something else altogether, something near to you - McGill.

The boy I coached for the June matriculation is now at the University, and through him I am finding confirmed all that I have often felt about the curriculum, at least in respect to first year science, the part with which I have come in contact.

As far as I can make out, the students are "examined" every week, with the result that they are doing a sort of perpetual "cram". I may be wrong - and that's why I am speaking directly to you, instead of writing a "crank" 's letter to the press. But I think there's some truth in the charge.

I asked this boy how he was taught the subject of Light, and it seems that the curriculum follows the text-books slavishly. Most of the text-books teach first of all what is known as "geometrical optics", after which they take up the "wave theory of light", which they consider as "too advanced" for "elementary" students. I'm quite sure that that is all nonsense. I learned Light under Sylvanus Thompson, who threw text-books to the winds. We were given the "wave theory" right away, and so learned to reason the whole subject out, not learn a lot of "geometrical" formulae parrot-wise. I can't imagine anything worse than perpetual examinations on text-books, And the text-books themselves! I looked at the physics, and found that the discussion of the kinetic theory of gases had no worked examples as a guide to the student in answering the questions at the end of the chapter.

I should be glad if you would give this some thought, for I do not think I am wholly wrong. Teaching is not as forward as it should be. I taught this boy his trigonometry up to matriculation standard in a few days, but how? By throwing the text-books away, and commencing where most of them leave off (in elementary work), with the graph of