

any real capacity ought to take his start. We have mistaken the "irreducible minimum", the "iron ration" of the dull boy for the standard of acquirement of his gifted and fortunate superior.

No change can be made in this by a mere raising of the percentage of the pass mark. This is worse than useless. It forces an unnatural and mechanical perfection in the rudiments of a subject which is the exact opposite of the true method of advancing knowledge. It substitutes memory for thought, and apprehension of failure for intellectual interest in the subject.

In thirty years of work at McGill, I have found a widespread and apparently irremovable misunderstanding among my colleagues about entrance into the University of Toronto. There is, or was till this year, a "pass matriculation" similar to ours. But the better students, apart from financial pressure, do not content themselves with that. Those who have the advantage of good homes, good schools and good brains and wise parents, spend another year at school and present themselves for the higher examinations, the 'honour' examinations in either one or several subjects, - in older days at times in all of them. These men then become the typical students on whose knowledge and for whose needs the curriculum is planned.

When I went to college I had among my classmates and immediate generation Howard Ferguson, Mackenzie King, Arthur Meighan, and Hamar Greenwood: without looking up the records, I should think it unlikely that any of these men came in as pass students. If they did, it would only be with regret, because of lack of funds and would represent a handicap to be effaced by hard, overtime industry.

I have found the childish belief at McGill that the Arts student starts behind the Toronto man but overtakes him. But when? and why?