

seminary. This is merely the common experience that technical seminaries give more length than breadth to the subjects which they profess to teach. Medical men, trained in purely medical schools, rarely succeed in life so well as those trained in universities, because the latter attach equal importance to the sciences as to the technics of the profession. They therefore make broader men, by infusing culture and science into the professional faculties. In Scotland, the old parochial teachers were university-trained men, and now there is a strong public opinion to join together the normal schools and the universities in the future training even of elementary teachers in that country. It has been found that an elementary teacher thus educated is more efficient even for primary instruction. About ten years ago the Education Department thus gave their opinion of university-trained teachers in elementary schools:—"They are the best teachers of all—best because most intelligent, most independent of routine, and ablest to take a broad comprehensive view of their position and their work." Of course in Scotland this is more easy than in England; still in this country excellent colleges like University College, King's College, and Owen's College, Manchester, might be combined with equal advantage along with normal school teaching. No doubt, notwithstanding the obvious advantages of universities for higher teachers, normal schools for them may arise in the provinces, just as a promising one has been connected with the Cathedral school at Bristol, and they would correspond with the provincial medical schools. But I attach a very high importance to training the secondary schoolmasters in our universities, and to trusting the latter with the issue of certificates of efficiency. Were no higher motive involved, one has some weight: that hitherto the *status* of the secondary teacher has been largely upheld by his connection with the clerical profession, and when that becomes severed, it is well to compensate the loss by a university position. Of course a mere B. A. degree would be no worthy certificate for a secondary teacher. That is not much more than the *Maturitätszeugniss* got at the leaving examination of a German gymnasium. But a B. A. degree, with honours in particular subjects, might give a *facultas docendi* for them, if other securities were given that the teacher had acquired a knowledge and practice in pedagogic method. The universities will quickly put themselves in the position of Edinburgh and St. Andrews, by establishing special chairs of education, when teaching becomes a recognised profession requiring attestations of efficiency on the part of its members. When such an organised system of training exists, the universities will doubtless revert to their ancient practice of giving special degrees for teaching, for it should be borne in mind that the original M.A. was not only a qualified teacher, but he was bound to *regent*, or act as a tutor for two years after graduation. But will the universities undertake the training of female teachers? I see no reason why they should not. The subjects of classical and scientific prelection are unobjectionable to mixed audiences. But, even should the universities hesitate, the extra academical teaching for women now in connection with most of them might be adapted to training female teachers. Doubtless, when there is a demand, special training schools for higher female teachers may be formed. At present there is no such demand. Mr. Jodrell has established six scholarships for female teachers in connection with Girton College, but they are not filled up. The fault lies less with female teachers than with the public. The demand in ladies' schools is for a trivial instead of a solid education. At present mere accomplishments are substituted for mental culture. Women are taught to use these, as birds employ their brilliant plumage or sweet notes, in order to attract the opposite sex, while the demand for a true cultivation of the mind in female education, though growing, is far from active.

Let us now pass to the practical part of the subject, and enquire how far we have reason to expect that the State may help in organising teachers into a recognised profession. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that a former Government proposed to legislate on this subject, and actually introduced into Parliament a measure for the purpose. This certainly brings it within the region of practical politics. The Bill was known as Mr. Forster's No. 2 Endowed Schools Bill. Its main purpose was to secure a supply of well-qualified teachers for endowed schools; but it went beyond this object, and offered to all private schoolmasters the opportunity of registering their qualifications, if these were satisfactory to a central authority, which was empowered to hold examinations and grant certificates to teachers generally. The bill had compulsory provisions for endowed school teachers, but only voluntary provisions for private teachers. It also provided for a compulsory inspection and examination of endowed schools, permitting private schools to enjoy the same advantage on the payment of a fee. These provisions were only to be prospective in regard to new teachers, those already in possession of schools having acquired prescriptive rights. Most of these provisions were founded on the report of the School Enquiry

