

of scholarship that approaches mastery seems to us to be a basic principle. We attach more importance to sound scholarship than to an unnecessary number of lectures in methods. A teacher who has not himself come within sight of this mastery in any field can hardly communicate the real stimulus of scholarship to his pupils.

McGill, with its four years' degree course, its desire for a change in the diploma regulations that will give more scope to honour students, and its plans for graduate courses of training, is endeavouring to build on this foundation. Hence, Dr. Rothney, if he wishes to make his comparison quite fair, should extend it into this field, or else claim - as the only alternative - that the duration and thoroughness of a candidate's own education are irrelevant to his training as a high school teacher. We do not believe that any number of hours of lecturing on Education can make up for deficiency in scholarship. Dr. Rothney thinks that the time has come when certain things should be done. We think that the time has come - especially with high school teachers - when we should rid ourselves once and for all of any idea that instruction in the methods of teaching a subject can balance real ignorance of the subject itself.

You refer to the meeting that Dr. Rexford had of his Special Committee which deals with the subject of "A" diplomas. I have this comment to make. It is, that opportunity should be given for all who are directly concerned with the working out of a satisfactory scheme of training high school teachers to meet together to discuss their difficulties and differences. I agree with Professor Clarke when he says that the method of what he calls "informal personal correspondence" seems to be the least satisfactory that could be devised.

Ever yours faithfully,

Principal.