

no flowers on them, and goes and gets cuttings from most beautiful flowers, which he sticks into his garden, without any roots. The effect is very good; and though they soon fade, child B. runs off and gets some more most beautiful flowers, and so on.

This way of managing is, perhaps, satisfactory, but it must take a great deal out of child B; and, after all, there is something of hollowness in his showy best-of-all, is there not, reader? Let us be child A.

The following subscriptions have been received for the organ since our last:—

	£	s.	d.
G. H. Purves	1	1	0
A Friend	1	1	0
H. G. Purves	10	0	

£2 12 0

ERRATUM IN OUR LAST.—Page 4. Mr. S. W. Bromfield obtained a first-class in Mathematical moderations, not in Final Mathematical Schools.

The Rules published in our last, for the regulation of Football House Matches, were passed through Bigside Levée, on Thursday, July 18th, without a division, although it must be explained that in Rule 1, only one representative is to be chosen from the Caps of each House, and not an indefinite number. Also the representative is to be chosen by Bigside in the House, not by the whole House. In Rule 3, we cannot think what will happen to the House which does not scratch during the first week after drawing. We should have suggested "That Houses not wishing to play, be requested, &c." Rule 8, which has been the subject of so much derision, empowers the Committee to give the victory to the House which appears to be the best, although the other may have had a slight advantage.

The School Single Hand-fives have been won by Gwatkin; 2nd, Haslam.

The following Eleven is going to play at Derby and Burton next week:—Gemmell, Bicknell, Browne, Clark, Collins, Eaden, Gardner, Gwatkin, Gray, Rowden, and Steward.

Two large holes are the only signs at present of the new pavilion.

The Examiners for Exhibitions are the Revs. P. Chase, T. Mayor, and T. Ward.

The Swimming took place about a week ago. The heats were won by Gordon, Russell, and Crofts. The final heat was won by Russell, Selous being second.

The Diving was won by Hudson and Prevost, equal, who both brought up 11 eggs.

HOUSE NEWS.

REV. T. W. JEX BLAKE'S.

The Challenge Cup given by A. Babington, Esq., for best average in House Eleven, has been won this year by Tobin, ma., with an average of 39.—The Double Racquets have been won by Gray and Fletcher; the Double Handfives by Tobin, ma., and Johnston.

REV. C. B. HUTCHINSON'S.

The Single Handfives have been won by Yardley, and the Double (buttress courts), given by F. E. Kitchener, Esq., by Yardley and Wilson.

NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY.

Meetings were held of this Society on June 29th and July 13th, the President in the chair.

On the 29th the Secretary, G. B. Longstaff, read some notes on "Galls upon the Rose," and the Rev. T. N. Hutchinson read a most interesting paper "On the structure and habits of Sea Anemonies." He illustrated his paper by exhibiting living specimens, brought at some risk from his own aquarium, and the Society were introduced to some young sea anemonies not 24 hours old.

F. Hawker was elected an Associate.

On the 13th a fine sketch in water-colours painted by W. C. Marshall, was presented to the Society. It represents a curious contortion of the Lias at the Newbold Lime pits, and was explained by Mr. Wilson.

Dr. Oldham, Superintendent of the Geological Survey of India, made an address on the difficulties of that undertaking, and generously presented to the Society all the publications as yet issued by the Survey, and promised to gradually complete the Series.

Among many exhibitions of interest may be mentioned the beak of the Sword-fish, extracted this year from the planking of a vessel on its arrival at Liverpool. This was exhibited and described by F. R. Smith.

J. Lowe and J. M. Lester were elected Members, and W. Sutcliffe an Associate.

The Society will not meet again this Term.

CORRESPONDENCE.

We cannot be answerable for the opinions of our correspondents.

Contributions will be received at the *Advertiser* Office, or at Mr. Pepperday's, under cover to the "Editor of the *Meteor*."

SUPERANNUATION.

To the Editor of the *Meteor*.

SIR,—I hope you will pardon my presumption if I venture to suggest a solution of the problem with which your genius has failed to cope. But I think that the question which was started by your correspondent "Anti-super-Education" is so important that it well deserves a frank discussion. And in offering a few remarks upon the rules of Superannuation, I wish it to be understood that I am speaking solely from my own experience, and do not pretend to give an explanation which shall represent the opinions either of those who approve of the rules, or of those who are opposed to them.

Though I was not superannuated myself, I confess I sympathize most strongly with the feelings of your correspondent. I am quite certain that there are cases in which moral worth cannot be measured by intellectual development. I know that there are many fellows who cannot imbibe the elegancies of the Classics, or dive into the mysteries of Mathematics,—who are the stumbling-blocks of Form Masters and the despair of their Tutors,—and who, nevertheless, are burning and shining lights in their House and their School, the unfailing supporters of all that is manly and noble, and whose unconscious influence may be traced far beyond the circle in which they have moved, long after they have left.

But though I am quite willing to allow all this, I would ask any impartial Rugbeian whether he can assert that this is true in the majority of cases? And if it be not true, I can see two strong reasons for supporting the rules of Superannuation,—the one intellectual, the other moral.

I trust that I am as little inclined as any one to attach an extravagant value to mere force of intellect. But if a School is anything at all, it is a place of education. If, therefore, those who come to it do not choose to conform to its principle,—do not suffer themselves to be educated,—I think that the School has a perfect right to say "You are not doing your duty by me. You come here

professing to learn, and you obstinately refuse to learn anything. I consider that you have no longer any claims upon me. You must go." Now I maintain that this is what takes place in the majority of cases. A fellow without brains, instead of working doubly hard to make up the deficiency, generally takes the other line, and says "It is no use working; I shall never be a swell. Much better give up work altogether, and stick to football and cricket; I shall, perhaps, be a swell at those. Blow Education!" Has a fellow like this any right to remain at a Public School?

I contend, then, that if Superannuation rules were designed to make the idle industrious, there is every probability that they will effect their object. Nor do I think that it can be justly said that their working is unfair, for I should fancy that the number of really industrious fellows who cannot get out of the Middle School by 16 must be very small. That there are exceptions I have already allowed, and regret as much as anyone; but I do not see how it is possible to make rules to which there shall be no exceptions.

Lest your correspondent should be still unconvinced by what I have said, I would add the following anecdote. At the time when I got into the Lower V. there was in it a very clever fellow, about 18 years of age, who had been bottom the half before. One day I happened to ask him how it was that he had been so low the preceding half? "Why," he said, "this is how it was. The first paper which we had in Long List was an Unseen Paper, and early the next morning — called me and up and said 'Jones, you have done the best Unseen Paper in the whole Form; if you do your other Papers half as well you are certain to get out.' You may fancy what a fright I was in. The bare thought of the Upper V. and Long Copies made my blood run cold, so for the next four papers I sent up *four blanks running!* No, no! I know a good thing when I've got it, and you won't catch me leaving the Lower V. as long as I stay at Rugby." Could the force of absurdity further go? Here was a clever fellow, who might have been in the VI., taking as much trouble to avoid promotion as most fellows take to win promotion! Ought such a paradox to be possible at any really good School?

So much for the first reason. And now for the second, which in my opinion is by far the most important. I think that, as a