

limited course (and whether such a course will develop taste depends infinitely more on the culture and the zeal of the teacher than it does on school programmes or examination papers. But really satisfactory results can be secured only by extended familiarity with our best authors. It is, I believe, generally felt that for the proper cultivation of taste, the amount of English Literature now prescribed is quite insufficient. This defect many schools remedy by a system of supplementary reading which indeed, should, under any circumstances, be maintained; but, as not all have adopted this system, and in some quarters an examination is the most powerful incentive, it would be well to adopt the system proposed above, which is but a reproduction of the very admirable system now adopted in the department of English Literature in the Provincial University.

The course proposed for the Primary would, I am sure, prove defective were no Physics and Botany taken by all pupils, no matter what their options might be. For the purpose of general education, my suggestion is a proper one; and it has already been adopted in some of our best schools. It would also secure for the pupil one year's study of Science in Form I. and would allow Botany to be, what in the nature of the subject it should be, the first science taken in the school programme.

The general scheme I submit for your consideration ignores the question of the relative values of the different departments. The examiner will simply assume on the part of the pupil such knowledge of the subject as may be fairly expected after a course of the prescribed length of time. The matter of organization may be safely left to the judgment of the High School Principal.

SECONDLY, AS TO THE STANDARD.

I take the position that the present capabilities of our High Schools and the evils of a low July percentage for matriculation necessitate the higher percentage proposed. These evils are intensified by the existence of supplementals which have no justification, I maintain, either in reason or in expediency. The bad effects on the Universities are made still worse by the vicious system of, in some cases, an apparently unlimited admission of non-matriculated students. The High School master who guards the door of his school with the High School Entrance examination needs no mentor on this subject. A scarcity of students, as every one knows, does not justify the present laxity of admission into our Universities. Nor can it be justified on any educational ground.

As to the Supplemental: Those who defend its maintenance, apparently assume that the candidate who passes in some of the subjects in July and in the rest in September is as well prepared as the candidate who in July passes in all the subjects at once; that, assuming the papers to be as difficult, there is no real lowering of the standard in September. This is on a par with the argument that the man who can lift two hundred weight at once is not stronger than the man who can lift them only one by one. If supplementals were maintained, the examiners thereof should, of course, be the same as those at the July examina-

tion; but any argument that the standard should be kept the same applies also to the Junior and it would be unwise, not to put into motion in September the expensive machinery of the Board. Some maintain, and I think rightly, that it is unjust to put back for a week or a month of a slight failure a young man who is the average candidate, or to reject a candidate who has failed a little in some departments; and that, to make such cases, a supplemental is inadvisable. To this reasonable objection, the Board has only to say what the Education Department does at the Entrance Examination: In all such extenuating circumstances, the Board when passing judgment upon a candidate, should better pass a candidate at the July examination than put him and the University to the expense of a second examination. The knowledge he can cram up during the month of August is worth little as a preparation for university work, while the examination furnishes a plausible pretext for lowering the standard to those who think apparently that the influence of a University depends on numbers it has on its roll than on the quality of the work done by its faculties.

Before I close, let me examine briefly the objections I have heard urged against the proposed percentage.

The main one is the alleged inability to desire a University course to qualify for a standard at the age when a University should begin. Let us see what the facts are on this point. Of 1,496 who last July obtained Primary certificates, thirty-seven were only sixteen years of age or under. If a full-time study would, of course, fit them for the Junior Leaving—and of 1,008 who then obtained Leaving certificates, nearly forty were only seventeen years of age. When we consider that most of those who take these examinations are teachers' sons, and therefore, older than the average, the significance of the figures cannot be said. It is surely time enough to begin university education at the age of seventeen, when the supplemental is a *deus ex machina*; certainly not pass or might have to pass, but the theory that a University education is possible even for the intellectually weak or the naturally slothful, is not justifiable on any able grounds whatever. My own opinion is that it might be a good thing in many of our Universities and the Ontario University did not attempt an education which was not fitted them to receive.

Another objection is that raising the standard would reduce the attendance at the University and exact too much from the High Schools. The latter objection I need not deal with. The Provincial University is concerned with the attendance would, for a time, be suffering in disguise. The University, I have already referred to, shows that the departments are crowded, and cannot