

DISCUSSION.

To the Editor of THE EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY:

SIR,—In your last issue "Head Master," writing with reference to the university matriculation examinations, expresses the hope that hereafter all honor and scholarship candidates will be required, as formerly, to write in the university examination hall under the eyes of the same presiding examiner. As far as those competing for scholarships or for relative honor standing are concerned I reluctantly agree with him. I say *reluctantly*, because some really well prepared and deserving students would not consider their chances good enough to make it worth their while incurring the expense of going to Toronto to write. For instance, I think I know of one scholarship winner this year who would not have gone to Toronto, and of another candidate last year, from another school, who would, as her standing showed, have won a scholarship if she had written in Toronto. If, however, "Head Master" means that candidates seeking merely honor standing should also be required to go to Toronto to write, I decidedly dissent from his opinion, and fail to see the slightest necessity or justification for such a retrograde step. In the case of those competing against one another, we all know that the slightest deviation from the regulations might give some candidates a material advantage over their rivals, and with candidates writing at a large number of centres it would be difficult, if not impossible, after last summer's experience, to make those most interested feel assured that the regulations had been observed with absolute uniformity at all the centres, and hence that all the competitors had

written under precisely similar conditions. When, however, all that is sought is absolute standing, i.e. whether a candidate is entitled to honors, and if so whether first or second class, I cannot think it at all impossible to secure such an observance of the regulation as will make it just as safe to have honor as well as pass and senior leaving candidates write at their own centres. If presiding examiners, whether inspectors or deputies appointed by them, prove incompetent, careless, or untrustworthy, let the department see to it that they are not employed again in a similar capacity; but surely it will not be said that it is impossible to make regulations and instructions so explicit that no one can misunderstand them, or to find in each county experienced and trustworthy persons who are just as competent to act as presiding examiners as any university professors.

H. I. STRANG.

P.S.—By the way, are we not to be allowed to see the report of the commission that was appointed to inquire into the irregularities reported to have occurred at the last examinations? Surely after the grave charges that were made, the teachers and candidates who were interested in the results are as much entitled as the university senate to know just how far these charges were found to be substantiated by evidence; and surely too, it is but reasonable to suppose that confidence in the management of these examinations will be best restored by letting the public know the facts of the case as far as they have been brought out by the investigation.