

*regular* monitor should be employed, but that the teacher should select a pupil, perhaps a different one each day, to give out, say, dictation, and that the position of trust should be granted as a reward for good conduct and diligence. On my recommendation several teachers during the year put this plan into practice with signal success. Monitors should be as carefully instructed in the duties required of them as pupil-teachers, and they may be regularly employed for ringing bells, for putting pupils into line, for opening and closing windows, for giving out ink, books, pens, &c., and for looking after maps. When a pupil gives out dictation he should himself write the passage as he dictates it, and all the work written should be seen by the teacher. All "learning lessons" in school and "silent work" at desk should be avoided as only other names for idleness.

Monitors are largely used in Victoria, and in a recent report of the Inspector-General and the principal of the Training College of that colony on the efficiency of the school systems of New South Wales, South Australia, and Victoria, the alleged greater efficiency of the small schools in Victoria is attributed "to the use of monitors, by which the constant employment of all classes is much facilitated."

In the largest schools in this district there is no doubt that some headmasters think they have done their duty if they have taught their own special classes well, while others are very careful to direct the efforts of their subordinates, and require them to keep books showing the matter, &c., of the lessons given. During the last examination of several of these large schools I received very fine or good work in all classes but one, and this one—generally Standard IV. or Standard III.—broke down badly in arithmetic, grammar, or spelling, and sometimes in all three. With a view to prevent a recurrence of such an undesirable experience, the Board issued a circular to all headmasters informing them that they were held responsible for the work of their subordinates. This ruling was deemed by some teachers a harsh one, on the old time-worn plea that, as teachers had no say in the appointment of their subordinates, they could not fairly be held responsible for their work. As far as pupil-teachers are concerned this plea does not hold ground, for no scholar is appointed a pupil-teacher without a certificate from his headmaster, and many pupil-teachers were not only taught in their school days, but were also trained by the masters under whom they are now serving. With regard to assistants, surely there are none so incompetent as to be unable to carry out instructions from an efficient organizing headmaster; and, if there are any such, ought not the headmaster to have sufficient moral courage to report them to the Board? As a matter of fact, however, in the case of the schools that led to the notice being forwarded, all the teachers, with, perhaps, one exception, whose classes broke down were quite competent to do their work well, and failed merely through their efforts not being properly directed, and through neglect of proper supervision of the pupils' back work.

The style of questioning a class is still often very faulty at many schools, and on this I have written a great deal on the inspection reports forwarded to the teachers. The importance of the subject shall be my excuse for referring to it at some length here. Collective questioning is still too much employed. As a means of testing the effectiveness of the instruction it is nearly useless, and, besides, it is very misleading in its results. One or two smart children supply the answer required, at the first suggestion of which the rest of the class join in. Indiscriminate answering, too, is very prejudicial to intellectual work. For instance, the teacher puts a question to, say, a class of twenty, and before the words are well out of his mouth two or three pupils call out an answer which is not a statement, and this calling out generally develops, before the lesson is over, into shouting. Now, if a teacher wishes to really educate his pupils, can anything more absurd be imagined than this style? A smart boy merely tells, in a badly-expressed manner, what he already knows; no one has time to think, and so in a short time the slow pupils (who are probably the most intelligent) get discouraged and will not try to answer. This style of answering, too, is prejudicial to good order, and the majority of teachers who allow it give questions requiring merely "Yes" or "No" for answer. The style of questioning I would recommend is this: The question should be put generally to the class, when all who know the answer would, unbidden, hold up the right hands, then the teacher, after giving all a reasonable time, would name the pupil to answer. He should not name the pupil immediately after the question is put, else thought is prevented, and the slow pupils are discouraged and will not try. The forward children should be restrained, while the retiring, timid ones should be encouraged. In all intellectual work, as distinguished from mere memory work, full statements should be required in answers. In a class trained in this manner one would see, after the question is put generally, some pupils hold their hands up at once; others put their hands partly up in a doubting manner, then lower them in disappointment, and finally throw them up in triumph; others with contracted brows, and staring, thoughtful eyes, and presently the brows would clear, and up would go the hands. Then the teacher would name a pupil to answer; and if such pupil were of the second or third named class, how proud he would look if, after all his mental trouble, he had given a good answer! Again, other pupils should be encouraged to improve upon the wording of the first answer, or to express the answer in another way. In indiscriminate answering, on the other hand, how disappointed the thoughtful pupils must feel if, just as light is beginning to dawn on their minds, a sharp but probably thoughtless boy calls out the answer! Can anything be more pleasing to find in a school than a class trained in the manner recommended? Surely such a class is being educated in the highest sense of the word. At the risk of being wearisome (to many teachers by whom the method recommended is invariably adopted) I have now pointed out what appears to me to be the best method of handling a class in oral work, and I trust, therefore, that I shall not have, at future inspection visits, the disagreeable duty of frequently finding fault in this direction with some teachers.

Many teachers might be more particular about their position when they are engaged in oral teaching. There is a tendency to lean against the front row of desks, and so lose sight of some pupils; and I have seen even headmasters teaching while sitting across a desk, or standing with one foot on a form. Walking about, too, is very common, and by this the attention of pupils is