

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]



EDUCATION.

M. B. A. D. June 1919.

Par.



SALTER HAYDEN.

UMI Number: EC52119

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform EC52119
Copyright 2007 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

EDUCATION.

" 'Tis education forms the common mind
And as the twig is bent, the tree 's inclined."

Education is the most vital problem that ever confronted the world. When the intellect of Adam was darkened and his will weakened, the problem of education really began. Thenceforth man was to be beset by temptations, as he slowly and laboriously sought to make his living by the sweat of his brow. This is man's heritage. As a wayfarer, he must journey through life until the " night cometh when no man can work". Then he must give an account of his stewardship to the Master of the world, his Creator. Then he must await judgment of all his actions; no element of mercy enters into the scales of the balance. Everything stands in its true light. For man has been told " as ye sow, so shall ye reap". Knowing full well that an eternity of happiness or damnation depends upon his rule of life here below, it is only to be expected that man would take every means of safeguarding himself and of ensuring for himself a place among the elect in God's spiritual kingdom.

But all life is progression. Man is born, he develops, he reproduces his kind and he dies. The child of to-day is the father of to-morrow. That child, however, is not born with all his faculties fully developed. He must acquire his knowledge from others and, from his surroundings. As he increases in years, his intellect broadens and new objects and ideas greet his ever-receptive mind. Thus the child is in some measure like a man in strange surroundings. At first he understands nothing; then as his stay on earth stretches into years, some objects become familiar. So he passes on from the familiar to the less familiar. From this statement it is readily seen

2.

that childhood is the age in which the intellect will receive with the greatest avidity all the information and all the knowledge presented to it. These impressions being first impressions have no contrary ideas or prejudices to overcome. Furthermore, no attempt is made to combat these ideas, no effort is made to test the truth or the falsity of them. The whole energy of the intellect is directed not on sifting the good from the bad but on acquiring knowledge. To pass judgments there must be previous notions and a previous standard in the intellect. But the child has none of these. Therefore in the ordinary state of things, everything that strikes his senses would be conveyed to his intellect and would be treasured there. However, as there are some things that a child should not learn in his early years and as there are other matters which should be given a very prominent place in the field of youthful knowledge, it follows that some restrictions should be made and some definite course of studies outlined so that the child may acquire the necessary and useful but never harmful knowledge.

The problem then arises, who are the proper persons to determine what shall or shall not constitute the program of youthful studies? Who are to be the judges and who are to exercise complete control over the development of the infant mind? Are the governments of the people to regulate and dictate the policy to be followed? In Canada, for instance, ^{is} the man from the wilds of northern Ontario to determine by his vote in the Provincial Assembly, absolutely and without appeal, the nature of the education to be imparted to the son of a laborer in Toronto? God forbid! Or have the parents of that child, who carried out the will of God in bringing that child into the world, have they the inalienable right of settling such a question? This is the problem which confronts the world; a problem as old as the world, yet one which has given rise to endless discussions, and much bloodshed through all the centuries. Therefore an exhaustive examination of this question

3.

shall be the task of this present essay.

To discuss this matter properly an exposition of the various conflicting opinions must be given. But the work is not then at an end. When the responsibility for the education of the child has been definitely established the next step will be to determine the nature of that education. Special emphasis will be given to the object of primary and secondary school education and the fallacious theory of utility in the matter of education will be thoroughly dealt with.

To intrust the settlement of this problem of responsibility to the socialists and the communists would be to acknowledge the supremacy of the state. They can see no farther than the state and without the slightest hesitation they would deprive the parents of the right of educating their offspring. These theorists assert that this task belongs to the state, since the parents by the mere fact of living in and submitting to the laws of the state have sacrificed their rights in this regard. They are subject to the laws of the state and as a consequence, the state is master and teacher. Such opinions are supported by the Freemasons and other enemies of Catholicism who would invest the state with this authority so that religion might be more easily dropped from the curriculum. But in spite of these adversaries and in opposition to their teachings we intend to prove that the right of securing or determining the education of their children devolves directly and immediately upon the parents in virtue of the principles of natural law, and that, while they may delegate their power, still it primarily belongs to them.

