

ance has protested against the baths and municipal building. It opposes the baths on the ground that landlords should be compelled by law to put these in the city.

There has been boodling on the San Francisco School Board. A civil suit between one J. P. Reynolds and an investment company will, no doubt, bring all the details of the case to light.

In Reynolds' preliminary affidavit, however, is set forth a scheme of corruption which, if true, will be sufficient to land seven members of the School Board behind prison bars. Briefly, the charges are these, Reynolds alleges that after the courts had decided that the Lincoln School property, consisting of eleven most valuable business buildings, between the Emporium and Fifth street on Market street, belonged to the School Board, the Board decided to lease it.

The investment company, of which the plaintiff is a member, was, he claims, incorporated simply to secure this valuable lease. In order to make sure of getting it, the company decided to buy the Board of Education. Reynolds says that Director Waller of the Board agreed to control seven votes for \$4,000, with \$1,000 for himself.

The bids for the lease, it is claimed, were so advertised that bidders were unable to conform to the conditions. The bid of the investment company, it is charged, was not filled out till the others were known, and then it was made \$41 higher than the highest. Thus the lease was secured by the investment company. As the lease is in a fair way to pay fifty per cent. interest on the money invested, it will be seen how valuable a property it is.

Reynolds, the plaintiff, was to receive 1,850 shares in the Investment company as a reward for his services in

securing the lease. He received but 1,000, and sues to recover the balance. The members of the Board who are charged by Reynolds deny the charges, and are trying to discredit the character of Reynolds himself. It is likely that the whole matter will be sifted, and it is best for San Francisco's good name that it should be.

The following instance shows how easily it is to trump up a charge against the poor teacher, and we know one teacher in the Dominion at least who will see in the instance how history repeats itself:

At Thetford Petty Sessions Miss Edith Wagg, head mistress of the infants' department of the Board School, was summoned for assaulting a child named Herbert A. Sterne, to which she pleaded not guilty. The evidence showed that the child was brought to school, by its mother, crying. Defendant took him into the school, and was going towards a class room, when he threw himself down on the floor and kicked and shouted. He continued to be very obstinate, and she had to slap his face—one gentle slap, and no more. Mrs. Sterne called once on the Tuesday and once on the Wednesday, each time demanding some recompense, but, as she could not get any, she told defendant she should prosecute. The Bench, after a few minutes' consultation, dismissed the case.

There is another of the rueful knights who has the most dreadful things to say about the examiners. Before it was a defeated candidate for a sub superintendency in New York, now it is a candidate for lay headmastership in England. And our English contemporary thus teases him over his recalcitrancy: Mr. T. E. Page, of Charterhouse School, is not happy. He wouldn't be happy till he'd got it—his lay headmaster—and, now that