

3. No section to participate in the fund that does not tax itself two and a half mills on the dollar for teacher's salary.

4. The fund to be divided among the sections entitled to it in proportion to their rates for salaries only, so that a section levying five mills on the dollar to pay its teacher, shall draw twice as much as one that taxes itself two and a half mills.

We thoroughly agree with Mr. Brown as to the cause of the immense annual exodus from the teaching profession. We hope to see a general agitation for the cure of this gigantic evil. If a regular provincial grant were made in accordance with the grade of certificate held by each teacher a great step in advance would be secured. Public opinion must be educated up to this point. When a certain grant is made for a third class certificate, twice as great a grant for a second, and four times as great for a first, the matter will be brought within the comprehension of the average trustee.

We prize the esteem of our friends, and never wantonly shock their prejudices. On the University Question we are, however, compelled to differ somewhat from both disputants. In our last issue we adhered to the traditional policy of the JOURNAL; our statements were guarded and, we believe, strictly accurate. Nevertheless a valued correspondent, deeply interested in the debate, complains in good set terms of the expressions, "exaggerated statements," and "bitter partisans." A month ago we received a vigorous protest from another highly esteemed correspondent, who felt deeply injured by a couple of lines which merely told the settled public opinion of this province on the other side of the question. So far as courteous language is concerned we are anxious to set a good example; no one concerned in this matter can gain anything by the use of intemperate language. The supporters of the denominational colleges have everything to lose by making charges which cannot be proved; the friends of the University have everything to lose by obstinately clinging to an effete institution which has outlived its mission; higher education has everything to lose by hostility and recrimination between those who are its natural guardians. We willingly incur the pains and penalties of independence, to make at one those whose interests are identical and undivided.

GLEANINGS.

We select the following from letters which have appeared in *The Times* on the subject of "Reading Aloud" in schools.

The Rev. J. R. Bryne:—"Sir,—A letter has been addressed to H. M. Inspectors of Schools by a well-known master of elocution, offering to lecture to teachers and pupil teachers in their respective districts on the art of reading aloud; and the subject is of so much interest educationally, and consequently of such moment to the community at large, that I crave your permission to call public attention to it. Reading is the most important of the three subjects which should form the main staple of the instruction given in elementary schools. He who has mastered it has obtained possession of the key to that vast storehouse of knowledge which is represented by books, and it may be doubted whether any one is completely master of the art, so as to practise it easily, habitually, and with pleasure, who is not to some considerable extent expert in reading aloud. At any rate, reading aloud is held, and justly held, to be the one test by which to judge of proficiency in reading. In elementary schools in Germany, if I mistake not, reading—that is, reading aloud—is the subject proficiency in which determines the class in which the scholar is placed on his first admission to the school. One main object of the elementary school is, or ought to be, to turn out scholars, when they leave it, who have a taste for reading. After this preface I shall scarcely be believed when I repeat, what is matter of common remark among all who are versed in the subject, that, in schools under the supervision of the Educational Department, reading is the most 'passed'—that is the

most liberally paid for—and notoriously the worst taught of all the three 'R's.' True, scholars as a rule 'can read'—that is, they can express more or less correctly in speech the sounds represented by the words before them; and the traditional singsong of the dame school has been almost, although not entirely, improved away in schools under Government. But, beyond this, there is little progress. Articulate, intelligent, expressive reading, suitable to the reader's age, with correct pronunciation, is a rarity indeed in elementary schools, and is rarely aimed at by the vast majority of teachers and pupil teachers. Fluency—to turn the tap—that is what they aspire to for their scholars and for themselves, and it is to be feared that recent alterations in the Code of Education, whereby reading books are regarded mostly as vehicles of information, and stress would seem to be laid rather on the matter than the mode of the reading, may be held—wrongly of course—to give the sanction of authority to what is an inveterate and much to be regretted mistake. I know there are those who will differ from me and maintain that mere fluency is sufficient. Reading aloud, they will say, is for culture, not a necessity for life, but rather a luxury. It is in the front rank of accomplishments, perhaps, like drilling and dancing, but nothing more. We do not need that all our children, least of all the children of the working classes, should be brought up to be public speakers or to go on the stage. Let those learn to read aloud who have to get their living by reading aloud. The working man is sufficiently equipped for the journey of life if he is in possession of that key to knowledge which the mere ability to read at all supplies him with. But, again, I repeat that of that key he is not yet master until he can use it without difficulty and with pleasure. He will not like to read until he likes reading, and reading he will be most disposed to like and to pursue as a habit when he can practise it with that accuracy of apprehension and fullness of enjoyment and profit which are his and his alone—with rare exceptions—who has attained to some considerable degree of proficiency in reading aloud. For this reason I would venture to commend to the favor of the public generally, as well as to that of educational officials, all well-advised efforts that may be made to popularise and improve instruction in reading aloud, as in truth a matter of national importance.

Mr. J. S. Laurie, formerly H. M. Inspector of schools:—"Mr. Bryne's letter is a true but severe commentary on the Code, and his criticism is amply confirmed by all his brother Inspectors—namely, that 'articulate, intelligent and expressive reading is a rarity in elementary schools.' That reading stands first and foremost in the rank of elementary branches of instruction also commands universal assent. Hence it follows that the major part of the toil and expenditure—amounting to a lump sum of six millions sterling—falls in the most important particular. He states that reading is the subject most easily 'passed' by the Inspectors; in other words, that fairly correct utterance is the accepted standard of qualification. Such a test as applied to even mechanical reading is, however, inadequate where, as is generally the case, the hearer uses a book; for if the reading is unintelligible through the ear alone, it is clearly worthless. Were such a rule put in force, instead of indistinct mumbling we should soon have at least articulate and loud reading of a certain kind. Intelligent reading is a more difficult question, reference to which in Schedule I is relegated to an obscure note. Mr. Bryne indicates the main obstacle to its attainment in deprecating the new fangled and, at the same time, antiquated notion of the Education Department in favor of reading of a specifically historical and geographical kind. Nothing could be more nicely calculated to defeat a most desirable aim. Barren facts of time and place cannot by any conceivable process be couched in language adapted for fluent reading, or, indeed, for exciting in a young bewildered mind the smallest particle of interest. The laudable object of the Department is to secure, along with the acquisition of the art of reading, the conveyance of information of a useful kind. But in regard to history the subject is by far too complicated to be learned in so perfunctory a manner; and, besides, the effort amounts to a *reductio ad absurdum* on finding that about three-fourths of our elementary scholars finish their 'education' at Standard IV. They consequently leave school under the impression that English history ceased either at the date of the battle of Hastings or at the end of the Wars of the Roses. If history must be taught to children, it would be more practical, if not more sensible, to begin with the reign of Queen Victoria and go backwards, according to periods. To be learned aright, geography as well as history should be taught morally, and the latter