

perform the needful experiments and to make researches, others to record and co-ordinate the results, others to travel abroad and ascertain new facts, and others of higher rank to suggest, and direct new experiments, and, finally, three superior officers, who were to be called "interpreters of nature," and whose business it should be to raise the results of the various discoveries to greater observations, axioms, and aphorisms—in fact, to arrive at large general laws. Now something analogous to this was needed for the full development of a science of education. We required not only the strenuous and patient efforts of the teacher in the laboratory of the school, but the sympathetic onlooker or inspector to estimate and compare the results of work, the traveller who would tell us what was done in other lands, the man of affairs who knew what were the wants and feelings of parents and the public and who viewed the whole problem from outside of the school, and the thinker in his study, who would reveal to teachers the principles of their art and the true theory which underlies all practical rules. No one of these classes of workers could be dispensed with: no one of them could alone be trusted to forecast the future of public education, or to legislate for it. It was by the harmonious co-operation of all these authorities that true progress could be secured. And in the great hierarchy of such authorities room ought always to be found, not only for a Froebel, a Pestalozzi, a David Stow, or an Edward Thring, but also for a statesman like Mr. Forster, a critic like Matthew Arnold, and a philosopher like Herbert Spencer. Whether they considered teaching as an art or as a science, they were only on the threshold of it, looking forward to developments far more important than any hitherto arrived at. If education

was an art, it was a fine art, whose greatest triumphs had yet to come, and if it was a science, it was a progressive one, the principles of which had not yet been fully illustrated or discovered, about which the last word had not been spoken, or the highest truths attained. No teacher should be satisfied to go on in the traditional way, without endeavouring to discover new modes of reaching the minds of the children under his charge. The present was an auspicious moment for those engaged in the profession of teaching. At no previous period of our history had there been, on the part of the public, a keener appreciation of the difference between good teaching and bad, or a greater variety of new and important openings for the activity and enterprise of thoroughly accomplished and earnest teachers. It was an animating prospect, and he envied those who were young, and who might have a share in realizing it. "The harvest truly was plenteous. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he may send forth labourers into his harvest." It was because the Educational Institute of Scotland was adding to the number of teachers qualified by skill, self-devotion, and enthusiasm to render priceless service to the community that he was proud of being enrolled among its members, and that he predicted for it a great future of honour and public usefulness.

Professor Laurie said they could not part without expressing their thanks to Dr. Fitch for having taken the opportunity of giving them his views on education in this and other countries. He moved a vote of thanks to him for his address, which they had great pleasure in listening to.—*The Journal of Education.*