

by proper qualification in this as in the medical or legal professions. So far as the patrons of the schools under government control are concerned, the protection is ample; but what of other schools? The injury done by an inexperienced or ill-trained teacher is infinitely greater than a mistake made in the other professions. The child is committed to the teacher's hands in the very morning of life, when the character, still more than the young limbs, is, so to speak, in the gristle. Both limbs and character have acquired some of their proper consistency and powers of resistance; but how much of the intellectual and moral frame are not the first impress and shaping given at school? Is this a matter to be disregarded? Mistakes that lie on the surface, and are easily seen, are soon remedied, and the best means are employed to prevent their recurrence; but mistakes that affect the proper care and culture of the intellect and character—"that unspeakable mystery on earth, a thinking, reasoning, discoursing, immortal creature,"—are so subtle and the consequences so remote that they often pass unheeded. No one now questions the value of the professional training of teachers, or the right of the State to impose a rigorous supervision of the teacher's work; but this supervision does not go far enough. Any scheme proposed will but half meet the necessities of the case that does not concern itself with teachers of all grades, and with teachers not at present under the control of the Department of Education; our organization must extend from the highest rung in the educational ladder to the lowest—from the highest chair in the university system to the humblest private school in the land. The inefficient teacher should not be permitted to practise privately in educational work any more than the sciolist should in medicine or in law. Teach-

ing is not a mere piece of job-work to which any one may turn his hand, but a professional calling which requires knowledge, judgment, and experience.

Holding these views with regard to the value and character of the teacher's work, and of the necessity for some sort of organization, a review of the operations of the College of Preceptors, London, England, will, I dare say, aid us in working out the problem before us. The English College of Preceptors was established in 1846, and incorporated by royal charter in the year 1849. It was founded, we are told, "for the purpose of promoting sound learning and of advancing the interests of education, especially among the middle classes, by affording facilities to the teacher for acquiring a knowledge of his profession, and by providing for the periodical sessions of a competent Board of Examiners, to ascertain and give certificates of the acquirements, and fitness for their office, of persons engaged or desiring to be engaged in the education of youth."

With these aims in view the charter empowered the College to hold examinations of teachers and schools, and to grant diplomas and certificates to such persons as pass these examinations satisfactorily.

To effect these objects, two plans of examination were established:—

1st. The examination of *teachers*, to ascertain their qualification and fitness to take part in the work of instruction.

2nd. The examination of *pupils*, to test their progress, and to afford at once to the teacher and to the pupil a satisfactory criterion of the value of the instruction received.

It is a distinctive feature of these examinations that in all cases the *Theory and Practice of Education* is an obligatory subject for each grade.