

ulations we believe to be highly detrimental to the interests of the University itself. But without dwelling on that aspect of them, we proceed to point out their bearing on schools and teachers.

We do not wish to be understood as depreciating in the slightest degree the study of Classics. On the contrary, we believe that they must, if not forever at least for a long time to come, hold a foremost place in every scheme for a truly liberal education. Nor do we wish to be understood as disparaging Mathematics, the study of which is, in addition to its practical utility, one of the best kinds of discipline the mind can undergo. What we object to is, that while they had ample prominence accorded to them in the old Curriculum their prominence has been greatly increased in the new. In addition to a disproportionate increase in their share of the scholarship fund proper, they have been further favoured by the conversion of the Prince of Wales' Prize into a money scholarship, and its dedication to general proficiency in Classics and Mathematics at the Junior Matriculation Examination. The effect of this change will be to make classical and mathematical specialists of intending matriculants amongst our High School pupils, and to discourage general proficiency, to the great detriment of the schools and the permanent injury of the candidates themselves. In connection with this it may be noticed that a determined effort was made to secure a place for Chemistry and Natural Philosophy, but especially the former, on the Curriculum for Matriculation. Had they been placed upon it even as optional subjects, an impetus would have been given to the study of Chemistry which nothing else could have imparted to it so well. The change is one which must be made before long, and High School masters would do well to remember the necessity for it when electing their representatives on the Senate.

Both of the limiting conditions respecting scholarships above mentioned are calculated to have a highly injurious effect on High Schools. The age beyond which a candidate cannot compete for a scholarship is twenty-three, and it is needless to say that many intending matriculants in attendance at High School are over that age. Why should one who happens to be six months older be ruled out of competition while one six months younger is allowed to compete? It may be said that the line must be drawn somewhere; but this is begging the question. It has never been shown, and cannot be shown on any intelligent theory of a system of scholarships, that there ought to be such a line at all. Be that as it may, the practical result will be to put many deserving High School pupils under a disability which should never have been inflicted upon them. Still more injurious to the High Schools is the regulation depriving every scholar of his scholarship unless he attends lectures in University College—for that is what it amounts to. What the Senate of Toronto University should do, if it wanted to legislate in the interests of higher education and not of University College, is to encourage pupils to stay at their own High Schools until they are ready for Senior Matriculation. Every High School master knows that the presence of his University boys for a year longer at school, would be an inestimable benefit to his school as well as a legitimate source of encouragement and gratification to himself; and it is not going too far to say

that in very many of our High Schools the first year might be spent quite as profitably as it is in attending lectures in University College. We must leave the question for the present, but it is not improbable that it will be necessary to return to it hereafter.

### DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS.

Some time ago an incident occurred in School Section No. 2 in the township of Percy, which, though not at all of an unusual character in itself, has led to rather important consequences. The head master of the school having had occasion to visit the room of his assistant, left his own class during his absence under the charge of two monitors, who, on the return of the master, appear to have charged several of their fellow-pupils with misconduct. One of the latter denied the charge; and when the teacher asked another pupil to give testimony in the matter, he refused to do so. For this he was suspended, and, eventually, it appears, expelled, on the understanding, however, that he would be reinstated whenever he was ready to admit the right of the school authorities to require him to give evidence in such cases. The Inspector of the district having been appealed to in the matter, expressed the opinion that there was nothing in the school regulations to warrant the expulsion of the pupil for such an offence, and this view was endorsed by the Minister of Education, whose first memorandum on the subject is as follows:

"The Trustees of School Section No. 2, Percy, have appealed to me from the decision of the Inspector, as to the expulsion of a pupil by the teacher for refusing to disclose his knowledge of damages to school furniture. The pupil took the ground that he would refuse to tell upon a fellow-pupil, and adhered to this position, upon which he was expelled by the teacher, who has been sustained by the trustees. The Inspector, however, thinks there was no ground for expulsion under the regulations, and that the pupil should be restored to his place in the school. I concur in the decision of the Inspector, and upon the same grounds—there was no violent opposition to authority in this, under Regulation viii (1) 3 (2), nor was it a case which came within provision 4 of the same regulation. The teacher would not appear to have any authority to coerce a pupil into telling on a fellow-pupil, and the discipline of the school can be maintained without encouraging a practice which would degrade the pupils in the estimation of each other, and so lower the general tone of the school.

"(Signed)

ADAM CROOKS,

"Minister of Education.

"Education Office, May 26th, 1877."

The publication of this memorandum gave rise at once to a general discussion of the point at issue, the prevalent expression of opinion being that the general principle enunciated in the latter part of the document would seriously curtail the power of teachers in administering discipline in their schools and protecting school property. It seems, however, that the principle was generally understood in a much wider sense than the Minister of Education intended, and he therefore issued a second memorandum on the case, which puts the matter in a different light. It is as follows:

"A misapprehension evidently exists as to the true scope of the decision pronounced by me on the 26th April last on the subject of an appeal by the Trustees of this school from the Inspector, who held that under the circumstances of the case the expulsion of a pupil was not authorized under the regulations in that behalf.

"The letter of the Secretary of the Trustees to the *Globe*, with a copy of my decision, did not question the correctness of my con-