

was not that it should talk well, but that it should work well, and reporting would be a great impediment to work."

The first argument of the learned President in favor of closed doors is "The Council was not administering public moneys. They (the public) had no special reason for keeping a very sharp or vigilant eye upon it." Is it to be inferred from this statement, that the "administration of public moneys" is of all other matters the most important to the public, and that only in cases where their pockets are concerned, has the public a right to know the views of the representatives? Or would Mr. Smith, following up the analogy propose, that only in those cases where the business involved the expenditure of money, the doors of our Legislative Halls should be opened and the public permitted to know the opinions of their representatives? The expenditure of "public moneys" has never been a matter of any serious consequence, in connection with our educational system.* The Council of Public Instruction acts under instructions in such matters from the legislature, and its duties are merely Departmental. But in other matters, much of the choice of text-books, regulations for the public schools and the management of the depository, the council possesses legislative functions. It is from these functions it derives its importance and interest. It was to give scope and breadth to its deliberations, that we advocated the introduction of the elective principle, but now we are told, that, forsooth, because it does not administer "public moneys" its deliberations may be invested with all the secrecy of a Privy Council.

Considerable stress is laid by Mr. Smith upon the necessity of the Council being a *working body*. He says, "what they want to do, is not to talk well but to work well." We agree with Mr. Smith on that point. But is it not the duty of every Council and every legislative body to *work well* rather

than to *talk well*? Are not our Parliaments and County Councils equally bound by this obligation? And yet who ever suggests that they should sit with closed doors? The argument that publicity means talk and buncombe and no result, is simply a reflection upon the whole council, and unworthy of a man who has so long and so closely studied the liberalizing tendencies of education as Mr. Smith has. It is quite possible that some might, from a desire to lay their views before the public, occupy more of the time of the council with the reporters present than without them, but what of that? Surely *haste* is not a valuable element in legislation, and even should the sittings of the council be somewhat protracted the public benefits accruing would far more than counterbalance any inconvenience to its members.

But Mr. Smith believes that with publicity the labors of the council would be of less practical value. How? Why? To be of any value at all the work of the council must be practical. To be practical, the council must know the wants of the public. Now how are their wants to be ascertained? Is it by preventing discussion, or by inviting an expression of public opinion? Does Mr. Smith suppose that when the council meets in solemn conclave and shuts out the busy world around, by excluding the only means of daily communication with the world we now possess, by some special revelation the *practical* knowledge so much desired will be made known? Would it not be far more in conformity with the 'precedents' of history to throw open the doors to the reporters, to allow the views of individual members to go to the public, and let the press as it has done in other matters, direct public opinion to the most desirable conclusions.

But Mr. Smith is afraid if reporters were admitted, it would be very difficult to keep out politics. Keep out politics! Why not in one case as well as the other? Are the