by schoolboys each side has a leader or captain. If the game is to be successfully carried on every player feels he must obey implicitly the directions of his leader. A boy may have an opinion which differs widely from his captain's as to the disposition of the "men" on the field, or as to the particular method to be adopted in the play, but he soon learns that to make the game a winning one the captain's words must be law. Thus we see that these games exert a very powerful influence in teaching boys discipline, and in shewing them the advantage and necessity of having a recognized head whose will should be supreme. This lesson, although learned on the play-ground, becomes invaluable in the school-room and in after life. Moderation and self-control are also developed by participation in these games. A boy cannot always be victorious, nor always on the losing side. When he begins to take part in these manly sports he is very liable to lose his temper, to be unduly elated by victory and too much dejected by defeat. As time goes on he finds that it is more discreet not to get angry, and wiser not to shew too much joy at success, nor dissatisfaction at defeat. He knows not but that the very next game may reverse the relative positions of the sides, and so he wisely moderates any display of feeling and inwardly enjoys the game if he wins, and does not give his opponents the chance of exulting over him if he loses. The play-ground is the miniature of after-life. A lad who has learned the important and necessary lessons of moderation and self-control while at school will be better prepared to face the struggles of life than one who has not thus been trained for the battle. I have named a few of the advantageous influences which these sports exert on the character. That they are always attained it would be rash to assert; but that they sometimes follow is a sufficient reason for the encouragement of every healthful game.

This leads me to a question of great importance to teachers. To what extent should they encourage these sports? Should they take part in the games themselves, or be content with giving their advice to participate in them? I say decidedly the teacher should take part in the games. Let his encouragement be not merely by words, but by example. The strongest objections that I have ever heard urged against this course are that it tends to lower the teacher's influence with his pupils, to lessen their respect for him, and to encourage undue familiarity. Were these well founded I would most unhesitatingly say that a teacher should not take part in any games with his pupils. But, as a matter of fact, do we find that such is the case? Most emphatically, no. On the contrary, the pupils respect their teacher more,—they feel that he is making a sacrifice for their good,—they become grateful to him, and this naturally begets affection. He then becomes divested of that grim character which, unfortunately, is too often ascribed to him by his pupils. He is now no longer regarded as a hard, unsympathetic taskmaster, but as one who has a good deal of fellow-feeling with his scholars. And as "Fellow-feeling makes us wondrous kind," they not only take no delight in trying to annoy him, but on the contrary strive in many ways to please him. They know that one of the surest ways to do this is to manifest an interest in their studies. That such is the natural result of a teacher's participating in out-door sports with his pupils I not only believe but know, from cases that are within my own experience, to be a fact. Such being the case, there can be no difference of opinion as to whether a teacher should, when possible, take