

signifies "in," or "through," or "towards" Latin, horticulturally speaking. Doubtless this explanation will satisfy Collegiate Institute masters. If not, it will merely prove that they are not conversant with "historical" allusions on this subject, that they are unfamiliar with the simplest process in hot-bed culture, or that in an evil hour their reasoning powers have been dwarfed, possibly by the *inverting* process referred to.—*Requiescat*.

In the third place, if his statement be correct, it follows that localities where Institutes are situated deserve no special credit for liberality and enterprise in educational affairs; that the Institutes exist merely by reason of a large local attendance, etc. I contended that these places which had at first complied with initial conditions, in many cases had far exceeded these requirements; that great expenditure had been incurred in local improvements; that in fact nearly one half the amount expended in Ontario for salaries, improvements, etc., was in connection with Institutes—much of this being caused by a competition that induces municipalities to devise liberal things. This being the case, it could not be fairly said that Institutes "spring up" as a matter of course. The credit *claimed* for these localities was cheerfully accorded to those whose High Schools are rapidly developing into Institutes, by reason of similar local enterprise. The multiplication of these secondary schools was regarded as a hopeful indication of the rapid improvement in our High School system.

I am taken to task for promulgating "the startling theory" that it is a principle of the Government in distributing school grants, to regulate the appropriations to some extent according to the sums raised in the locality. I hesitate not to say that is a fundamental principle, and runs through our entire school system. (1) It applies to every Public School, which can receive nothing without the raising of a "local equivalent." (2) It applies to High Schools, whose very organization depends on a certain sum being guaranteed by the municipality, and whose annual grant is increased or diminished, even to an odd cent, according to local enterprise in provid-

ing accommodations, apparatus, full staff of well-qualified teachers, etc. (3) It applies to schools in poor townships, and to superannuated teachers. (4) In legislating on this subject constant reference is made to this aspect of the question. (5) The High School Inspectors' Report of 1877 refers to this general principle in the words "these grants were intended to supplement and stimulate local effort," referring to localities not poor but penurious, and threatening, on this account, to close their schools. Undoubtedly the principle generally prevails, that those localities are aided most liberally that are most willing to help themselves.

The arguments (?) of "Whitby" are further strengthened by passing criticisms of certain terms; for example the words "centres of classical and general culture" are four times quoted, just as if he really believed, or expected anyone else to believe that they were used in an invidious sense. So also the terms "Government" and "generous" do not escape criticism. Strange to say he *did* overlook the former word, standing as it does the *first word* in the article he defends. With a Cabinet Minister at the head of the Education Department, *we* were quite correct in referring general regulations to the *Government*. How the Minister escaped his notice, when, speaking of grants to schools, he used the words "*generous* expenditure sanctioned by *Government*," is past comprehension.

In regard to my naming certain schools as within a step of Institute rank, hinting at the same time, that once in such a position, these and similar charges would disappear, I can only say that the uncharitable remarks referred to provoked a well-deserved rebuke.

"Whitby's" explanations extract much of the sting from the first article; and, *and*, *and* the meek spirit of his interpretation more fully characterized the original, we would not have seen the "odious comparisons" now so repulsive to "Whitby."

So much for *side-issues*. Want of space forbids any reference to substitutes suggested for the present "Latin test." I can only say, in conclusion, that I heartily approve of some modifications proposed, and trust that candid discussion may lead to the adoption of certain desirable changes.

March 19th, 1880.

JUSTITIA.