

teachers material to elevate the mind, to dignify their labors, and, if possible, to make them more deserving of public sympathy and support. We will not hesitate to discuss any topic within the range either of school legislation, ethics, or practice. We entertain no feelings of hostility, (as is sometimes said,) either against the Council of Public Instruction or the *Journal of Education*. We are quite willing that both should exist to do whatsoever they can to advance the interests of education. We

hesitate not, however, to say that we will freely and fearlessly criticize the action of the one or the tone of the other, whenever we consider it in the public interest to do so.

Relying upon the appreciation of our readers, we trust to secure that support which will place the ONTARIO TEACHER in the position which an educationist has wished for it, "a source of benefit to the profession, and a power in the land."

### TEACHERS' INSTITUTES.

The deficiency of trained teachers in our Public Schools is unquestionably one of the greatest drawbacks to education in our Province, at the present time. It is now almost universally admitted that teaching is a profession, and that success as well as efficiency depends upon a course of training for this, the same as other professions. There was a time when little or no scientific training was required for the Practice of Medicine or Law, but times have altered, and we now invariably prefer the trained practitioner to the quack or the pettifogger. And what experience has done in the one case is being speedily done in the other. We notice that last year there was an increase of 168 trained teachers on the preceding year. And yet the number is very small in proportion to the whole number of teachers employed. By the Report of the Chief Superintendent we find that out of a total of 5,306 teachers, employed last year, only 844 were trained in our Normal School. There may be a small percentage of those holding County Board Certificates who were trained elsewhere, but doubtless the number is very small.

That this element of inefficiency exists in our system we may gather from the Reports of several of the School Inspectors through-

out the Province. In the Report of the late Rev. Mr. McKenzie, M. A., and J. A. McLellan, M. A., L. L. D., Inspectors of High Schools for 1871, we find the following:—

It is the opinion of not a few, that, as a University degree is no indication as to a man's ability as a *teacher*, some additional qualification should be demanded—some evidence that in addition to scholarship, there is a knowledge of school organization, methods of discipline, government, modes of teaching, &c. Something of this kind seems to be necessary. The stripling fresh from his college halls is placed on a level with the experienced teacher, too often thinking that, having taken honors in languages or science, he consequently knows all about the work of the arduous profession upon which he has entered. Could lectures on "Pedagogy" be delivered in the Universities for the benefit of those intending to teach? Or could provision be made for giving such instruction in the Normal Schools?

A. W. Ross Esq., Inspector of Glengary, says:—

In nine schools out of ten there seems to be no emulation, and no encouragement to work. The method adopted in teaching would, in nearly all the schools be better named lack of system or method. Teachers are apparently ignorant of any difference in systems and care as little.