

gentleman capable of forming a judgment and it raised a series of questions that deserve consideration:

1. *Should the school consider the cultivation of a gentlemanly demeanor as of very great importance?* It will be conceded that in life a gentlemanly bearing is most desirable. None of us wish in our business relations to deal with uncultured, uncouth specimens of humanity, and in our social intercourse we are careful to cultivate the acquaintance of those who have not only intelligence, but that style and manner which characterize the gentleman. It may be said that *internal worth* and not *form* determines the man. In answer to this it may be said that where real worth exists the form will be desired, and many a man of real worth suffers because he has not that repose and manner which indicate "the man of good breeding." Again, it may be said that the special aim of the school is "scholarship," and it is the duty of the home and society to look after manners. In answer to this it might be asked "Who settled it that the special aim of the school was 'scholarship'?" and if it were, is not the great aim of education—the upbuilding of life—of more account than this special aim? There is not an institution of civilization but has a right to expect that the school will supplement its legitimate efforts to improve the condition of mankind. The school which carries on its work as if it were not co-operating with home and society is decidedly 'out of order.' There must be as good manners, as good style. As much consideration for others in school as in any home or any society in the country. Once more

it may be urged that we don't want *prigs* and *popinjays* but men. Most certainly we want men; but we want *gentle men* and not *boors* and *hoodlums*." The man of business who made the criticism a few minutes ago has in him not a particle of prig and popinjay, but he is a man in the fullest sense of the word, and he believes that the first requisite in any man's education is that he have the bearing and manner of a gentleman. And he is not far astray.

2. *Does the criticism apply to the schools of to-day?* There is no use in evading this question by saying that our teachers have a high sense of their moral responsibility, that they are aiming at character formation. This is quite true. Yet the conduct of pupils, the bearing of teachers in schools, the reports of inspectors, would all indicate that this "making gentlemen" is not, in many cases, receiving the attention it should. There are indeed schools in which the very worst of bad manners may be seen, where both teachers and pupils lack the repose, the courtesy, the finish that characterize the refined. There is instead an air of roughness, crudeness, confusion, and discord. A gentleman is known by his temper, his speech, his address, his general style. He does not scold and nag, he does not use coarse or inelegant expressions habitually, he does not insult childhood, he is more careful to speak gently and tenderly in the presence of little ones than in the presence of his ball-room associates; it is in him to be kind and gentle; he can not be otherwise.

*O si sic omnes!*

3. *What is required under the circumstances?* First of all it