

of a healer of men, a material and narrow experimenter instead of a true man of science. The literary type will become the bookish boy, the pedant man, the mere theorist, the sophist journalist, the sterile critic, the lover of art for art's sake. The administrative, managing type will produce the driving brute in business, the boss and wobbling politician, instead of the statesman and captain of industry.

What I am going to say now requires some hardihood, but you have placed me in a position in which it is my right and duty to state my serious conviction for what it is worth as a result of twenty-five years of work in schools of various types here and in the United States and in our University. When what may appear as a radical position is taken it is always of some value to know the general attitude of the speaker to the whole subject. My own is this: As I reflect upon our system, while I am conscious enough of grave defects in university education, the education of the common school, so far as it is illustrated by this city, appears to me wonderfully good. I accept it and believe in it, "frills" and all. But the secondary system seems to me cruelly mistaken from the standpoint of the teacher, the pupils and the public. I maintain, then, that if a number of really educated men with sons of their own in the schools—a very necessary qualification—met each other in thoughtful deliberation across a table, they could work out such a uniform secondary programme as I have postulated. In broad outline it might be something like this: English, simple mathematics, history, Latin, French, elementary science, with an option toward the close between Greek and German and further work in mathematics, more or less of each as might seem good for individual pupils. Our practical aim should be eventually to do away with "pass" matriculation. Such a curriculum at once removes all specialization in science. Many university men in science could go much further and remove it altogether, but with this I do not agree. I would completely remove the formal teaching of English grammar in any stage of the course and the more formal teaching of English literature, enlarging the meaning of English far beyond pure literature, and greatly enlarging the amount of reading. The process of simplification, however, should go much