

bot's "Christian Schoolmaster." It is there distinctly stated that to take the Bishop's license is required from every teacher; and it is added that any one teaching in any parish without a license ought to be persecuted by the Churchwardens of the parish where he teacheth for the said offence.

My last instance of insistence on the necessity of obtaining the Bishop's license falls within the reign of our present Sovereign. In a book called "Church Clavering; or the Schoolmaster," by the Rev. W. Gresley, Prebendary of Lichfield,\* we have a picture drawn as it presents itself to his mind of an ideal master of a National School. Joseph Primer just escapes becoming a Dissenter preacher and becomes instead a teacher of a National School. "I have often wished," he says, "that I had received a regular license and commission from the Bishop. I should feel more comfortable with such an authority and do not live without the hope of receiving one some day." An interlocutor inquires: "Well, but you do not mean to say that in the present day you would prevent all persons from keeping schools unless they are licensed by the Bishop?"

To which Primer replies that "those who belong to the Church should obey its rules. All Church of England schoolmasters, I conceive, would be bound to go to the Bishop for a license if he required it . . . let the Bishops," continues Primer, "if they think fit, revive the practice of licensing masters. Let such masters be subject to a strict examination as to their principles and qualifications, and let the Church people send their children to masters who are so licensed. What is then more extraordinary in requiring that schoolmasters should be licensed

than forbidding surgeons or lawyers to practise without authority? And is it not better to send our children to be educated by a master whose competency is guaranteed by authority than to commit them to the tender mercies of any ignorant person who may think fit to open a school?"

With Mr. Primer's last argument we all here should cordially agree. But, seeing that national education has to be organized, we wish our licensing or registration to be national also, and have it on a wide basis which may, or rather shall, include all teachers of every sect and denomination—men and women teachers, public and private teachers, University, secondary and elementary teachers, on the common possession of the knowledge of the principles of, and skill in, the practice of teaching—without regard to either theological or political opinions held by the teacher. The National Church once was without the competition of dissenting bodies of theological thinkers. It included the nation. Now the nation includes all the Churches. But the importance of education is still as great and is much more widely recognized as urgent. It behooves us therefore as a nation to assert the distinction between a qualified teacher and one not qualified with as keen an emphasis as was done by the old license of the Church, though now on strictly professional lines.

Nor ought we to be ungrateful to the Church for the organization of the past. Modern developments have led to a differentiation of functions. The Church once provided the hospitals, almshouses, libraries, and provided our other national needs. Now voluntary secular bodies manage hospitals, poor-laws provide for the poor, municipalities for libraries. So we now have School Boards

\*Published in 1843.