

studies in the school. At present one Professor takes lecture-courses with no responsibility for work in the schools; another Professor takes charge of practical work in school with no responsibility for any lecture-courses. In a well-considered scheme there should be constant interplay back and forth between the studies of the lecture-room and the experiences of the school. Not a week should pass without a fair share of both. I am not able, with present resources, to take over from Dean Laird responsibility for the practical work in school, nor am I prepared to do so until a fully-considered scheme of training has been worked out.

2. The Simultaneous Pursuit of Degree Courses and Training Courses. The attempt to carry on work for a degree and work for a Teacher's Diploma simultaneously has always broken down unless extra time is provided. There is never time to do both properly and it is not unnatural that, since one or other must suffer neglect, the training work should be scamped.

With the present organization of degree courses at McGill, many students find that, if they are to preserve a wise balance of degree courses with proper integration, they must regard courses in Education as "extras". Hence they come to the study of their chosen profession already overloaded and fatigued, and unable to give proper attention to it.

Significantly enough, I find it is the better students who regret most keenly their inability to give proper time and attention to the study. They become painfully alive to large interests which they have neither time nor opportunity to pursue worthily.

Students less able and less keen carry out the work in perfunctory fashion, submitting to the inescapable operation of training rather than actively identifying themselves with it. Arising from this vain attempt to pursue general education and specific training concurrently, two other defects call for mention, the Want of Concentration of Studies, and the Immaturity of the Students.

3. Want of Concentration. This deficiency presents itself in two main aspects:-
- a). Lack of focus and integration among the elements of the training as a whole.
  - b). Omission of certain necessary elements.
- a). The present scheme is, almost literally, a thing of shreds and patches, the four parts into which it falls:- degree courses; courses in Education at McGill; courses in French, Music and Drawing at the Montreal High School; and practice-teaching, are in no sense co-ordinated or brought to a common focus, unless we are to regard the Regulations of the Protestant Committee as a sufficient co-ordinating agent. Each of the four elements stands by itself and there is no provision for real common control, or for cross-interpretation and cross-fertilization of one element by another. For example, Departments of the University that are concerned with school subjects, such as English, French, History, Classics, Science, and Mathematics, play no direct part, outside of their routine teaching, in training students to teach these subjects in the schools. Thus one whole side, - perhaps the most important side, - of the University's resources for the training of High School teachers is not brought to bear at all. Yet I have no doubt that these Departments would be willing and anxious to contribute to the training of High School teachers of their respective subjects if the scheme of training afforded the necessary scope and opportunity.
- b). The scheme of training now in operation is conspicuously lacking in certain elements that ought to find a place in the equipment of the High