

of some older child, who knows nothing thoroughly, so that several years are spent in learning, and in the end neither reading nor writing has been acquired.²

And when the instruction is successful, to what does it lead? To the reading of the lowest and worst forms of ephemeral literature. I mean that which is distinctly intended to be inflammatory, to rouse passions, of which the political, which are bad enough, are, perhaps, the least reprehensible. Compulsory teaching of the poor is therefore less than a half-measure, if we do not provide the natural sequel—a good supply of reading. Local libraries should be attached to every school, and every poor child should be brought within reach of at least some of the books which make it worth while to learn to read. We shall consider the modern intermediate system in connection with the competitive system generally, and pass on to the vulgarisation of universities and their titles by extensions and new foundations.

There is not a single passage in this whole discussion where the old and trite distinction between Education and Instruction must not be kept in mind.³ In the case of Extension schemes there is, indeed, some teaching, but neither systematic nor general. There can be no attempt made to mould the pupil's mind and character; nor is this teaching much more than a prelude to the local examinations in which the pupils

even competitions; but rather the prolonged and thorough teaching of the great subjects of knowledge concurrently, to pupils under moral discipline, leading a common life, and having their characters moulded by subtle forces which operate perpetually upon that common life. Even now when the old universities are violating their trust, when they are allowing examinations to usurp a more than subordinate place; even when they are relaxing those general requirements which constitute their only idea, for the pursuit of single subjects—even now the education of a university differs *toto cælo* from instruction induced by the tests of an examining body. The so-called graduates of such a concern come from the four winds of heaven, are not required to have any common life, nay even ordinary acquaintance; they have no common traditions, intellectual or otherwise; no solidarity, even in sentiment.

Why, then, is this monstrous birth of our century so prosperous? Why are its ubiquitous examinations crowded with candidates? Because it gives for very little money, and in return for a very small outlay, all the titles once reserved for those who had spent treasure in money and time to acquire them. These titles, however acquired, are the passports to many professions; as they once used to mark those who had leisure and means to be educated, so now they are still supposed to suggest the same distinction. But the B.A. is like the commission in the army, which used to mark the officer and the gentleman, and which is therefore still very attractive to those whose claim to be the latter is doubtful. Such attainments are now no longer the marks of better breeding or culture, but of success in passing an examination. How long the old associations will cling about either title is not a

² I state this from cases under my own observation.

³ It is worth pointing out that, while the French, who understand the use of language, call their director of this department the Minister of *Public Instruction*, the English, with greater ignorance (or is it greater assurance?), call him the President of the Board of *Education*—in fact, Minister of Education, though such a thing as real education is seldom dreamt of in the whole department.