Commission, but the machinery for carrying them into effect was derived from the working of the Medical Act, which constitutes a council of administration and supervision of the medical profession and its schools. A similar council was devised for the teaching profession; its members were to be partly nominated by the Government, and partly by the English universities. The bill was well conceived, and went as far as could have been expected in 1869, when it was brought forward. It received a very favourable support from the leading teachers throughout the kingdom; but it was dropped in Parliament from want of time, and has not again been brought forward. Since its introduction, the country has made large advances in educational organisation, the question of certificating teachers according to their qualifications is now ripe for legislation. The very fact of a large progress having been made implies as a necessity the introduction of a better system into educational work. The bill of 1869 would scarcely be wide enough for a bill in 1877. Formerly it was limited to England, but now it is required for the whole kingdom. It was limited to teachers of schools analogous to endowed schools, but now it is required for the teaching profession at large. The Council of Education, which was its main feature, would have been in itself an enormous gain to the teaching profession, and would have been equally valuable to the Education Department of the State, as a source for counsel, advice, and technical experience. The Council of the bill was limited to twelve persons, six being nominated by the English universities, and six by the crown. This constitution did not give a sufficiently direct representation to the teachers, though no doubt that is a difficulty not easy of solution, when a profession does not exist, but has to be organized. The bill of 1869 very wisely did not attempt to force all teachers through the single portal of an examination by the Council of Education. The latter was indeed to be an examining and licensing body, but it was also empowered to accept and register well-attested qualifications for other bodies. A single portal of entrance into a profession necessarily produces a dead level of uniformity. Differentiation is as necessary in learning as it is in nature. It is not difficult to attain uniformity in a profession by forcing it through one portal, as wire-drawers pull wires through a single hole. The Chinese do this with their teachers, and have managed to restrict their learning to the maxims of Confucius and Mencius. In medicine there is even now an effort to establish a single portal system, but the good sense of the profession has hitherto defeated it, though undoubtedly the nineteen licensing bodies are too numerous. The General Medical Council, however, has exercised a salutary influence in upholding the standard of examination in the different licensing bodies. A Council of Education would exercise a similar influence in regard to teachers. Such a Council would represent the highest interests of the profession, and while it might be in itself an examining and licensing body, it should be empowered and even instructed to register all well-attested qualifications from the universities and other bodies which prove their right to public confidence. Perhaps there may be various teachers' associations in this condition, but I allude to one only because I have some personal knowledge of its working: that is the College of Preceptors, which has now forty-eight fellows, one hundred and twenty-four licentiates, and one hundred and fifty associates. If the State Council of Education which future legislation may institute, find, after full investigation, that the diplomas of the College of Preceptors represent real and solid acquirements, they doubtless would receive registration. I confess that I should see with dismay any measure which tried to force the teaching profession through a single examining board. It is absolutely essential to a healthy professional life that there should be few trammels to its growth, and with this view there should be varied systems of training, while the attestations of qualifications should be rigid, but certainly not uniform.

I venture to urge that teachers should try to reusucitate Mr. Forster's No. 2 Bill, with such amplifications as may now be required. It was obligatory on endowed school teachers, but permissive for private teachers. Has the time arrived when all new teachers, perhaps after 1882, should be brought under an obligatory provision to obtain certificates of their qualifications? The answer to that question must soon be made by the teachers themselves, for it is clear that speedy legislation is inevitable. About three hundred decayed grammar schools have been reorganized in England under the Endowed School Acts. But Parliament has not yet provided that these schools shall not again fall into decay. Their teachers have no attested qualifications, and these schools are not inspected and examined by competent authority. All this was provided by the dropped No. 2 Bill, and it must undoubtedly be revived, either in a cramped or in an enlarged form. If the teachers of the nation desire to be organized into a profession representing the supreme importance of their art, they will soon have an opportunity of forcing Government to recognise their claims. The