

etc., *usque ad nauseam*. This is surely the essence of pedantry. Can we not succeed in having great general principles clearly presented, well illustrated by a few good examples, and left for every man to work out in detail in his individual fashion? One way to secure this is to employ leaders to introduce topics and give direction to the current of discussion. It would be better policy we believe to have fewer subjects than at present is fashionable, to have them led off by men of known ability, and to devote a length of time to the discussion sufficient to allow the younger members to grasp the main ideas, and to allow all sides of the question to be glanced at. Where set papers are hurriedly read, raw recruits to the profession put forward with their immature notions, too many abstract and non-practical subjects on the programme, etc., the every-day life and history of the school neglected, the highest benefits will not accrue. It may require a few more years' experience to teach us the most efficient means of managing our convention. Already great improvement is manifest, and the general principles of good teaching, the actual result of experience in school management and discipline, are securing more attention than the lever, "equational impossibilities," and the like. Much valuable time might be economized if the presiding officer enforced a little more strictly the common rules of order. To stick to the question under consideration, to address only the chairman, and to speak a limited number of times on the same topic, should be more carefully observed than at present. The danger lies in putting long-winded vagaries and the chimeras of theorists in the place of common sense and the actual facts or real experience. The remedy, we fancy, lies in giving more utility to the business of the convention by securing well-qualified leaders to direct the discussions. The number of subjects at any one convention ought also to be somewhat more limited. When the programme is over crowded, we run the risk of "grasping at the stars and sticking in the mud."

MORAL CULTURE AN ESSENTIAL FACTOR IN PUBLIC EDUCATION.

*An Address delivered before the Ontario Teachers' Association,
Toronto, August 14th, 1879.*

BY THE REV. D. H. MACVICAR, LL.D., S.L.P., PRINCIPAL PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, MONTREAL.

Great moral principles are freely discussed everywhere—in our nurseries and primary schools, in our parlours and social gatherings, in our warehouses and workshops, as well as in our courts of law, colleges, and legislative assemblies. Subtle points of casuistry and questions of right and wrong, of duty, what ought and what ought not to be are constantly canvassed; and unfortunately very many persons dogmatise and pronounce upon them blindly without having received any systematic or scientific instruction. Surely this natural and universal disposition to deal with ethical subjects should not be ignored by the educator, or treated as a secondary and unimportant matter.

I propose, therefore, to urge certain reasons in this paper why a knowledge of the fundamental facts and principles of ethical science, and of their practical application in every-day life, should be made an essential factor in public education. I do not say the

sum, or chief part of education, but only an essential factor in it. This appears to me to be demanded:

I. In order to secure a fair and symmetrical development of man's entire nature, and to avoid a one-sided and pernicious education.

To make this fully apparent, it is necessary to indicate in outline what should be aimed at in education. I do not mean by this, however, a discussion of details as to methods of instruction, branches of study, the age at which certain of these should be taken up, the extent to which they should be prosecuted in our Public or High Schools, and the measure of information to be imparted to pupils at various stages regarding the multitude of subjects which now claim attention. It is sufficient for the purpose of my argument to point out generally the sort of training which is required, or the directions our educational efforts should take in order to secure the well-balanced and harmonious growth of man. I take it that no one can doubt that this should be the practical issue of our work. The common sense of mankind demands this. The broad test which it applies to any system, whatever amount of machinery and show and red-tape it may possess, is, what sort of men and women does it produce? And, in the long run, it treats with well-merited contempt and scorn all fine theories which fail in this respect. To secure the highest style of man, therefore,—the man who is not weak, or capricious, or unreliable, who is not an incubus or a firebrand in society, but is fit to take his place and discharge his duties in relation to God and his fellow-creatures, it is self-evident that we cannot neglect the training of any part of his nature—we require to draw out in a legitimate manner all the grand possibilities of that nature. Hence we must provide for the culture of the senses, the culture of our physical organs as mechanical instruments of the mind, the culture of our mental powers, and the culture of our moral nature—the last accompanying and interpenetrating all that is done in the other directions. Let us look at these separately.

(a) *The culture of the senses.*—It is only recently that attention has been given to this as specially vital to education. A quarter of a century ago physiologists and metaphysicians generally treated with scorn what they denominated the ravings of phrenology. In their opinion it was the sheerest nonsense to attempt to explain mental phenomena and to guide the work of education by reference to the brain. A distinguished man who now holds a position of high trust and responsibility in this city was then my fellow-student, and used to tell me with great glee and triumph that phrenologists were ignorant fools because they placed bumps, upon the brain as organs of mentality where there are actually depressions and empty cavities in the skull. My metaphysical friends of that period, whether as books or as living oracles, were not much more respectful to this line of investigation.

But the educational world moves. Now, you can hardly take up any school manual which is not decorated with pictures of the brain, and the learned authors, from Dr. Carpenter downwards, tell you all about the weight, and shape, and size and density of the brain—its convolutions, ganglionic centres, and the rest. They trace it from its first stages of development through infancy, childhood, manhood and old age—they even venture, with surprising minuteness of detail, to connect with its different stages of growth the appropriate parts of the great programme of modern studies, and to indicate how it is to be treated, fed and disciplined, from its early pulpy plastic state until it becomes the shrivelled occupant of a hard and barren old skull. Well, there is truth in all this, although we may, in the meantime, take some of it *cum grano salis*—as not altogether infallible gospel. At any rate I have no time or need to argue with these enthusiasts. For my present purpose a general statement made by Tyndall is sufficient, as bringing