

the Pacific Province. After leaving Canada, in 1878, he served his Queen and country in St. Petersburg, Constantinople, and in India, Italy, and France; he filled all these onerous posts with great ability, and was rewarded with brilliant success. He was one of the most graceful speakers and writers of his day; the mantle of the Sheridans was his by heredity. We all mourned with him in his financial troubles, and rejoiced to learn that there was no crookedness connected in any way or degree with our honored Viceroy. We bowed the head with him in grief at the loss of his son in South Africa. But Canadians will choose to remember the Marquis of Dufferin, not as he was in his late days and time of sorrow, but as he was in his prime, the gifted speaker, the ready writer, the genial host, the enthusiastic and patriotic Canadian.

Educational Report—II.

Last year we felt it necessary to give special attention to the number of pupils reported in the different reading books. This year the same difficulty appears. The number of pupils reported in First Reader, Part I., is 107,908; the number in First Reader, Part II., 69,706; the total number therefore in the First Reader during 1900 was 177,614, an increase over 1899 of 3,172. The number of pupils reported as being in the 2nd Reader, is 88,836, less by 4,240, than the number reported in the 2nd Reader last year. In 1900 there were in the First Reader

177,614, and in the Second Reader, 88,836; only a few more than half the number that are reported in the First. Can any person of average intelligence and ordinary knowledge of school affairs, believe that statement to be correct? Impossible! We do not forget that some of our readers suggested to us, when writing about this same mystery last year, that, if we divided the number of pupils in the First Reader in two classes, the difficulty would disappear. We have all acted upon the well-known truth, "that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts"; therefrom the division does not assist us; because the scholars in the First Reader would still be in the First Reader. The only way we can explain the difficulty, is that many of the pupils in the First Reader are counted twice. Thus a pupil in the First Reader, Part I., is counted in the First Reader, and then on being promoted into Part II., same reader, he is counted again. This explanation will solve the difficulty, but it is at the expense of the intelligence of the teachers, and especially of the inspectors of the schools; hence our reluctance to suggest or to accept it. If this is the true explanation, the correction can easily be applied, and next year we shall all rejoice at the beauty of a correct return of the children of school regard to the number of pupils in age in the First Reader. With the other readers, the noteworthy feature is that the number is smaller this year in each than it was last year. The largest num-