

able to get a better on the first opportunity, is not likely to accept the lowest salary a niggardly Board of Trustees may offer. It is only the teacher who feels doubtful about his success, or who cares little whether he succeeds or not, that grasps greedily at the first situation offered him. And yet Trustees, too often, because he is *cheap*, enter into bonds with him to teach their school forgetting that they are perhaps sacrificing and even worse than sacrificing every dollar they pay him.

2. Cheapness often means *failure*. The successful teacher never offers himself at a low salary, and that for the simple reason that he knows some trustees will give him good value for his services.

3. Cheapness also means indifference to success. Those who take up the profession as a "make shift," what do they care for the prosperity of their school? Their position is one of necessity, not choice. And just as soon as the opportunity offers they leave it for something more congenial.

These being the principal causes of

cheapness in the salaries of teachers, it needs no argument to show that such cheapness is *false economy*. What is it but a waste of money to pay a salary that is never earned? What greater mistake could possibly be conceived, than to place a teacher in charge of a school who neither realized the responsibility of his position nor cared for the prosperity of his pupils? And besides the loss of his own time there is the permanent injury which he inflicts, injury which his successor, no matter how well qualified, cannot speedily remedy. Habits of insubordination and inattention are formed, which may never be fully overcome and much time lost even partially to repair the injury done, and all through a false idea of economy. How surprising that in this practical age, when every trade and every employer of labor seems so anxious to get full value for his money, that school trustees utterly disregard all those economic principles of business by which investments may rationally be expected to realize the greatest profits.

COMPOSITION—HOW TO TEACH IT.

BY RICHARD LEWIS, TORONTO.

Paper II.

The object we have in view in the practice of Composition, is not to foster authorship. We have book makers enough even to surfeit, and he who possesses the primary conditions of literary power, originality of thought and the faculty of invention, will never fail to find expression for mental conceptions and creations. But composition is a fine art; and it is necessary to understand its principles before we can truly appreciate, enjoy and receive the best advantages, from the elaborate productions of great thinkers, or the creations of

genius. Public taste in literature amongst us is low, with all our boast of progress. Fiction is chiefly read, not only because it pleases the imagination, but because it makes no demand on the judgment, or the reasoning faculties. As fiction ascends and approaches philosophy or true poetry, it diminishes in popularity. The works of Shakspeare or Milton are more talked of than read, by the great public. Excepting where there is a native love of noble poetry, the average educated public cannot enjoy Shakspeare or Milton, because they cannot understand them. Poetry like