

tion of a much more serious question : the effect of the entrance examination upon the schools in respect (1) to the pupils, (2) to the teachers. And in this I shall draw no fancy sketch, but speak from the actual experience and observation of ten years in the work. No question meets a teacher in the college preparatory work more frequently than this : "Do I need this for the examination?" There is no thought of mastering the subject, no delight in knowing, no spirit of true scholarship, but only the question how to pass the examination. There is no idea of moral responsibility, or of fidelity to duty, or of obligation to self-reliance. The whole attitude is, "Here I am, get me ready for the examination." Of course, there are exceptions—and all the more noble in the general degradation—but I am speaking of the rule. Only one thing will induce the pupil to work, the fear of the disgrace of not "passing." And if at any time he begins to realize that he may not pass, he gets a tutor to "coach" him, or if unable to do that and still unwilling to work, will give it up. On the moral side the effect is fully as bad. While writing this paper I was informed on the very best of authority that not more than one student in ten passes a really honest examination. I can neither affirm nor deny this statement. I can only say that he who made the statement is worthy of credence, and that it is an open secret amongst college men that cheating is terribly common, and worse still, that the disposition to it is almost universally prevalent. Who does not know that this cheating is not only not thought wrong, but is either boldly defended or treated as a joke? The teacher has constantly before his eyes the examination and he holds it constantly before the eyes of his pupils, until at last he comes to think that the sole end of teaching is to get his

pupils ready for examination. All freshness in work, all earnest purpose to awaken in his pupils a love for learning, all hope of making them see some of the beauties of it are burdened or crushed out by this nightmare of examination. Under such circumstances is it much wonder that work becomes perfunctory on the part of the average teacher, especially when we are judged solely by the way in which our scholars pass?

Lastly : Professor Seymour, in the February number of *School and College*, says that if ever he becomes a monomaniac the word that will be found uppermost in his mind will be "review." I most cordially agree with all that he says about the importance of review, and my own practice has always been consistent with my belief in this matter. I believe in reviews frequent and careful while the subject is in hand, and one comprehensive review when the subject is about to be completed. But what does the entrance examination compel us to do? If we wish to have the class try the preliminary examinations we must stop all advance work and devote time to the review of work, some of it completed a year, more or less, before. In our own school two months are devoted entirely to this purpose. If the whole work is left until the last year the matter becomes still worse. Again at the end all work not passed must be reviewed, some of it a second time. I will not go so far as to say that time so spent is entirely lost, but I do maintain that it could be much more profitably spent. Here are from four to five months occupied in merely freshening up for examination at the most important time in the student's school life, worth almost as much as a whole year at the beginning of his four years' course. Suppose we could go on with advance work during that time, would not the boys be better prepared than