

mal 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 the 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 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 most 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 great ignorance on our part 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 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 insufficient 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 regulations 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. The announcement of fuller particulars will no doubt remove such apprehensions, and make it clear to every young graduate worthy to teach in a High School that the course proposed, instead of humiliating him, will rather tend to confer upon him that dignity which is felt only by those who are conscious of being fairly prepared for this work.

I can therefore see nothing unkind or unjust to our young men in the course proposed. Those intending to make teaching their life-work will not be slow to avail themselves of the advantages arising from a good preparatory course of professional training; and it is but just that those who merely desire to make the position a stepping-stone to some other calling be required also to fit themselves for discharging the high trust they thus undertake to fulfil.

If there is any injustice at all, it lies in the injury done to *permanent* teachers by persons who press into ranks already full—thereby cutting down salaries and displacing men who, in view of teaching as a life-work, have duly prepared for it. I would suggest that if "obstacles could be thrown in the way" of some young men at *this point* it would be only an act of justice to many honest toilers in our schools, who, by reason of such supplanters, "stand in jeopardy every hour."