

In conclusion, I have only to leave my reply to the charges made against me in the hands of the Government, assuring them that in no case have I ever been guilty of any irregularities in the performance of the duties of my office, nor have I wittingly violated the law or infringed any of the regulations of the Council of Public Instruction.

But in view of the conduct of Mr. Archibald and his insubordination, of which the members of the Government have had ample proof, as well as of the charges preferred by me against him, the Government must, I feel assured, see how exceedingly unpleasant my official position has been made, and the difficulties by which I have been surrounded in consequence of Mr. Archibald's constant and unprovoked aim to circumvent me in the discharge of some of the most important duties of my office.

MR. ARCHIBALD'S WRITTEN SPEECH TO THE COUNCIL.

Having endeavored to substantiate by proof the charges preferred against the Superintendent of Education, it now devolves upon me to follow up that proof by such a statement as will bring clearly to your notice, with what necessary proof has been presented. In doing so, I shall endeavor to follow the charges as nearly as possible in the order of their number, particularizing the point to be proved in each.

By the first charge, the Superintendent is accused of falsifying the valuation of two of the Provincial Examiners by preparing memos. for license bearing larger numbers than these examiner's envelopes. The two examiners referred to are Ross & Daly. In the case of Dr. Ross the charge has been proved true only as respects one candidate, viz.: No. 24, Station G, in whose case the envelope shows the following figures: 15, 35, 35, total 85, while the Superintendent's memos. shows the same valuation for all the branches or subjects, viz.: 35, 35, 35, total 105. It will be remembered that the Superintendent, when the envelope and memo. were compared, sought to throw the blame of the discrepancy upon me by calling attention to the blotting out of the Station No. as first written, and saying that a designing man could very easily substitute another envelope of the same station for the original one of this candidate. Possibly he might have succeeded in throwing discredit upon the proof in this case, and perhaps also in impressing some of you with the idea of a plot on my part against him had that envelope itself been my only recourse. Fortunately, however, the painstaking of the examiner placed that beyond his reach, the *private record* showing figures corresponding with the envelope and not with his memo. By no pos-