

dian boys are generally quicker witted than their English contemporaries. But, though their ambition does not turn as a rule in the direction of the army or the navy, it is undoubtedly true that the outside attractions of the rink, sliding, &c., take the place in the mind of the Canadian that is occupied by cricket in England. Our readers will be amused by the following passage upon the schoolboy's sense of humour.

"The boy decidedly has not a fine perception of humour. Let no pedagogue dream that his choicest witticisms are really appreciated. For ulterior purposes they are frequently received with great laughter. But the average boy is not really tickled by that which most provokes the amusement of his betters. Two things, however, excite his genuine mirth. One, a bodily slip, fall, or accident happening to one of his fellows; or, still better, to his master. The other, a chance allusion to the name or nickname of some boy in his form; still better, again, to the name or nickname of the master of the form. Thus, not long since at a concert at a well-known public school, a song containing an allusion to beetles was received with the greatest applause, because 'beetle' was the nickname of one of the masters who happened to be present. These are things that always cause the boy to give way to inextinguishable laughter. On the other hand, many mistakes which most tend to upset the gravity of masters, he regards as boring incidents, useful only by way of occupying time, and postponing inconvenient questions."

The paper concludes with a timely protest against the disposition to subordinate literary to scientific training; to look upon the former as useless and impractical and the latter only as worthy of the attention of educationists in the nineteenth century.

"If the systems and methods of the professional are such as to irritate the lay educationalist, some of the tenets of the layman are equally irritating to the professional man, who after inheriting a system and practising it has honestly found that, in his opinion, it answers its purpose. And it is especially irritating to see how in appraising 'the relative value of knowledge,' an immense amount is said in favour of such sciences as chemistry, botany, anatomy, and comparatively little in favour of literature; and how it seems to be assumed that true religion is fostered by observation and study of the Creator's works as manifested in matter, much more than by the study of His highest work—the