

named, Private Schools, Public Schools, and High Schools. The annual expenditure may safely be put at \$35,000, representing a capital of over half a million dollars.

In the United States the annual expenditure in 370 colleges and universities for scholarships alone is over \$100,000. Add to this the money spent for this purpose in their other educational institutions, and we shall have an annual outlay of probably \$160,000 a year, representing a capital of *over two and a half millions*.

Now, if my supposition is correct, that these prizes are offered mainly to attract and retain students, we are in a position to estimate approximately what it costs to induce the youth of our continent to accept the blessing of a good education.

It is important, in reference to this matter, to inquire whether this great attracting force really does attract—whether by this means students are induced to attend our institutions of learning; if so, what class of students are reached, and also whether a sufficient number of students worth educating might not be secured by a process more rational and less expensive. We may profitably consider, besides, what other use might be made of the capital thus invested.

Perhaps the best test of the attracting power of scholarships and prizes can be made by asking each teacher that prepares students for college, or for other examinations where prizes are offered, to estimate for himself the effect of such inducements.

I think that the united testimony of these teachers will be, that with many students the question of winning scholarships at matriculation is one of supreme importance—in some cases determining the college selected, and even the course of study to be pursued.

The practice of annually displaying long lists of scholarships and prizes would hardly be kept up unless it were found to be effectual.

The amount thus offered by some of our colleges is ridiculously large for the number of matriculating students.

Trinity College, for example, with ten or twelve arts matriculants offers \$500.

McGill with thirty arts matriculants offers them about \$500 in cash scholarships; and of the 110 free tuition scholarships, at \$20 each, a large number are given in the first year.

Dalhousie last year offered to twenty-one arts matriculants the sum of \$2,500. This was distributed to these fortunate young gentlemen in the form of five exhibitions, of \$200 each; and ten bursaries, of \$150 each—each prize tenable for two years. That is, at the end of their second year five of this class will have received \$400, and ten of them \$300 each in cash. If any one can persuade himself that Dalhousie does not offer a warm welcome to matriculants, he must be strangely insensible to the charms such bursaries would have for the average student.

To take an example from American universities, the John Hopkins University offers the enormous sum of \$20,000 annually, on competitive examinations alone.

In view of such facts, it is hard to see how certain colleges could fail to be popular in this money-loving age.

If it can be shown that the students who must be attracted by these prizes could be reached in no other way, and that they are worth the effort made to obtain them, possibly the outlay may be justifiable. In my opinion, however, the material thus drawn into our colleges is not of a superior kind, in some cases consisting of students that could be secured by nothing less than money, and who hardly pay for the four years' coddling they receive.

What High School Headmaster has not received letters from such persons, inquiring what inducements we were offering for intending students? After entering a High School or Collegiate Institute,

their chief concern is to get the most they can for the least money. This mercenary spirit controls them in their course through the High Schools, guides them as they proceed to the University, and is an actuating principle until at graduation they receive the final instalment in cash or an equivalent, and go forth to swell the ranks of the mercenary and venal.

That such instances are to be found is perfectly certain; that they are not more general is to be attributed to the limited resources of colleges for offering scholarships.

If one may judge from recent action in the Provincial University, these attractions would be multiplied if the funds were available.

What would be the effect if throughout our country all these scholarships were to be withdrawn to-morrow? I think that among other good results the following would appear:—

1. Those students who are attracted mainly by prizes and scholarships would soon be missing.

2. Our colleges would have about all the really good students they have at present.

3. The colleges, thus left without pecuniary attractions, would so improve in educational attractions as to fill their classes with students who would do credit to the universities and to their country.

Take for example the \$20,000 annually expended in Toronto, Trinity, Victoria, Queen's, McGill, and Dalhousie, and with it either establish an additional chair in each college or increase its material equipment. To the true student every one of these colleges would soon present irresistible attractions.

Assuming, then, that this first reason for the prize-system is the principal one, I submit that the funds are misapplied; that the practice not only fails to attract the talent we need, but that by creating a false ambition and encouraging mercenary motives, it actually tends to attract an inferior class of students. To this add the fact that, by a proper use of the funds the best class of students might be attracted, and this, too, through the constant upbuilding and permanent improvement of our colleges.

(b) The second reason assigned is that many *poor students* are thus encouraged to attend college, who would otherwise be debarred from the privilege. Let us examine this question. The desire to aid poor but deserving students is certainly a laudable one; but if the distribution of funds contributed for charitable purposes, say in Toronto, were surrounded with the doubt and uncertainty connected with the appropriation of this money to poor students, I fear that the distribution of funds to the city poor would soon be looked upon with distrust and suspicion. Contributors unable to trace contributions to the objects of charity, would cease to give, and the system fail from want of confidence.

In the first place I do not believe that poor students as a rule win and receive the scholarships or any fair proportion of them. And in the second place, I contend that there is a much better way of aiding such students as do receive assistance.

If I am credibly informed, not more than ten per cent of the scholarships awarded at Toronto University go to students who can be considered poor. This very year two of the leading scholarships are won by a son of one of our merchant princes. In the very nature of the case we should expect no other result. The scholarships are awarded on competitive examinations. To succeed at these long, and in many cases expensive training is required—just that kind of preparation which the sons of the wealthy can and do receive when they are reading for honors. An inspection of the prize-lists will show that these prizes, which are distributed without reference to the circumstances of students—solely on the marks obtained—are generally received by men whose securing a college education does not depend on their winning scholarships. The object in view, in other words, is not attained.