

receive an amount of encouragement so utterly disproportionate to their numbers? Is an acquaintance with the classics more conducive to the prosperity of the country than a knowledge of mechanics; or proficiency in the dead languages, belles-lettres, and the abstruse sciences, of as much importance as a thorough knowledge of our own language, the practical mathematics, geometry, designing and chemistry? And yet these more practical studies are almost lost sight of during the first year or two of academic courses, and but little thought of during the subsequent years; while studies in a host of Latin and Greek Authors, Grammars, Lexicons and Readers, with a fair sprinkling of French, Spanish and Italian, and Exercises in Ancient History and Geography, logic and rhetoric, Metaphysics, and the higher departments of science, absorb almost all the time and attendance of the student, leaving him but little leisure and less inclination to pursue the more important subjects of a useful education. We would not complain of this system of instruction for those to whom it is adapted, did it not monopolise nearly all the legislative aid, and thus induce so many of our most talented young men from the industrial classes to enter the professions; and how many sons of mechanics are there, who, having thus graduated, are now *barely* existing as masters of Grammar Schools, at salaries of from \$500 to \$800 a year, or are connected with the press at no better or even worse remuneration, that might have become eminent men, and have taken honorable positions as mechanics or mechanical engineers, or in various other active employments, had they been enabled to obtain in the country a suitable technical education.

We have no hesitation in saying, that our colleges and universities do not at present afford suitable means of education for any but professional occupations; and the sooner the curriculum of studies of each is re-modelled, so as to give increased attention to, or embrace a greater number of the more useful and practical departments of knowledge, the better will it be for their graduates and for the industrial interests of the country. We have *too* much education of the *higher* kind, and *too* little of that which leads to practical results. How many of our university graduates can be found in any callings but those of the pulpit, the bar and medicine, or as grammar school teachers, or editors of party political newspapers? They have become unfitted, by the very course of studies they have had to pursue, for any more practical vocations—no matter what their former positions in society may have been, it would be *losing caste* for even an A. B. to descend to the position of a me-

chanic or manufacturer, or even to that of a mechanical engineer.

The *Scientific American* recently stated that "it is now not uncommon for graduates of our collegiate institutions either to settle down as mechanics or attempt the *role* of journalists"—the latter position some amongst us in Canada may take, but we doubt if one can be found who has committed himself to the former. Since commencing this article, we have met with some excellent remarks in the London *Mechanics' Magazine*, on "Technical Education in England," in which the writer says:—

"There is a marked contrast between the avowed intention of the instruction of youth on the Continent and in this country. The general consent of authority here is, that the object of the school is chiefly and primarily mental discipline, and, in a secondary degree, the acquirement of rudimentary knowledge of those subjects which either form the key to other studies, or which must necessarily be studied early, if they are ever to be mastered. It is only casually that useful knowledge is admitted in our conventional notion of education. The chief work of our public schools is the classics, and these are taught more as illustrations of general grammar and of the structure of language than with a view to the mere facility of reading Latin and Greek authors. Mathematics are but little studied; and the modern tendency is to regard them more as a peculiar example and exercise of logic than to teach them with direct reference to their immediate practical use. Mensuration, linear drawing, and practical geometry have been dropped, and descriptive geometry never adopted in the ordinary curriculum. The presumption is that the school and the university have trained a man to learn, and that his practical education begins when he leaves the latter. We are not prepared to discuss the propriety of this system, in so far as it applies to the higher and wealthier classes. We may be quite sure that they will always see their own true interests, or if they do not, that they will soon be replaced by people who are more alert. It is sufficient to observe that it defers practical education to an age when the children of the middle and professional classes ought to have begun to maintain themselves.

Now in France, Prussia, Switzerland, and the states lying between them, the instruction of the people is conducted on a totally different principle. While the classics are far less exclusively studied, a knowledge of them is much more common. They are taught as languages to be understood and written, while the chief application of grammar is to the language of the country, whether French, German, or Dutch. Geometry is taught, not from Euclid, but in a thoroughly practical form, and the whole of the mathematical instruction has direct reference to possible application. The result is, that an English boy leaves school at fifteen or sixteen years of age with an imperfect smattering of Latin and Greek, and an acquaintance with algebra and Euclid which it would be ridiculous to dignify by the name of mathematical knowledge; while the French or German has