

the teaching profession and entering the ministry, but if I do, the JOURNAL shall follow me, as I consider it THE journal for all who are engaged in teaching either the old or young." These friends are on the right track. Those who were true teachers will not lose their interest in educational matters when they leave the profession.

We are glad to see that the press of the Maritime Provinces is again agitating the project of a confederation of its many colleges. The prospect of success in Ontario has probably given an impulse to the movement. We fancy, however, that centralization is not likely to be found practicable there, but do not see why this need be a *sine qua non* of college federation. A scheme of affiliation to a central examining University might secure the chief benefits of Confederation without the shock of transplanting institutions which have become rooted in chosen localities, and derive no inconsiderable part of their moral strength from local memories and associations.

It does not distinctly appear from the published scheme of University Confederation whether the students of the various colleges are to be free to attend lectures in any college. We hope this is understood. Any restriction of the student to the lectures in his own particular college would take the life-blood from the emulation between the colleges which is one of the best features of the scheme. By all means let students be left free to choose their professors in any of the college subjects. In this way each professor will be put upon his mettle and each Board of Regents under bonds to employ only the best men. Under such a system it would be impossible for Dr. Dryasdust to go on discussing dead issues and drawing his salary for long years after his usefulness was gone.

The two articles in this issue on the question of University Federation will, we are sure, be read with deep interest. They present the subject from quite contrasted points of view. Mr. Shannon, of Kingston, a graduate of Queen's College, may naturally be supposed to look at the question from a Queen's, and Kingstonian standpoint, while Mr. Beattie, a graduate of both Knox College and Toronto University, as naturally regards it in its Toronto and Toronto University aspects. Each is well qualified to do full justice to his view of the subject and the opinions and arguments of both will carry weight. It is not of course, meant that either claims to write as a representative of any body or institution. Each speaks for himself alone, and asks to have his opinions and arguments taken simply upon their merits. We have a second article from each writer which will appear next week, with, perhaps, others on the same subject.

The practice complained of by Teacher in another column is a real grievance. In fact the hardship and the injustice are so obvious that it is strange such a custom could ever have come into vogue. It is well, however, for Government to interfere as little as possible with the freedom of Trustees and Teachers in business matters. Might not the teachers take the matter into their own hands? A combined action is all that is needed. Let them agree in associations and conventions, or otherwise, to insist in every case upon quarterly or more fre-

quent payments, and the end will be reached without legislative interference. We observe, however, that the Teachers of the Peel Association recommend, in one of the resolutions published in another column, the same remedy as our correspondent.

In the revised regulations respecting entrance examinations to the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes of Ontario, we find the following remarkable paragraphs:—

HISTORY.—The outlines of English and of Canadian History; how England, Canada, and Ontario are governed; the municipal institutions of Ontario—all as contained in a History Primer, to be authorized by the Department about August, 1885.

We believe most thoughtful educators will agree with us that the above embodies at least three bad principles or methods. In the first place this primer business in History or Science is about the worst that can be adopted, and is unworthy of our Ontario School system. It contains the quintessence of "cram." It offers a standing premium to both teachers and pupils for laziness. It serves up dry bones instead of healthful, invigorating, stimulating food. It takes away all inducement to thoughtful reading and exercise of independent judgment, robs the pupil of the legitimate reward of intelligent study, and renders history distasteful for all time by associating it with barren facts and dates. In the second place the primers foreshadowed are evidently designed to be, like the combined orthoepist and elocutionist, a school-room hodge-podge. The idea of embracing British and Canadian History, general, constitutional and municipal, in a single primer, is decidedly ambitious. The Department must have found a genius to undertake such a literary exploit. Such safe old maxims "one thing at a time," and "what is worth doing is worth doing well," have evidently fallen into discredit under the new *regime*. In the third place here we have in its boldest and worst form the evil of which we have before spoken, that of promising authorization to books before they exist even in embryo. The law of competition is repealed. The best stimulus to exertion is taken away from the writer. The door is thrown wide open to incompetence, favouritism and corruption. To promise authorization to so important a book at least eight months before it is written, implies in the Head of the Education Department either "a degree of faith in some book-manufacturing employee, or a peculiar notion of what a school-text book should be, neither of which will be shared by the intelligent teachers of Ontario.

Prof. Mills of the Ontario Agricultural College states, in a recent address, that not more than two per cent. of those who go into mercantile life meet with success, while seventy-five per cent. of those who choose farming are successful. These facts, as it may be presumed they are, teach a valuable practical lesson. Prof. Mills is of opinion that the education given in many of the public schools does not fit boys for earning their living on a farm. He is probably correct in saying that writing and English composition are not given sufficient prominence. We do not think it the business of the public school teacher to fit boys for any particular pursuit. Their parents should see to that. At the same time the influence of a true teacher will