

moreover, several letters had appeared in the newspaper of a neighboring village; but as Mr. Hepburn was in a position to repudiate either being the writer or the inspirer of the articles in question, his defence was confined to what he had said about the College among his parishioners and fellow-townsmen, and for this he expressed regret. In justification of the Principal, under whom the institution has enjoyed a longer period of prosperity, perhaps, than at any time previously, the matter could not be allowed to rest here, and, before the meeting closed, the following resolution was passed: "We, the Corporation of St. Francis College, having heard the statement made by Principal Bannister *re* the standing of the College, and in view of what has appeared in the *Granby Leader*, desire to place on record our satisfaction with the status of the College and our continued confidence in Principal Bannister, and we repudiate as false and misleading what has appeared in the *Granby Leader*." Our purpose in referring to this matter is not so much to give publicity to the event, as to urge upon all our communities the necessity of rallying round the school of the district. Mr. Hepburn, in his defence, disclaimed any desire on his part to injure the College, his purpose being merely to improve what he thought to be defective in the management of the institution. And we cannot but accept his statement as an honest one. His manner of bringing about a reform, however, is objectionable, and it is this we wish to emphasize in mentioning the case. The teacher needs sympathy from all—not antagonism. His work is the work of the community, and, unless the community comes to the support of his conscientious efforts in behalf of the coming community, there is a canker eating at the root of intellectual progress in such a locality. It is always a suicidal policy to defame the teacher. Even when he is thought to be wrong or injudicious, there is a way of coming near him with sympathetic advice, and we can hardly think that the outcome of the Richmond investigation does other than prove this. As a parallel case to the above, we have followed, with some interest a libel suit in England, in which a member of the School Board was charged with defaming the teacher. The summing-up of the Judge, Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams, is as follows:—

"Undoubtedly, the words which were published were words which were capable of the meaning—that the writer charged the plaintiff with personal cruelty towards the children. We have had this investigation, and I must say that it is abundantly clear that the defendant could make out no case of any such cruelty. On the other hand, I think every one who has watched the evidence