

ance attached to the skilled acquirements of his assistants."

III. Objections which arise evidently from a fear lest graduates and undergraduates of denominational colleges may be required to attend lectures on certain subjects in Toronto University.

Now if it can be shown that the objections of either class are valid, the proposal of the Minister could not and ought not to be favourably received. If the real interests of High School masters are to be sacrificed; if the principles commonly supposed to underlie normal methods are radically defective; or if the Regulation can be shown to operate solely in the interests of *one* university, then, of course, it should be opposed by every High School teacher—in fact by every educationist in the country.

If, on the other hand, it be found that the proposed regulation will really benefit these teachers, by greatly improving the character of their teaching; if the friends of the measure can satisfy us that the special course will give a thorough training in the theory and practice of teaching, in harmony with the generally-accepted principles of good Normal Schools; and if the outlying universities are assured that their interests are in no way to be interfered with—no true friend of education, certainly no intelligent teacher, will be found to oppose the measure.

After carefully examining the question, I am of opinion that the reasons assigned for introducing this Regulation are such as fully to warrant the Minister in requiring a suitable professional training of all who teach in High Schools, as in the case of those who teach in Public Schools; that most, if not all of the objections enumerated can be satisfactorily answered; and that we, as a section, after full and fair discussion, will conclude that at least the principle on

which the Regulation is based is indisputably correct.

Taking these objections in order, permit me briefly to refer to each of them.

I. In the *first* class may be placed about the only form of opposition that has appeared in the newspapers—a defence of the supposed interests of those who are or are to be masters in our High Schools. And the sole plea for perpetuating the existing state of things is, in effect, that by the new rule an old and well-worn stepping-stone to other callings is likely to be removed, or rendered less accessible. The question, of paramount importance, how we can best secure the highest attainable efficiency in our High Schools, is almost entirely overlooked, in the plea for those whose quiet enjoyment of a special privilege is likely to be disturbed. I think it can be shown that some such regulation as the one proposed would ultimately benefit not only the High Schools, but also the temporary teachers in these schools.

That well-trained, experienced teachers are preferable to novices in any class of schools, no one can doubt. As Goldwin Smith remarks, "Of all matters, public education most needs stability, and shrinks most from the touch of 'prentice hands.'" To object to a regulation which aims at gradually displacing inexperienced teachers and filling their places with well-trained teachers, appears to put a premium on mediocrity and inefficiency, and to regard the temporary advantage of certain individuals as of greater importance than the status of our secondary schools. In other words, to say that we *cannot* greatly improve in our teaching, would indicate on our part great ignorance of what good teaching is, and of the actual state of our schools at the present time. To admit that we *can* improve in our teaching, and yet to