

custom, particularly custom, regulate it. Our teachers occupy an honourable position in the community, it is sometimes said, with a small percentage of truth in the statement; they occupy a useful position, it is generally conceded; that they occupy an anomalous position every teacher with a particle of ambition in his make-up feels keenly enough. In rural districts, in times past, if of the masculine gender, he was ranked next the clergyman and was considered something less than a man and something more than a woman if fairly good-looking he was a favourite beau with the young ladies of social ambition. If a "school-marm," she took the hearts of all the young men by storm, and became a source of jealousy and admiration. The consequence was her teaching days were few. Times have changed somewhat since the days when the Hoosier school master was a power in the community. But the change in our social habits has not tended to elevate the teacher, and bring him his due influence; his salary is a little larger, his expenses are heavier, his examinations more difficult, his term of apprenticeship considerably increased—but his power to modify and mould his surroundings has diminished; why? Because there has grown up in this land of ours a peculiar idea that the functions of the teacher begin and end with merely intellectual work—intellectual in the narrowest sense of the word. The teacher of primary work teaches reading, writing and arithmetic; a little geography, a little history from some dry, boiled-down skeleton of a manual, a little grammar, and a very little literature. His moral powers find their fullest play in teaching text-books on temperance and agriculture. One step higher and we reach the secondary schools, when the first class certificate and the university degree are brought into use. We get now a

little more history and literature, a smattering of science and classics, and some knowledge of algebra, trigonometry and euclid. The teacher reads without comment a passage from the Bible every morning with his class,—and there moral instruction ends. If we ascend the high and rare latitudes of university education—we find less teaching, less instruction, less energy, and more cramming. In this sphere, as in the lower, the work of the teacher is of a purely intellectual character, the moral and humanizing element is still absent. Now how does this operate on the teacher, his classes and the community he serves? If we descend the scale, we find that the university professor, with rare exceptions, is in Canada one of the least known and least influential of men. In Ontario, omitting two or three names fairly well known, the university professors outside of their limited circle, are not known to the people of the province at all; instead of being leaders of public opinion, and moulding thought on great public questions, they have less influence than a ward politician, and count for nothing in the moral and political scale. How many of our citizens have ever heard of the professors of Toronto University? Yet these men are paid large salaries, imported from England and Scotland at considerable expense to enlighten us, and then drop into endless obscurity. Why? Is it because these gentlemen are deficient in mental force and ability, that they make no stir, take no prominent place in the great movements and questions that are abroad? By no means, the cause must be sought elsewhere. What has been said as to the influence and importance of our university professors applies under altered circumstances to our teachers in the secondary and primary schools. If the university professor is not a man of