

though he will still continue to write for its columns. All communications of whatever nature, whether relating to the editorial or business department, should henceforth be addressed to Mr. J. L. Robertson, Educational Emporium, 423 Yonge Street, Toronto. Let him be notified promptly of any irregularities which may occur, and they will be as promptly rectified. The new arrangements are now complete. Punctuality, efficiency, and progress are the watchwords, the determination being to make the paper better than ever.

Philadelphia has fallen into line in the work of industrial training in the schools. The Board of Public Education of that city has opened a Manual Training School for the instruction of boys who have graduated from the grammar schools, in the use of mechanical tools. A suitable building has been fitted up and furnished with all needful appliances, and competent instructors have been appointed to superintend operations. It is not the trade, but the use of tools that is to be taught, or, in other words, the school is strictly for manual training. Of course, as every educator knows, the training of the hand means the training of eye, taste, judgment, and all the correlated perceptive faculties as well. This institution is understood to be but the commencement of a system which is to be gradually extended down through all grades of the Public Schools. These new departures in the direction of industrial training, which we are chronicling from week to week, will be watched with great interest by students of the hard educational and moral problems which are everywhere pressing for solution. It seems scarcely too much to hope that in a wise and skilful combination of industrial and mental training is to be found a means of deliverance from much of the moral and social evil which is the outgrowth of the helplessness of large classes who are growing up in the city for lives of poverty, vice, and crime. The argument which the *Bulletin* so well puts for Philadelphia admits of a much wider application.

"Whatever adds to Philadelphia's industrial forces, whatever increases the class of her skilled mechanics; whatever tends to dignify manual labor; whatever enlarges the opportunities of honest self-support, puts money into Philadelphia's pocket and reinforces the elements of Philadelphia's greatness. These training schools have come into existence by no fanatical creation of educational theorists, but as the necessity of the times, and as such they must be liberally supported. Whatever they cost will come back to Philadelphia a hundred-fold."

Principal Grant, in his address at the anniversary of Queen's College the other day, referring to the proposed university federation scheme, said:—"The so-called confederation scheme has not a single clause to secure the continued existence of the colleges, we now have, much less a single word indicating a desire to improve them." In these words Dr. Grant puts his finger upon the weak point in the scheme of federation as finally modified. The great end to be sought in any such movement is the expansion and vigorous life of the colleges. A central university, surrounded with a cordon of teaching institutions, each full of vigorous life and of possibilities of unlimited growth, might give a mighty impulse to the higher education of the country. A central university, constituted to

relieve the colleges of a portion of their legitimate work, and thus acting as an enervating rather than stimulating force, would be a very questionable boon. Not as a help to existing theological schools, but as a means of fostering sound and broad literary culture, would the federation be justifiable.

"An Old College Boy" writes to the *Mail* on the Upper Canada College question. Speaking for many other old college boys as well as for himself, he says:—"We believe that the college in its present situation is an anachronism, while we also believe in the vital necessity for its continuance as part of our educational system." With the first part of this sentence every intelligent educator in Ontario must agree. The college is an anachronism. With the second part most such, old college boys perhaps excepted, will, we think, differ. Having admitted so much, the burden of proof rests upon those who can suppose that the mere removal of the institution to the outskirts of the city will make it the less an anachronism. It is to be hoped that the suggestion that a meeting of old college boys be called to discuss the question, may be acted on. We should be glad to learn what can be said and all that can be said in favor of continuing as a part of our educational system an institution which has outlived its special usefulness, and is now doing merely the same work that is being done by numerous collegiate institutes, doing it no better and at ten times the cost.

The abuse of the written examination which has made the name a synonym for "cram," is leading to a very natural but illogical result. The whole system of outside examinations is being vigorously denounced in many and even in very high quarters. This is, we think, a mistake. We know no other method at all equal to it for compelling the pupil to conceive clearly, think closely and reason logically. Nor can we conceive of any substitute, at all comparable to it, as a means of testing the reality and extent of a student's acquirements, a desirable and often necessary thing. The root of the evil is not in the system but in the kind of examinations. Examining is a science and an art and should be raised to the rank of a profession. We believe it quite possible so to frame a set of questions on almost any subject as to give the death-blow to cram, by rendering it useless, and so to estimate the value of answers as to recognize only genuine, intelligent, and conscientious work, and developed brain-power, and to recognize these in whatever form they may appear.

The *Globe* in a recent article defends the one text-book system in the following remarkable manner:

"If the last book authorized is really the best text-book on the subject, why not allow it to displace all the others on the list? Is it not a positive loss to a school to be using inferior text-books? Is it not the truest economy to use the best implements, as it is admitted to be the most economical to engage the best teachers? And this brings us to consider the second proposition, that there should be but one authorized text-book on each subject in the Public School course. To this it is objected, that you limit the choice of the teacher and consequently dampen and perhaps cramp his energies. But the teacher is after all a public officer, appointed for a well-known