

The principle involved is one which is worth the careful study of every public school teacher. Of course the average boys and girls of the public schools are hardly sage enough to be trusted with the duty of legislating for the school. But the farther the teacher can go in throwing upon them a sense of responsibility in the matter, the better for them and for himself. The most mischievous bane of school government, yes and college government, too, is the feeling of antagonism that so often exists between teacher and pupil. The latter tacitly assume that the former are despots, if not tyrants, and that it is a duty they owe to themselves to strain or evade the rules at every possible point, and the former as naturally expect this passive resistance to their authority. He is the true ruler, the model disciplinarian, who can succeed in creating the feeling in the pupils that their aims and interests are identical; that the school is theirs; that they are honored by its success and disgraced by any failure in efficiency or tendency to disorder. He was a wise captain who always said "come," never "go," to his men.

Referring to the practice, now almost obsolete, of punishing delinquent pupils by keeping them in after school hours, the *Journal of Education* says that "all progressive teachers, most supervisors, all normal schools, all pedagogical literature, all physicians, are arrayed against the practice." Apart from other important considerations, there is a crucial philosophical objection against this and every other form of punishment which tends to create in the child's mind an association between study and penalty. The judicious teacher will make it his great aim to create a delight in study for its own sake, but it would be absurd to impose a pleasure as a punishment. The day is not so long past when the committing to memory of verses of Scripture was a favorite "imposition." A better way to teach boys and girls to hate and shun the Bible could not easily be conceived. So if you want your pupil to dislike study, give it to him as a punishment.

The appointment of Dr. Schurman of Dalhousie College, Halifax, to the Chair of Christian Ethics in Cornell University, is worthy of note as showing how Canadians sometimes make their way in the world. Dr. Schurman is a native of Prince Edward Island, where he received his preparatory training. He afterwards attended Acadia College, in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, and while there succeeded in winning the Gilchrist Scholarship. Other successes in English Institutions paved the way for a course of study at the great German universities. Dr. Schurman occupied for a time a chair at Acadia, whence he went to Dalhousie. He visited Toronto two or three years since in the capacity of examiner in Metaphysics in the University. He is a man of superior abilities, fine presence and genial manners. His course thus far has been exceptionally brilliant, and we congratulate him on having now reached a position in which he will no doubt gain still greater honor for himself and his native land.

The question of the advisability of an interchange of professors among the colleges is being discussed in the New

York *Nation*. A writer well suggests that it would serve the same purpose and be more feasible to keep the professors stationary and allow the students to change colleges occasionally. We have always thought that the advantage of a choice of professors was the strong argument in favor of a real confederation of Canadian colleges, could that be brought about. The student should have the privilege of choosing his professor in each branch of study from amongst the competing colleges. The contact with a variety of minds and modes would not only profit the student; it would give new life to the colleges. Let it once be made clear that dry-as-dust professors would have empty lecture-rooms, and there would be a great remodelling of the staffs. Such an option would do more to compel colleges to shake off old-fogyism and get out of old ruts than any other innovation we can conceive of.

We quite agree with our New York namesake, that a good teacher will never get so high and dignified that he cannot enjoy a good joke, and that if anything laughable occurs in the school room it is right and proper to laugh. The teacher who knows how to laugh will stand the strain that leaves his long-faced, sour-visaged contemporary, limp and nervous. A good laugh too is an excellent moral disinfectant in the school room. "He that is of a merry heart hath a continual feast" says the Wise Man. By the way, the Revised Version gives it a "cheerful heart." That is no doubt still better, better philosophy as well as better theology. The man or woman who can be genuinely and perpetually cheerful, will scarcely fail in any sphere; will not certainly fail of friends and cordial welcomes. But this is very high, few can attain to it. But most of us can be merry occasionally, when we will. Try it teachers. The next blue day, when everything is going wrong, and the very demon of stupidity, disorder, or mischief seems to have been let loose in the school, call a halt, and start some good-natured fun. Tell a witty or amusing story; never of course one of questionable taste. Get up a good laugh. You will find it a most effective exorcism.

The Kingston correspondent of the *Toronto Mail* recently sent the following:—"An old rookery is being used as a school, and when an official entered the building to-day he found the children wearing their overcoats, caps, and mitts, and the teacher muffled up. If the pupils wet their slates ice formed on them at once. The school was at once dismissed, and now the parents threaten to lay the matter before the Board of Health to see if their children cannot be secured proper school accommodation." Can such things be in this Ontario of ours and even in the good old city of Kingston? Where has the Inspector been? How many such institutions as that described are there in the Province? One of the strangest inconsistencies in human nature is the fact that so many parents, whose children are comfortably and perhaps luxuriously lodged and cared for at home, are almost oblivious to the discomfort, suffering, and danger those same children undergo during five or six hours a day at school? Those who