

long these are to be associated, now that the *Royal Canadian Readers* have made their appearance, may be readily answered. With their use, the bad teacher, so far as literature and the reading taste is concerned, must disappear. The series is so good, and the teacher's own intelligence and methods of instruction are so aided, that the use of the books must, we think, in Canada at any rate, become universal. Throughout Ontario there is a quiet but largely prevailing preference for a single set of Readers, and the Department will assume a grave responsibility if it does not sufficiently consider this. We do not wish to embarrass the Executive by any opinion we may express, nor are we in a position to say which series, if any, should be the sole choice of the Department, of those now submitted to it. One of the series we can scarcely be said to have seen. The series for which a snap judgment, in some quarters of the Province, was some time ago extorted, has already been cursorily referred to. But we are in a position to say that no series could have had the benefit of higher or more varied scholarship and practical experience than the "Royal Canadian" has had; and we venture to think that no Reading Books will more beneficially aid the general development of the pupil's intelligence or more gratifyingly shape the intellectual character of the typical Canadian youth, than will the various issues of these admirable Readers. Upon the decision of the acting-Minister and his colleagues in the choice of new Readers great interests will hang, for not only the status of education in the Province, but the moral integrity and independence of all branches of the profession, will be affected by the result arrived at. The matter, therefore, should be weightily considered.

THE PAY OF FEMALE TEACHERS.

THE *New York Tribune*, the best of American dailies, by the way, recently published an account of the "Strike of a Metropolitan Schoolmistress," the incidents of which are of a rather novel and startling character. The lady striker, it is affirmed, is a most experienced, accomplished, and successful

member of her profession, and at present in receipt of a salary of \$950 per annum. As the price of her many and complex services, in continuing to teach the young idea how to shoot, she is understood to have claimed from the School Board of New York the modest sum of \$5000 per *diem*. The advance demanded must have been a shock to the members of the Board. The claim, however, is well put forward, and if a little unreasonable, her arguments in support of it are worth considering, in view of the compensation paid for what not a few deem inferior services in the case of other toilers of her sex. Here is her argument:—

"Permit me to inquire, gentlemen, why, if Madame Patti hereafter is to receive \$5,000 a night for *her* services, I should not be paid at least as much for mine. She has a genius for singing, and I—it is the verdict of experts—have an equal genius for teaching. We both get our living largely in the use of our vocal organs, she in the opera house and I in the school-house; she by entertaining, I by instructing. What then? Is singing to be regarded as of pre-eminent account and teaching of no account? I am loth to believe, gentlemen, now that your attention has been called to this matter, that you will deny my request, since to do so would be tantamount to an official decision that the woman who entertains is first, while the woman who instructs is nowhere. I have deep and genuine enthusiasm for my vocation; I constantly magnify it; but you can readily understand that such a decision would be well calculated to quench my ardour. We are constantly reminded that 'we should do our utmost to encourage the Beautiful, since the Useful encourages itself.' But I submit, in view of my \$950 a year and Madame Patti's \$5,000 a night, it is high time that this particular piece of advice was reversed so far as the variety of the Useful known as teaching is concerned. I anticipate the reply that will be urged by those who would fain see my prayer for \$5,000 a day denied. They will call my attention to the fact that Patti supplies the world with a luxury, while I merely meet one of its necessities; and then they will go on to remark that political economy and experience alike demonstrate that people are willing to pay far more for the dispensable than for the indispensable, and inevitably they will wind up by echoing the famous exclamation of a brilliant Bostonian, 'Give me the luxuries of life, and I will dispense with its necessities.' But this sort of talk is more showy than forceful. It sounds plausible, but is it more than that? Who