

I contend, moreover, that the Regulation, instead of operating against temporary teachers, would ultimately benefit even them. Those who thus make one position a step to another very naturally have constantly before them their future calling. To fit thousands for their life-work they employ their best energies; their special studies lie in this path; while temporary employment often degenerates into formal routine, destitute of high motive or real enthusiasm. In fact no one can long occupy such a position without convincing proof of inefficiency—not necessarily a want of knowledge in the subjects taught, but inability properly to impart this knowledge to others. To this may be added the difficulties in government and discipline which usually beset all beginners. This it is which I think must prove anything but helpful to one preparing for other work. As compared with an assurance of success, this feeling of failure is very depressing to any young man of spirit, and must unfit him for calmly pursuing his course of private reading. On the other hand, success in temporary employment conduces to success in future fields of labor. Hence I say that if every one wishing thus to spend one or two years in High School teaching were first to learn the practical details of his work, he would reap the benefit not only while teaching, but also when exclusively devoted to his chosen vocation.

It seems but fair, then, to all concerned that a special course of professional training form an essential part of the outfit of all our teachers.

All this may be said, and is intended, without generally condemning the work now done by temporary teachers; but when to the concurrent testimony of the Inspectors and the opinion of many experienced head masters we add the frank admission of a large proportion of those young men themselves, I think we must conclude that under the present system in the case of inexperienced beginners comparative inefficiency is the rule, and first-class teaching the exception.

II. To discuss fully the second class of objections would open up questions of an extent quite beyond our present limits. These objections, briefly stated are: *Teaching cannot be taught*; there is no *philosophy* of teaching—no such thing as a *science* of education. This antiquated notion is less frequently entertained now than before the relative superiority of well-trained teachers was fully established. It is now generally admitted that while teachers who have not been normally trained reach their level—stop growing—on an average at the end of three years of service, good Normal School teachers continue to improve throughout their entire career. Can any one give a good reason why such should not be the case? This fact is now *practically recognized* in all countries that rank high in popular education. The precedent found in Germany, with her forty or fifty lectures on Pedagogy and Didactics each semester, by university professors; the example of various countries of Great Britain; suggestive and encouraging results in France, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, the United States and elsewhere, ought surely to dispel any doubts which exist in regard to the increasing importance attached to skilled labor in education.

I do not share in the fear lest a *dead uniformity* be the result. The condition most to be feared is a *lifeless mediocrity*, as the result of aimless, desultory experimenting of novices left free to invent their own methods. Intelligent well-trained teachers may adopt similar methods of treating given subjects, and yet have scope for originality. They are not necessarily servile imitators; but, mentally appropriating the principles of a good system, retaining meanwhile their own personality, they reproduce them in their own way. That is, the adoption of scientific principles in teaching need not conflict with a judicious employment of original methods.

The untrained teacher, on the other hand, not having been taught at the outset *how to avail himself of the practical experience of the best educators*, must blindly follow his own empirical methods, with those results which are admirably characteristic of the average beginner.

Let us welcome, then, any measure that will lift our teaching wholly from this condition of empiricism, and give it a settled scientific status. Not until this take place, will our work rise to the dignity of a profession, nor will teachers receive the consideration which appertains to the professional character.

Whether the average college professor will impart enthusiasm to be compared in kind or degree with that which may be created by persons likely to be selected for the special course proposed, is very questionable indeed. Besides, at present many become High School teachers without ever entering college, and a large proportion of our assistant masters first accepted their positions as undergraduates. It should not be forgotten, moreover, that any assistance received by those who do attend college is altogether incidental, since no provision is made in our universities for lectures on pedagogics, such as are given at Harvard, etc., to say nothing of German and other universities. If such chairs were established, well-directed enthusiasm there received would count for something. At present, however, it is to be feared that our universities furnish no superabundance of helpful inspiration. Professors are supposed to be interested in their special departments, and students in whatever will aid them in their course. But to suppose that by a few hours' intercourse per week with an enthusiast in classics or science a student will unconsciously absorb anything that will reappear to aid him on the occasion of his first facing a class in a High School, is in the highest degree unwarrantable. What young men get from such professors, in addition to an acquaintance with the subject, is at most a love for study, possibly an ambition for a post-graduate course. What they need, as prospective teachers, but do not get, is practical instruction in the best methods of imparting knowledge. For a young teacher to attempt to imitate his professor's usual style of lecture, however good in its place, would indicate a serious want of tact and power of adaptation. Some conspicuous failures in teachers may be traced to this practice of half-unconsciously imitating a style inappropriate to High School work.

It is as unreasonable to hold college professors responsible for the early efforts of such graduates as it is to claim for them the requisite ability to supply our High Schools with teachers *who can teach* without first being trained.

Then it is said that our graduates and undergraduates, when preparing for college, had ample opportunity in High Schools to see how classes are there conducted. Granted; but who can guarantee that the young men, say, who this year matriculated have been taught by methods which it is desirable to perpetuate? Those most familiar with our teaching as a whole, while giving high rank to many teachers, are frank enough to condemn in unmistakable terms the work of many others. Besides, as our more experienced teachers drop out of the ranks, and their places are in this manner supplied by inexperienced men, it is easy to see what the average teacher will be a few years hence—certainly not an improvement on the present. Is this result desirable? Would we apply such a rule to Public Schools? Why not? Why trouble *them* with a professional course? Are the subjects of the High Schools' curriculum of less importance than that of the Public School? Or are we to believe that the principles which lie at the basis of all successful teaching in elementary work may be disregarded in advanced subjects?

It may be a somewhat humiliating admission, but I candidly believe that the average teaching in our leading town and city Public