

understand why it is that the Government refuses to give the county power to dismiss at pleasure, and insists upon the clause as to the power of dismissal by Government for cause. It would really appear to me as if the Government thinks that the public money which this House agrees shall be spent among the people of this country is Government money; and maintains that, when we—the representatives of the people—determine that we will spend the people's money in a particular way, the Government—the Executive—is to have the power of interfering with the manner in which that money is to be spent; arguing thus: "We contribute half the price, and we ought to have something to say to the officer." But, Sir, they do not pay; they may, perhaps, hand over the money when we tell them to do so; but it is the people of the country, through their representatives, who pay their own money. And I think that the people of the country have sufficient confidence in the county officials—men chosen by themselves—to trust to them to determine whether the Inspector is doing his duty, or is deserving of dismissal. I say, Sir, that it is a miserable attempt to take away our heritage by offering us this mess of pottage—by offering, in fact, to bribe us with our own money. They may use the same argument with respect to the public money paid over to municipalities, and claim the power of dismissing Reeves and County Treasurers because of malfeasance in the administration of this money. These Inspectors ought to be free from the apprehension of being dismissed by the Government, either because they have displeased Government or because they have displeased the Chief Superintendent. I do not see why the Government should press this clause, which was proved on a division to be distasteful to a large majority of this House on a former occasion, and which I believe will be found distasteful to a large majority again. With regard to the existing certificates of teachers, I say that every man who reads this Bill, and who listened to the speech of the hon. Secretary, without the answer that was extracted from him, must come to the conclusion that the Bill is not consistent with his speech. But the answer extracted from him shows that it is not intended to give up any of the power taken by the Bill; and I say that the practical result is, that the day that this Bill is passed the Council of Public Instruction may meet and settle its programme and regulations, and supersede the qualification of every teacher in the country. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that the Council does not intend to deal unfairly with the teachers. I do not know. The hon. gentleman is not the Council of Public Instruction. We all know who the Council of Public Instruction is—we all know that it is the Chief