

hours per week are given to the study of Latin and the same with Greek; in English three hours, with two tutorial classes and the same in French. There is a lecture in Mathematics every day, that is five lectures, two of which are tutorial.

It will be seen therefore that fewer subjects are studied in the universities visited, that the ground covered in the principal subjects is a little more extensive than with us and that the time devoted to each is in proportion to its importance and the amount of work that should be done in it. Our practice of giving the same time to every subject, regardless of its value, does not seem to be a wise one. Some of those in the First year for instance to which only three hours per week are devoted should have four, such as Latin and Mathematics, while others could do with less, for instance History. The course for the degree in Arts is, so far as I have been able to make comparisons between this and other universities, well arranged, but one regulation should, I think, be changed. It is that which requires the study of three subjects for three consecutive years. The idea of requiring an undergraduate to know a good deal about several subjects is a wise one, but it seems to me that it is overdone in our case, although it is the rule in Oxford. It would be better, I think, to require a student to carry ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> subjects throughout the three years, rather than three, and ~~two~~ <sup>two</sup> for two <sup>(viz. the third and fourth)</sup>. This would give him a little more latitude, in case he found that he had made a mistake in the choosing of his subjects in the Second year, which might very well indeed happen owing to his lack of knowledge. Moreover there is no particular reason why a student in the General course should be tied down more than one who takes an Honour course. In the former case the student is obliged to take three subjects continuously, but only one in the latter.

The object of a course in Arts is, I take it, to give students an advanced course in continuation of their high school work and to enable them to specialize in the later stages in one, or, at the outside, two subjects, thereby giving them a foundation for a higher degree when their Bachelor's course is finished. We cannot expect to produce finished scholars within the limits of a B.A. course. The best that can be looked for, and that should be looked for, is to start them on the way by giving them an opportunity for say two years to study along the lines of that subject in which they would like to carry their studies further. According to the present regulations a student is required to choose three subjects at the commencement of the Second year and to carry these three on for three years. It is almost like taking three honour courses; at any rate the principle is the same although the extent of work is not so great. In other universities a student is advised not to attempt two honour courses, whilst in McGill he is required to take three on a reduced scale. It is quite unlikely that any student would have a sufficient liking for any three subjects to carry on study in them for three years, although he might for one or even two. Would it not be better to require him to carry on studies for two years continuously in two subjects and for three years in one? Were such a regulation enforced the difficulty that exists in the case of those who would like to be teachers and who yet cannot under the present regulations meet the requirements for a diploma which will be laid down very shortly, <sup>could be overcome.</sup> These requirements will