

and absence of harmony and want of agreement of method or aim are fatal to the success of the school. Even Arnold would have failed to raise Rugby if he could not have surrounded himself with men after his own heart. A weak master, whether head or assistant, is not simply a neutral element in a school: he is a cause of difficulty and mischief. The evil resulting from his retention is only slightly less in degree than that arising from positive defects of moral character. Such a man should be removed, and the only question is: Who shall have the responsibility of removing him; who shall have the thankless duty?

The difficulties of the question are admitted on all sides and in regard to every grade of education. For instance, a few nights ago, Major Rasch asked Mr. Acland "whether he had considered the position of teachers who were now liable to dismissal at the will of the managers of schools; and whether he would grant them some security of tenure by permitting an appeal to the Department, without which no dismissal should be valid." In reply, Mr. Acland said: "This question has been frequently under my consideration, and I should be very glad if I could do something to mitigate the hardships which arise in connexion with this matter. It is very difficult to discover a satisfactory remedy, though the Department has given much attention to the subject. I may, however, say that I do not think a general power of appeal to the Department would work well."

In endowed schools the question has cropped up in connexion with both headmasters and assistants. The conditions of tenure of office in both cases are arranged by the schemes of the Charity Commission. There is no absolute fixity of tenure in either case. The Commission leaves it to the headmaster to judge

of the fitness of his assistants, and holds him responsible for the successful working, and often the economical working, of the school. He must keep the salary list below an assigned limit, or make up the deficiency. In some schools with small endowment he must finance the institution as well as manage it. Hence, he has not only the appointment, but also the dismissal, of his assistants. At the same time, if the governors are dissatisfied with his management, they have the power of dismissing him without reason assigned. Moreover, where there are funds, the governors hold the purse strings and annually vote the amount to be devoted to salaries. Hence the usual custom amounts to this, that the headmaster has the power and responsibility of appointing and dismissing assistants, subject to the approval of the governing body. This plan has been in operation for a quarter of a century, and has worked well. It would be very difficult to devise any single method which would better suit the very varied circumstances of the endowed schools of the country. No doubt it is true that a power in the hands of one man is always liable to abuse, but in twenty-five years probably not more cases of alleged arbitrary or cruel conduct on the part of a headmaster have occurred than can be counted on the fingers. Very little, therefore, could be gained by changing the arrangement, and the administration of the schools might very easily be enfeebled by a weakening of authority. It is very clear, moreover, that, if an appeal is to be granted to assistants against their headmasters, the appeal should not be to the governors. They know too much of the case to take up a strictly impartial or judicial attitude. If they disapprove, they have their remedy. An appeal to them would amount to little more than a challenge to them