

employed in the instruction of youth." A local Superintendent in the neighbouring State of New-York having rejected candidates upon the ground of profaneness, it was made the subject of representation to higher authority; and the following is the very just and enlightened decision of the State Superintendent on the subject:—

Secretary of State's Office,
Albany, 21st July, 1843.

SIR,—You desire to know whether habitual profanity should be regarded a disqualification in persons presenting themselves as Candidates for School Teachers.

Among the qualifications required for a School Teacher, a good moral character is not the least important.—He may be a proficient scholar, and may possess undoubted ability to impart instruction with success, but if his instruction is immoral in its tendency it is worse than ignorance.

Profanity is not less a violation of morality than falsehood, drunkenness, or theft.

It begets a recklessness of thought and action—a moral vacuum, where every vice may find a sure receptacle; and in tender youth, a person entrusted with their character, their prospects, and their usefulness, it should not and cannot be allowed.

Your refusal to grant certificates to Teachers who are addicted to habitual profanity is therefore in strict accordance with the rules of this Department, and meets my approbation.

Yours respectfully,

CHRISTOPHER MORGAN,
Sup't Common Schools.

Mr. C. D. KEATON, &c. &c.

EDUCATIONAL RELATIONS BETWEEN UPPER CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

—We copy the following very candid and generous remarks, in answer to some remarks of our own, from *The District School Journal of the State of New-York* for the present month. We are happy to find, from so satisfactory authority, that we have been misinformed in respect to the employment of efficient British Teachers in the United States. It may have been the *qualifications* and not the *Country* of the British applicants that prevented their success. We hope our own Legislature will not be less liberal than that of our American neighbours, and that the nationalities of the two Countries will more and more link reciprocal courtesy and mutual respect and good-will with independent and emulating patriotism:—

The Journal of Education for Upper Canada in reply to our remarks upon the inhibitory provisions of the Provincial School Law, asks "whether we, or this government, would encourage or allow, the use of Foreign books in the Common Schools of the State of New-York, which reflected upon the Institutions and character of the American people? Would they patronize school books which contained paragraphs, lessons, and orations, denouncing the government of the United States as a tyranny, its people as tyrants or slaves, its Institutions as incompatible with human freedom? We are sure they would not. We are satisfied that the most enlightened educationists in the United States will say, that their Institutions do not require the

support of this peculiarity in their school books, and the removal of it will be honorable to themselves, and terminate the objection to the use of their books in the schools of other countries."

We admit there is force in this objection to what is certainly an unnecessary feature in our text books. The former relations of the two countries have given rise to sentiments and feelings, which succeeding generations, it is hoped, will never learn by experience. The school books partook of the spirit which existed at the time of separation, and probably exerted no small influence in securing attachment to our Institutions. The reflections upon the laws of the mother country were but the natural language of a child whose maturity was