

evil of this is twofold, the teachers are taken from their appropriate work, and must, to a great disadvantage, multiply classes, and the pupils, who come under these conditions must largely fail in obtaining the expected instruction. Failing, they go out, having only the name of Normal School pupils, to exercise an influence most unfavorable to the professional reputation of institutions. To prevent this it will be necessary to fix such a higher entrance examination as will render it necessary for pupils to be familiar with certain branches of study before applying for admission.

A Normal School is not for the ordinary education of teachers, but to train them to be good practical instructors that they may the better discharge, with credit to their country, the responsible duties they undertake. This essential feature in our Normal School work should not be overlooked, as otherwise a large expense must be incurred for instruction, amply provided for in another branch of our school system. It should be distinctly understood that a Normal School is for training in professional work, and not for teaching the ordinary branches of education. When we have a class of Normal School men, we shall be on the pathway to permanency in the teaching profession. At the present time the average continuance of our male teachers in their work is not quite five years, and that of female teachers somewhat under this. Any one can see the disadvantage at which such a limited period of service places our schools, in the lack of skill acquired only by a continued application, and in the want of that experience for which no substitute can be provided. We trust the day is not distant when all first-class teachers will be either Normal School pupils or College students, who in their several College courses shall make instruction in the art of teaching a specialty. In the effort for educational success the superior or well-trained teacher must win the day, and in the end prove himself to be the very man the country requires.

The *Spectator*, (London, England,) has the following sensible remarks on the Science of Teaching:—

"It is remarkable that 'Pedagogik,' or the Science of Teaching, has never yet been thought worthy in this country of formal recognition as a subject of academic instruction. The lawyer is presumed to study the principles of jurisprudence, and the medical student to learn anatomy and therapeutics; provision is made in universities and colleges for professional instruction of this kind, and even for those prelections on theology and pastoral work which are presumably necessary for the skilled minister of religion. But for the special aid of one who is to devote himself to the profession of school-keeping, no provision whatever has yet been furnished by the universities. There is among scholars a vague impression that teaching is not a science to be studied, nor an art to be learned by systematic practice, but a knack, which comes easily to men and women who know their subject, and are in earnest in their wish to teach it. Given a well-instructed master, a good text-book, and an obedient pupil, and the teaching apparatus is presumed to be complete. Yet all experience proves that the possession of knowledge is no guarantee whatever for the power to impart it; and that there is the same difference between the skilled and the unskilled teacher, as between the trained and the untrained practitioner of any other art. Much, undoubtedly, of this difference comes