

Higher Examination.*Higher English.*

The results of this examination do not call for any special remark. There were more failures and more credits than in last year's papers, while the gulf between those who merely passed and those who gained high marks was very clearly defined.

Higher Modern History.

There was some good work sent up by the Higher Public candidates; the answers were sensible and showed careful study of the text-books. The examiner has still to complain that questions are carelessly read—one candidate wrote the life of the younger Pitt instead of the elder; and another gave an account of the war of the Spanish succession instead of its causes.

There was an improvement in mapping, but several candidates exceeded the question and did the whole of Africa instead of South Africa: one candidate drew an outline and marked off divisions (which did *not* agree with the political divisions of South Africa) and labelled them "conquest", "treaty", "acquisition", etc., but put no names.

The answers to Question 4 were disappointing; most candidates were able to show the application of the principle of free trade to the repeal of the corn laws, but hardly anyone seemed to realize that the question of free trade was not finally settled in 1846 and is still a debatable point.

One student who evidently had no idea of the subject of the *Wealth of nations* showed much unrewarded ingenuity in inventing the probable subject matter of a book with that title.

Higher Ancient History.

The few who sat for this subject did good work. Those who are taking Latin and Greek will find Ancient History very helpful; in fact, not only is a classical training incomplete without it, but also a literary training of any kind.