

tained. Similarly our social organization has rendered us practically a homogeneous people. The distinctions which arise from the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few, or, worse still, the distinctions which arise from what Tennyson calls "long descent," from fortuitous preferment and consequent assumption of superiority, do not appreciably interfere with the social equality of our people. It is easy, then, for us to establish a system which compromises no man's social position. To the rich man it is no reproach that his child sits on the same form with the child of his poorer neighbour. Nor does the poor man boast that in securing the education of his children without cost, he has obtained a socialistic victory over the rich. But when we come to consider a system of education adapted to the business life of a people, we are met with difficulties of no ordinary nature. What might suit a rural population, might not be as well adapted to an urban population, and so on through all the variations of trade and commerce.

In seeking the solution of this problem for ourselves there are certain considerations at least common to all systems of education. (1) Education is not *knowledge*, but *power*. True, this power is to be acquired partly through knowledge, that is through the discipline which the acquisition of knowledge gives, but after all the real purpose of the educator is to generate power. The function of the furnace, if I may use such a word, is to generate the steam by which the engine is driven, but the furnace is not the *power* which drives the engine. It is not necessarily *what* the pupils learn, as *how* they learn, that determines the value of any department of knowledge as an educating force. The classics may be as good a means of mental discipline as the sciences—a passage from Burke's *Reflections* as a problem in commercial arithmetic—and yet considering all the circumstances of the learner, the latter may be far more important from a practical standpoint than the former. The question then to be considered is, "How can we apply the educational forces which the various branches of knowledge contain, in such a way as to generate the greatest power and secure the best results?" In other words can we frame a curriculum of studies which is educating and at the same time useful? This is the question discussed by Professor Elliot in his able address before the members of the John Hopkins University last February. After giving due credit to the classical course prescribed by all the continental universities, he asks, is it not possible to find in the study of English literature as good an educating force and at the same time many more of those practical elements of culture which would be available for everyday life? Let me quote the eulogium which he pronounces on our much neglected literature:—

"It cannot be doubted that English literature is beyond all comparison the amplest, most various, and most splendid literature which the world has seen; and it is enough to say of the English language that it is the language of that literature. Greek literature compares with English literature as Homer compares with Shake-

spear
be sa
which
and v
mora
hithe
Fr
soun
it doe
Le
curri
usefu
shoul
In
in an
great
givin
schoo
is it
in id
sary.
avera
enter
of th
fifte
justi
sider
Th
1.
ature
their
signi
2.
ness
3.
but a
and i
4.
as m
or th
5.
gene
ence
6.
ledge
7.
expro
8.
press