Before proceeding farther in the discussion, it would be best to consider briefly what education signifies and to insist on the importance attached to it. Education is the formation or moulding of the individual so that he may reach his proper and ultimate goal. What could be more important? His whole life will be made a success or a failure according to the nature of his early training. Consequently,

4.

since the impressions of childhood and the knowledge acquired in his younger days have such a marked influence upon his whole life, it is not arbitrary at all to work against methods which may be detrimental to the best that is in humanity.

In speaking of education, however, it is necessary to distinguish between mere instruction and education properly so-called. The first consists in presenting to the minds of the children various truths in order that they may comprehend the different movements going on around them. To be in a position to grasp these facts the children must possess a certain amount of intelligence and also must have average physical development. By instruction, you can make a child wise but not good. On the other hand, education properly so-called deals with the will. It would lead to the moral development of the children and it would put into practice in the family life and in the social life the great principles of religion and morality. Thus, education would produce virtuous and honest citizens. Hence it is that by instruction and education, both moral and physical, since physical education is required in order that the body may be kept in a state of health which will enable the mind to operate freely, hence it is that by those we may develop a citizen for the state who will be ready and capable of fulfilling any demand.

But such training depends in a great measure upon the parents. While some may be imparted to the children in the schools whither they are sent by their parents for instruction, still there can be no total substitute for home education. Even the principles gathered in the school-room would avail nothing if the parents did not oblige their children to cultivate them by constant practice.

The basis, then, for a total refutation of the advocacy of the state control rests on the fact that the matrimonial or conjugal society is the first society. It is anterior to the civil society because,

5.

if we destroy the civil society, the conjugal society still remains. But we cannot destroy the conjugal society and its consequent conjugal felicity. It is natural, it is based on nature and "you may as well go stand upon the beach and bid the main flood bate his usual height" as to endeavour to destroy the natural inclination of man and woman to unite their forces and to sail life's stormy main together. The contracting parties plainly realize that the object of their stable and indissoluble union is the generation and education of their offspring. However with the coming of the children, the actual scope of the society is enlarged. There now has to be considered the relation between parents and children and the obligations and the responsibilities which this relation gives rise to. All this is the function of the paternal society which may be ^{aptly} ~~aptly~~ defined as the natural society of parents and children in which the care and education of the children is the recognized duty of the parents. Upon whom else could it devolve? Has the state a better claim to the new-born babe than the parent who brought that child into the world? If then there is a natural bond and dependence between the child and its parents even in its earliest years, is this feeling only temporary or does it outlast the extreme youth of the child? Surely it would be absurd to suppose that this bond could be made to disappear. Does not the world stand aghast at the ingratitude of a child who in its maturity rewards with unkindness and neglect the parent's sacrifices? Such a feeling is universal and certainly there must exist a bond of union between the child and parents which can never be broken and no one can effectively aspire to the parent's place.

This natural, indefinable link between the offspring and the parents would be the best ground on which to sow the seeds of responsibility. The close relationship would magnify the interest. Truly then it can be said that parents alone are commissioned by nature to secure the education of their children. What influence can take the

6.
place of the cheerful, sympathetic atmosphere of the home during baby-
hood? All nature teaches that the proper guardians for the offspring
in its earliest years are the parents. Must the parents then hand over
the child to another authority when it becomes older? Must the parents
stand idly by and see the fruits of their patient and wearisome watch,
which had taken hold and which promised well for the future, must they
see these qualities blight under the spirit of indifference and lack of
paternal affection which strange masters would display? Could ^{teachers} they have
or would they have the interest of each individual child so closely at
heart as the parents of that child? If then the parents are more vitally
concerned in the welfare of their children and have their interests more
at heart, they should then be ever in a position to oppose anything
which might militate against the welfare and happiness of their children?

