

appointment of Mr. Hunter, a High School Master, to Brantford, some years ago, and of Mr. Mills, another High School Master, more recently, to Guelph, the Ontario Government conceded the principle and acknowledged our claim.

The profession fairly expected, then, that when the vacancy occurred lately in the Asylum for the Blind at Brantford some prominent and successful Master of a Collegiate Institute or High School would be selected to fill it; and they had reason to expect this the more because the Minister of Education—the champion of teachers' interests—was also a Minister of the Government with which the appointment lay. But the Government in this instance, for reasons best known to itself, has departed from this commendable course, and has made the position a reward for political services. I am not saying a word against the recipient, whom I do not know; I am only protesting against the principle of making the educational institutions of our country subordinate or subservient in any shape or form to party exigencies. My contention is that when a prize of this kind falls out, the best and fittest man should win it without any reference to politics, and that this best and fittest man is most likely to be found in the ranks of High School Masters, for the reason that their literary attainments are guaranteed by the University degree they must have; their calling renders them acquainted with the various idiosyncracies of youth and eminently fitted to deal with them; and their life work brings them into close and earnest sympathy with Education in every phase, particularly with the education of that unfortunate class whose only usefulness and enjoyment of life depend on the educational efforts put forth in their behalf.

The profession are not alone in thinking that the Government should have given the principalship of the Blind Asylum at Brantford to some High School Head Master and not to a political servant.

What private *cause*, they had, alas, I know not, that made them do it; they are wise and honourable, and will no doubt with reasons answer you.

Hoping that these sentiments will meet with your approval and advocacy,

I remain, yours very truly,

A. PURSLOW.

HIGH SCHOOL, PORT HOPE,

May 30th, 1881.

THE REPORT OF THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION FOR 1879.

WE give insertion to the following letter from the Education Department with the comments of the Reviewer of the Minister's Report thereon.—ED. C. E. M.

To the Editor of the C. E. Monthly:

SIR,—In criticising the Report of the Minister of Education for 1879, in the April number of the CANADA EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY you make a curious blunder. You state that the average salaries, multiplied by the total number of teachers (Table D), should equal the total amount paid to them during the year, as given in Table A. Why should they? The figures reported in Table A contain only moneys paid between the 1st of January and the 31st of December, generally, including salaries of the current year, and arrears of previous years, omitting however balances due but not paid on 31st of December; while Table D shews simply the average salaries at which teachers are engaged, and has nothing to say to payments. One instance will suffice in explanation. Suppose a teacher to be employed at a salary of \$500 per annum, and the school kept open but six months: in this case his salary would be reported in Table D as at the rate of \$500 per annum and in Table A only \$250 would appear as having been paid to him. The product therefore obtained through the multiplication of average salaries by number of teachers, does not, and ought not, to tally with the sums paid to teachers during the year. It is singular that a critic so keen as the Editor of the EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY should have fallen into such an error, and still more strange that he should, on such an illusory