

Report alleges, "furnishes an illustration of the Provincial Normal and Model School system," while the latter, it affirms, affords only an illustration of "*the old system*, except in the character and furniture of the School-houses." This statement also, seems to have been made to meet the objections of a certain writer against the whole School system, "on account of the state (and expensiveness) of the Common Schools of the city of Toronto."

Now, while willing to concede to the Normal and Model School System all the excellence it may reasonably claim, I cannot suppose that any system will be exalted in the estimation of the community by invidious comparisons, and misrepresentations entirely at variance with facts.

The Public Schools of Toronto have had to contend against many antagonistic influences which have retarded their progress and efficiency from the earliest period of their existence, but more particularly since the adoption of *the free principle*; but, I emphatically deny that they have, in any degree, failed in their beneficent design from the causes alleged in the special Report of the Chief Superintendent.

The question of fact, is, whether "Toronto has ignored the Normal School," and "has not placed a Normal School Teacher in charge of one of the Public Schools of the City, and has only employed two or three in subordinate positions?" Having for many years taken an active part in the Board of Public School Trustees, in this City, and occupied the place of Chairman of the Committee on appointments to office during the whole period, I believe of my connexion with the City Schools, I give my unhesitating testimony, that, in no instance within my knowledge or recollection, was any teacher who applied for office rejected on the ground of his or her being a Normal School Student, or having only a Normal