For education does not mean intellectual development alone; it
also includes moral development. We must not only educate the youth in-
tellectually and physically, but we must point out to him his last
end, we must make known to him the fact that his presence on earth is
the result of no purely material forces or blind chance. We must ex-
plain to him the purpose of his being and we must show him how to co-
ordinate means so as to reach his ultimate end. In later years, he
will feel the desire of happiness but without early training in the
principles of religion he is liable to mistake his own good and regret
when too late the blunder he has made. This desire for perfect happiness
is the characteristic of all men. Man naturally desires to be happy and
at every stage in his life, he is seeking to make his happiness more
secure and more perfect. But perfection does not rest with us; we only
have the tendency to perfection. Thus, we find the rich man fondly hop-
ing to acquire more riches, a man of position ambitious to reach a more
elevating rank, and the lowest mortal dreaming of the day when he

will be able to demand some respect. Since there is no absolute perfection on this earth, the desire of man can never be totally satisfied in this life. Matter hastens to decay and decay speaks imperfection. Therefore absolute perfection must be sought elsewhere than in this world. Who else could it be than the ^aauthor of all things, the infinitely perfect Creator of the world? To satisfy completely then this longing for perfect happiness we must attain the presence of this being who is essentially perfect.

But, it stands to reason that only those who are friendly to Him can hope to enjoy the perfection of His Being. The conclusion is consequently that we must never do anything to lose that friendship. The child, however, is unable in its tender years to grasp these facts and if he fails to understand them and act properly he will suffer the loss of that perfect happiness which his nature demands. Therefore it follows that a religious education must be begun even in the tender years of early childhood and the environment must be such that the child will always be attracted by what is honest and good. In a word, if we wish to have a healthy race we must teach them their obligations towards their Creator because, if we neglect this religious formation a terrible spectacle of vice and paganism will confront us in after years. It is plain to see that children have certain rights; but upon whom does this inflict a duty? Surely the parents are the best position to satisfy these demands. They are constantly associating with the children and the children naturally look up to them. There is a strange bond of fellowship between them which would provide the best ground on which to impart education. Everything bears testimony to the truth of this assertion. Thus, to apply the recognized axiomatic saying that duties and rights are correlative we may say that he who has the duty of doing such a thing must also possess the right of fulfilling that duty. Hence it follows

that the parents, whose duty it is to educate their children, are directly and immediately responsible for their education in view of the fact that an inherent duty gives them the natural right of taking all available means in pursuance of that duty.

Common sense and past experience support this assertion. If the education of the children has been neglected, if the children are allowed to do as they please without any attempt at correction, who is to blame? Is it the state? Decidedly not. We rightly criticize the parents. Why, anyone who even hinted that it was the fault of the state would be a candidate for ridicule. Surely then the state cannot come before the parents. If the blame for non-education is laid upon the parents, the duty of educating their offspring must rest with them.

To consider the matter from another angle, if we deny to parents the right of educating their children, we say at the same time that matrimony has for its only object the generation of offspring. We would lower this sacred union to the mating of the beasts of the field. We would deny by this fact that the superior and distinctive faculties of man were given to him to see farther and to act as master not as partner of the beasts of the earth. By the admission of this doctrine, the children would be sent out upon the highways of life to imbibe knowledge from all sources, however evil and corrupt. That which is patent to all, would be ignored, namely that man naturally desires perfection and that the development of his faculties by proper education will enable him to enjoy a higher grade of perfection than if he were left to gather it for himself in every nook and alley-way. The object of society is to enable man to obtain more easily his ultimate end, beatitude or perfect happiness. Without moral development and religious exercise he will be unable, as we have already seen, to

perform those acts which are necessary towards reaching such a state. It is quite evident that the outside world never produced a perfect man. It is in the home that we look for the honest and the virtuous, in the Christian homes where the atmosphere is purer and sweeter and more productive of religion than that of the street where the seeds of vice are nurtured and allowed to grow and reproduce their kind without interference. There is no choice. The home is the place for the education of the young; here their characters must be formed and upon the successful accomplishment of the same depends their whole future life.

