

13. Though one of the Stratford newspapers partially corrected this yet he was a party to inserting an advertisement in the *Daily Globe* of 30th August stating "Number attending last half-year, 215. 1884 record at Toronto University passed, 29 out of 32 and obtained 13 first-class honors and 11 second-class honors. At Departmental examinations obtained 6 A's 10 B's 12 III's and 14 I's."

The Complainant adopts the language of the *St. Marys Argus* and characterizes this as follows

"The advertisement of the Stratford Institution in the *Globe* is also a fraud of the very worse kind. The advertisement gives the record of the school for 1884 at Toronto University as 29 passed out of 32 with a whole string of honors thrown in. The inference is of course that 32 candidates wrote at the Matriculation Examinations and all passed but three. The fact is that there was not a solitary matriculant at all. The 29 referred to were simply candidates at the Ladies' Local Examination."

14. In considering this question of dishonest puffing of the school and of the results of its pupils' examinations the Complainant will ask the Commissioners to investigate each of the notices of that character published in the *Stratford Beacon* ever since Mr. McBride had charge of the school and determine how far he is responsible for the misrepresentation therein and especially the notice of the last June Matriculation Examination which was replete with dishonest representations of the kind complained of and for which the Complainant believes Mr. McBride is responsible.

15. In replying in the month of September 1884 to some criticisms made by the Complainant upon the results of the then last examinations he (Mr. McBride) said of the Complainant: "He thinks the number passed should be proportionate to the number attending school but he forgets (?) that the influx last half year was into the junior forms and pupils from these forms are not sent up to Departmental or University Examination" thus trying to mislead the public that he had not the material in the Upper School to draw from whereas in his report to the Board at their July meeting he states that the attendance in the Upper School for the half year is 36 or 33 in excess of the first half of 1883 or more than half the reported average increase for the whole school for the past half year."

Either statement must the Complainant submits have been knowingly and wilfully false and misleading.

16. The Complainant had called attention to the fact that the failures at the 1884 Departmental Examinations were largely in Arithmetic taught by Mr. McBride and he replied as follows on 17th September 1884. "Further on he says 34 failed in Mathematica and of these 16 failed in Arithmetic. I have before me the report from the Educational Department signed by the Secretary in which I find he is quite astray in his 35 and that 14, not 16 are reported as having failed in Arithmetic."

The Complainant charges that this was a dishonest statement that he (the Complainant) corrected it publicly shewing he had under-estimated instead of over estimated the failure but the said Mr. McBride never withdrew his misrepresentation.

17. The complainant will also ask the Commissioner to investigate fully the following statements made by Mr. McBride in his letter published on the 17th September 1884: "In regard to Intermediate he says I sent up 37 as fit. Again he is wrong. I did not send up 37; moreover several of those whose names were entered I did not think fit and I did not hesitate to tell them so but of course had not power to prevent their applying. 'Tis true I thought some of them fit and in fact induced them to write but these either passed or came so near it that we thought most of them justified in appealing."

In the face of the facts that his report as published claim 37 as sent up for Intermediate, and that the whole third form was Complainant believes distinctly to be by him a school that each and every of them must go up or go back to the second form. These statements of Mr. McBride are I submit most disingenuous and furnish formidable evidence of want of integrity.

18. In July 1885 the Board were considering Inspector Seath's report which reflected somewhat severely on the teaching in the Classical Department of the School and the teachers responsible therefor being Messrs. Mayberry and McBride they represented to the Board that such a report was unfair as Mr. Seath had really only inspected one class in classics and that composed of only three pupils.

The Complainant claims that Mr. McBride in making this false representation and allowing Mr. Mayberry who was the chief spokesman of the two ignorantly as the Complainant believes to urge it on the Board as he did was guilty of a most mean and dishonest act.

19. Thereupon at that and a subsequent meeting a number of members of the Board attacked Mr. Seath in the strongest manner and denounced such supposed misconduct on his part of reporting thus on such slight inspection or means of knowledge and instructed Mr. McGregor and the Complainant to bring this under the notice of the Minister of Education