

Apportionment to Counties for 1860.

Counties.	Com. Schools.	Sep. Schools.	Total.
1. Glenkerry.....	\$2697 00	\$211 00	\$2308 00
2. Stormont.....	1836 00	...	1836 00
3. Dundas.....	2102 00	...	2102 00
4. Prescott.....	1668 00	91 00	1759 00
5. Russell.....	839 00	...	839 00
6. Carleton.....	3209 00	132 00	3341 00
7. Grenville.....	2352 00	46 00	2398 00
8. Leeds.....	3640 00	49 00	3689 00
9. Lanark.....	3314 00	...	3314 00
10. Renfrew.....	2032 00	...	2032 00
11. Frontenac.....	2325 00	113 00	2438 00
12. Addington.....	1985 00	46 00	2031 00
13. Lennox.....	881 00	...	881 00
14. Prince Edward.....	2100 00	...	2100 00
15. Hastings.....	3952 00	26 00	3978 00
16. Northumberland.....	3842 00	36 00	3878 00
17. Durham.....	3778 00	...	3778 00
18. Peterborough.....	2063 00	...	2063 00
19. Victoria.....	2027 00	...	2027 00
20. Ontario.....	4259 00	...	4259 00
21. York.....	6271 00	133 00	6404 00
22. Peel.....	2919 00	...	2919 00

Counties.	Com. Schools.	Sep. Schools.	Total.
23. Simcoe.....	\$4347 00	\$69 00	\$4416 00
24. Halton.....	2130 00	12 00	2142 00
25. Wentworth.....	2923 00	41 00	3063 00
26. Brant.....	2169 00	...	2169 00
27. Lincoln.....	1904 00	53 00	2047 00
28. Welland.....	2139 00	...	2139 00
29. Haldimand.....	2629 00	46 00	2675 00
30. Norfolk.....	3061 00	9 00	3070 00
31. Oxford.....	4501 00	...	4501 00
32. Waterloo.....	3347 00	181 00	3528 00
33. Wellington.....	4292 00	183 00	4475 00
34. Grey.....	3743 00	...	3743 00
35. Perth.....	3435 00	27 00	3462 00
36. Huron.....	5272 00	...	5272 00
37. Bruce.....	2167 00	51 00	2218 00
38. Middlesex.....	5283 00	37 00	5320 00
39. Elgin.....	3408 00	...	3408 00
40. Kent.....	2789 00	52 00	2841 00
41. Lambton.....	2302 00	...	2302 00
42. Essex.....	2082 00	89 00	2171 00
	123543 00	1733 00	125276 00

TOTALS.

	Common Schools.	Separate Schools.	Total.
Total Counties.....	\$123543 00	\$1733 00	\$125276 00
" Cities.....	7792 00	3136 00	10928 00
" Towns*.....	8295 00	1955 00	10250 00
" Villages.....	4788 00	334 00	5122 00
	*144418 00	7158 00	151870 00
Additional sum reserved for any Roman Catholic Separate Schools which may be established in 1860.....			630 00
			\$152500 00

* Report from Town of Perth not received, and amount for Separate School not determined.

IX. Papers on Practical Education.

1. OVER-TAXING THE MIND.

Mental labor, without excess, is doubtless as beneficial as it is pleasant. A well occupied mind is conducive to bodily health. But with mental labor as with physical, to attempt too much, and to know no recreation, tends to injury of more or less permanence. And if this is the case with adults, how much more likely is it to be so with children. And yet a system is now pursued in our common schools, and in other and more private educational establishments, which permits to our children during waking hours no respite from mental labor. We refer to the custom of burdening children, after having spent the best part of the day in close mental application in a crowded school room, with lessons to be studied or committed to memory at home and out of school hours. The system has been more than once strongly condemned in our columns. It is deserving of blame for two reasons. It is unjust to the parents of the children. It imposes a burden upon them that of right belongs to the school teacher, who is paid to superintend the education of the child, and yet devolves that superintendence in a considerable degree upon the parent or parents. It deprives those parents of a large share of their children's society, and in some circumstances of the services of their children, often of considerable value and importance. It has pained us more than once to see a young child sitting apart during a whole evening from the rest of the family—shut out entirely from their pleasant society and intercourse, and from their rational amusements, because all the child's time and powers were required for the mastery of the four or five lessons brought from the school to be studied at home.