But, even in the face of such facts we have world-wise men who would invest all power in the state. They would deprive the home of its influence for good and force the children into state schools under conditions which would be productive of all kinds of immorality. The same halo does not surround the words of the teacher and the words of the father. The great problems of life are sanctified by the atmosphere of the home: and the seriousness and affection of the parents elevate them and invest them with dignity in the eyes of the children. In the classroom explanations could not be given to satisfy each individual mind. Some children are more precocious than others. In addition, the teacher, lacking the personal appeal of the parent would arouse rather a spirit of curiosity than a feeling of respect and understanding. This curiosity would be fertile ground for the development of the basest that is in humanity. No matter what way we look at this system, it is unjust and illogical. For, we have just established the fact that the parents have the right to secure the education of their children and in this regard we made mention that, while the parents may delegate their power to teachers yet they have a perfect right to the choice of teachers and to the determination

of what schools their children shall attend. No matter of education can be discussed without consideration of the point of view of the parents. But, if the state assumes authority and endeavours to say what schools the children must attend and by what teachers they must be instructed, disregarding totally the will of the parents, then we would say that this is an arrogant presumption of authority on the part of the state and that they are violating the natural right of the parents. For, no positive law can overrule a natural law. Indeed the positive law to be properly a law must be based on the natural law. If then the action of the state in education is opposed to the natural law it is not binding, it has no force. For the law of nature is anterior to the law of man. Hence it is evident that the state has no right to interfere ~~can~~ directly and that it would be contrary to natural law if it invaded the sanctity of the home and ordered the parents to send their children to such a school where the parents were aware that the character of their children must surely be affected and their religious tendencies checked.

Should such a step as state control in education be justified we might expect anything. Socialism pure and simple would follow in the natural course of events. If the state has the direct right to interfere or is given the right to do so, in matters of education why could it not regulate the family life? Why could it not at pleasure deprive us of the enjoyment of other natural rights. Surely if it can override one natural inherent right, there would be no difficulty in the way of its further advance. The beginning is always the hardest. Then we would have an era of socialism and communism. Why we would soon have to ask the state for food and clothing and perhaps for permission to draw a breath since they might even monopolize that. It is ridiculous. The right of private

I I.

property and the natural right of educating the offspring are anterior to the human laws of any state. They are above them and as a consequence any attempt to destroy them must be resented.

Then we have that satanic invention which has been miscalled the plan of neutral schools and which should be properly called an attack on Catholicism. The idea that no religious instruction should be imparted to the youth, that they should be educated without mention being made of God, is simply paving the way for atheism and paganism. It is so absurd that really it would not be worth considering but for the fact that it has already been introduced in various countries and has indeed been proposed in Canada under the title of non-sectarian schools.

To reach the heart of the kernel without delay, we assert that the first and greatest duty of the parents is to secure the moral and religious education of their children. It is an inalienable human right and the children in virtue of this duty have a perfect right to demand such development, because without such training, without such education, they could not attain that end for which they were made. And any interference which might lead them away from this end should be strenuously opposed. But, this is just what the neutral schools would do. By excluding from the school all religious education the moral development of the children would be rendered impossible. Without religion, without the idea of God, moral education is impossible. It is senseless, it is meaningless; for there would be no fear of incurring punishment, there would be no possibility of being held responsible for our actions. When we leave out God, we destroy the root of morality; for actions are said to be morally good or morally bad according to their conformity or non-conformity to the will of God. This is what the neutral schools would do. They would deny to children all moral and religious education

12.

Then, when they would have reached manhood's estate, religion would be held as of secondary importance since so little had been said of it during their earlier years. They would relegate it to the old and infirm, but in the full bloom of life why should they dwell on such matters? Thus would materialism become rife and scoffers would abound and the worship of God would gradually die out until the conditions of the pre-deluge period returned once more. Consequently no sane man could advocate the establishment of neutral schools.

