

a part, and of which the Danish invasions were but a continuance? A hint of this kind is always fruitful, because it brings together events that are apt to stand apart, and because the pupil cannot help but see that he is looking at events from a broader standpoint once he has grasped the general fact.

Other points suggest themselves, but space forbids. The authors are to be congratulated on their work as a whole. Only the lazy or the careless can fail to be benefitted by the book, since, even if the book itself is not all that it should be, it indicates the sources from which the teacher can draw the facts which will expand and correct it.

Special.

PRIZES AND SCHOLARSHIPS,

BY D. C. M'HENRY, M.A., PRINCIPAL COBBOURG COLL. INSTITUTE.

(A paper read before the Ontario Teachers' Association).

A retrospect over the history of our educational methods shows that decided progress has been made. This progress, however, has not been uniform and continuous, but is made up of a succession of lines, much like those of a vessel tacking against the wind—generally onward, but in its progress often going from one extreme to the other.

Those of you who have spent many years in teaching, can recall numerous changes that are nothing but a series of contrasts. To younger teachers also the past decade furnishes not a few such changes in the laws, theories, and practices of our educational work.

That which strikes one as singular is the fact that each novelty has been fairly popular in its turn, almost on its introduction. Indeed, the greater the contrast the more readily has it appeared to meet with popular approval.

Such, for example, were the changes from the operation of our educational system largely through local centres of authority, to the general control of the system from one central office; from the general superintendency to the present ministerial regime; from the payment to High Schools on the basis of attendance only, to payment by results; from payment by results to payment according to local liberality; from the special fostering of classical teaching in High Schools to the reign of mathematics; from the so-called mathematical craze to a corresponding specializing in English; and so on through the erratic line which we are expected to recognize as the path of substantial progress.

It would seem, indeed, that legislative enactments and departmental regulations have had much to do in making and unmaking our opinions, instead of our having statutes and regulations as the outcome of opinion prevalent among those who are more directly experienced in educational matters.

To the changes enumerated may be added the remarkable change in public and professional sentiment on the subject of prizes. For many years the Educational Department regularly encouraged the practice of distributing prizes. To-day, if I mistake not, its influence lies in an exactly opposite direction. As for teachers, the entire abolition of prizes now appears to be the proper thing. In our universities the tendency is clearly in the same direction. This, moreover, is undoubtedly the popular view of the question.

If I prove not indifferent to traditional custom, I shall dispose of the question by simply tossing it aside with the remark that it is virtually settled, and must take its predestined course, until the pendulum takes a swing to the opposite extreme.

This easy method, however, is hardly satisfactory. The emphatic and even impatient utterances of some writers and speakers on this subject—while in harmony with a prevalent spirit of change—may

and probably do reflect current opinion; but I am sure that in some cases there has not been a full and impartial investigation of the principles that underlie the question.

In fact it is largely a question of motives, and such considerations bring us as teachers into the realm of our deepest problems.

The principles that govern the giving of prizes are not easily distinguishable from those motives that lie beneath our most praiseworthy efforts to excel in the various callings of life.

If we exercise a little patience, I think we shall find that the question is fairly debatable, and also that it will ultimately resolve itself into that of the preponderance of resulting good or evil. Herein I hope we may find a practical issue.

1. Let us first examine the reasons usually assigned for giving prizes and scholarships, and ascertain, if possible, how far the intended objects are realized.

(a) *In order to attract students.* This evidently accounts for the major part of our university prizes, scholarships, and medals. It is no secret that our arts colleges are as eagerly competing for numbers as the most enterprising of our medical schools or Collegiate Institutes. The quiet dignity of the competition does not diminish its keenness, nor is the real object of these pecuniary attractions concealed beneath the bland expressions we hear on convocation days as to the heroic struggles of medallists, and the congratulations bestowed in distributing scholarships among the needy sons of wealthy parents, who generally receive them.

We must have colleges, and colleges must have students, even if they have to be bribed to attend by displaying long lists of cash prizes. As a rule these inducements are carefully placed at or near the entrance, in the hope that if students thirsting for knowledge can once be enrolled and kept for a year, the charms of an institution so generous will not fail to hold them till graduation.

The same remarks apply generally to all schools that add to the educational advantages they offer these pecuniary inducements. I say they apply generally. It would be too much to say that every educational institution that offers prizes does so merely or mainly to attract students; for prizes are offered in some schools that are crowded with students without an effort being made to swell their numbers. We shall find elsewhere the reasons that operate here. Our universities, however, will hardly deny that the main reason they have for offering prizes of various kinds is to attract students to their halls.

The amount thus expended is very large, as may be seen by collating from college calendars the lists of cash prizes.

I understand that during the past ten or twelve years Toronto University has spent on an average over \$4,000 a year out of public funds. To this must be added private scholarships amounting to about \$600 a year. The Senate, moreover, has decided to increase this amount by placing at matriculation five additional scholarships.

Trinity College spends annually \$2,000 in prizes and scholarships, \$500 of which is placed at matriculation.

Victoria spends annually about \$500 in prizes, scholarships, and medals.

Queen's spends \$1,000 a year in prizes for arts students, to which may be added \$930 offered to theological students, and \$240 to medical students—about \$2,100 in all.

McGill College offers prizes, medals, and scholarships, of the annual value of over \$4,000.

Dalhousie College, Halifax, offers prizes of the annual value of nearly \$7,000.

From these six arts colleges we have an annual expenditure of over \$20,000, representing an invested capital of more than \$300,000.

To this we may add the large sum spent for this purpose by our Theological Colleges, Ladies' Colleges, Medical Schools not already