

gression without envy. "Let nothing be done through strife or vain-glory," saith the Scriptures; and if this command be broken, surely the golden rule, to prefer another to yourself, is also transgressed, in which, says Dr. Wilson, "the whole essential essence of true gentlemanly conduct lies."

Having thus defined emulation, let us examine how it serves duty as a motive to influence our desire for information. A more common phrase than "getting on" I cannot think of. Every man you meet, be he rich or poor, learned or unlearned, is desirous of "getting on" in the world. Is there anything wrong in this desire? Certainly not. What a world this of ours would be if we were content with our present acquisitions, thoroughly conservative in all our actions, not an iota of go-a-head in our nature! Truly, a Sleepy Hollow it would be. But such is not our constitution. We are either progressing or performing a retrograde movement. The majority incline to the "getting on." How is it done? In an upright manner? Is the tendency of our teaching to make men love the golden rule—to prefer another to oneself? I am afraid not. When boys and girls, young men and maidens, can be found who rejoice at the blighting of the hopes of their companions—who glory in their own success, and openly proclaim, "None is like unto me"—when we find this not confined to individuals alone, but displayed in the family, is there not "a screw loose" somewhere—something wrong that requires to be set right? No wonder that a gentleman said to me the other day, that "the total sum of the work done in our schools, Public and High, is intellectual culture, the social and moral element being entirely ignored." This I consider due to emulation, meaning rivalry and envy. The whole powers of our pupils are applied that

they may head the list on examination day, crow over the result, and bring into contempt those who are unsuccessful. A story told by Sir Walter Scott of his school days may illustrate the point, though far-fetched. "There was," said he, "a boy in my class at school who stood always at the top; nor could I, with all my efforts, supplant him. Day after day came, and still he kept his place, do what I would, till at length I observed that, when a question was asked him, he always fumbled with his fingers at a particular button in the lower part of his waistcoat. To remove it, therefore, became expedient in my eyes, and in an evil moment it was removed with a knife. Great was my anxiety to know the success of my measure, and it succeeded too well. When the boy was next questioned, his fingers sought again for the button, but it was not to be found. In his distress he looked down for it: it was to be seen no more than to be felt. He stood confounded, and I took possession of his place; nor did he ever recover it, or ever, I believe, suspect who was the author of his wrong." Does not the same principle live to-day? Should this be the case? I could take you to a house not a thousand miles away; thither the weekly papers were carried, that certain names might be displayed, knowing well that the members of the household were conspicuous by their absence on this printed sheet. We talk about questionable advertising. Is not this questionable advertising? Judge for yourselves. What is published? Is it entirely the result of perseverance? Is it entirely the result of effort or of worth? You will surely not say it is; nor yet would I affirm that they are absent. But of one thing I am certain, viz.: that some hard-working student's name is not there, and we do him an injury by its absence. Let us do right, encourage our pupils to do..