

tor and of his tact as a disciplinarian, to enable the persons who certify to his ability to make a statement that is worthy of acceptance or credence. Such a statement cannot be made by anyone intelligently or honestly, until he has seen the teacher at his work and studied his peculiarities of thought and of method.

It need not be thought that a school for practice is a place where young teachers are simply criticized for their faults; in fact, a school conducted in such a manner is a misrepresentation of a proper school of practice. It is rather a place where whatever is excellent in their character or their modes of management and methods of teaching, is commended, and where they are encouraged to strengthen themselves in every proper way for doing the best work that they can do. The first act of a teacher who supervises the novices in their practice, should be an act of commendation, if it be possible. The beginner is to be encouraged both by illustration from model lessons and by gentle and wise counsel from his teachers, to supplement his deficiencies and overcome his defects. In this way only can the best possible results be secured. The student teacher is not restrained in any wise in the manifestation of proper individuality, but he is not permitted to experiment upon his pupils for the purpose of disclosing some new and original methods of presenting subjects, unless the teaching is in accordance with the known and acknowledged principles of the science of education. Neither is he restrained from doing something new, simply because it is his own. A school of practice becomes thus a place where teachers are trained for their work. When they have completed their course in such a school, they go into the public schools with some definite knowledge of how they

are to proceed; they have methods of teaching, modes of administering and managing schools, they have principles on which to base their future work, and, best of all, they know their own weakness and strength as viewed by persons who have their interests at heart.

If the Normal Schools of the country have any right to existence, it must be because they are successful in preparing teachers for their work; and, right or wrong, the average man regards the ability to control or manage pupils as a chief element in success. If we are ever able to state that a teacher is successful, it must be from seeing him actually doing the work of teaching. The value of a teacher's work should be estimated from the use he makes of principles which he should employ, and his skill in controlling and directing pupils; consequently, no one should certify to excellence in these respects unless he has himself seen the teacher at his work. In view of these facts, it becomes evident that a school of practice, which also affords an opportunity for the pupil-teachers to witness the best kinds of teaching, is an absolute necessity, if a certificate is given vouching for the proficiency and efficiency of the person holding it.

Viewed from any standpoint whatever, from that of benefit to the pupil-teacher, or of benefit to the pupils taught, a school of practice is an excellent institution. It is more, it is a necessary part of every school in which the training of teachers is sought. I cannot understand how it is possible for Normal Schools to exist and receive popular commendation without this adjunct, which shall be in itself a model for the students as to discipline and instruction, as well as a school for training and testing the teachers for their responsible duties.—*Educational Review.*