

diency of returning to something like the old system of a Council of Public Instruction. Not that I have any personal desire to repeat the experience which I once underwent as a member of that body. The Council had obvious defects. A body consisting of members engaged in other occupations, and meeting only occasionally, could not undertake the work of current administration. But it might be very useful for the decision of general questions, and perhaps as a court of appeal in questions of right, where there was any danger of political or other influences creeping in. The Council was broken up in a storm, which perhaps prevented the Government and the province from considering sufficiently what there was in the institution that was good and worthy to be retained. The causes of the storm were two-fold, upon both of which I, as a member of

the body wrecked in it, can look back without any compunction or shame.

1st: Our insisting upon a revision of the text-books, some of which were then not only below the mark, but full of blunders, and 2nd: our proceeding to inquire into the usefulness of the Books and Apparatus Depository. In the latter case it seems to have been subsequently proved that we did right. The Council, as I have said, had its defects, and it may have committed errors, but at all events it was entirely free from political influence, and decided questions in the interest of education without caring for any political vote. I wish that I had any matter of greater interest to bring before you, but at present I have not, and can only conclude by thanking you for your attention, and wishing success to the objects of your conference.

OUR POOR RELATIONS.

BY DAVID BOYLE.

WE have been told that the "proper study of mankind is man;" and although some captious people, finding fault with the aphorism, insist that the proper study of mankind is WOMAN, we, who are disposed to accept broader views, embrace a wider field, and construe *man* so as to include "his uncles and his sisters, and his cousins and his aunts;" in a word, taking in the whole animate creation from the "noblest work of God," down through the anthropoid apes, to what Cowper calls "the meaner things that are."

After such a letting of the cat out of the bag as this is, it would be needless to deny that our paper is written on an evolution basis. So far as I know, there are only two theories

by means of which to treat the subject—viz., those of evolution and revolution.

To many good people the latter theory, although they don't call it by any such name as I have attached to it, is the very embodiment of the "palpable obscure" in the garb of the evangelic; to them it is as easily conceivable that the present condition of affairs is the result of spasmodic action, and of violent and innumerable catastrophes, as that the production of a bag of flour, or a piece of machinery, is the result of similar human puny spasms and catastrophes. To such, the acknowledgment of one that he is an evolutionist, comes with hardly less of grim horror, accompanied by the usual flesh-creeping