

mulated evidence, for and against, a number of evil-disposed principles, who have burglariously abstracted from our various educational establishments, sundry antique furniture of rare value, substituting, in some cases, flimsier and less sterling articles. If perchance I may imitate *innocent* prisoners at the bar, I have the satisfaction of knowing that their interest are entrusted to the enlightened jury before me.

I. Home Lessons Neglected.—From the popular notion, that the pedagogue of yore paid little or no attention to out-door exercise, or physical training in general, (except that branch which he illustrated by *wood-cut*), our *modern* educator, besides recess twice a day and a weekly afternoon, gives no home lessons; of course he thinks the close application at school is even too much for the child's mental strength. What train of evils fellows in the wake of this mistaken notion. No sooner do the young ones enter their homes, than gentle Peace spreads her pinions and flies away to some more congenial clime. Children *will* do something, and so they turn the house upside down, and, scampering off, have an hour's *street* training.

But where has gentle Peace alighted? Annie and Lizzy had nearly finished their abstract of sermon, Tom has just commenced inserting his parsing in exercise book, and mother is hearing Willie his tables; while Peace broods over the happy circle, and domestic joy sits smiling on every countenance—the father, the while, elbowing his old arm-chair, transported by his favourite newspaper to the jungles of Hindostan, or the banks of the Ticino. He is not driven to the public-house by bawling children. The army of smoking, street-loitering juvenile-delinquents, would experience numerous desertions, were our youthful population trained to habits of industry at home; and perhaps you would err on the right side, by giving them *too much* in the shape of evening lessons at home.

II. Giving prominence to those subjects which will have a bearing upon the future trade or profession of each individual child.—I maintain, that the carrying out of this principle is utterly impossible and irrational. My office, as an elementary teacher, is to train the *whole* child, regarding him as a child—a cosmopolite—a citizen of the world, and not *merely* the son of a cobbler or gardener. Our province is to develop *all* the powers of the mind—"to lay hold of the human faculties, one after the other, as they come to view," (in their order of development),—to train the children to habits of thought—to give them information which shall be useful in *every* sphere of life—to give no undue prominence to *any class* of faculties, but to send from our schools children with well-stored and well-balanced minds.

The question—How can we successfully train the *whole* being? will not be answered by us, if we are ever lastingly viewing a lad as a future *mechanic*, or rather, a machine—a tool to be used in some manufactory? Besides how is it practicable in our elementary schools, which are mainly conducted on collective methods so to individualize our attention, as to give to each child in a class of 30, special information upon, it may be, 30 different trades? In my opinion, the idea, beautiful in theory, is practically absurd.

III. Industrial Schools.—Another danger now presents itself, a first and a very kindred one to the above. I refer to Industrial establishments attached to our elementary schools. The subject has been so ably treated, and exhausted in a Periodical, valued by all earnest teachers—"The Papers for the Schoolmaster,"—that any remarks of mine would be useless. I shall not indicate the whereabouts of the article alluded to, but give you the pleasure, which I often experience, of perusing the biography of Education (though by no means deceased) contained in the past 8 vols.

IV. Too much Local Geography.—I always fail to understand the rationale of giving the minutiae of the Geography of our own neighbourhood. According to existing notions, we must sketch every lane or street; trace every river, tributary, rivulet, stream and tiny brook; particularize every hill and undulation; and by this time three-parts of the school life are expended, leaving the other quarter for the acquisition of facts, &c., which will be really useful in after life. I know that children may be taught by *magnifying* our neighbouring hills, ponds, brooks, woods, barren and fruitful spots, valleys, &c., some notions of mountains, lakes, rivers, forests, deserts, oases, and plateaus; but to give such information, from a conviction of its intrinsic worth, is a practice I cannot understand. My scholars know far more about this locality than I even *desire* to know. Hence, home observation is essential for illustration, and in my opinion comparatively useless in the light of absolute knowledge.

