

Board in Canada that would venture, or need venture, so far towards the comical phases of physical culture? The Edmonton Board of Guardians may (says the *Evening Standard*) be congratulated upon a very sensible performance. They are equipping the Chase Farm Schools with gymnastic apparatus, and the daring proposal was made that three sets of boxing-gloves should be included for the pauper boys. Some of the members recoiled in horror from the idea, foremost among them the two lady guardians. It is easy to imagine the arguments that were used. The gloves would brutalize the boys, would turn their innocent minds to deeds of blood, and prove the source of a career of destruction. It may possibly have been urged that if boys were taught to box, they might want to be soldiers when they grew up, and this calamitous prospect must be averted at all costs. So the minority—happily it proved to be a minority—moved an amendment providing that the gloves should be omitted from the equipment of the gymnasium. But the board numbers a majority of common-sense people, and the amendment was defeated. We are glad, though not surprised, to see the names of two clergymen among the champions of the gloves, for clergymen know from their own school days, and from their frequent association with the young, that the boy who is taught to receive and give a fair blow is likely to become all the better man for it. We have never countenanced the pampering of poor law school children, any more than of Board school children, to ideas and pursuits incompatible with their future condition of life. Piano-playing and the like is an absurdity. But a boy has to look after himself in his encounter with the world, physically as well as intellectually and morally. There are times when it

is absolutely necessary for him to show fight in the literal sense, and if his early training has included an introduction to the art and science of boxing, he has reason to be grateful. If schoolboys of all grades and classes learned nothing worse than boxing, the "unco' guid" would have little to complain of."

Sir John Lubbock has lately been sounding a note which has been sounded frequently in Canada in connection with our University training and the course of study and manner of examination. In defining the position of London University he thus quoted his predecessor's words: "As people talk very much and understand very little about what they called University teaching, I will try and explain the subject. The word 'University' as used at Oxford and Cambridge has two distinct meanings. Its proper meaning is the body incorporated by the Crown, which has by virtue of that incorporation the privilege of conferring a degree. In this sense the universities are not teaching bodies at all. There is, however, another sense in which the word University is used; it is used to include the colleges, . . . and it is in this sense that the term 'University teaching' is used. Now, is the union of teaching and conferring degrees in the same hands a good or an evil? There is no other way of explaining the admitted fact that at both Oxford and Cambridge the degree is so low . . . because those who teach, instead of working up to a fixed standard, can fix the standard for themselves. Nothing would improve the universities as teaching bodies so much as to take out of their hands the power of conferring the ordinary pass degree. . . ."