

third established, and that candidates be allowed to divide the work over more than one examination. If the present third assumed the place of monitors' and assistants' certificates, then with the third A we would have seven grades of certificates instead of eight, as at present. A correspondent in this number condemns grading, arguing that distinction is essential. There is ample room to distinguish the grades proposed between the present third and a first-class A.

By making the third A the standard of eligibility for a mastership, and requiring therefor the introduction to the higher mathematics, a foundation would be laid upon which the third-class teacher could prepare for the second-class examination.

With regard to the division of the work over more than one examination, we see no reason why the subjects prescribed for first and second class examinations might not be grouped like the High School subjects, and candidates allowed to take one or more of these groups at an examination. At the end of three years the man who had carefully studied one-third of the subjects each year would be much better educated, in the true sense of the word, than the one who crammed himself on the whole course, obtained his certificate and relapsed into mental stagnation.

It would not encourage systematic study to allow a candidate to write all the subjects, and at each examination thereafter write such as he had failed in the previous year.

School Discipline and the Civil Magistrate.

Verily, the Public School teacher may be said to stand between two fires. He hears reiterated again and again, for his personal benefit, by trustees, inspector, and ratepayers, such wise and pointed remarks as "order is heaven's first law"; "implicit, unquestioning obedience must be secured, if possible by fair means, but in some manner"; "discipline is an important part of education". He cannot fail to be convinced of the propriety and wisdom of the statute—"It shall be the duty of every teacher to maintain proper order and discipline in his school," and of the regulations laid down for his guidance,— "He is a public officer, and as such shall have authority, and it shall be his duty . . . to practise such discipline in his school, class, or department, as would be exercised by a kind, firm, and judicious parent in his family." Nor can he fail to have brought before his notice the direction of a wise father, even King Solomon himself, suitable advice for the right disciplining of youth (some would add of his day); besides he is in possession of the authoritative definition of proper modes of enforcing his rules,—by moral

suasion, kind, but firm reproof, or such severe punishment as the case really warrants, properly administered. There is yet a good sprinkling of the "Hossier Schoolmaster's" "Pete Jones" class, whose motto is "Lickin' an' larnin', lickin' an' larnin', you know. That's the good ole way."

An inexperienced would naturally suppose that the teacher's chief danger would arise from laxity, from neglect to exercise proper discipline and control in his school. Strange to say, the reverse is the case. Laxity in many cases is security.

On what theory can such a state of affairs be accounted for? Can children of the present age be constituted like those of Solomon's time? Even those of a later day were enjoined to "obey their parents"; in this latter half of the nineteenth century the practice is that parents obey their children. We see numerous cases of youthful perfection, judging from statements made by parents (and who should know better?) our public schools affording the opportunity of illustrating this youthful rectitude. When an undiscerning teacher inflicts punishment on one of these young infallibles, or doubts his statements, then he learns to his astonishment that this pupil is ever guided by a well regulated conscience, and "would never do" such and such things, or that he is concentrated veracity itself: in comparison, George Washington with his cherry-tree sinks into insignificance. A teacher who punishes one of these, should expect nothing but magisterial visitation.

But the interposition of the peace officer may surprise the teacher when he finds the suit initiated by a regular "Pete Jones." A misunderstanding sometimes arises between parent and teacher of what constitutes *deserts*. For example, a man declared "I believe in whipping a boy when he deserves it, but not for telling the truth." The boy had only replied "You're a liar!" when the teacher had mistakenly imputed to him the commission of an offence. Or there may be disagreement as to the amount or mode of punishment. We know of a woman who sent a message to her son's teacher to whip him. In the meantime the master had taken the boy in hand, and had resolved on the same prescription. When the mother was asked at the trial, "Did you not send word to the teacher to whip the boy?" replied "Why yis, I thought shure it was the noice tinder young lady was going to trash him, and not the odther murdering vilyen."

For the teacher who brutally or wrongfully punishes in anger we have no sympathy, and not only would we resign him to the tender mercies of the Justice of the Peace, but also raise a hand to vote for his removal from a position in which he may do irreparable harm. But where the teacher performs the duties of his office with moderation and