

teacher would compel his pupils to go out at recess. Instead of doing so, it is the custom in many schools to allow the pupils to have their recess and play in the school-room. It is desirable that a recess should be given for relaxation from study. The hygienic laws relating to both mind and body demand frequent rests from labor. If these were more frequent in schools, and of shorter duration, there would be more work, less scolding, and better order. Relaxation and unrestrained play are not synonymous, however, nor is the one the natural consequence of the other. If children play as they choose in a school-room they are certain to make too much noise, and endanger the safety of desks and other school property. The worst effect of such a license is the loss of proper feeling of respect for the school-room. While children should not regard the school-room as a place of solitary confinement or look upon the teacher with dread, they should feel that there are proprieties of conduct and manner inseparably connected with entering the outer door of a school building. They should never be allowed to play even in the halls of a school-house. They may be allowed to converse, or even to move around the room in a quiet and regular manner. There is no harm, for instance, in pupils of the same sex walking in couples around the outside aisles during the recess, provided they all walk in procession in the same direction, and with a slow, measured step. Pupils may very properly be taught to march by the teacher at these times, or they may perform calisthenic exercises in time with singing. Promiscuous playing around the school-room should be prohibited also on the part of those pupils who wish to remain in at noon, or who arrive too early in the morning. It is best, if possible, to have assembly-rooms in the basement of the building, but if these cannot be secured one room should be set apart for a lunch or assembly-room. A teacher should always have charge of it, and pupils should understand clearly that *good behaviour* is the one condition on which they are allowed to remain in it.

IT IS A MISTAKE TO GIVE AN ORDER WITHOUT HAVING IT OBEYED BY ALL TO WHOM IT IS GIVEN. A great deal of disorder exists in some schools, because the teacher while changing exercises, or dismissing his class, does not wait to have one order obeyed before giving another. Whether the signals be given by word of mouth, by numbers, by touching a bell, or otherwise, every pupil should have fully completed the motion indicated by "one" before "two" is given. If any other course be adopted, confusion and disorder are inevitable, and the pupils learn to pay little attention to the teacher's commands.

Obedience to an order and submission to a rule may be quite different. The one should be *prompt* and *decided*, the other should be *intelligent* and *voluntary*.

IT IS A MISTAKE TO TREAT PUPILS AS THOUGH THEY WERE ANXIOUS TO VIOLATE THE RULES OF THE SCHOOL. If a teacher does not respect his pupils they will not respect him. Confidence is necessary on the part of both teacher and pupils. A threat implies that the teacher does not trust his pupils, and prevents the class having sympathy with the teacher. "It is better to assume that your pupils will be eager to carry out your wishes, and so impose upon them the obligation of honor, than to take it for granted that the only motive which will deter them from disregarding your wishes will be the fear of a penalty." Blind confidence must, however, be distinguished from honest trust in those who have not proved unworthy.

IT IS A MISTAKE TO WHIP PUPILS IN A MERELY FORMAL MANNER. Some teachers hold that the disgrace of receiving punishment constitutes its chief restraining power. This is a grievous error. If the opinion were a correct one it would be one of the strongest reasons against corporal punishment. It is certainly not the teacher's aim to bring disgrace on his pupils. Boys laugh at the cre-

dulity of a master, who takes it for granted that they feel intensely humiliated by a whipping. Whip rarely, but severely. Whip only for serious or repeated offences, but let the whipping be of such a character that it will not need to be repeated often.

IT IS A MISTAKE TO RIDICULE A PUPIL. It is wrong to do so for bad conduct, neglect of lessons, or any breach of school discipline. The pupil so treated loses to a certain extent the respect of his classmates, and what is of more consequence to himself, he frequently sinks in his own estimation. Sarcasm inflicts a poisoned wound which does not heal. No personal or family weakness or peculiarity ought to be publicly referred to by the teacher. Hon. Mr. Wickersham, in his masterly work on School Economy, says: "Sarcastic remarks, or such names as numskull, blockhead, dunce, &c., &c., do not become a teacher in speaking either to or of his pupils." Do not make a pupil lose his own self-respect, or expose him to contemptuous remarks by his companions. To ridicule a feeble attempt, may prevent a stronger effort.

IT IS A MISTAKE TO PUNISH BY PULLING A CHILD'S EARS, SLAPPING HIS CHEEKS, &c., &c. Punishment should subdue. The horrible idea that the chief object of punishment is to cause pain is not accepted by modern teachers. The punishments referred to above always cause rebellious feelings, and nothing but the comparative weakness of the pupil ever prevents his prompt resentment of such an indignity by the personal chastisement of the teacher. Such punishments are improper:

1. Because they indicate haste, bad temper and inhumanity on the part of the teacher.

2. Because they are inflicted without any previous explanation of their necessity and justness to the pupils. Explanations should precede punishment.

No teacher should ever torture his pupils by pinching, &c., or by compelling them to keep the body long in unnatural positions.

HOW TO STUDY A READING.

BY RICHARD LEWIS, TORONTO; AUTHOR OF "HOW TO READ," &c.

The claims of Reading as an art, and, like every true art, as one having a scientific basis, are making such progress and awakening such interest that we may be justified on entering into the discussion of some of the principles which entitle it to this distinction. It is no part of our business to vindicate its worth or necessity; but it is impossible to approve its present aspects or character. Whatever measures had been taken to improve reading as an art, there is little reason to believe that any marked excellence has yet followed those measures. It is more than probable that the demand is not so high as to give impulse to the supply; for the scholastic economy comes under the same law as the manufacturing. In this case the public is the purchaser, and its taste has to be almost created. It admires good reading, but is content to let the bad pass current. The public, however, is alive to the defects of speech on the platform and in the pulpit. Congregations can appreciate the Scriptural lesson or the Hymn read with expression; and audiences are liberal in their applause when a favorite reader or actor renders a passage of poetry with any approach to dramatic excellence. But Reading does not yet hold equal rank with Music or Painting. Some regard excellence in it as a gift of nature, and others consider its best and most gratifying displays as theatrical, and therefore doubtful and suspicious. Hence the earnest teacher, qualified to explain and illustrate its principles, is discouraged, and the study is only countenanced even in the highest quarters as an ornament and a luxury, which must by no means claim the same consideration as the other studies on the programme.