. One of its principal characteristics was the differentiation between education and instruction. Education might be divided into education of the attributes of the mind and of the body. Instruction comprised every branch of learning—human and divine. Where to draw the line between the two had been the problem and the mystery. He remembered the first time he was in the Tasman Sea between New Zealand and Australia. That was education. At that time he had to cram up a whole lot of information from books to pass the matriculation examination at Cambridge. That was instruction. He did not agree with Mr. Johnson in his analysis of the bearing of Plato's views on education. It was true that it was largely aimed at developing the physical qualities of men and women as animals, and beauty for the sake of beauty in an æsthetic spirit, but the founder of that system of education had another thing in his mind, and what the most earnest and puzzled thinkers of Australia had in their mind now, the connection between education and the problem how to protect the Commonwealth from danger. After glancing at later systems of education, His Excellency went on to refer to the principle of competitive examination, for which he felt great contempt, but he did not sneer at the examiner at competitive examinations, who was a creature of circumstances. After praising the modern organisation of training colleges His Excellency touched on one of the drawbacks of democratic government, the enormous difficulty of getting rid of incompetent, worn-out, or out-of-date servants. The remedy for this, in his opinion, was an adequate and generous pension system for school teachers. After some further remarks, His Excellency proposed a hearty vote of thanks to Mr. Johnson for his interesting and able paper. (Loud applause.)

In acknowledging the vote, Mr. Johnson corrected a misunderstanding by Mr. Clemes as to the use of the word private school in England 50 years ago. The schools referred to by Mr. Clemes were not the ones he had had in his mind, but the primary schools, where the children of the poor were educated.

This terminated the business, and the meeting closed.

OCTOBER, 1906.

No meeting in October.

NOVEMBER, 1906.

On November 8th, Professor W. Baldwin Spencer lectured before the Society on "The Australian Aborigines."

Other business was postponed, including a paper by Colonel W. V. Legge, R.A., on "Ben Lomond."