

a progress. In the making of appointments he has to give heed to the canvassers, but when they all have had their say he draws his own conclusions as to the ability of the respective candidates, and lets the brothers and sisters and cousins and aunts of the defeated candidates think what they may of his action, as long as he secures for the district the best teacher. In this he differs from the board's master, the man who is ever hugging his compound ignorance as an easily asserted sufficiency. The parish or municipality needs the services of the best teachers, and the good and true trustee puts forth every effort to secure them, while Master Ignorance is content with the cheapest teachers, and crows over his success in presence of the tax-payer whenever he has a chance. If a difficult case of discipline is mentioned in the hearing of the former, he labors to reduce the frictional points; whereas his lordship of the ash-heap is always on the *qui vive* to urge the chairman or the secretary to call a special meeting of the board so that he may have another opportunity of adding fuel to the flame that illuminates his own self-importance.

An author has written on the subject, "The Monarchs I have known," and a most entertaining volume it is; but when the teacher, perhaps taking the hint from what we have said, comes to the authorship of "The School Trustees I have met," what a scramble will there be for the early editions of the book, and what a number of libel suits will there be on hand for the knights of the flour-barrel and the ash-pit.

In looking over an advertisement the other day that announced a vacancy in one of our schools, we were struck with a clause in it which, in somewhat dubious English, declared that "References are no good." Now, if references are "no good" under

such circumstances, what sort of things are to be considered good when application for a situation is made by any of our teachers. The testimonial, we all know, is pretty well played out. A man or woman who has been baptized in a Christian Church, or who has any lingering attachment to one or two pews in any place of worship, has only to make application in the right quarter to be supplied with a bushel of testimonials that will set either of them up in life for any calling, as long as no further enquiry is made of their antecedents. In a word, the testimonial has run to seed through the good-heartedness of our clergymen. Then some boards have declared that they will have no personal calling on members of the board, and one corporation has even gone the length of saying that the remotest approach to a canvass will be visited with condign punishment. What then is the poor teacher in need of a situation going to do when on the point of applying for a vacancy, with "references no good," testimonials dubious, and all attempts at personal introductions prohibited? Is the knight of the ash-heap to have it all his own way, and continue to claim that the best teacher is the cheapest teacher and *vice versa*. In a remote section of one of the provinces the commissioners used to do away with even the written application. An advertisement was inserted in the paper, and trustees and candidates met on a given day in a given hall, and the various vacancies in the township put up at auction; lowness of salary and "good looks" no doubt being the counterpoise as the candidates came up respectively to be weighed in the balance.

But now that references are declared to be "no good," which means that no man should be called upon to give his private opinion about a candidate for a vacancy in any of our schools