

which this technical training is to be imparted to those who look forward to High School work as a profession. I have no fault to find with the choice of schools, probably the selection is as suitable as could be desired; I apprehend that there is never likely to be much rivalry amongst our larger schools for this "honour" (?). But if, in the case of these schools, I should say that their present staff is altogether inadequate to the discharge of the additional duties imposed, I hope, sir, you will not construe my language as reflecting in the slightest degree on the efficiency or literary attainments of the gentlemen who compose them. Nothing is further from my object. On the contrary I know that both the principals, and many of the departmental masters, have justly earned and maintained an enviable reputation, Provincial in its character. And this leads me to the marrow of the subject. In the formation and maintenance of this reputation who shall say but the gentlemen themselves what unremitting toil in the class-room and continued preparation in the study have been involved? Perhaps no class of professional men undergo more intellectual tear and wear, or have their work subjected to more crucial tests in the present age than High School masters. And to all this, additional burdens are to be added; a pretentious syllabus of studies is to be lectured upon by masters who are already sufficiently loaded with work. But they are to be paid. Yes, the munificent sum of \$300, if we are correctly informed, is to be voted to each of the Institutes. Tell it not in Gath! We should have expected from the Hon. Minister of Education, who has been an educator himself, sympathy of a more practical, if less demonstrative, order. But every thing in this world, we are told, has its marketable value, and \$300 per Institute is the price placed by the Depart-

ment on the training of High School masters. It is very cheap, talk is cheap too. However glib the utterance may be in official quarters in favour of such training I am constrained to say that it is not very earnest, and that it has other aims to serve than the ostensible one. Had the compensation been ample, so as to warrant the boards in engaging additional masters, the objection to the use of such schools might possibly lose some of its points; but, so long as no such provision is made, we can see evil and nothing else in the arrangement. It must inevitably disorganize the school, and this means demoralization, less or more, and especially more to both pupils and masters. The remedy lies with the board. Our trustees are usually good business men, and they will not be slow to see that the schools they direct are handicapped in their contests with other schools for academic distinctions. It will be very competent for our legislators to ask the Minister of Education to produce his authority for regulations which must place at a discount institutions otherwise excellent. If the training is to be worth the salt; if text-books are to be mastered and supplemented; in other words, if the whole thing is not to be a sham, then it must be placed in the hands of specialists who will receive compensation that shall be adequate and commensurate with the importance of the work.

But they say it is easy to find fault. Certainly it has not been difficult with the regulations of the Education Department, and so will it ever be as long as such an important trust as education is wedded to party politics. Surely in all honesty we are not shut up to a plan that will enervate the best of our schools by this training of masters. I made suggestions before on this subject in your columns; but as your paper, I am afraid, is not the