

is now making, hardly likely to be found in men who, as our Canadian graduates too frequently do, take up this profession for a year or two, as a stepping-stone to some other—and, finally, a lack of that spirit which leads so many Canadians to regard their engagements as a mere matter of dollars and cents,—of so much work for so much pay—these are some of the points, in which, in most cases, English graduates are superior to the Canadians who apply for the positions in question.

A few words as to an implication in an article in the *Star*, that the staff of the High School is composed of Canadian graduates. Of the present regular staff, who have “stuck,” as the *Star* expresses it, for periods varying from three to thirty years, two are Canadian graduates, and of these two, one did not consider it *infra dig.* to supplement his Canadian course by studying at Cornell under a distinguished Oxford lecturer. As for Englishmen not being likely to prove successful with Canadian youths, we have, as a striking argument to the contrary, the fact, that one of the most successful private schools we have ever had in the city is being carried on by three Oxford and Cambridge graduates, and many other instances of like success, both in private and public schools, could, no doubt, be produced.

I have yet to be convinced that my late colleague was a failure as a teacher. To take an outside view altogether:—Granted that a man must keep discipline of some sort, in order to be able to teach at all, is anyone inclined to dispute the converse, that a man capable of producing such results as this master did,—his classes showing marked improvement, week by week, in knowledge of the subjects taught, and passing creditably the June examinations,—must have been able to maintain among his pupils at least a tolerable state of attention. Could any objection be made to his teaching on the ground that, being a remarkably thorough and painstaking master, he insisted on thorough and painstaking work on the part of the boys?

With regard to the present occupant of the position, no one who has had any experience of teaching in the High School will deny, that any judgment, either favourable or adverse, after so short a trial, must be premature. I myself should have been very sorry to have been judged by the result of my first six month's work in the school. If a thorough love of his profession, a lively sympathy with his pupils, both in their studies and sports, and a good share of that quality, which we call “pluck,” have any weight in the management of boys, there is every reason to suppose he will soon silence his detractors.

Does “Nihil Verius” covet the position for himself? Is he one of the applicants so ignominiously passed over? It is very easy to gain sympathy by raising the National cry while indulging one's spleen! Were the gentleman a master in the High School, he would discover that more is required than a minimum of ability with a maximum of conceit to make teaching a success.

Yours faithfully,

G. E. Jenkins, B.C.L.

SIR,—In a late number of the SPECTATOR there appeared a letter over the initial “C.” The writer of that letter endeavoured to show the want of a History Course in McGill College. His statements were in the main correct, but were not complete, and room is left for more comment on the subject. The course of study, as stated in the calendar of the University, should consist of Classics, Mathematics, English Literature, History, etc. Of Classics it is not my intention to speak. They may have their uses, but why they should monopolize the time, to the exclusion of other branches of study equally as important, is a question I cannot understand. History, as above stated, is placed on the calendar as a separate branch of study, but what that History is, and where and when it is taught, no one seems to know, much less care. Whilst no History is taught, strange to say, there is a “Professor of History.” During the first and second years of the Faculty of Arts in McGill College they do not think of teaching History; the third year, although it is marked in the calendar, none whatever is taught, and in the fourth year there is an Honour Course of History not taken by ordinary students. Let us look at other Universities. The Roman Catholic Colleges of this city have extensive courses of ancient and modern History, as well as special courses of Canadian History. There might be much said concerning the teaching of Canadian History in our colleges, but time and space will not permit. If, however, Canadian educators wish the young men to become patriots and statesmen, they must give them a thorough knowledge of Canadian History. They must teach them that Canada is not a land of “know-nothingism,” but a land of great deeds and great names. When this is done, perhaps we shall be able to procure Canadian professors for Canadian colleges. In the University of Toronto, History, under the able superintendence of Dr. Wilson, is extensively taught. Hence it is that so many of the young men of this city, having a taste for History, and a desire for its acquirement, instead of attending McGill College, leave this city for Toronto University. And now, seeing how the case stands, the question may be asked:—Is it necessary that History should be taught in our Universities? I do not think it is necessary to answer that question. The advantages to be derived from the study of History are obvious to all. I quote from Carlyle:—“Under a limited, and the only practicable shape, History proper, that part of History which treats of remarkable actions, has in

all modern, as well as ancient times, ranked amongst the highest arts, and perhaps never stood higher than in these times of ours.” If History is to be ranked amongst the highest arts, if it is taught in the different Universities of this city, and also in the large Universities of other cities, as Toronto, etc., should it not be taught in what is supposed to be the first University of the Dominion—McGill College? B.

I have been making a few inquiries relating to the subject with which the foregoing letter deals, and their outcome is as follows:—The gentleman who is entitled Professor of History is also an Associate-Professor of the English Language and Literature. His time is chiefly employed in the duties of the Associate Professorship, and rightly so, as the English courses of McGill, both Ordinary and Honour are and always have been in their spirit, literary and not historical. On appeal to the calendar, I find an extensive and thorough English Honour Course of a threefold nature. First it has language—Anglo-Saxon and English—then literature—consisting of portions of the English Classics, from Chaucer to Tennyson: and lastly, History, consisting mainly of English History, Constitutional and Political, together with General History, as embodied in certain selected chapters of Hallam's Middle Ages.

It also appears that History is not a University Course, raised to the dignity of Classics or of Mathematics, but there is a course of lectures on History. This course is compulsory in regard to Honour students, optional in regard to others. Still, History forms a distinctive feature of the examination for the Ordinary Degree. It is an easy matter to fill the pages of calendars with the titles of books which the students are not supposed to read, and which in some instances, at least, are not to be found even in the libraries of the universities themselves. Such schemes do not produce scholars. The essential quality of scholarship is thoroughness, and this can be attained only by careful work over a limited area. I may add that Ancient History finds a place in the Classical Course, and that some specimens of the English examination papers will be published to give the public some idea of the tenor and scope of the work done at our University. Those statements of correspondents which are the result of inaccurate information, we may suffer to pass unnoticed.

Although the *Toronto Globe* is giving every sign of approaching senility it is evident that the old spirit of unfairness and malice still actuates its writers. This was very evident in the leader of last week on the reasons for appointing the Railway Commission. I had ventured an opinion that there was no particular reason for the Commission, except that the *Globe* had been keeping up a constant cry about corruption—that it had no real and tangible charges to formulate, but was making the noise just to have something to say to sell the paper, and the taxpayers will have to pay for this questionable dodge. The *Globe* answers *suo more*. First, it quotes but does not name the paper it is quoting. It can go no further than “a contemporary.” That is an old trick of the *Globe's*, and the idea is, not to advertise the paper it attacks. Mr. Gordon Brown has an eye to business; he knows well enough that if he were to give quotations from well written papers his readers might be tempted to transfer their patronage to papers which contain better writing and sounder argument. From a business point of view I think he is right, for the *Globe* just now is only to be counted amongst the second-rate papers of the Dominion.

The next trick of the *Globe* is to hurl a charge of corruption against the quoted but unnamed paper. Of course there is a purpose in that—for if the writer can create an impression against his opponent at the beginning the work of convincing the reader will be easier. The reader will perhaps take it for granted that the charge is well founded, and so admit a prejudice in favour of the *Globe*—for he is not likely to be able to judge for himself since he does not know what journal is being quoted. If one reading the statement of the *Globe*—to the effect that the contemporary quoted is subsidised by Government advertisements to support the Government—had happened to know that the reference was to the CANADIAN SPECTATOR, and had