

temptations to abuse. On this point the *Daily Express* remarks,—"It was originally intended, in projecting the reformatory system, that a part of the expense should be levied off the parents as a penalty for their share in the guilt of their children, either in having neglected their moral training, or inducing them to commit crime by direct encouragement or the indirect influence of a vicious example. It is tolerably plain that as the system now works neither party is punished, but, on the contrary, both receive substantial rewards. The parents are relieved of the care and cost of their offspring, and the children are brought up in comparative luxury. Hence there is reason to fear that reformatories may even contribute to the growth of criminality in its early stages as a qualification for obtaining the tempting advantages which they afford."
—*English Journal of Education.*

—By the 24th and 25th Vict. c. 113, which received the Royal assent on the 6th August, and is now in operation until the 1st January, 1864, the law as to industrial schools in England is amended and consolidated. The mode of certifying and sanctioning the establishment of these schools is, as before, through the Home Secretary, upon the application of the managers of any school "in which industrial training is provided, and in which children are clothed, lodged, and fed, as well as taught," and after inspection of the premises by an authorised officer. The law has more clearly defined than in the previous act of 1857 what children are liable to present to industrial schools. Before any description of vagrant might have been confined therein; but now, by the 9th section, children of the following descriptions only can be sent in pursuance of the act—viz., "1. Any child apparently under the age of 14 years found begging or receiving alms, or being in any street, or public place, for the purpose of begging or receiving alms. 2. Any child apparently under the age of 14 years that is found wandering, and not having any home or settled place of abode, or any visible means of subsistence, or frequents the company of reputed thieves. 3. Any child apparently under the age of 12 years, who, having committed an offence punishable by imprisonment or some less punishment, ought nevertheless, in the opinion of the justices (regard being had to his age and to the circumstances of the case) to be sent to an industrial school. 4. Any child under the age of 14 years whose parent represents that he is unable to control him, and that he desires such child to be sent to an industrial school, in the pursuance of this act, and who at the same time gives such undertaking or other security as may be approved by the justices before whom he is brought in pursuance of this act, to pay all expenses incurred for the maintenance of such child at school, provided that no child who, on being brought before the justices, is proved to have been previously convicted of felony, shall be deemed to be within the provisions of this act." Two or more justices in petty sessions may, after inquiry into the facts, order such child to be sent to any certified school, the managers of which are willing to receive him; but the justices are to select, if possible, a school conducted in accordance with the religious persuasion of the parent; the period for which the child is to be detained resting with the justices, except that no child can be detained against his consent after he has attained 15. The managers of the school may permit the child to lodge at his parents, or with any trustworthy or respectable person, so that they educate, and feed, and clothe him. The managers may make rules for the regulation of schools, which cannot be enforced unless approved by the Home Secretary. The Home Secretary may remove a child from one school to another, or may discharge him either absolutely or upon condition of the parent or any other relation undertaking to educate him. Justices also may discharge the child from the school if satisfied that a suitable employment has been provided for him, &c. As to the maintenance of the children at school, the Treasury may, out of means provided by parliament, contribute towards the same (except those children who are sent at the request of their parents), at such rate per head as the Home Secretary may determine. The justices sending a child to a school, or those where the school is situate, or in which his parent resides, may, upon the application of a person appointed by the Home Secretary, make an order on the parent for payment of a sum not exceeding 5s. a week for the expenses of the child's maintenance at school, and the justices may from time to time vary the order whenever circumstances require it. If a child absconds from the school before attaining 15, or refuses to conform to the regulations thereof, the justice may order him to be sent back to the school, or may commit him to a reformatory school; and any person inducing a child to abscond, is liable to a penalty of not exceeding £5, or, at the justices' discretion, to be imprisoned for not exceeding twenty days. There are other pursuances as to the mode of recovering penalties and sums ordered, and as to the evidence of the schools being duly certified, the orders of the justices, &c.—*Id.*

