

but I must hasten to a close. My reference to the brotherhood of men, had associated with it a reference to our Canadian nationality, and though made partly in jest, I cannot let the opportunity pass without re-enunciating my suggestion in favor of establishing a central Bureau of Education at Ottawa. When one considers the interblending of educational influences that has taken place throughout the Union, since the Bureau of Education was first organized in Washington, the nearest possible approach to one country, one educational system that the United States is ever likely to see, and when one further considers how far we are from a truly national consolidation even thirty years after confederation, and how effectually the school house can be made a nursery ground for the true patriotism, it is easy enough to put this and that together, and plead for the organization of a like institution in Canada. To advocate a national system of education for Canada is to cry for the moon, is at least to shut our eyes to the constitution and the rights and interests it protects. The establishing of a national system of education for Canada means revolution, and we are hardly prepared for a revolution that would be sure to rend us apart rather than bind us together, before we really have had time to become a nation. In the organization of a central Bureau of Education there is, however, not even the faintest tendency of a revolution about it, its functions being missionary, and its administration *ex officio*. All that would be required would be a vote for its support as a sub-department under the federal government, and liberty to work out its own destiny of usefulness, as a co-ordinating force in the educational affairs of the Dominion. As such a force it would neither be over nor under any provincial authority, perhaps not even advisory, yet bringing

about by judicious and justifiable means, an assimilation of provincial efforts and pedagogic necessities that would bring all the teachers of Canada, and through them the rising generation, to see the provincial shade away into the federal, into the national. Nor is there need for me to go into particulars. I have done this already, and intend to return to these particulars when there is more time and better opportunity. Suffice it to say, if the Fathers of Confederation by any chance left out an element in the arrangements that were expected to lead us nationward, it is our duty to find out wherein lies the defect, and if it be found that the Nova Scotian teacher is still steeped in the provincial and the Ontario teacher the same, that there are Quebec teachers and Quebec teachers, and Manitoba teachers and New Brunswick teachers, there is in the fact some indication of the reason why our lads growing up towards manhood and our maidens towards motherhood, continue to look upon our nationality as a mere sentiment, thinking little of the active principle that makes for the true patriotism. "What constitutes a state?" our boys still recite, as the Fathers of Confederation recited when they were pleading from the hustings for federal union.

What constitutes a State?
 Not high-raised battlement or labored mound,
 Thick wall or moated gate;
 Not cities proud with spires and turrets crowned;
 Not bays and broad-armed ports,
 Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
 Not starred and spangled courts,
 Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.
 No:—men, high minded men,
 With powers, as far above dull brutes endued
 In forest, brake, or den,
 As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude,—
 Men who their duties know,