

other Universities the responsibility for the present low standard, and the utterly indefensible twenty-five per cent. which is all that is required of candidates.

Let us see on whose shoulders the blame really rests. It is an open secret that in 1885, if not sooner, representations were made on behalf of Queen's to the authorities of Toronto, urging a common matriculation examination. No attention was paid to these representations, except in the way of raising imaginary difficulties. The correspondence shows that in 1886 the Senate of Queen's took formal action on the subject, but the Senate of Toronto by its unbroken silence bars the way. It has not had even the civility to give reasons for this negative attitude. Possibly it mistakes sulkiness for dignity. As for reasons, it is either ashamed to give them, or it has none, and, therefore, cannot give any, further than to acknowledge receipt of the communication from Queen's. This reminds us of a little story, as Mr. Lincoln of pious memory was wont to say in winding up a conversation: "A Scottish peacher, having come to the end of his written sermon, closed the book with the orthodox formula, 'I add no more.' 'Ah,' cried one of his hearers who detested *the paper*, 'because ye canna!'"

YEAR by year the list of subjects prescribed for study in the public and high schools seems to increase. New subjects are added and the old ones widened until the amount of ground which the ordinary pupil is expected to get over has become quite astonishing. Indeed as the pupil of thirty or more years ago surveys this list he might well regard with awe and admiration the prodigious intellect and vast attainments of the rising generation. Surely the law of evolution has got to work with a vengeance at last and men will be as gods in a few generations. So at least we might judge

taking quantity as our standard. But how about quality? We shall see. Enquiring into the matter a little we find that the lists of subjects have been extended on very simple and natural grounds. It is assumed that in these advanced times no one should be ignorant of Chemistry, Botany, and Physics; of Physiology and Sanitary Science; of English Literature, Rhetoric and Philology; of Drawing, Music and Elocution. Therefore these subjects must be added to the already extensive list, if not in the public schools at least in the high schools. Our Department of Education seems to be guided by the very liberal principle that whatever it is in any way useful to know must be taught in the schools. How then do the pupils manage to get over such a wide field of knowledge in the short years of school life? Any one who cares to seek a practical answer to this question will soon find that the pupils do not study these subjects in an intelligent manner. Their knowledge of them will be found to be of the crudest, vaguest and most disappointing kind. It is a mere smattering of disjointed facts; yet acquired at the expense of much mental effort and retained with great difficulty for lack of connecting, meaning-giving principles. The very multitude of the subjects gone over makes it impossible that justice can be done to any of them. The consequence is that, while what is acquired of the new subjects is of small advantage, the old fundamental subjects, which are the very instruments for the general acquisition of knowledge, are neglected in proportion to the time spent on the others. Thus the youth after having dragged with weary and labouring footsteps over nearly three-fourths of the field of knowledge is left with a chaotic jumble of odds and ends picked up from various corners of that vast realm. The keen edge of native curiosity—the mother of learning—has been worn off, but