

objects to be shaped in their spelling after their own orthoepic notions, regardless of their history and derivation. No doubt, there are many, however, who do not go this length, but, retaining some respect for the traditions of the language, are modest enough to refrain from chopping it beyond recognition. To these good people we would say, possess your souls in patience: time will effect whatever changes may be desirable, without precipitating the language into a chaos of Josh Billingsism, and committing a desecration at which every sensible man must shudder. Let us, in this matter, "go slow;" for while there are, no doubt, many "Birds-fredum Sawinses" who would fain see English orthography accommodate itself to the vagaries of those who want to spell as they speak, there are a few of the race left who have not fallen prostrate before the Baals and Ashtaroths of modern phonetics, and whose tastes revolt at the indecent clamour to mongrelize our literature. "Man wuz mād to moarn, sez wun Burns, a Skotchman, who wuz edikated tew poetry frum hiz infansy;"—in the phrase again of Artemus,—and it will be the fate of all of us to mourn if, believing the authority we have quoted to be serious, when in confidence we are told, that "Chaucer didn't no how tu spell," we take Josh Billings *et al.* to our hearts, as heaven-born deliverers from the tyranny of traditional spelling, and accept them as our coming guides and mentors in philological science. If, despite our protests and our conservatism, the day of "fonetic" rule shall unhappily come, then may we pity the youth who, after conning his lesson from a "fonetic" primer, turns to steep his fancy in the literature of the past, but finds that by a perverted training he is unable to decipher and enjoy it. When that calamity shall overtake him, it will be well if he is not heard to exclaim, that "it hud bin better than \$10 in mi pocket iv I hud never bin born."

INSPECTOR KNIGHT ON THE INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS.

EXTRACT FROM REPORT TO THE LINDSAY BOARD OF EDUCATION.

The examination of Intermediate candidates is a useless expense, and only makes the

teachers' examination more cumbrous and complicated. No certificates to teach can be issued on this examination, as third class candidates are required to take four or five additional subjects. It does not serve as a promotion examination, as pupils who pass are not necessarily fit for the upper school, while those who fail may be promoted to any of the classes. For a number of years a portion of the legislative grant was distributed according to the number of pupils who passed the intermediate, under the designation of "payment by results." But, as in many cases, the results of the teaching and the results of the examination did not agree, another basis of distribution had to be adopted.

The regulations that in future candidates must take the intermediate before the third class, and in case they pass in some subjects and fail in others they need not be re-examined in those subjects in which they pass, will be found difficult to carry out, and also objectionable in principle. As a matter of expense, the cost of furnishing rooms and providing presiding examiners is about the same for a given number of candidates whether they all take every subject or only a few of them. The greater the number of options the greater the cost will be. At the late examination five rooms and five examiners were required. For convenience I arranged to have one room all second class, another all third class, two rooms all intermediate, and the remaining room, taken by myself, had candidates of all three classes. This was the best arrangement that could have been made. But on one day the intermediate candidates had to write only one hour and a half, and on another day two hours; the Department requiring your Board to pay the examiners the same for that limited time as to the examiners who had second class candidates, and had to be present over seven hours a day. On the last day, the only subject being French, one examiner was sufficient.

If the subjects in which candidates fail this year, and have to write again next year, are those options which only a few take, such as natural philosophy, chemistry, etc., there will be very little additional cost; but if, as is quite likely, they should be history or arithmetic it may require one or two additional examiners, and more rooms than we are able to provide.

The matter of keeping track of the subjects in which individual candidates respectively pass and fail is one for the Education Department to deal with. If candidates are allowed to write one year at one school and another year at another school it will make things complicated. If they are required to write both years at the same school it may