

coming into touch with the world of science, or with scientific thought will turn a man from his purpose of preaching the gospel—better let him go. This fear does not seemingly recognize any divine impulse such as Paul felt when he said "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel!" His 3rd deduction under the second general principle must go into my second class. It practically calls for different kinds of education for different classes. It ignores the now well-established educational principle that true education does not recognize class distinctions. It is directly opposed to the most modern educational movements, such as the co-education of the sexes and the adoption of thoroughly scientific curricula in ladies' colleges, instead of the superficial training of past years. His principle if adopted would tend to widen and perpetuate the chasm that now divides the rich from the poor—surely a consummation not to be desired.

With Dr. Harper's suggestions and criticisms as grouped on pages 207 and 208 of the MONTHLY, I am in general accord. But if I understand them aright, they are nearly all practically and successfully incorporated in McMaster's curriculum already. Such as are not I would place in my class 3, "progressive and valuable." Concerning his closing recommendations, if I understand them, I would say that every one is now practically in operation in McMaster theological work.

Speaking generally then of Dr. Harper's propositions, I am compelled to one of three conclusions: (1) That Canadian schools and colleges and particularly McMaster University—both Arts and Theology—are a long way in advance of kindred American institutions. (2) That Dr. Harper has been so engrossed in his Hebrew and his work of organizing his great University, that Rip-Van-Winkle-like he has not kept track of the educational progress of late years. (3) That I am so obtuse that I do not understand his propositions. As I do not like to believe the 3rd, and cannot believe the 2nd, I accept the 1st. I believe that McMaster has all that is good in Dr. Harper's suggested changes and has wisely decided against those of his innovations that would be in any way inconsistent with our great motto. And hence my conclusion is that McMaster theological curriculum needs but few if any modifications.