

the lawless and disobedient." Have you no law to reach him? You have no right to discipline him. It is an interference with his freedom. He is a man, and not a boy, and he should resent it. He is able to guide himself. His widowed mother lives a thousand miles away, and cannot reach him. He continues in this course. Are you to allow him to remain in the institution to ruin himself and corrupt others? You answer, we will send him away. But you cannot do so (so I hope) without evidence, and this implies that horrid thing, discipline. But you dismiss him. I have been obliged to dismiss students on rare occasions. It is a terrible ordeal to me. I have sometimes felt more than the student himself. And when the father comes to me, the father trying to suppress the bursting feeling, and the mother in agony which cannot be restrained, I am crushed, I am prostrated. But my creed is, prevention is better than punishment. Surely, if we have the right to dismiss and expel (I never expelled a student), we have the liberty to instruct, to advise, to remonstrate, nay, to discipline. I have some painful scenes to pass through in the government of a college, but I have had more pleasant ones. I have to testify that three-fourths, I believe nine-tenths, of the cases of discipline I have administered have ended in the reformation of the offender. I have been gratified by many fathers and mothers thanking me for saving their sons from ruin. Scores of graduates, when they meet me, have said, "I thank you for that sharp rebuke you gave me; you gave it heartily, and I was irritated at the time, but now I thank you as heartily, for I was arrested thereby when rushing into folly."

It is time that fathers and mothers should know what it is proposed to do with their sons at college. The college authorities are in no way to interfere

with them. They are to teach them Music and Art, and French Plays and Novels, but there is no course in the Scriptures—in their poetry, their morality, their spirituality. The President of Harvard recommends that all colleges should be in great cities. Students are to be placed in the midst of saloons, and gambling-houses, and temples of Venus, but meanwhile no officer of the college is to preach to them, to deal with them. Suppose that under temptation the son falls. I can conceive a father saying to the head of the institution, "I sent my son to you believing that man is made in the image of God, you taught him that he is an upper brute, and he has certainly become so; I sent him to you pure, and last night he was carried to my door drunk. Curse ye this college; 'curse ye bitterly,' for you took no pains to allure him to good, to admonish, to pray for him." I was once addressed by a mother in very nearly these words. I was able to show that her son had come to us a polluted boy from an ungodly school, and that we had dealt with him kindly, warned him solemnly, disciplined him, given notice of his conduct to his mother, and prayed for him. Had I not been able to say this conscientiously I believe I would that day have given in my resignation of the office I hold, and retired to a wilderness to take charge of myself, feeling that I was not competent to take care of others.

It is a serious matter what we are to do to provide religious studies in our colleges. Professor Huxley knows that there is little or nothing in our ordinary school books to mould and form the character of children, and so, as member of the London School Board, he votes for the reading of the Scriptures in the schools, not that he believes them, but because they are fitted to sway the mind,—which I remark they are able to do, because