

June 11th, 1930.

Professor Carleton W. Stanley,
Department of Classics.

Thank you for letting me see Sutherland's letter, copy of which I have taken the liberty of making and retaining.

It is true that at the last meeting of the Protestant Committee I stated that the subject of Physical Geography could not at present be accepted by McGill for matriculation. My reasons were three, and as follows:-

- a) McGill does not regard Physical Geography as the equivalent of the Physics and Chemistry, such as it is.
- b) The subject is not one for study in the University.
- c) I cannot believe that it would be taught any better in the High Schools than are Physics and Chemistry even under present conditions. In fact, I cannot see how it could be taught so well. Those who are training for teachers in the High Schools would not take the subject during their University career and therefore could not be expected to have much more knowledge ~~()~~ of the subject than was theirs when they matriculated. We believe, and we try hard to make others believe, that the first requisite of a successful teacher is to know his subject. A teacher cannot teach a subject which he does not know, and the less he knows about it the less able is he to teach it. He should have a far greater knowledge than his students. As far as Physical Geography is concerned, I do not see that he would have any more knowledge than they.

It is my opinion that if we accepted Physical Geography our standards for admission would be even lower than they are now, and that, you will agree with me, would be a step in the wrong direction.