

larships, or the few additional ones who unsuccessfully compete for them. The competition has no beneficial effect on the others. They recognize the mercenary element in the activity of the competitors and there is no inspiration in the example for them. For themselves they either know that they could not win the prize, or they think the game not worth the candle.

And among the scholars themselves there is the freest admission that apart from the moral dangers which are imminent in the case, the intellectual results of such a competition are, as a whole, flat and unsatisfactory. Money, as an intellectual stimulus, is both artificial and pernicious.

We have a plan to propose which contains all the good in the scholarship system without the evils that have hitherto accompanied it. We advocate the conversion of the scholarship endowments into a loan fund, the claim to benefit from which would rest simply upon need and not upon ability to succeed in competitive examinations.

The details of the scheme might be worked out in various ways. It might be decided, for instance, that the loans should not exceed \$100 per year to any person, or \$300 altogether. Interest should perhaps be required at a low rate, and the time of repayment might be limited to five years. No security other than the honor of the recipient would be required. Losses from death would be guarded against by insurance, the trustees of the fund to hold the policy and pay the premiums, which would also, of course, be repaid by the beneficiary.

As it is well recognized that a university course is not necessarily the highest good for individuals of every variety of mental or physical constitution, the loans should only be available to those who, in the judgment of the trustees, would probably be especially benefited thereby and who required such assistance.

No loss of dignity or independence would ensue to the student who took advantage of the assistance of this fund, as may to some extent occur under the present arrangements. The whole thing might be considered a matter of business. There is not here the appearance of working for pay which adheres to the scholarship system. And if intellectual culture is a good thing why should any one be paid for receiving it?

The President of University College and a committee of the faculty should be the trustees of this fund. They would be the most competent persons to judge of the qualifications of the applicants.

Messrs. Blake, Mulock, Macdonald and other benefactors of our University and College, would certainly not object to the conversion of their endowments in the way mentioned. We conceive that what these gentlemen desire is the good of our students and not the perpetuation of any special plan of assistance.

By this plan the money laid out would be replaced in a few years, and friends of our university who do not approve of ordinary scholarships would contribute readily to this fund.

There are many university men who have received benefit from scholarships and who are now in good positions with an income more or less greater than their needs. No doubt the establishment of a loan fund would be retro-active in its effect, and many of our old scholarship men would return to the university the money which it gave them in the time of need.

On the simple presentation of this scheme, and entirely without solicitation, three well-known graduates in this city have already signified their approval of our project by the following substantial offers: The first graduate will contribute to such a fund \$360, being the amount of the scholarships won by him, with interest in full since the date of graduation, now more than ten years ago. The second and third graduates will pledge themselves to contribute similar sums, but they are not prepared to do so at once.

We submit this scheme to the fair consideration of the friends of our university. Should the Council or the Senate see fit to act upon it, we think they will be sure of the active assistance of many of our graduates.

ENGLISH IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

The Report of the Minister of Education for 1885 contains some interesting remarks on "English," by John Seath, B.A., Inspector of High Schools. Mr. Seath is this year one of the University Examiners, and every under-graduate has therefore a peculiar interest in knowing what he thinks about the subject. His whole report (pp. 152-172,) may be read with advantage by those who have access to it, but for the benefit of those who may not be able to see it, we take the liberty of making a few quotations from the section devoted to "English."

"There is a wide-spread feeling that some, at least, of the English branches have not received the attention they merit. My experience as Inspector leads me to conclude that, although there are many schools in which English is admirably taught, this feeling is justified by the facts. Here again, however, the teacher is not wholly in fault. The schools are largely what the examinations make them; and in some of the English subjects the examinations have set what, to my mind, is too low a standard. There is little use in declaiming against bad methods in English grammar or in English history, or against the neglect of English literature or composition or reading. In these days of examinations, the examination papers being unsuitable examination papers, produce or perpetuate bad methods; and the subject on which it is difficult to pass, and neglect of which means failure, is the subject that will not be neglected. If, then, English is to secure its proper place in our system, we must have a higher and a better standard at the examinations. . . . On the subject of English literature, I find in many a great deal of misapprehension. The history of English literature is often confounded with English literature itself. . . . The biography of the writers and the forces that produced certain forms of our literature, should be taken up in connection with the literature texts; but they deserve special attention only in so far as they have been agents determinative thereof. Literature itself, according to the accepted definition, is the thoughts and feelings of intelligent men and women, expressed in writing in such a way as to give pleasure by what is said, and by the artistic way in which it is said. The teaching of literature, therefore, deals with the author's meaning and the form in which he puts it—with the meaning primarily. *The elucidation of the meaning should be the teacher's grand object.* If this be attained, all else will follow. . . . An English Classic is not, as many make it, a mere collection of linguistic pegs on which to hang every conceivable form of biographical, historical, philological, archaeological, and grammatical questions. Side work, the true teacher of literature sedulously avoids, even when it thrusts itself forward in its most seductive garb. Grammar and philology, history and biography, are his servants, not his masters. . . . In most of the schools there is too much destructive, too little constructive work in English composition. . . . We learn how to do anything by doing it, not simply by correcting the mistakes others make in doing it. . . . The University authorities have taken a step in the right direction, in prescribing a prose author as a basis for English composition. . . . We learn how to speak good English under proper and systematic guidance, and by frequenting the society of those who speak good English. Similarly, we shall learn how to write good English under proper and systematic guidance and by the careful study of those authors that have written good English. . . . Experience and reflection both show that the mere study of the principles of grammar can never impart the ability to speak and write correctly. The ability comes chiefly from fortunate associations, and from being habituated to the right use of words by constant and careful drill. . . . Greater freedom from the cast-iron systems of martinet grammarians is urgently needed. The inductive method of presenting English grammar is not in general use. Our false conceptions of