

says the American people will pay more for what they could do without than for what they couldn't do without? If the assertion is true, then, by the shades of our forefathers, our Republic must be doomed, since that fragile simplicity which is one of its corner-stones has crumbled to decay. I would not, gentlemen of the Board, be understood as undervaluing the services of Patti; as arguing that they are among the things that we could do without. From all accounts it is worth \$5,000 a night to any appreciative audience to hear her sing. I myself have never had that pleasure—I could not spare the price of a ticket out of my \$950 a year. . . . In conclusion, permit me to say that even if I am not entirely successful in this application, I shall be quite satisfied if it perchance results in a discussion which leads to the formation of an International Society for the Re-adjustment of Compensations."

"How this appeal will strike the School Board," the *Tribune* remarks, "remains to be seen. We believe that they will deny her application, gently but decisively." To assuage her disappointment, the editor consolingly adds, that "Patti is paid not only more than she with her genius for instruction is paid, but more than is paid to any other sort of genius. . . . Many a newspaper man—we mention this in confidence—is glad to make a \$1000 a day, to say nothing of \$5000. What shall we say then? That woman is the crown of creation and that the foremost opera-singer is the crown of women? Or shall we say that some people are shockingly overpaid, and that the public is a gorgeous idiot for assenting to the over-payment?" Such are the incidents in this little bit of satire, and the *Tribune's* comments upon it. But is the story told for mere literary effect, or simply to create laughter? Is there not a moral? Does the pay of the teacher, male or female, correspond in any reasonable degree with that of men in business, or even with the skilled artisan? Many workmen earn from \$1500 to \$2000 a year in manual labour; and professional incomes, even in the case of the class we are accustomed to speak of as "the poor parsons," run up to very respectable, if not colossal, amounts. Some of the latter we have known whom one might accuse of incapacity to spend their fortunes. But where

did one ever hear of opulence in the case of a teacher, we were almost going to say, the collective body of teachers? As a class they are notoriously ill-paid, and their incomes are shamefully disproportionate to their services. In the case of women who take to the profession, their remuneration is little better than the pay of a factory hand. It is true that an adequate income possessed by the teacher would make him independent of that beneficent institution, the school-trustee; and with private resources he might crash through a whole jungle of these considerate and worthy gentlemen. Better, therefore, keep him poor and humble! Ah, good friend, are we not both in the same box? The poor editor may any day shake hands with the poor teacher. But can we not together build our airy castles, buy, in fancy, all the personal luxury we can enjoy, including social and professional deference (if we care for this), and immunity from each exasperating annoyance and every menacing trouble? True, we may have no wish to cut a great figure, or go through the world in a more ostentatious manner than comports with modest dignity. Yet who of us will say that a hundred dollars or so added to his income would be an oppressive burden, or keep him awake o' nights thinking how it was possible to spend the augmenting moiety? And is there one of us who feels that intellectual labour has here its adequate compensation or righteous reward? There may be few of the sex Patti's or "Jersey Lily's," though their lives, we may be sure, are not all sunshine; but do the incomes of these favourites of fortune bear any just relation to that of an Ontario schoolmistress? Are "singing and play-acting to be regarded of pre-eminent account and teaching of no account," may well be asked—and by all means, if possible, answered. But such queries are bootless; and to rail at inequalities of fortune is to bay at the moon. Yet might there not be some approach to justice—to humanity, we should add—in remunerating the services of the female teacher wherever employed? A beggarly two hundred dollars for a year's services in the education of youth in this