

guage. I was willing to see the experiment tried of making Latin compulsory for junior leaving certificates. I have seen no reason, however, to change my belief that the putting on of a second language was, to say the least, unnecessary and unwise.

The grounds on which the language requirement was defended at the time the change was made were, I believe, substantially as follows :

(1) It was desirable as far as possible in the interest of simplicity and uniformity to assimilate the matriculation examination and the teachers' examinations.

(2) It was in the interest of the teachers themselves to do so, because (a) a teacher having passed the junior leaving examination would then be able at any time to enter a profession or a college course, and that many would thus be encouraged to seek a higher rank in the profession, either as first class teachers or as High School masters; (b) the languages furnished a superior culture.

I may add that the dropping of arithmetic, grammar and rhetoric, and British and Canadian History from the junior leaving examination was a direct result of the action of the University Senate in making three languages compulsory for matriculation, and of the decision of the Department requiring two for junior leaving. Owing to the numerous options resulting from these decisions it became practically impossible to provide time for all the subjects, and when the question arose which should be dropped the lot fell after much discussion on these three.

Now I am not going to deny that there is some force in the arguments which I have mentioned. Looking back to the time when each University, the Law Society, the Medical Council and the Education Department had its own examinations, and remembering that these examinations

differed more or less in the times that they were held, the work required, and the percentages to be obtained, I should be ungrateful indeed if I did not frankly acknowledge our indebtedness to the Education Department for the relief it has given us by securing the adoption of a uniform examination for the various bodies I have mentioned. It cannot justly be affirmed, however, that it is essential to this assimilating and unifying process that the junior leaving examination should coincide in every respect with that for University matriculation. Indeed, the Department has itself conceded this, for while three languages are required for matriculation only two are compulsory for junior leaving.

As a High School Master I do not see that it would cause any special difficulty if the junior leaving candidates were relieved of the second language, and, having thus more time to devote to the other subjects, were required in return to obtain a higher percentage than the mere matriculant. Under the present regulations a candidate who has passed Form I. or the Public School leaving examination may obtain a junior leaving certificate with only one-third of the marks in each subject. Now it is hardly necessary to point out that the ordinary pass matriculant, who is either going to enter on professional study or to continue his University course for four years, is in a very different position from that of a junior leaving candidate, who, after a brief term at a Model School, is going forth to teach the very subjects in which he passed, it may be, by a bare one-third. Apart from the fact that, as a rule, students at the stage of the primary examinations are not mature enough to get a sufficient grasp of grammar and arithmetic, will anyone say that the ability to obtain one third of the value of a grammar or an arithmetic paper, a third made up