

THE TYRANNY OF STATE
COLLEGES.

AT the opening of Queens' University, Kingston, Professor Dupuis delivered one of the ablest addresses on higher education it has fallen to our lot to read. We publish below the section which deals trenchantly and logically with the State College and School system.

"Let us suppose, as in the case of some of my colleagues, that God has blessed a young father with a young son. According to the natural order of things, the child immediately becomes a source of solicitude to the parent. The father feeds him and clothes him, and, to the best of his ability, protects him from harm. He cares for his comforts and his amusements, for his physical training and his moral and religious instruction. He provides him with some means of earning an honest livelihood. He starts him on his career in life, and watches with anxiety his progress, even into the middle age. Is it not natural, then, that the father should like to have some say in the character of his son's mental training? But the moment he says, 'I would like to educate my son in such a manner, or try such a method,' the Government of the country steps in and says, 'No, we cannot allow you to educate your own son; we will educate him according to our system. You may care for your son in every other respect. You may make him an honest man or a thief—a beggar or an industrious citizen—a drunken, blaspheming nuisance, or a noble man of exemplary habits, as you choose, but we must attend to his mental education.' But you say:—'Your system of education does not suit me. I do not think that it would be best for my son to be educated after your manner, and as I am under the necessity of furnishing everything else to him during his minority, and am morally responsible for his welfare, I think I should have a right to do something in directing the character of his mental development.' But the powers reply:—'You have no right to think anything about the matter, we have a whole department to do the thinking upon that subject, and that is quite sufficient.' Again you say:—'But an authority on mental diseases, who knows whereof he speaks, has lately said that he believes that the alarming increase in insanity in our day is largely due to overcrowding the young brain with a multiplicity of subjects, and taking it beyond its power in the continual educational rush from childhood up to adult age; and as my child is dear to me, I do not wish to run the risk of evil to him that might follow from subjecting him to such a system.' Again the answer comes:—'Our system is rigid. If you do not like it send your boy to a private school. But we forewarn you that we will not recognize your school nor assist you in any way, but that on the other hand we will treat you as if you patronized our schools—i. e., we will make you pay for your son's education according to our system, whether he gets the education or not.' Well might the father exclaim, 'Then

if you will put the whole burden of my son's education on me except his mental training, and if you will persist in conducting that in a way of which I cannot approve and which I do not believe to be right, I would rather have the system of the ancient Spartans, in which my boy would be made a child of the State and be wholly cared for under the protection of the State.' Now, this is not an exaggerated illustration of our present school system. I know that some people are politically so thin-skinned that every question raised in regard to perfection of our educational system is taken by them as a reflection upon the political party in power. Such a course is not wise, for no one party, and not even the present generation, is wholly responsible for that system. It is a growth, but it is not a free growth, for it has been largely modified by extraneous influences. Hence we have no right to say that that system might not have taken some other form of development, under other circumstances, nor even that the present form is the best possible under existing circumstances. Besides, we should remember that no improvement can be made in any system unless some fault can first be seen in that system. But you say, is any fault to be found in the present educational system? I only know, judging from the proceedings of the late session of the Synod of the Church of England in Ontario, that a large body of our people do see some fault in the system, inasmuch as they proposed, or are proposing, to ask that their schools might be to some extent under the control of their Church. But, you say, how absurd! Talk about establishing Church schools? Why, it is contrary to the whole tenor of our constitution, and quite preposterous to think of committing the country to a principle so dangerous. If you were using such arguments in New York State they might be valid. *In Ontario they are without force.* The country has already committed itself to that principle. Every separate school in the land is a Church school, directed and supervised by the Church, and to a large extent employing teachers possessing what I may call lower clerical orders, and making no returns to the Government, except through an inspector belonging to the Church, and practically appointed by it. Oh, but you say, the cases are quiet different. But hold; I will take that back; the cases are different. Our Roman Catholic friends were able to follow up their demand by a vote that would sink a refusing Government, whereas I fear that our friends of the English Church would lack that persuasive power."

DIGNITY.

SOME have thought well of our comment on 'Reverence'—and some have not. Well, it is not a time for mealy-mouthed speaking, nor for dilettante Churchism, nor for effeminacy in religion. We have to lay hold of the manly, and those whose appeal is, through 'Catholic usage,' to, after all, 'common sense.' One sees a Church set up amid the utter poor of London or among the sailors in

a seaport, its first intention being to allure outsiders to the Church's teaching and influence,—and a complicated, æsthetic, difficult service is placed before them. It is intended, as a matter of fact, to teach, in (nearly) dumb show, Transubstantiation, or the veriest fine distinction from the doctrine. And what is the result of the irreverent, artificial performance? That those for whom the church was built are conspicuous by their absence. How should they be attracted—and you want to attract them—by an unintelligent, mumbled service: a thing of fantastic, bewildering figures—a service seemingly intended to be 'not understood of the people?' For what else should they in the new teaching be required to do, save to 'hear Mass'—to hear, without any necessity of understanding what they hear?

A sensuous, bewildering service—a performance, in which the last thing desired is, that the congregation should participate—mumbled prayers, intricate figures of ritual: the whole, to the spectators in the Nave, like to a child's play or to the movement of puppets on a barrel-organ. 'The hungry sheep stand by and are not fed;' rather, they absent themselves from this farce of worship. One writes to me: 'It is that kind of thing that does so much harm in the present day in driving away young manly fellows from church, and I am very sure they would get much more good from riding their bicycles on Sunday than they would by attending such services. These be strong words, still they betray the movement of the heart of the people. Simple, natural, earnest, beautiful should be the service which would appeal to the hungry soul of man—of those as yet outside of the Church. You should not repel by intricacy, by effeminacy, by unreality. Moreover, in addressing the people, those careless or ignorant as to their real, best interests, the attitude, the manner, the voice should be real, earnest, pathetic, pleading.

Is not dignity to be considered in the service, in the sermon? Not, however, to dwell on the attitude, let us consider the garb, in the extreme ritualistic church. The graceful, dignified surplice is set aside for, I suppose, the alb. The biretta is—who knows why?—placed on the head, after the elaborate undressing toilet within the chancel rails, the dalmatic being, by two attendant priests, carefully lifted; then, on the way to the Pulpit, the biretta is removed, and the sermon begins.

But the very garb of the preacher is provocative of irreverent mirth. He hitches up his sleeves, which are troublesomely cumbersome, and he himself presents the appearance of a long bundle of clothes prepared for the wash, tied with a handkerchief in the middle. Dignity is impossible in such a grotesque garb, and dignity is no small aid to impressive in the preaching. 'Manner,' says one who knows, 'manner is something in every one, and is everything in some.'

Dignity. This is a thing to be richly desired in our ministry for the people and in the conducting of the services. Everything ought to be complete and finished in the service of God