In all discussions relative to this matter, we should bear in mind the fact that education is becoming more and more a recognized necessity. The educated man is supposed to be a man of principles, but unless he has a good moral foundation such would be the rankest of suppositions. A matter of such importance should impose an obligation somewhere. Happiness and peace of mind are desired by all and consequently an inclination so universal and constant must impose a natural responsibility upon someone. Not upon the state, since the state is simply an outgrowth of man's sociability. Then if not upon the state, not upon any of the regulations of the state. Plainly, it must and should be upon those who bring that individual or those individuals, as the case may be, into the world. They are responsible for the existence of their offspring and it is incumbent upon them to give to their progeny everything which may render them good citizens, but above all which will enable them to obtain final beatitude. Education is the only means. Therefore, it rests with the parents whether their children are to attain their ultimate end or not. In this connection let all remember that the principle of state-control was the basis of the system of military autocracy in Germany. It was to down such autocracy and to assert the natural rights of mankind that the grim struggle of yesterday was enacted on the

far-off fields of Flanders. If we subscribe to the principles of these countries that upheld the rights of individuals, then we must countenance nothing that works in opposition to nature. From a consideration of the problem of education, it is evident that the natural right rests with the parents and unless the state adopts the principles of Prussianism which it has so heartily denounced, it cannot and must not interfere to usurp the authority of the parents.

Having determined the relative position of the state with regard to the education of the children, and having decided the question of responsibility in the matter of education, another question immediately presses for solution. How should this education be given to the children? Should they be restricted in their study to a few branches of knowledge or should their curriculum include all knowledge? To answer this question a distinction must be made between primary and secondary school education. In the primary school the child receives a rudimentary knowledge of things. Here he becomes acquainted with his surroundings and his intellect broadens so that he is then in a better position to grasp the outlines of higher sciences and to make a study of those branches which will give proper training and culture to the mind. But opinions differ with regard to the object in view in this secondary school education. Some assert that only such education should be imparted to the graduate of the primary school as will fit him for a certain position in life. The question of utility should govern the boy's course of studies. Nothing should be placed upon the curriculum which would not be of practical and immediate help to the boy in his acquirement of a position in life. These people are guided solely by the idea that education should serve no other purpose than to secure advancement in life, that is, to obtain a position

I4.

which shall gain for the occupant the respect and the admiration of others. At the root of this desire lies the love of praise. It is this that prompts people to assert that utility in education is the only proper plan to follow.

Ruskin, who in the course of his teaching came in contact with all classes of people, relates that the general trend of communications from parents with reference to their children, was that they wished their children to be given such an education as would assure them of a position in life. The thought that rules uppermost in their minds is that their children should be given only such education as will fit them in the shortest possible time for their contemplated station in life. The cry is for an education "which shall keep a good coat on my son's back; which shall enable him to ring with confidence the visitor's bell at double-belled doors; which shall result ultimately in the establishment of a double-belled door to his own house- in a word which shall lead to advancement in life,- this we pray for on bent knees and this is all we pray for." This, as Ruskin relates, is the essence of the doctrine of utilitarianism in education. According to this theory a prospective medical student should, after he has acquired a preliminary education, devote his time to the study of those subjects only which bear directly on the goal which he has in view. Such a philosophy of education has struck deep root in the minds of many people and their first consideration in any proposed matter is "what shall it avail me." We assert that there is an education which is in itself advancement in life and that the benefits of education, a general education for its own sake and ultimately for the sake of all people, are such, that every student should be compelled to pursue a course of liberal studies before being admitted to the study of a profession.

A liberal education, from its very nature, demands that all branches

15.

of knowledge, as far as it is possible or feasible, should be taught. To acquire such an education the student would be compelled to remain in a University after his matriculation. Then he would have the opportunity of collecting, revising, and assimilating his smattering knowledge of things. While the habit of thinking and the development of the mind secured by such studies, would place him in a position where he could act more quickly and more intelligently even in difficult and unusual situations. His course of studies would embody the great outlines of knowledge together with the principles upon which it is based and the relation which the various parts have one to the other. Surely then, the man possessing a University training is infinitely superior to the follower of the doctrine of utility. It is self-evident. But, since such a question has been raised, a complete refutation of utilitarianism will be given and a sweeping assertion of the necessity for that education which is in itself the end and not a means, will be made.

