

mentary education is shaped, not by men in the actual work, but by men who have some "method" or other by which the millennium of the education of the human race will be brought about without any labour on the part of the one educated? "You press the button and we do the rest" is their cry. And this public opinion affects all the schools, public and private, except those fortunate few that are richly enough endowed and sufficiently strong in their management to be practically independent. It seems to me all wrong that men engaged in the actual work of education, especially the college men, should not have had a more important part in shaping education, and I lay the charge at the door of the college men that they have not sufficiently informed themselves of the work done in the schools.

But there is another aspect of the matter. No college or university exists simply for the purpose of preserving within itself sound learning and education in its highest and best sense. Though this is a high privilege and sacred duty, there is still a higher and holier one: that of service to the people. This I take to be the fundamental purpose of the existence of colleges and the noblest reason for them. No college or university, therefore, in order to perform its highest function can afford to be out of sympathy with the people. It must touch them somewhere. The disposition of the colleges has too often been to perform the first duty, but to stand aloof from the second. But this is Pharisaism, for there can be Pharisaism in learning as well as in morals, and both are diametrically at variance with the Christian idea, and carry in themselves the seeds of the decay of that which they thought to preserve. At what point or points the colleges will put themselves in touch with the people must be left for them to determine. All that I am pleading for now

is that as a first and important step in that direction they interest themselves in becoming thoroughly acquainted with the schools which might form a direct and vital link between them and the people, but which do not in the present condition of affairs.

For, to state the matter somewhat broadly, there is no continuity in the work. We receive our boys and girls from the lower schools prepared for—what? To pass the examination set for their entrance into the high school. And what then? We immediately set to work to "put them through" a course which apparently has been made partly because it contains some things which a school of about our grade ought to teach and children of about fourteen to eighteen years ought to learn, and partly because some of them want to prepare for college. Any vital connection with the work of the schools below or colleges above? None whatever. The lower schools get them ready to pass the examination into college. After they have finished our "block" the college takes them and does what it can with them. Is it any wonder that under this "block" system—why not call it a blockhead system?—the conception on the part of the pupil is that the college is not something towards which they are to grow in their school work, but something into which they are to be "boosted," when they have arrived at a certain age and have "bolted" a sufficient number of slices of learning? And so by feeding our boys and girls on the milk of methods in the lower schools, on "scraps" in the secondary schools, we lift them into the college not only weaklings unfit for the strong work the colleges ought to give them, but with a total misconception of the meaning of the world into which they have been thrown. Let me not be misunderstood. I am not pleading for any great system which shall take in all colleges as part of it, for it seems