

when waiting on him in regard to other matters relating to the school. Mr. McBride sat there at the table, round which the members were thus denouncing Mr. Seath heard all that passed and never opened his lips to explain or asked leave to explain the facts well known to him and of those present him only [knew] that he (Mr. Seath) had not acted on such insufficient or slight knowledge but had also examined a very much larger class whilst Mr. Mayberry was absent from the school and which class had been taught by Mr. McBride.

The Complainant charges this was such grossly dishonorable and dishonest conduct that the actor is unfit to be a teacher of youth.

20. At the meeting of the Board on the 2nd September 1885 Mr. McGregor and the Complainant having reported these facts as appears by their written report a discussion followed and Mr. McBride's conduct in the matter having been reflected on by the Complainant he offered an untrue and if by a play upon words held to be true—most disingenuous explanation to the effect that he had understood the Examinations of this Intermediate Latin Class was not an inspection.

21. On the Complainant proposing a resolution to report the matter to the Department of Education the following more friendly course and resolution were adopted: "That the Secretary send a copy of Mr. McBride's statement to Mr. Seath Inspector and state that Mr. McBride intends communicating with him and that the Board will be glad to have Mr. Seath's remarks upon the statement at its next meeting."

The statement or statements in question are entered by the Secretary or taken down then and appear in his minutes as follows—App. number three:—

2ND SEPTEMBER, 1886.

"Mr. McBride's statement that on the occasion of Mr. Seath's visit in May he stated to Mr. McBride, who at the time was sick and only at school for the day to meet the Inspector—that he did not owing to the disorganization of the School through sickness of teachers &c., consider this an inspection in Classics or Mathematics although he did hear shortly the Latin Class Intermediate.

"On the occasion of Mr. Seath's visit in June from a conversation he (Mr. McBride) had with Mr. Seath which he thinks he can recall to Mr. Seath's memory it will be shown that the subsequent report as to Classics was based on his examination of the one pupil or class then examined by him."

These statements the Complainant believes and alleges to be untrue and dishonest attempts to mislead the Board.

22. Instead of communicating by letter as expected by the Board he went to Toronto to see Mr. Seath but missed him. Mr. Seath's reply did not bear out his statement and when the matter on receipt of Mr. Seath's reply came up at the October meeting of the Board he told the Board for the first time that he had really desired and intended in the first place when the members were complaining of Mr. Seath to have explained it but had no opportunity. The Complainant charges this to be a manifest falsehood.

23. In the same report by Mr. Seath the teaching of Natural Sciences at this School having been condemned and Mr. Moran the teacher of Chemistry and Botany declared not to be a Science teacher within the meaning of the Act Mr. McBride before the Board whilst dealing with this asserted that Mr. DeGuerre had been engaged as a specialist in Natural Sciences in compliance with the requirements of the Department when making the School a Collegiate Institute but that Mr. Moran had in effect by his persistence forced himself into possession of these classes against the wishes of the Principal; at the same time intimating that Mr. DeGuerre being a First Class Honor man was better fitted for this work.

The Complainant in this matter charges as follows: (a) that in this Mr. McBride misrepresented Mr. DeGuerre's qualifications (b) that if true as stated by him that Mr. DeGuerre had been engaged as a specialist in Natural Sciences he was guilty of practising a fraud upon the Department in setting him at entirely different work leaving this to others not so specially qualified and (c) that if not true he made the statement for the purpose of misleading the Board and did mislead them into passing on the 11th July 1885 the following resolution:—

"That in view of the Inspector's report and the explanation that Mr. DeGuerre was represented to the Department of Education as a specialist in Physical Science he should be allotted the work in Physical Science throughout the whole school but allowing discretion in the Principal as to Botany." The latter part as to Botany having been modified expressly to meet his views.

24. When the subject of re-engaging the Principal and his staff and fixing their salaries was before the Board in the month of November 1885 the Complainant pointed out that the school was in a most inefficient state that it was badly organized, that the teachers had unhappily not been so assorted in their qualifications as to make a good school possible but that even of the material we had the best use was not made that especially in the case of Mr. DeGuerre who