

oppose a measure which will soon provide a supply of good teachers, indicates a deplorable lack of interest in higher education, if not a willingness to sacrifice *the school* for the sake of *the teacher*.

I think it devolves upon those who are opposed to any change to show that, contrary to the united testimony of the Inspectors, the teaching in our High Schools is on the whole satisfactory; and that if the two hundred and thirty assistant teachers now employed (to say nothing of Head Masters) had *all* received a good professional training, the work would not be of a much higher order. I say it devolves upon such objectors to show cause; for, from what we know of the work of well-trained Public School teachers, we have a right to assume, what every true educationist will admit, that well-trained High School teachers would produce results far superior to those of novices, many of whom begin their experimenting on High School classes.

But if it be admitted that the interests of our High Schools would be promoted by employing in them none but those who are proved capable of properly doing the work required, then it simply becomes a question of High School interests *versus* the personal interests of inexperienced temporary teachers.

I submit, however, that to leave the masterships of our High Schools accessible to inexperienced and therefore comparatively inefficient persons, merely because they desire to work their way through college, or for any similar reason, is both unreasonable and unjustifiable.

Surely no one will contend that those who frame our school laws can be expected to provide temporary employment for any class of persons, if it can be shown that by so doing they are imperilling the educational interests of the country.

Why not distribute the operations of this transitory, temporary system of experimenting over all the leading professions? Is there any good reason why an inexperienced person should be permitted to minister to the wants of a child's *mind* in its education, and prevented from administering to the wants of its *body* in case of disease? We do not find our Medical Council and Law Society charged with heartlessly "throwing obstacles in the way of young men," because they require a certain amount of *experience* in all whom they allow to practise. It appears to be left to the teacher's occupation to supply the means which in many cases ought to be obtained from such other employments as can safely be undertaken with little or no preparatory training.

The great fallacy lies in assuming that the teaching profession is a common thoroughfare along which any person may pass, with no other preparation than a knowledge of the subjects to be taught. Under such circumstances, "The teacher gains access to the sanctuary of the mind without difficulty, and the most tender interests for both worlds are entrusted to his guidance, even when he makes pretension to no higher motive than that of filling up a few months of time not otherwise appropriated, and to no qualifications but those attained by accident."

Why it should be considered an improper thing for a university graduate to spend a few weeks with First Class Candidates in a special course at the Education Department, is not easy to understand. Possibly some misapprehension exists in regard to what is actually intended. Some there are who suppose that the Regulation requires attendance for a full session on lectures by Toronto Normal School teachers; others, that a few dry lectures by specialists are to be given, without any practical work.