—The Revised Education Code met with such vigorous opposition in England—not only from school corporations and the great body of teachers, but also from comparatively disinterested school managers—that the Committee of Council on Education was forced to yield for the present; and thus the measure will not go into operation until the end of March. The object of this code is to do away with the present system by which the pecuniary remuneration of teachers is regulated, and in its place to substitute a new distribution of the public grants based upon the results obtained, which are to be determined at the

examinations. The *Papers for the Schoolmaster*—a London publication—not only expresses its disapprobation of certain changes which it condemns as pernicious, but appears to question the principle involved in the measure, which it also characterizes as an "untried theory" upon which an attempt is made to distribute half a million of money. Among the obnoxious features which it points out, we may instance the limiting of the test to examination in reading, writing and arithmetic,—involving forfeiture of one third of the grant allowed for attendances in case of failure in the examination,—thus neglecting to stimulate religious and moral training; the objectionable system of school organization which is made to depend on age instead of on proficiency, the refusal to allow any grant for pupils except after passing an examination, thus destroying the Infant school system; the withholding of the grant from pupils above 11 years of age; the transference of pecuniary responsibility to school managers who will have to advance the teachers' salaries, incurring the risk of loss should the examination be unsuccessful; the heavy blow to training colleges by depreciating the value of teachers' certificates, and finally the breach of confidence involved in the repudiation of engagements with above twenty thousand teachers, apprentices, &c.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

—Before taking leave of Canada, the late Governor General gave a grand Ball in the Parliament Building, which was attended by at least seven hundred persons. Sir Edmund Head entered upon his administrative functions towards the end of 1854; and, with two short intermissions, continued to discharge them for nearly seven years. He was replaced during the first absence by Gen. Eyre, and by Gen. Williams during the second.

The *Montreal Gazette* thus concludes a review of Sir Edmund's official career in Canada:—

"Nor should we forget to record to his special and personal credit the interest which he, a scholar and author, has taken in our institutions of learning. They, at least, have cause to remember him with favor and gratitude."

"We believe that, though being human he has erred, he has honestly sought to promote the interests of Canada; and we will conclude this very imperfect sketch of his Canadian career, with the expression of a hearty wish that he may enjoy long life and happiness in his English home, and that a literary leisure may be in store for him, unquieted by any such vexations as attend colonial official life. If so, we have good ground to hope that the cause of literature will gain more even than that of politics will lose."

—On referring to the *Peerage* we find that Lord Monck, the new Governor General, is the fourth viscount of that name.

Charles Stanley Monck, Viscount, and Baron Monck, of Ballytrammon, Wexford, in the peerage of Ireland, was born on the 10th October, 1819, and is consequently in his forty-second year. In 1844, he married his cousin Lady Elizabeth Louise Mary Monck, daughter of the Earl of Rathdowne, and has two sons and two daughters. He is a descendant from the Duke of Albemarle, the restorer of Charles II. The founder of this family was William LeMoyné, lord of the Manor of Potheridge, county of Devon, who followed William the Conqueror from Normandy. This circumstance has furnished an occasion to some of our contemporaries to refer to the Norman descent of the LeMoyné family, so famed in the military annals of Canada.

Charles LeMoyné came to this country from France in 1641; and was elevated to the nobility in the year 1668, about which time he took the names of his domains of Longueuil and Châteauguay. Of his large family of fourteen children, twelve were boys who almost all distinguished themselves in the military service of their country; among these were Charles, first Baron of Longueuil; James, Sieur d'Iberville, distinguished for his exploits at Hudson's Bay; Paul, Sieur de Maricour; Francis, Sieur de Bienville, who at the age of 25 was killed in a combat with the Iroquois at Repentigny; Joseph, Sieur de Sérigny whose descendants are still in France; Louis, Sieur de Châteauguay, killed at Hudson's Bay; Jean Baptiste, Sieur de Bienville, founder of New Orleans; Antoine, Sieur de Châteauguay, who acted a conspicuous part in Louisiana. The historian of the French navy (Léon Guérin), quoted by M. Bibaud in his *Panthéon*, says, "It is thus that the most glorious family that has perhaps ever graced our colonies long continued to shed its lustre from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico, and from New to Equinoctial France."

Lord Monck sat in the House of Commons, and has filled the office of a Lord of the Treasury.

—A strange *canard* was recently perpetrated in some of the London journals. It was gravely asserted that a deputation of French Canadians had waited upon the Emperor, at Paris, to solicit his protection for their nationality! The hope was expressed, at the same time, that the British embassy would watch closely the doings of these redoubtable plotters, whose precise designs, however, were not clearly pointed out.