

work; the second, the reading in Quick's "Educational Reformers" the following statement: "Locke's argument is this: It is the business of the master to train the pupils in virtue and good manners, much more than to communicate learning"; the third, Emerson's advice "Give a boy address and accomplishments, and you give him the mastery of palaces and fortunes where he goes." We all probably agree with that writer on education who says that the most important thing to teach is "How to live." We may differ, however, as to what constitutes that knowledge and as to how and where it may be taught. The cultivation of manners, if not moral culture, is very closely allied thereto.

How near to good is what is fair!

Since the death of George William Curtis, I have read many beautiful tributes to his character; and I have noticed that the aroma of courtesy seemed to be about everything he did. Those who knew him best seemed to regard his name as a synonym for "gentlemanliness," just as that of Sir Philip Sydney has been for so many years.

Thinking of the trouble that is avoided by courtesy, of the power that it gives over others, of the large sum of happiness in this world that is directly due to it, lessons in it are evidently among the most useful lessons we can give. Nor must we teachers be satisfied when we have made eloquent appeals for their being a part of every day's instruction,—sometimes by example, sometimes by suggestion, sometimes by precept. I think some of us have had mothers so careful of us from infancy that we fail to realize how many are dependent almost entirely upon the schools for instruction in manners. Then again, judging from some of our failures to observe the rules of etiquette, I am led to wonder whether we ourselves have

ever known them, or whether we have forgotten them. It will not do to say that we shall trust these matters to the good sense and warm heart of our pupils. For, while we may be labouring patiently for years to make the former clearer and the latter softer, bad habits of address may all the time be forming. I am glad that Emerson says "But I will neither be driven from some allowance to Fashion as a symbolic institution, nor from the belief that love is the basis of courtesy." I do not think it necessary for us to follow all the dictates of Fashion in all her whimsical changes; but certain forms which have been observed by the best society (I use "best" in its noblest sense) for years, we cannot afford to neglect. That a cordial greeting should be extended to a visitor, we should teach by the manner in which we receive those who come to our school-rooms, as well as by precept. In our primary schools, we teach our little ones the use of "Good morning," "Good afternoon," etc., and yet I have had older pupils, on first coming under my care, act awkwardly, and, in fact, sometimes fail to respond to my "Good morning" if I addressed it to the entire school. Even after learning to respond to me, they have seemed to doubt as to whether it is proper for them to respond to visitors. Now, I think words have to come in to aid example, and we must tell our pupils that it is not courteous in the school-room, or elsewhere, to let any greeting or farewell pass unnoticed. There is a difference of opinion among our teachers of most cultivated manners as to whether pupils should rise out of respect to the superintendent when he enters our school-rooms; there ought to be no difference of opinion as to the welcoming smile and bright nod of greeting which they can give him without hindering any work in which they may be engaged.