

tions which should have paramount weight in the difficult task of appraising their value and of making proper choice of them. A due regard for these considerations is the first step towards securing efficient school manuals.

Nothing is more important, moreover, than that the machinery of the Advisory Committee should have no interest in the determining voice of its decisions. Under the old régime, the unwisdom of impeding the free exercise of the judicial function in permitting officers of the department to write school books, was made clearly manifest. At the present time there is some danger of our forgetting the lessons of the past in this respect, though, on the surface, no serious overt act has been committed. The breach of propriety involved in the connection of authorship of text-books prescribed for use with the inspection of schools using, or not using them, is apparent to any one who reflects for a moment upon the matter; and the gain that is had by the adoption of works produced by any of the learned Inspectors of the Department is more than qualified by the effect upon the profession which such an infringement of the code of propriety produces. That other, and more positive evils come of permitting this unseemly engagement in dual occupations, one can scarcely doubt. Of course, it may seem hard that those who have the ability and the aptitude to produce good school manuals should not be free to do so; but while employed in other specific duties, and in those which are apt to conflict, even remotely, with their official work, self-repression should not be considered too obligatory. When the lawyer is elevated to the bench, he is expected to concern himself with judicial work, and not with that of the pleader. His duties are to administer the laws: not to write treatises upon them.

The truth is that in this matter there should be no semblance of anything that would interfere with the rigorously impartial discharge of the duties of Inspectorship; and no entangling or embarrassing interest should be allowed to interpose itself in the due exercise, on the part of both inspector and teacher, of the responsible legitimate work of either officer. The more independent these respective functionaries can be, the one of the other, the better,—always, of course, subject, but only so, to the wise and deliberate control of the chief executive of the department. In the system on which the school grants are made, we have, in the “payment by results,” quite enough temptation to truculence, and more interference than is desirable with the independence of the teacher. The most valuable quality in those engaged in the profession, and one which most wants continuous exhibition, is moral fibre, and anything that tends to repress its growth and expression, and to enfeeble the teacher in an already notoriously weak spot, should be reprehended and removed. In the matter of the pocket, the best of mankind are weak; but to temptations that already environ the teacher, there is little sense in adding those that should not connect themselves with the machinery of the department. Let the profession, therefore, be free from the motive to use, or refrain from using, a text-book in which any Inspector has even remotely an interest. Those who fill the arduous office of Inspector, also, will best consult their own interests, while conserving that dignity and self-respect most essential to their efficiency and success, by abstaining from even the most distant commercial connection with the implements of education, and from any alliances that might derogate from the high status to which their official position assigns them.