

to avoid compromising their sacred office, and injuring interests of a still higher order, they have felt themselves and still feel themselves bound to use great prudence; even in some places they have not thought it consistent with their duty to accept the office of commissioner. It is emphatically as *curés*, and in some places as *curés* only, that they can render the greatest services to public education.

If, in order to give greater importance to the office, no more than one Inspector were to be appointed in a county, the remuneration must of necessity be slightly increased, and as one of the principal motives of opposition to the present Inspectors has been their salaries which they receive from the Government, that opposition would be much increased by the levying of the amount, by local taxation of the inhabitants of the county. Might we not apprehend that, in some places, it would fail to be provided for, and be raised in a very irregular way?

If the law did not restrict the choice of Inspectors to teachers, they might be regarded, under this system, as being virtually excluded, for influences much stronger than what any of them possess would be set to work in the County Council. If, on the other hand, the law restricted the choice to teachers, might we not apprehend that they would become, with a view to obtaining the office, partisans of one of the factions into which counties are generally divided, and so throw away in petty intrigues and degrading efforts, the time and the energy which they owe to the instruction of youth, together with what is of equal importance, the respect of the public?

Neither can I understand that an Inspector should not be removable. Will he be liable to periodical re-election by the County Council or only to dismissal in case of neglect or bad conduct? In either case he would be too dependent on local authority, nay, we may say he would be immediately dependent on each school municipality, seeing that the latter are generally the same as the rural municipalities, and the County Council is composed of the mayors of the same respectively. Will the Superintendent of Education be permitted to dismiss an Inspector who has been appointed by the County Council? In such a case, what a struggle will ensue for the ascendancy! Has not the Superintendent enough on his hands in contending with the School Commissioners, without bringing him also in collision with the County Councils?

A purely local and municipal system of inspection supposes, moreover, the existence of a population which has long enjoyed municipal institutions and had the benefit, for several generations, of a system of primary instruction. The Inspector is, in that case, less the agent of the central than of the local authority, and it is natural that he should be appointed and paid by the latter. But this system would still leave room to wish for the official agent of the central authority, as Mr. Rendu so well expresses it in the passage above quoted. Even these persons who would not have the inspection lodged in the hands of the central authority, who would wish to decentralize the direction of public education, must admit that in order to effect this, they must change our legislation.

Let us look back to the time when the present school system was inaugurated in Lower Canada, and we shall confess that the undertaking was at its outset apparently a moral impossibility. The establishment of a system of public instruction by the agency of local and municipal authorities, themselves elective amidst a population who had been always opposed to every system of direct taxation, among whom primary instruction had been, by a succession of occurrences ever to be regretted, almost completely interrupted for a period of ten years, was in truth asking men of no education to educate others—men who set their faces against all taxes to tax themselves for a purpose of the importance of which they were ignorant. The law, moreover, had only prescribed one restriction as regards the choice of Commissioners, and that restriction, however favorable to the rate-payers, was very far from being so to the establishment of schools. In order to be a Commissioner it was not necessary (nor indeed is it so now) to have any education whatsoever, to know even how to read or write; all that was re-

quired was to be a rate-payer as the owner of real property. There was nothing to prevent the election of five proprietors at once the most ignorant and the most hostile to taxes of any kind. And this used to be done, and unhappily is done still, though not so frequently. To attain the success, as we have, under such circumstances, was it not to prove the falsity of the keenest human foresight? It is true that on the one hand the law had enacted various penalties, and that on the other hand it counted on the efforts and zeal of educated men, at the head of whom would naturally be found members of the clergy. It counted, moreover, (and this has not proved the least important element of its success) on the good sense, the spirit of order and the peaceful and pious habits of the population. But these penalties and restrictions had been valueless without the aid of the central authority to apply them. It was necessary that the zeal and the efforts of educated men should be seconded and sustained by an authority independent of that which it was intended to supervise, frequently even to control. In fact the good disposition of the Canadian people required to be stimulated and developed by men specially charged with that mission, and receiving fair remuneration for their struggles with men—educated men, unfortunately, but partisans of ignorance, with a view to the attainment of political ends. Thence arose the office of Inspector, and only since its creation has any progress been made.

Since that time the opposition to schools has not ceased to exist, but taken a fresh direction. It is no longer directed against taxation absolutely (although in many places there is still a predilection in favor of the illusory resource of voluntary subscription), but its aim is now to prevent the increase of teachers' salaries, to impede the establishment of Model Schools, and to oppose all improvements necessary to promote the progress of education. So well aware of this were the Legislature and the Government, that every succeeding Session has conferred new powers on the Department, to enable it to contend with these

TABLE A.

NAMES OF 27 INSPECTORS.	Extent of the districts in superficial (acres).	Population in 1861.	Number of schools under control.	Number of scholars.	Salary of each inspector.
J. B. F. Painchaud.....	2,651	5	271	\$ 125
Joseph Meagher.....	13,092	30	2,662	700
Thomas Tremblay.....	241,340	11,426	21	905	600
V. Martiu.....	69,669	10,478	26	1,116	500
G. Tanguay.....	584,092	60,473	181	7,961	875
S. Boivin.....	209,007	21,324	45	1,935	500
John Hume.....	214,121	26,232	83	3,340	750
F. E. Juneau.....	34,442	99	6,837	700
P. F. Bédard.....	685,437	35,935	106	6,690	700
J. Crépault.....	396,134	41,748	138	6,534	750
P. M. Bardy.....	544,571	100,498	180	11,986	1,000
Rev. R. Pless.....	10,931	16	1,205	250
P. Hubert.....	443,909	51,956	122	7,000	750
G. A. Bourgeois.....	175,000	22,581	71	2,998	700
B. Maurault.....	333,482	37,608	112	6,075	750
H. Hubbard.....	484,143	47,033	284	9,868	800
R. Parmelee.....	390,704	49,813	246	8,107	875
J. N. A. Archangeault.....	47,687	112	7,588	800
C. H. Leroux.....	931,219	55,945	172	10,547	800
Michel Caron.....	45,563	131	7,924	700
Louis Grondin.....	470,523	44,638	114	7,856	700
John Bruce.....	331,139	58,231	150	8,303	1,000
F. X. Valade.....	424,175	117,068	150	8,644	1,000
A. D. Dorval.....	630,003	72,885	193	10,432	875
C. Germain.....	393,584	49,398	133	7,476	750
G. B. Rouleau.....	27,148	43	1,796	550
Wm. Hamilton.....	826,227	13,866	39	1,692	550
Totals.			3,004	157,748	19,050