

living questions—we must, in justice to Dr. Clark, submit his conclusion in his own words :—

“Education should be conducted somewhat as follows :

1. No teaching beyond object lessons up to six years of age.
2. Object lessons with reading and writing up to nine years of age.
3. Reading, writing, arithmetic in its four primary divisions, and geography up to twelve years of age.
4. The preceding with history and primary arithmetic and grammar up to fifteen years.
5. From this age such studies as will assist the girl in feminine duties, and the boy to some definite employment or profession.
6. No studies in the evening until after fifteen years of age.
7. Three hours daily of school time up to nine years of age, four hours to twelve, and six hours until fifteen years of age.
8. After fifteen years of age studies to be intermingled with congenial and useful mechanical work. This to apply to both sexes.”

With Nos. 6, 7, and 8 we heartily agree. To Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, and especially 5, we take partial exception. We believe that mental training proper, *i. e.*, thinking processes carried on by means of the mind's own conceptions, without tangible objects, may be pleasantly and profitably employed from the very first, and the child gradually and soon led up to the point where object lessons are rarely needed. We are inclined to think that a great deal of time is wasted over arithmetical and grammatical exercises at too early an age, but the bill of fare presented above is surely too meagre and too monotonous for any healthy appetite; and we do not believe that it is the business of the Public Schools to train pupils with an eye to any definite employment or profession, but rather to aim at the highest possible development of all their powers, physical, mental, and moral.

All live teachers will be interested in whatever affects the character and progress of the Provincial University, now that its standings and honours are brought within the reach of all, of both sexes, who choose to fit themselves for its examinations. Two or three matters in connection with it just now merit attention.

First, we are glad to see progress in the right direction in the Senate. Instead of having no settled sessions, but meeting for the transaction of any business, no matter how important, irregularly at the call, and we might add convenience or whim, of the Chairman, it is henceforth to have regular quarterly sessions. Slight as this change may appear, it has long been asked for in vain, and it really involves some important advantages. Many of the most active members of the Senate reside at a distance from the city. Heretofore the notices of meeting might reach them at the most inconvenient moment, and often did so when it was too late, or otherwise impossible to attend. In fact we have known Senators living at no great distance, to receive their notices a day or two after the date of the appointed meeting. The assumption seemed to be that their attendance was a matter of no great importance, as all the business could be done by a few Toronto members. The date of regular meetings being now fixed, every member interested can make his arrangements accordingly.

Another advantage accruing from the new arrangement will be the more orderly transaction of business. Special meetings may still be necessary, but they should be called only for matters of routine, or in cases of emergency. All important work such as the passing of Statutes, change of curriculum, etc., should be done only at the regular sessions.

Another much-needed reform is the payment of the travelling expenses of non-resident members. These will of course be much reduced now that four trips, instead of a dozen, in the year, will suffice. Yet it is manifestly unfair that those who come up to consult for the public good, should be mulcted to the extent of a few dollars every time they do so. We have known one of the government appointed senators to spend fifty or sixty dollars in a comparatively short time in attending meetings of the University Senate, for the transaction of important University business.

The graduates of the University have been making a demand—not quite unanimously—that their representation on the Senate, be increased from fifteen to twenty-five. We write subject to correction, but we are unable to acquiesce at present in the justice of the demand. Nor can we admit the principle on which it is understood to be based, that the fact of having enjoyed the advantages of the University, creates a paramount right to control its policy. Were the different affiliated colleges and all other educational interests in Ontario fairly represented in the list of graduates, the change asked might seem more reasonable, and would have more promise of being salutary. As it is, nine-tenths of the graduates up to date are, we presume, alumni of a single teaching institution, University College, and past experience has shown that the views of many of these are narrowed by the predilections formed by that relationship. It is evident that if ever the University is to become thoroughly liberal and national, it must be the exponent of the combined views of all classes of educators, and not of the opinions, or prejudices, of those who have been trained under the same set of influences.

## Special.

### HIGH SCHOOL LITERATURE.

By J. E. WETHERELL, M.A.

TENTH PAPER.

#### “DEJECTION: AN ODE.”

(INTRODUCTORY.)

1. When and where was this ode written?
2. In what famous volume will you find the “Ballad of Sir Patrick Spence?” What influence had this book on contemporary literature?
3. What were the causes of the dejection that oppressed the poet?
4. What do you remark regarding the *subjectivity* of the ode?
5. Quote from the ode those verses which describe most aptly and concisely the poet's state of mind.
6. Why is “joy” mentioned so frequently in an ode on dejection?