

means of cultivating the reasoning and observing faculties; but it has been felt that everything reasoned about and observed, so far as life and its objects are concerned, is worthless. Chemistry has won its place because it not only cultivates these faculties, but also turns them in a proper direction. The results of the teaching of chemistry we may soon look for in the improved health of the people, and in the advanced civilization due to a greater command over the forces of nature. The principle that has brought chemistry into our schools is the principle of practical utility; and having thus recognized it in the case of this one natural science we should be alive to its application in other departments of the school curriculum.

Dissatisfaction had, no doubt, long been felt at the treatment of modern languages, and especially of English, by the University of Toronto; but it is only some five years ago that this dissatisfaction took definite shape in the organized protests of the moderns class of '83. It is through Mr. John Squair (now lecturer in French in University College), and an earnest little body of thinkers gathered around him, that a revolution has ensued, which, to-day, is about to *crown* its success with the adoption by the University of a course of modern language study superior to that of any other American College, and calculated vastly to stimulate original composition and the most liberal study of literature. This change has originated from the same motive that has introduced chemistry into our schools—the longing for the practical utility of the subjects taught.

It is not surprising that this revolution in the University should necessitate corresponding changes in our High Schools, whose system is modelled on the pattern furnished by the University.

Two things especially are now demanded: knowledge of English literature, and ability to write English. These demands are quite in a line with the objects of education, that the pupil may be more, and that he may do more. The great conceptions everywhere embodied in English literature necessarily force the pupil into a wider range of thought and feeling, and in every way expand his nature. But it is not sufficient to content ourselves with a play of Shakespeare, and a book or two of Milton. These are all very well. But to spend a year on such a small fragment of our literature is not wise. We should remember our object will best be accomplished by encouraging the most active, miscellaneous study of this literature; and this can best be done by making the literature class the auditorium for the constant reading of the pupils' favourite authors. If we can only awaken a love for literature, we shall have done a grand work. I have spoken here of reading. To judge from its entire neglect in our upper classes, we seem to have forgotten the value of good reading. Let me insist on its importance. It is not only the source of great pleasure to those around us; but is essential for a proper appreciation of literature. The memorizing of passages of our literature should be carefully attended to and encouraged, that the pupils may have a storehouse of great thoughts, fine images and models of style. It goes without saying that the study of prescribed texts should be almost entirely directed with a view to the realization of the spirit of the work in the mind of the pupil. In the case of dramas, the rendition of important scenes by the scholars will be most beneficial, not only on account of the value of the passages learned, but also on account of the life thus infused into the play. We should not neglect philology. It will be a great work if