

holding their positions, can thoroughly and satisfactorily discharge their Inspectoral duties when they have so large a number of schools in their respective Inspectoral districts, as they now have. The size of the schools does not matter so much as their number.

Reduce the number and give either of these gentlemen thirty or forty schools to over-look, and they can do the work well and much more satisfactorily to themselves and the public than they can ever attempt to do now. In fact, and it must be evident to any one who considers the matter, the Inspectors have at present no chance. With thirty or forty good large schools, well kept, well taught, well-disciplined, they could inspect each one thoroughly four or five times a year, and I have no doubt but that they would find much more pleasure and satisfaction in the discharge of their duties under such circumstances than they can with the cursory methods which they must, perforce, adopt at present.

Here let me ask, is the system of inspection, which the public demands, the right one? I do not think so. The common idea is that the Inspector should visit the schools as frequently as possible (which under present conditions cannot be often) and examine the classes. I do not know that the present Inspectors adopt or act upon this idea. I know it is generally held, but as the Inspectors happen to be good men, I am inclined to think they may hold a wider view. It seems to me that the *purpose* of inspection *is* inspection and *not* examination. An Inspector should be able to take any class, high or low, in hand and examine it. He should occasionally do so, but it does not seem to me that that is really inspection. It may be, and I think is an incident very essential to successful and thorough inspection, but it is not inspection. It seems to me that inspection means seeing how the teacher carries on his work; seeing that it is properly carried on, and that it is kept up to