

that its staff is not equal to the work imposed upon it, that in point of discipline it is in a demoralized state, that on account of its defective condition many young men have to go abroad to complete their education, that the course is too short and the curriculum too limited, that the governing body needs an infusion of new blood, and that generally the college needs a good deal of shaking up. These charges come from members of both political parties, and the Premier, while admitting their truth, confessed himself at a loss for a remedy.

It will be remembered that last year something like a state of rebellion against the faculty existed amongst students of the University of New Brunswick, and one of the speakers in the above mentioned debate states that the full extent of the demoralization was not exposed in the newspapers at the time. To outsiders one cause of the trouble seems to be the inefficiency of the head of the faculty against whom personally the hostility was chiefly displayed. If this is a true view of the case the plain duty of the Government is to replace the venerable president by a younger and more efficient man. In this country, with half-a-dozen high class universities within easy reach in the United States, it is more to expect students to subordinate their true educational interests to feelings of patriotism.

It is worthy of note that in describing the curriculum as too limited one of the speakers complained of the omission of "the group of subjects embraced in political science" except in so far as they are dealt with in Mill's "Political Economy," and he added that "no young man can be called liberally educated unless he understands something about the constitution of his country and the principles of international law." To these subjects he might have added the principles of jurisprudence, and of political science proper, in the sense in which the term is now used by leading writers. It is to be hoped that the time will soon come when more attention will be paid to this important group of subjects in all Canadian Universities, and when every one who wishes to do so will be able to gain a clear view of the political and legal system under which he lives, without going to a foreign country for the purpose.

GRADUATES and undergraduates alike will share with us the sorrow in which we chronicle the death of Mr. Arthur W. Reid, who died at his residence in London, on the morning of Saturday last. All his life he has been the victim of a delicate constitution, enfeebled still more by hard and incessant work during his undergraduateship; heart disease, from which he has suffered for several years, being the immediate cause of his death. A. W. Reid was born in London in 1860, where he had ever since continued to reside, his father, Mr. Robert Reid, being Collector of Customs in that city. In his school days Mr. Reid was a hard and successful student, and won during his attendance at the London High School the Robb gold medal, one of the highest honors in the institution. Of his course in Toronto University—where he matriculated in 1877 and where he graduated, taking with him the gold medal in mathematics, in 1880—it is unnecessary for us to say anything. His kindly nature, as well as his ability as a mathematical scholar, were too well known and are too well remembered to require eulogy at our hands. So highly was that ability esteemed, where estimation carries weight, that on the institution of the fellowships, that in mathematics was immediately offered to Mr. Reid, and which his ill-health at that time prevented him accepting. In his university and her graduates A. W. Reid had always the deepest interest, and his fellow-graduates of the city of London will miss in no small degree his sympathy and co-operation in the advancement of the cause of their Alma Mater in which they and he have ever been foremost.

THE "NEW EDUCATION."

IN a lecture recently delivered in New York, Col. F. W. Parker, the famous exponent of what is popularly called the "new education," uttered several axioms of his faith which we cannot regard but as most essentially true, and of the greatest importance. The following quotations will, we feel sure, establish the correctness of our opinion:

"In the best methods there must be freedom. Imitation

never leads to creation. All cannot teach in the same way, and all children are not reached in the same way. Our teaching must be adapted to the child. . . . There is but one motive in education, and that is the working out of God's design in man. We call that design character. And so there is but one design in our work—to build up character. . . . The ideal of education, then, is the development of the human being, body, mind, and soul. In plain English, it is making the best of every child, and helping that particular one all that you can. . . . All children are not alike, and should not be trained alike; the great fault is that we take them as a unit, and make them take our way and adopt our ideas. The true way to instruct a child—the only way to develop and train his mind—is to find out what that child wants. How do we train the child's will? By giving him the opportunity to choose for himself and act for himself. Not by making him do as we think, but by letting him choose as soon as he can."

Few will deny that the application of such principles as the foregoing to our present system of instruction would work a revolution; and only those who from long association and connection with the old-fashioned code of educational ethics will deny that the benefits to be derived from such a course as Col. Parker is inaugurating would not amply compensate for the temporary confusion and interruption consequent upon the introduction of such doctrines into our school system. They would elevate the teaching profession and would make *men* of children, and not machines, as at present.

The Kindergarten is gradually assuming an important and well-recognized position in our school system. The doctrines and precepts of Col. Parker are destined to revolutionize our secondary schools—both public and high. And what are these "Quincy methods"? They are: (1) Freedom to follow natural inclinations and predilections in different departments of study. (2) Adaptation of methods to suit such inclinations and predilections. (3) Making the best of all, and helping each particular one as far as possible.

And if practical common-sense principles are to prevail in our elementary, primary, and secondary schools, why should they not be applied to university education? Would not such a course be perfectly logical and consistent? And can we not apply these principles with greater confidence in regard to university students than to pupils of the public and high schools?

The outcry against the classics—against Greek especially—is but the natural result of imagining that culture can only be obtained in one way and by one method, and that all must conform to one common standard. True culture and education does not consist in the amount or variety of information which a man possesses, but in the substance, and in the manner of acquirement of such information. The true way seems to be that which we pointed out not long ago, that a certain *amount* of work is requisite; that a fixed *number* of subjects must be mastered; but that each student may select the various branches which go to make up the *amount* of work required of him.

That our universities must ultimately adopt the principle of elective studies seems to us inevitable. The outcry against cramming is no mere sentimental whisper; the revulsion from the old doctrine of rigid uniformity is widening and deepening every day; the increase of knowledge renders utterly impossible the attainment of even a smattering of the principal branches; there is a premium on specialization; and, lastly, the cause of true culture and of a liberal education demand that "test acts" and "acts of uniformity" be done away with.

Since these things are so, and since the doctrines of the "new education" are spreading, and since a new race is springing up imbued with its principles, the time cannot be very far distant when our universities will be forced either to adopt the new system; to fail in their mission; or to allow those who believe in progress and true reform to take the management of affairs.

THE COLLEGE RESIDENCE.

AT a time of controversy, when public attention is directed to matters affecting the interests of our University and our College, we ought not to be surprised if fault be found with every institution in any way connected with them. In war we must expect no quarter, and, therefore, in appealing to the country for financial aid we must have no