All this is an injustice to the parents of that child. They ought to have the blessing of that child's society, and if need be, the aid of those many little services, to render which is to a child with a mind free from anxiety and care, a real enjoyment. But if the present system is an injustice to the parent, how much more so is it to the child!—How can a child thus burdened with mental labor enjoy the sweets of home and the delights of family intercourse? It is impossible. Those three or four or five lessons are to be learned and must be learned before that child retires to sleep. They may not be left till morning, (though often they must then be once more studied,) lest the place in the class be forfeited on the morrow, in the competition of the school room. We only sketch a picture that too many of our readers have seen under their own roofs, when we describe such a child poring over books and distracted with study, until long after artificial light has been introduced, with flushed cheek and knitted brow, and finally retiring to a troubled sleep, overcome with weariness and vexed with the inevitable head-ache. Is this—can it be,—kind or just to a young and growing child? There can be but one answer to the question.

It is a great wrong to the body of the child. An adult would find it not easy to preserve the health of his body, were he to devote as many hours in succession to close mental application as in many cases the children who attend our common schools, are now required to do. Our profession enables us to speak with some authority and accuracy on this subject, and we know well that close and continuous mental effort must be alternated with recreation and manual labour, if the health of the body is to be maintained. This rule applies still more strictly to youth, whose physical development must be retarded unless the mind is occasionally lightened of its load, and free untrammelled bodily exercise be freely indulged in, which cannot be the case if the child has as much to learn in the evening at home as he or she had in the school during the day.—Every authority on the subject of the laws of health lays down the doctrine that abundant

and hearty exercise, with a mind perfectly free and buoyant is a *sine qua non* to a proper physical development, and the present system of compelling our children to study for nearly as many hours out of school as they do in school, is utterly incompatible with such sanitary rules.

But the system is also a great wrong to the mind and intellectual capacities of the child. As fresh air and exercise are necessary to vigor and physical health, so a strong and vigorous body is essential to a strong and vigorous mind. This is the rule, and the exceptions are very few, especially among children. The mental and physical qualities of the child have a reciprocal influence upon each other. There might be here and there, a precocious child whose mental capacities are ready for almost any amount of intellectual food, and who progresses the more rapidly the more severely those capacities are taxed. But these are few. The all but universal rule with children is, that to cram the mind is to weaken its powers and destroy its energies. Yet our educational system is exactly of this character. The mind is crammed beyond its capacities, its powers of digestion and the memory and other faculties are kept upon a tension, that deprives them of their elasticity and their tenacity of grasp, and is calculated sooner or later to paralyze and ruin them. It is greatly to be wished that our Board of Education would put a veto upon this system so fraught with evil, and insist that the education should be given by the teacher in the school, so that out of school hours children may have their minds free to take in all the pleasure and reap the benefits of physical recreation.—*New York Com. Adet.*

2. TRANSCRIBING *versus* DICTATION.

The value of dictation is said to consist in the knowledge of spelling which it imparts. Any exercise in writing which would teach so useful an art as spelling is of course of paramount importance. But does dictation really teach spelling, or is the idea that it does simply illusory? It seems to me that the point is one which admits of discussion.

Spelling depends almost entirely upon the use of the eye. The eye which has become accustomed, either by reading or writing, to the correct shape and appearance of a word, will seldom fail to guide its owner to the proper mode of spelling that word. When a word is wrongly spelt, the eye becomes again the corrector. Again, when we are in doubt respecting the proper way of spelling a word, we write that word down in two or three different ways; and the eye is our silent monitor, teaching us which form of the word we ought to adopt. I go, then, a great way—in fact, all the way—with those who assert that spelling must be learnt by reading words in sentences, and by writing sentences. But I do not endorse their opinions when they say that dictation is the best kind of writing-exercise by which to teach the art of spelling. Teaching is entirely distinct from examining. When we teach, we should afford aid of the best kind; when we examine, we should render no aid. Dictation is an admirable instrument for *examining* pupils in spelling,—for testing, in fact, their knowledge of the art—but not for *teaching* the art. A child who is set down to write from dictation has nothing but the voice of the person dictating to guide him. Of course he makes mistakes,—writes the words incorrectly. But every time he so writes a word, his eye becomes familiar with its incorrect form; his impression of what is wrong becomes stronger by familiarity with the mistakes which he himself makes. It is true we correct him; but our object should be to *prevent* his making mistakes. We should put the correct forms of words under his eye to guide him. We should not allow him first to do wrong, that we may afterwards have the trouble of correcting him, and teaching him to do right. Prevention is better than cure. Until our pupils can learn to compose,