

heart of the matter. "That which the school ought to develop before all things, in the individual whom it trains, is the man himself—namely, heart, intelligence, conscience. But it must not be forgotten that the first and best safeguard that our schools can give for the morality of the man is to create in every scholar an aptitude for, and a liking for, that labor by which he will live."

Now, gentlemen, have the secondary schools, which we ourselves attended, done that for us?

Some of us can thankfully say that every day we live we realize more clearly what was done for us at school. No institution is perfect; least of all do good institutions think themselves so; but we may say, without challenge of denial, that we have in this country some secondary schools which, on the most essential points of educational influence, are absolutely without a rival in the world. Let us seek so far as may be to cherish and extend their best traditions.

But that is far from true of all. And there are others, of which their alumni might say, what Corneille said of his protector, Richelieu, "He has been too much of a benefactor to me for me to abuse him; but he has done me too many bad turns to deserve my good word."

With your leave I will try to examine a little more in detail how far our secondary schools do, or can, prepare for practical life.

By practical life, I mean the whole range of callings—professional, commercial, industrial, adventurous, military, administrative, directive, legislative, official, social—for which those boys are being prepared, on whom it is worth while to make the capital outlay involved in a course of secondary education, extending up to 16, 17, or 19 years of age, as the case may be.

(1) For a certain kind of practical life, the English higher secondary schools give a training which is universally admitted to be the best thing of its kind in existence. They train leaders of men. This is very largely due to two things: First, because they are chiefly boarding-schools—and a big boarding house at an English public school is a miniature world, the boys at the top having duties of administration and of responsible oversight. Secondly, it depends a good deal on the tradition of organized school games. They teach a boy to think of his side rather than of himself; to clench his teeth and put the thing through.

In saying this, you will understand that I don't mean to advocate athleticism as the final cause of education. But athletic interests are valuable in their way, as the gentleman knew who put the advertisement in the *Church Times*: "Little Boy, whose cricket is promising, can be received at once in high-class school in health resort for nominal fees."

(2) It should not be forgotten that, in former times, secondary education was only possible for the few, and that its curriculum had the special purpose of preparing boys for the more literary of the liberal professions.

This has left a very deep mark on the studies and traditions of our higher secondary schools.

An American writer gives it as his opinion that "the study of a dead language makes the student mentally, no less than physically, stooped-shouldered and shortsighted."

Of course (not to mince words) that is silly; but all the same, we may question whether in some schools some other form of intellectual discipline might not be made as searching and found more appropriate. Personally, I think that for the highest grade of education,