

Q.—Do these facts not show that the Inspector's reports are unreliable? A.—No.

In the first place you will notice that the Minister of Education does not answer in a straightforward manner the question: "Does the Schools Report for that school year state that the teacher during that school year was R. Offerhaus?" The fact is that the report does so state and the true and correct answer to the question is—Yes.

The Minister gives an exhibition of quibbling in his answer that is unworthy of any Minister of the Crown and he sets a shocking example to the pupils of the schools.

His answer shows further that he is not sure whether the Schools Report tells the truth or not. The Schools Report states in plain English that R. Offerhaus was the teacher during the year 1905-06.

The Minister says he PRESUMABLY taught PART of the year. When the Minister of the Crown has such little faith in the printed statements of his Superintendent, how can the people be expected to have confidence in them?

The Minister's answers prove beyond all doubt that the Inspector's reports are unreliable—as printed in the Public School's Reports.

The Legislature was informed by the reports that R. Offerhaus was the teacher referred to in Inspector Wilson's report. It was informed that the Superintendent knew perfectly well that such information was false, yet through his careless manner in preparing these reports he has made Inspector Wilson's report to apply to R. Offerhaus.

What better proof of their unreliability could any person wish?

The Public Schools Report informs the Legislature and the public that Inspector Wilson reported that a teacher who had been buried in November, 1905, was working hard to secure improvement in March, 1906. The Minister of Education tells the Legislature these facts do not prove that