

ever, believe still that Mr. McLellan's report, whatever may have been its design, clearly proves what we knew little or nothing about till we saw it there, that is, the inefficiency of the High Schools. For instance, in his report of the Guelph school, he says the "reading of nearly all the 20 candidates for entrance (*whom the regular pupils scarcely surpassed*) was VERY BAD."

Of Elora he says, "four candidates for entrance, 20 pupils present." Five got "coal" question—*three old pupils*. Stratford. "Parsing by *whole school* anything but good."

Strathroy. "Forty on roll. Only eight in *whole school* could find the difference between 2275 and 5-16ths and 2174 and 11-112ths."

Sarnia. "Even the old pupils did *badly*. All failed in analysis."

Wardville. "Forty-four on roll. *Only seven* got subtraction question and of coal."

Oakville. "Only *three* in school (36 on roll) got above question in subtraction."

From these quotations it must be apparent that Mr. McLellan's report (whether *ex parte* we cannot say) does more than simply refer to the candidates for entrance, and that we were justifiable in using it in the way we did.

We are well aware that the High Schools are not at all to blame for the "meagre attainments" of candidates who are sent up from the Public Schools. Nor did we ever say they were to blame. But Mr. McLellan's report not only shews the meagre attainments of the "candidates," but it also refers, in many instances to the "old pupils," "the whole school," in which cases we are obliged to infer that he means what he says. We say nothing in regard to inefficiency except what Mr. McLellan is evidently responsible for, and if his record is correct, then we have not said any too much. If, however, any injustice has

been done to the meritorious schools, ours is not the blame.

In our first article on this subject, we referred to the very liberal appropriations made by the Government to High Schools as compared to Public Schools, the proportion being \$8.75 and \$0.40 per pupil. There is another evil referred to in Mr. McLellan's reports, already quoted, that is the deficient training of High School teachers in the English course, which now composes the greater part of High School work. Mr. McLellan says, "I presume but very few of our best masters could take a first class A, under the new law." Further on he says, "I unhesitatingly assert (and my notes will prove it) a great majority of our union grades are not as well qualified to teach the English subjects as Public School teachers holding A 1 certificates under the new law."

Does not this account for some of the statements in Mr. McLellan's report, or are we to saddle the whole blame on the Public Schools; as Mr. McLellan says in his recent letter to a public journal would, "perhaps" be the guilty party? But why, we ask, require the High School to do so much Public School work at all? Why not begin where the High School programme naturally breaks off? As the respective programmes are now laid out, the High School begins with the Fourth Form of the Public School and assumes, we suppose, to carry out the balance of the programme with greater efficiency than could be done in the Public School, otherwise, why assumes to do it all? Would it not be better to confine the High School entirely to its original design of being a classical school, in the true sense of the word, and thus avoid encroaching on Public School work? Were this course adopted, then each could be held responsible for its own work, and neither could blame the other for dereliction of duty. Besides, if a First A Public School is more capable of teaching the