Briefly, the problem resolves itself into a determination of the end of knowledge. Should education be sought for its own sake or should a limited education be taken in order to carry out some plan or to reach some position in life? The opposing factors are then, a liberal education and a useful education. By a useful education, we mean a course of studies adapted to fit a man for a particular position or to prepare him for the study of a certain profession. Here the curriculum is limited to those subjects which have a direct bearing on the object in view. In order to point out the great difference between these two systems, we will employ an illustration. The sun as viewed through an astronomical telescope presents^a different conception to that very same sun when it is viewed through a piece of ordinary glass. We may say, then, that the appearance of the sun varies according to the means at hand. The application of this

conclusion to the question under discussion reveals an interesting fact. Those students who pursue but one branch of knowledge, acquire a thorough grasp of that particular science, yet their judgment is warped when discussion settles upon other sciences. The man who, after acquiring a useful education, has studied botany for years may make an expert botanist, but he will be completely eclipsed by the man who has entered the field of botany only after receiving a liberal education. With his extensive knowledge he will be able to handle the question of botany and its relation to the other sciences much more effectively. For, it must be borne in mind that all creation is simply relation and that there is therefore a connection and mutual dependence between created things. Consequently a science, considered as a portion of the whole, certainly tells a different tale to the same science considered in itself without reference to the other sciences. To attain greater perfection and therefore greater power for benefitting humanity, one should acquire a liberal education before specializing in this or that particular science.

Moreover, a well-known axiom in philosophy states, "Homo naturaliter desiderat cognoscere perfecte," that is, man by his very nature desires to know things perfectly. When this desire for perfect knowledge has been satisfied, he will rest and not a moment before. Now, knowledge is perfection; for it brushes away difficulties and enables man to comprehend things that were formerly obscure. A varying degree of excellence in the field of learning will produce a varying scale of perfection. But, since a liberal education produces a more capable and more enlightened man, it will satisfy man's craving for perfection to a greater extent than a useful education can hope to do. Therefore, everyone, who would be truly happy, should take the proper means; and as such a desire lives in every human breast, parents and guardians should not be guilty of stifling human

development by suggesting and advocating a course of useful instruction for their children. At some future time when it is too late to remedy the defect these very children, now men of the world, will bemoan the folly of youth and the lack of foresight of their parents.

It is obvious then that the product of a liberal education will surpass in intelligence and moral development the possessor of a useful knowledge. Even Cicero supports this idea. In enumerating the various heads of mental excellence he lays down the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake as the first of them. "This pertains most of all to human nature," says he, "for we are all of us drawn by the pursuit of knowledge in which to excel we consider excellent whereas to mistake, to err, to be ignorant, to be deceived is both an evil and a disgrace." If such is the influence of education upon the people of the world, surely the greater and more exhaustive a man's education is, the more opportunity there is for him to be right and the more remote is the chance of error or disgrace. This fact should be sufficient inducement for a universal acknowledgment of the necessity of a liberal education. For a maximum of education guarantees a minimum of error.

Lastly, knowledge such as is imparted by a liberal education brings to the individual great satisfaction. As Cardinal Newman has often asserted, true knowledge is capable of being its own end. For the greatness of mind which it gives to us is a sufficient reward without any extraneous and material consideration. What is it that prompts the poor struggling boy to make great sacrifices and even to endure physical hardship in order to secure an education? With what infinite patience and perseverance did the monks and priests of the Middle Ages shelter and keep alive the tender spark of learning which the darkness and desolation of the age threatened to extinguish. Surely ulterior motives cannot be ascribed to these men. The poor boy is unknown and even the possession of a thorough

education will not open the doors of society to him. Only by the slow and laborious work of a lifetime can he hope to reach such a goal. In the face of such facts only the earnest desire for enlightenment could create in one such a spirit of patience and perseverance. In the case of the monks and the priests there was no recognition or reward of knowledge. Ignorance walked boldly in the light of day. The motive then, which prompted them, could not be otherwise than their love of knowledge for its own sake. This is the distinguishing feature between a liberal education and a useful education. The motive which prompts the individual to acquire liberal knowledge is the desire to develop the faculty of intelligence. It is the very material consideration of gaining for himself a position respectable and honourable and, at least, as good if not better than his neighbors which makes the man of the world desire only useful knowledge.

