

many teachers, apprehensive of this danger attending examinations in other Counties than their own, lest an offended Inspector or a "doubtful" Examiner might exercise his authority to their detriment. But so far, we are not informed that the danger was anything more than imaginary. On a Central Board there could be but very little danger from such a cause.

*Cheapness.* In this respect there could be but little, if any difference, as somebody must necessarily take charge of the candidates in every County—the only saving would be in the time now occupied in examining papers over and above what is required to conduct the examination.

There is one objection to the Central Board system, which if removed, would at once

settle its superiority, that is, could the work be done with sufficient despatch to meet the wants of the community? To overcome that difficulty, it would be necessary to have as many Examiners on the Board as there were subjects of examination, and the county examinations must needs be held at such a time, that all the candidates for certificates could be apprised of the result at least one month before the close of the year, in order to be prepared for an engagement at the beginning of the year following. Could this be done, we would have no objection to see our County Board abolished at once and a system adopted, uniform in its applications and applying equally to Normal School students as to candidates from every other educational institution.

---

#### COUNCIL OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION AND THE "PRESS."

We are very much surprised to notice that the Council of Public Instruction insists upon conducting its deliberations with "closed doors." As yet, we have failed to see any good or valid argument for this extraordinary course. We readily admit that there may be cases in which, owing to the nature of the discussion, such as investigations into the "private," character of officers, it might be judicious to exclude the "Press;" but in regard to the general business of the Council there is no argument which can be applied to this exclusiveness which would not equally apply to all other deliberative bodies. The very fact that the Council is now a representative body shuts out, or should shut out, all idea of secrecy. Surely it cannot be urged, that the constituency sending a representative has no right to know how he votes and speaks. Yet from the meagre reports of proceedings contained in the "minutes" of the Council, nearly all that can be ascertained of how Mr. Goldwin Smith, or Prof. Wilson, or Mr. Wood, says

or does, is covered up, under the pedantic and red-tape phraseology, "ordered" that so and so should be done. Why thus smother and bury the idea of responsibility? If changes are proposed in our Text Books, or any "Regulation" of the Council made a law by which we are to be governed, let its paternity be acknowledged, so that those who voted for Prof. Smith, or Prof. Wilson, or Mr. Wood, may know whether they are entitled to a renewal of confidence.

We can easily see how such a system would be admirable in a Parliament, for concealing the defection of not over-scrupulous politicians. Are we uncharitable if we suspect that it is quite possible, such obscurity of action may be made to serve a similar purpose on the Council of Public Instruction?

It is also well-known that the *debates* of any deliberative body are valuable as educational agencies. They are calculated to inform the public mind in regard to the abuses which legislation is designed to remove; they also assist in preparing the pub-