

one of the most important and popular factors in our school system.

The Teachers' Associations, also, which under the old *regime* could hardly be said to exist otherwise than as a project, were, under Mr. Crooks, matured into the present most successful Teachers' Institutes. In the work of organizing them, the Central Committee have rendered most important voluntary services, but for which it is not too much to say that their present success could not have been secured.

Such has been the work of the Central Committee during what was in fact a transition period between the end of the old system under Dr. Ryerson, aided latterly by the Council of Public Instruction, and the present system under the Minister of Education.

Besides completing the work of unifying the examinations, a most important result has followed the improved and uniform system of examinations inaugurated through the Central Committee. The character of the examinations for Teachers in this province before that plan was introduced, was not only variable but quite unreliable. The Central Committee has carried out a method of examination which has raised the character of the teaching profession, and indirectly influenced the whole system of instruction in High and Public Schools. The character of the work done in the Normal Schools, is another point in which a great change for the better has taken place. Formerly in the only Normal School we had in Ontario, professional training was quite secondary to mere teaching. The utmost number of trained teachers it produced in a year was 150. Under the present system the Normal Schools limit themselves to their proper function, that of professional training, the only students who receive instruction in non-professional subjects being the candidates for first-class certificates. The yearly number of trained teachers sent out by the Normal Schools now averages 600.

Such are the results for which, as an impartial journal representing the teachers of this Province, we consider the gratitude of all interested in education to be due, not only to Mr. Crooks but to the central committee. The methods of examination have been systematized and raised to a high standard. The Model Schools and the Teachers' Associations are in full working order through the Province, completing a system of education second as we believe to none and superior to most others. For the due completion of these important changes it was necessary that the same hands should carry on the work from first to last. Any change in the *personelle* of the Central Committee would have disturbed the crystallizing process. But what was essentially a period of transition has now come to its natural close. It is very advisable now that the examination system is thoroughly organized by the labours of the Central Committee, to give the system the benefit of a rotation of examiners. By this it is obvious that freshness or variety of treatment in the mode of examination can alone be secured. Rotation of examiners is the method employed by all the best authorities, including the old Universities of OXFORD, CAMBRIDGE, and DUBLIN, as also the Public School Boards of England. The Committee may justly feel that it has done its duty well.

It has had to traverse ground, to discuss questions, and to disturb vested interests, which necessarily caused friction and criticism. But under the direction of the Minister of Education it has carried a difficult work of educational transition through a critical period, and whenever a very important part of the history of his Province comes to be written—the history of education—the zeal, tact, and practical success of the Central Committee will, we believe, shew that body to merit the gratitude of the Minister, the teaching profession, and the public.

#### THE CASE OF "BOMBASTES" AGAINST CANADA.

"The Montreal *Spectator* of November 13th contains a letter from Rev. R. W. Norman, M.A., Oxford, criticizing, with what is no doubt meant to be crushing severity, an article in the *Spectator*, which claimed that "in High School appointments, other qualifications being equal, the preference should be given to Canadian graduates." Mr. Norman "begs leave to hold exactly the opposite view." Yet his only reason for objecting to what Canadians may surely be pardoned in supposing to be their just right, appears to be that "geniality of temperament, sympathy with the young, a high estimate of education as a calling, *might* (the italics are ours) be found *more readily* among University men from the old country than among Canadian graduates." It is a pity that Rev. R. W. Norman, M.A., of Oxford, gave so modest a list of the good qualities peculiar to University men from the old country. He might at least, judging from his literary performance, have added the art of blowing one's own trumpet, and exalting one's own dignity by throwing mud at "Canadian graduates." Dr. Stephenson has a letter in the same issue of the *Spectator*, in which he declines to deal with the charges in the *Spectator*, on the ground that they are anonymous. Rev. Mr. Norman, M.A., Oxford, also makes much ado about the fact of the anonymity of the *Spectator's* criticisms of High School matters in Montreal. But as the editor of that paper justly says, "newspaper men are obliged to hide their personality under a pseudonym." That is perfectly true, and neither Mr. Stephenson nor Mr. Norman furnish any reply to the charge of want of discipline and magnetism in the school in question. Mr. Norman calls very hard names at the *Spectator* critic, "anonymous detractor," "impertinence," "scribble," "contemptible cowardice," &c., &c. Such are a few of his flowers of rhetoric. The *Spectator* is a live paper, and we affectionately hope that it will survive Dr. Norman's homily, which seems to us less indicative of the "good sense," "geniality," &c., &c., in which Dr. Norman says Oxford men so much ex. — mere "Canadian graduates," as of the eloquence peculiar to another old country institution known as Billingsgate. Meantime, the condition of the schools in question should be dispassionately ascertained, and Dr. Stephenson would be better served by a full investigation by impartial authorities, than by his friend Dr. Norman's tirade, which proves nothing, and suggests the story of the advocate who could only defend a bad cause by abusing the plaintiff's lawyer.