Furthermore, in this age, as indeed in every age of the world, great attention is given to the matter of exercise. Proper exercise produces a healthy body. This is the primary purpose of all exercise. Herein, then, exercise is indulged in for its own sake, no ulterior motives beyond the satisfaction experienced during and after the exercise, urge us to attend to this task. But when we partake of such development, merely to increase the value of our athletic prowess in professional sporting circles, the exercise can in no wise be termed liberal. In the problem of education the case is the same. A liberal education, wherein knowledge is acquired for its own intrinsic worth creates in the mind a state of intellectual health akin to the state of bodily health maintained by constant exercise. Even as the healthy ^{body} permits greater range of duty so the healthy mind allows the owner to cultivate a wider vision and clearer conception of things. In the commercial and professional training of the present day, too much attention is

paid to the idea of finishing the course, of setting up in the world and of making money and gaining social position. Something should be given to offset this narrowing and blinding of man's intellectual powers. The hope of salvation lies in the liberal or philosophical education of the Universities.

Consequently, the parents who are responsible for the development of their children should bear in mind these facts and should avail themselves of the opportunities for such study which are afforded by the Universities. They should remember that where utility is preached and practiced there can be no truly great intellectual development. Material considerations will so blunt their sense of feeling and of emotion that the realm of the spiritual, of the ideal, of the imagination^{ve}, will soon become unknown to them. Everything will be sordid and uninteresting and monotonous. Everyone will "talk shop"; and there will be no one to take the minds of the people from the cares and worries of life and concentrate them by way of variety on novel and fascinating problems which call into play all the forces and energies of the soul. Man wishes to know and to understand all things; his nature craves for an explanation of things that are seemingly incomprehensible. How can such knowledge be imparted if the rising generation are so deceived by prospects of position and money that they absolutely refuse to attend a University where a liberal education would be afforded them. The quality of sociability is a ruling one in humanity. It was this tendency that prompted men to gather in groups and to share the burdens and pleasures of life. In such a society, the greatest intellectual geniuses have the duty imposed upon them of advising and administering for their less fortunate companions. If, however, each and every professional and business man has acquired only an education of utility, then he will soon fall in a rut.

He will think in a business way, talk business and even dream of business. The whole nation would suffer by this fact a loss of ideal or imaginative development and nothing but cold realities would greet them on every side.

This is the fruit of a useful education. It has, indeed, been well said that while a man's friends are numerous they may all prove tiresome. But within himself in his own world of thoughts he can create any kingdom that he pleases. It would be in such pleasurable effort that true relaxation from worldly matters could be found. If, however, man is tied hand and foot and kept from ascending to such noble spiritual heights by lack of intellectual development, then to this extent he is paying for the sins of his youth. True happiness exists in the spiritual order rather than in the material. As a consequence man should avail himself of whatever means are afforded him, to attain perfection in the spiritual order. A liberal education emphasizes the spiritual side of man and raises it up and frees it from all material utilitarian notions. After all, ~~there~~ true happiness cannot be found in the sordid business of life. And what shall it avail a man if he heap up riches at the sacrifice of intellectual development and find in the end that he has been pursuing a phantom or ^{shadow} ~~shadow~~. Then it is too late to sigh and to wish for a second opportunity. All these things are patent. Let the parents of the world realize these facts and instead of hurrying their children through a limited program of studies, they will give them that education which will broaden and develop their intellects and leave them with a more healthful, more hopeful and more inspiring outlook on life.