V. Phraseology not improved.—The teachings and actions of Educational men, in this age of extremes, form a strange paradox. I hear men of high standing, encourage, in the highest degree, the use, yea, the *absolute* use of Saxon monosyllables; and yet, we find their sentences brim-full of words of Latin, Italian, and self-manufactured origin. But if Dr. Johnson made a grand mistake, when

he introduced so many words of foreign derivation, why do our professional men (teachers by no means excepted) make such an abundant use of it? The true answer is, that Saxon nomenclature is far too meagre for the present age. Who, that has any love for the English language, would ignore the recent introduction of such an expressive word as *telegram*? I *intentionally* introduce into my lessons words above the purely colloquial, which, from their position in the sentence, cannot fail to give the children a correct idea of their meaning. Nor can I justify the studied avoidance of all technical terms. All books of science, newspapers, and the conversations of literary and educated men, *abound* with terms peculiar to different arts and sciences; and to exclude them from our school phraseology would be the surest method of converting our *rising* race into the *stand-still* race, lisping their tiny Saxonisms, while men of science and education would be speaking in an unknown tongue. In my opinion, one of the greatest advantages of secular lessons, is the improvement and enlargement of colloquial language. It has been urged, as objections to the above remarks, that "unless the subjects, talked about in school, connect themselves with the duties of ordinary life: unless the mode of treating them in school bears some relation to the mode in which they are to be treated elsewhere; the learner begins to feel that he lives in two worlds—one in the schoolroom, and one outside it. In the one he speaks in a sort of falsetto, and uses words which are not natural to him; in the other he speaks his *own* language, and feels at ease," the provincialisms of the lane, street, and (I may say) homes of our neighbourhood. But granting all this, I ask, would it not be better to *attempt*, at least, the elevation of the *outside* language to the standard in the schoolroom, rather than reduce the school phraseology to the lower level without? My remarks are not at all applicable to Infant school teaching, or to the practice of troubling children under 6 or 7 years of age, with the names of such abstract qualities, as 'opaque' and 'transparent,' or indulging in any practice that betrays ignorance of the natural law of the mind's development.

VI. Too many subjects attempted in our Elementary Schools.—This is one of the most serious dangers to which we are exposed. "Of course," says the theorist, "*drawing* must enter very prominently into the routine of every well conducted school. For a minute or two, I will follow a young earnest teacher, who is anxious to bring up his school to the requirements of his Inspector, Committee, Prize Scheme Associations, and Popular Opinions." How persuasively the essayist shows that drawing educates the eye and hand—elevates our ideas of the sublime and beautiful, and therefore "gives force and acuteness to the moral sense,"—and finally, how it is indispensable to the acquisition of good penmanship. (Are good drawers always good penmen?). Again we follow him to a monster educational meeting, imbibing, till inebriated, the glowing eloquence of the speaker, expatiating upon the importance of "Common Things." "Common Things" now figures largely on his routine. Now he sits pondering over a recent paper on the importance of teaching Physiology in our schools. He is smitten by the new affection. He almost pities his past self and fellow teachers. Music, Chemistry, Phenomena of Industrial Life, and, of course, Labor Life, &c., &c., all in turn exercise a similar effect upon his mind and upon his time-table. But the *presence* of all these new subjects upon the routine must cause the *absence* of others. Two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time. It would not be amiss if my hearers would take down this reconstructed time-table for inspection. The subjects, with their allotted time per week, are as follow:—Physical Science, 12 hours; Common Things, 2 hours; Natural History, 1½ hours; Chemistry, 11½ hours; Physiology, ¾ hour; Music, 2 hours; Etymology, 1½ hours; Prospective, Model, Free Hand, Crayon, Practical Geometry, Drawing, each ¾ hour; Industrial Life, 1½ hours; Scripture Reading, 2½ hours.—Total, 26 hours. The average attention to each subject is not quite 1½ hours *per week*; of course no Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography, Grammar, Dictation, Spelling, Abstracts—these are unavoidably omitted.

VII. Secularizing Education.—Now I come to the most dangerous principle. Newspaper harangues on the subject are a mere nothing, compared to the fact, that modifications of the theory have crept into educational periodicals, and, I fear, into teachers' minds. Religious or Scriptural training is becoming an obsolete term, superseded by the accommodating and diluted term *moral* training. What Jesus said to Peter, he says to us—"Feed my lambs;" and dare I, in the face of such a command, give them merely the *husk* of a secular education, and deny them the bread of life? No! As long as a kind Providence gives me a place among the teachers of young Christendom, I will attempt to impart a sound, substantial, christian education—and not rob the Bible of its *vitality*; and Christianity by substituting a hollow sentimentalism, or by enforcing virtue and holiness by the eloquence of a few flowers of rhetoric. I cannot