

tanism in education, which will take away from him that arrogance that is apt to result from too narrow a specialization." President Sharpless of Mansford College, while advocating co-operation between the smaller colleges and properly equipped technical schools, enters an indignant protest against the action of those who would degrade the course of study to meet the demand for what is called a practical education. He says "It will be a sad day for America if utilitarianism usurps more than its proper place. The proper balance of ideas demands that the exponents of pure scholarship should not abate one iota of their claims. The colleges are their special working grounds and they must not surrender them unduly to intruders. While recognizing that a scientific course may produce a valuable culture, they must make good their title to being the real educators of the American people, and force an acknowledgement of the fact that for all men, whether working for material or intellectual results, their courses are an invaluable preparation." The drift of opinion tended to the advisability of making technical teaching a university rather than a college work, and of insisting on a large measure of culture study in connection with the technical courses.

The proposal to examine candidates for admission to the university in one or two English classics is one in which, if we mistake not, many advanced teachers in these provinces will heartily sympathise. The work which is set down for a high school department is largely determined by the requirements of the college matriculation examination. But the great majority of those who enter the high school complete their studies there, and must, therefore, enter upon the duties of life with such preparation as it provides. We cannot, however, accept as an adequate outfit in English, such a knowledge of grammar, including parsing and analysis, and such very elementary composition as is often required of matriculants to college. A higher standard of excellence in English composition ought to be fixed, and certain books selected from English classical authors, in the same way as we choose books from the Latin and Greek classics, should be prescribed for thorough study and careful examination, and manifestly the energies of the pupils would not be overtaxed if to this we were to add an elementary acquaintance with English literary history of the last three centuries. Were this done pupils would leave school more rationally trained than they are at present, somewhat cultured as to literary taste, and with the desire to read for themselves evoked and stimulated. And we feel assured that professors of English in our colleges would be delighted to escape the elementary work which must at present be the occupation of the first year's students in English, and devote the time thus rescued to pursuits more congenial to themselves, and more inspiring to those who are committed to their care.

THE FAILURE OF EDUCATION.

Under this heading we find a tart article by LeSuer in the *Toronto Week*. "How empty of all results a five or six years' course of schooling may be, hundreds of parents are daily forced to acknowledge. The conclusion that we draw is that in general the physical trainer knows what he is about while the intellectual trainer does not." This is the burden of his wail. And too much truth there is in it. But there are other parents, and other children, and other teachers.

Again:

"State education is and always will be book-education, if only on account of the uniformity that must necessarily characterize it. What is wanted at the head of an educational establishment is a strong and an original personality; when you have that you must allow it scope — more scope than it can ever have under the regulations of any department of education. A really rational system of education, moreover, would necessarily be much in advance of average opinion, and could not, therefore, be administered by the state, which in all things can only go as far as average public opinion permits."

But what if at the head of an educational department there is a strong and original personality? Would not that be as good for the state system as it would be for the private school? And would the results be considerably more extensive in their development?

He strikes the nail on the head, among his random blows, in the following paragraph:

"Every teacher in the land who divorces words from realities and thoughts from things, who puts meaningless or evasive reasons into the mouths of pupils, who fills the mind with abstractions before the perceptive and apprehensive faculties have had any proper exercise. Every teacher, we might almost say, who follows the ordinary method of the schools is inducing stupidity, more or less, in the minds of his or her pupils. The worse than nullity of the intellectual discipline in such cases is masked by the fact that a certain amount of positive knowledge has been communicated; and parents, who unfortunately judge of schooling by what their children seem to have learnt in certain recognized branches of study, are sometimes satisfied though more often not. 'My child seems to be learning absolutely nothing at school!' is an exclamation not unfrequently heard. We should not advise the parents of such children to despair, however. Barring cases of vicious obstinacy, the child who seems to be learning nothing at school may, perhaps, be keeping his faculties unimpaired for future use; while the boy who is the teacher's pride may be surrendering up his own individuality, in a most hurtful degree, to the will of another, and taking an impress of artificiality and intellectual dependence that he will not free himself from for the remainder of his days. Not often is the winner of many prizes at school the winner of the great prizes of active life."