

midable enough surely for a High School, but far beyond what can be faithfully attended to by the most gifted teacher in the limited time at his disposal in any Public School.

To show the absurdity of ever expecting one Teacher to teach all the branches in the "Programme of Studies" properly, let us suppose an ordinary school of fifty pupils whose advancement entitles them to use the five Readers prescribed by the Council of Public Instruction. The following will then shew the number of classes in the whole school as well as the lowest possible number in each subject:—

| | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Reading, | 8 classes. |
| Spelling, | 8 classes. |
| Arithmetic, | 8 classes. |
| Writing, | 8 classes. |
| Grammar, | 5 classes. |
| Object Lessons, | 4 classes. |
| Composition, | 5 classes. |
| Geography, | 8 classes. |
| Drawing, | 8 classes. |
| Music, | 1 class. |
| Ancient History, | 2 classes. |
| Modern History, | 1 class. |
| Canadian History, | 2 classes. |
| English History, | 3 classes. |
| Christian Morals, | 1 class. |
| Civil Government, | 2 classes. |
| Human Physiology, | 1 class. |
| Natural History, | 1 class. |
| Natural Physiology, | 2 classes. |
| Agricultural Chemistry, | 3 classes. |
| Botany, | 3 classes. |
| Agriculture, | 3 classes. |
| Algebra, | 2 classes. |
| Geometry, | 2 classes. |
| Mensuration, | 2 classes. |
| Book Keeping, | 2 classes. |
| Domestic Economy, | 2 classes. |

This gives a total of ninety-seven classes, to be taught by one teacher, in the short time of six hours each day. Now we care not what division the teacher may make of his time, or how hard he may work, or how

gifted he may be, we say it is impossible for him to do justice to such a variety of subjects. More, we say it is unreasonable to ask a teacher to undertake such an amount of work, and be expected to do it well. There is a limit to the capacity of a Teacher to impart as well as of pupils to receive. And when that limit is exceeded in either case the most disastrous consequences must ensue. Education does not consist in the variety of subjects to which the attention may have been called. Indeed it not unfrequently happens that too great a variety weakens and dissipates the mind, and defeats the primary object of education altogether. This must inevitably be the case where variety without thoroughness prevails.

In laying out a "Programme of Studies" for Public Schools, the question might be asked, "If you set aside the present what would you substitute?" This question is easily answered. The present programme simply attempts too much. It certainly is desirable that the people of this country should possess some knowledge of all the subjects which it contains, but as we believe this knowledge cannot be obtained at a Public School we would not damage their chances to obtain more important knowledge by diverting their attention towards too great a variety of subjects. We are thoroughly convinced that in the majority of schools there is ample room yet for rudimentary work, that even in Reading and Arithmetic there is much that they ought to know of which they are yet ignorant, and that until they have made more substantial progress in these branches, it would not be profitable to them, nor to society, that their energies should be wasted in grappling with subjects of secondary importance. How many pupils in our schools can read an ordinary paragraph in prose with proper tone and emphasis? How many of our Fourth Form readers can give a common sense explanation of all the words in the Second