

### THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

-Two members of the Central Committee retire each year. Those whose term expired at the end of 1881 are Mr. Glashan, Public School Inspector, Ottawa, and Professor Watson of Queen's University, Kingston. They are both excellent men, wise in council and judicious examiners, and great care should be exercised in filling their places.

It is understood that the High School Inspectors will, in accordance with a suggestion made in Parliament last year, be made *ex-officio* members of the Committee for all but examining purposes. This is proper, but it makes it all the more necessary to select a good member to fill the place of Mr. Marling, who will by this arrangement cease to be an examiner. We hope to see good, sensible men appointed on this important committee who have no crotchets, and whose training has made them thoroughly acquainted with the Public School System of our country. If the Minister of Education decides that he must have High School and University men for examiners, it seems perfectly clear that very soon he must form a special advisory committee. It is of the utmost importance this year that the advisors of the ministers should be practical men as it is understood that the question of the revision of the Public School Programme will be considered by the Department.

### INCREDIBLE!

It has been stated in the papers that two of the vacancies on the Central Committee are to be filled by Professor Hutton and J. Howard Hunter, M.A. It seems to us incredible that the Minister of Education could even think of appointing either of these gentlemen to positions on the Committee. To do so would be an insult to every teacher in Ontario, so deliberate and so unjustifiable that we are confident Mr. Crooks would not consider the matter for a moment. We can only account for the rumor on the supposition that some of the enemies of the Minister of Education circulated the statement for the express purpose of injuring him. Indeed, we understand the announcement was first made in a "monthly," one of whose aims since its birth, has been to misrepresent and attack the Minister, and as it betrayed a lamentable ignorance regarding the present membership of the Committee, we may safely conclude that its prophetic utterances are not more reliable than what it presents as a record of facts. The same article that announced that Messrs. Hutton and Hunter are the coming men, also stated that "Mr. Tilley is, and that Mr. Buchan is not a member of the Committee." As the latter statements are incorrect, let us hope that the former are also unreliable.

We have no hesitation in stating the reasons which lead us strongly to object to the appointment of the gentlemen named as members of the Central Committee.

Against Mr. Hutton our objections are purely of a negative character. As a man and as a scholar he is entitled to the fullest respect, and we cheerfully award to him our highest praise in these respects. We hold also that the members of the Central Committee should be gentlemen and scholars, and that so far Mr. Hutton is perfectly fitted for membership.

There are special qualifications for the position, however, which Mr. Hutton can not possibly possess. He is a foreigner and can not be sufficiently acquainted with Canadian schools to act in the capacity of an examiner justly to all parties concerned. However unfitted he may be for the post of an examiner, he is disqualified to a much greater degree for performing the duties of an adviser on educational questions. No one is competent to give counsel regarding the public school questions of any country who is not practically acquainted with the schools and their relationship to society, and all local circumstances directly or indirectly affecting them. What a force it would be for Mr. Hutton to advise the Minister of Education concerning the Public School Programme for instance. If objection was made to his appointment as a professor, to teach subjects of which he is master, how great will be the outcry, and how just, if he is called to give counsel concerning questions of which he can practically know nothing.

We object to Mr. Hunter for both positive and negative reasons. We can not say for him what we have said of Mr. Hutton. Even if Mr. Crooks wished to give him a prominent place in connection with the Education Department, Mr. Hunter would consult his own interests, if he is possessed of any feelings of delicacy, by refusing to accept it. There were many facts brought out during the investigation into Mr. Hunter's conduct in the Blind Asylum that were not commented upon at the time owing to his prompt removal from his position by the Government. These "arbor" scenes and others have not been forgotten, and the re-appearance of Mr. Hunter in connection with the Education Department, will assuredly stir them to life again, to the annoyance of himself and the Minister of Education.

Mr. Hunter is a man of some strength of character, but his strength is neutralized by his personal animosities, by an unfortunate acidity of disposition, and by his bitter partizanship. When he left the teaching profession, those in it breathed more freely and gave thanks. We know that we speak for the great majority of Public School teachers, High School Masters, and Inspectors when we say that the return of Mr. Hunter to official connection with educational matters would be a calamity, which could not be justified on any plea. The appointment of Mr. Hutton could only be justified on condition that the Committee ceased to have advisory functions; the appointment of Mr. Hunter would not be tolerated on any grounds whatever.

In conclusion we venture to make the strong statement that no Minister of Education, however popular he may be, can afford to surround himself with men like Mr. Hunter; and we express the hope that the day is far distant when the Education Department will be made a refuge for those who have failed to secure the confidence of their fellow citizens in much less important trusts.

If vacancies are to be filled an excellent opportunity is offered for popularizing the Department by securing responsible men, elected by the Public School Teachers, Inspectors, and High School Masters.

—A correspondent urges the desirability of having the marks obtained by candidates for First Class certificates issued to those who fail, as is done in the case of candidates for the Intermediate and Second Class Examination. The reason given for withholding the marks is, that no absolute standard is adopted for granting First Class certificates. The Central Committee varies the standard slightly according to the nature of the examination, and the publication of the marks might lead to much misunderstanding and unnecessary appealing. We think, however, that each candidate should be informed at least as to the subjects in which he made the lowest per centage of marks.