

cation Department, Ontario, and had plucked fifty-seven per cent. of the number of those who wrote for any part of the Junior Leaving Examination, the authorities of the Department took the report of the examiners, and passed anyone who obtained 25 per cent. on the arithmetic paper. Who the authority is the report does not say. We are informed that the sub-examiners were not consulted in regard to this mode of dealing with their report. This manner of dealing with such blunders is in a way of becoming historic. To remedy the evils caused by such papers, the Department has repeatedly adopted the convenient expedient, though a very misleading one, of lowering the usual percentage required to pass in the subject on which the paper was set. It is needless to say that the remedy is quite inadequate. To use a common phrase, we are "tired" referring to this unpleasant matter year after year. We are sure the people of Ontario, especially the teachers thereof, would be pleased to hear from the minister an explanation of this irritating phenomenon. Has he yet thought of calling to his aid the lady teachers of the province? Perhaps they by their skill and patience might be able in a short time to pull us out of this examination muddle. A word from the Minister on the repeated failures of securing reasonable and fair examination papers is in order. Mr. Coombs' article, in this issue, makes it plain that the same tendency to carelessness, or undue haste in the preparation of examination papers, is to be found among those responsible for the papers set for the Public School Leaving Examination. We feel ourselves compelled to ask "Are these men paid for their services?"

---

In the discussions that appear in the pages of THE CANADA EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY from month to month on the subject of school examina-

tions, it is remarkable how few of our prominent teachers care to take open part in the consideration of such an important topic, notwithstanding the fact that our columns are always free to them. In the address of the Minister of Education, which we published last month, a direct reference is made to the study of arithmetic as a home task, and there is surely no teacher in the land who will not commend it as a point well taken, when every phase of the question has been carefully examined. The teacher who requires a pupil to commit to memory anything which he does not understand is one who has failed to catch even a glimpse of what the true education means, and a teacher who confronts a pupil with discredit marks because he has failed to solve a problem all by himself, after hours of labor, has surely something of the unthinking task-master about him. But when the examiner, the gentleman who prepares the annual examination papers, attempts to puzzle children with problems that come within his sphere of what "may be just a little difficult," he certainly may safely be ranked as one who does not know his business. The cry against the arithmetical puzzles prepared for pupils on their way to the university is not confined to the Province of Ontario, though the other provinces, it would seem, found their grievance upon the inclination they notice in their school examiners to imitate the arithmeticians of Ontario. The example they say has been set by Ontario, and, unless the arithmetic papers of Ontario come to be modified at an early date, it is all but certain that the "problem craze" will run its impracticable course from Halifax to Vancouver, like an epidemic that leaves its victims behind it as it passes from district to district. Difficult problems, Dr. Ross has wisely said, should never be assigned for home study, and, were he only to say further that puzzling problems should