

School Journal's abstract is genuine, the Minister, in the Proposed Amended Regulations of the Department, has undertaken a heavy and rather astonishing task, and, in dealing with it, accepts a grave responsibility. In suggesting these changes, it is to be hoped that he is not trifling with the profession, and promulgating a policy which, like that announced last year in connection with Upper Canada College and the County Model Schools, is to be put forward one week to be withdrawn the next. To be frank, we admit that some of Mr. Crooks's proposed amendments commend themselves to common sense. For these, however, Mr. Crooks, as usual, deserves little credit: he has been forced to adopt them by enlightened public opinion. In the proposed Regulations, nothing original is good, and nothing good is original. But while the Minister continues to be seized and dominated by his official importance, and his volition controlled by political bias or professional intrigue, there is no proof that we are likely to see his amendments become law. It is very probable, however, that the Regulations for the distribution of the High School Grant will give little satisfaction; and, as the Legislature possesses the vetoing power, so far as Collegiate Institutes are concerned, we may hope that a more liberal spirit may rule that body. In view of the \$27,000 annual endowment of Upper Canada College, a maximum of \$1,250 to High Schools and of \$2,000 to Institutes, is grotesquely out of proportion. How long, we may ask, will the Province tolerate this gross injustice? The Minister's timid handling of the Normal Schools, moreover, is not likely to be satisfactory to either the public or the profession who know of their notorious inefficiency and have reason to put little faith in inspection as a remedy for stagnation. The condition of these Schools is now a byword in the Province; and, admittedly, there is something more wanted to improve them than rose-water treatment and that by proxy.

In our educational executive we want intelligent action; but we equally want that which is free and resolute. In Mr. Crooks's

case there is apt to be too much dalliance with the affairs of his office; or if there is activity, then an unhappy proneness to "mixing and muddling," with the occasional accessory of a scandal. It is well known, too, that the Minister's Regulations are persistently ignored and held in contempt by his subordinates, who trust for immunity to personal political influence or to their master's well-known ineptitude.

It was hoped that the Minister, as his mind became disciplined by the experience of administrative life, would, whatever his deficiencies, adapt himself in time to the duties of his office, and be able to fashion and keep in harmonious motion a well-knit educational system. But Mr. Crooks is so wanting in sensitiveness of apprehension, and, constitutionally, is so little in sympathy with the teacher and his work, that it would seem futile to look to him satisfactorily to guide or govern educational opinion. That opinion, out of temper some day, may happily, however, rid us of a Minister of Education, and release our school system from that which, in no slight degree, clogs and discredits it, and his colleagues from what they cannot but regard as a source of party weakness. We shall then, we hope, get back to a skilled administration, and to the revival of a representative, and we trust an eminently efficient, Council of Public Instruction. Indeed, the more we see and hear of Mr. Crooks's management of affairs, the more impressed we are with the necessity of this, and of the urgency of a return to the method of the old régime. With the change we have indicated brought about, we may see the Department in intelligent accord and sympathy with the profession, and its official correspondence cease to be a record of weakness and vacillation. To interview Mr. Crooks on professional matters has rarely been satisfactory; to communicate with him, never. His wordy flatulence is only equalled by his pretentious ignorance. At present, if you write to the Deputy, you get one opinion: if you write to the Minister, you get another. His political partizanship, too, is a public scandal. It shows itself in