

of at least a few, to exalt themselves as a sort of educational martyrs who, from purely unselfish motive, are daily immolating themselves upon the public school altar of their country, and demand as a right that a grateful community shall applaud the sacrifice, and prepare for them a suitable place of sepulture!

But our motives are *not* purely unselfish, and there is no martyrdom about the business. We are simply public servants, in a sort of semi-civil capacity, perfectly free to come or go as we choose, and the Legislature, by virtue of this very semi-civil relationship to it, and in consideration of the average low rate of remuneration we receive, has consented to shelter us with its ægis in the hope of raising the educational status of the people, and thereby making them happier and better.

It becomes us, then, under these, or in fact under any, circumstances, to have a regard not only to what we would like, or what we want, but to what the country is warranted in doing for us, if indeed it is warranted in doing anything at all.

Personally, I am opposed to gratuities in every shape, whether they be disguised as exemption from taxation, sinecures, or pensions properly so-called, save and except when the latter are awarded to private soldiers, who may have been disabled in the service of their country.

What we want out of the Superannuation Fund is not a pension, but what we have earned and saved, along with what is due to us by the country, but has not hitherto been paid. To be the recipient of a pension is simply to be a national pauper, unless it can be shewn that a substantial equivalent has been rendered for value received by the pensioner.

To put the Fund on the basis indicated, is, it seems to me, the object to which we should direct our best ener-

gies at this meeting of the Ontario Teachers' Association, and when we recall to mind that no less a sum than \$43,000 was taken from the Provincial Treasury last year to satisfy the claims upon the Fund, we may cease, in some measure, to wonder at the ominous mutterings of some M.P.'s. The total abolition of the scheme would be such a gross breach of faith on the part of the Legislature, and would bring so much real distress to a large number of worn-out teachers, that we may dismiss its consideration altogether from our discussions.

Taking it for granted then that the intention is not to abolish it, what do we want? What modification of it do we propose?

Merely to enumerate all the changes that have been proposed from time to time during the past twenty years would occupy us too long, and this we shall not attempt.

After complying with the request to read a paper introducing this subject, I addressed upwards of a hundred circulars to Teachers' Associations, Inspectors and Principals all over the Province for the purpose of eliciting information as to how the condition of the Fund was regarded in their localities. The replies I received were numerous, and pretty evenly distributed. Only in a few instances was I informed that the County Association had never passed any resolution on the matter, or had never given it any consideration at all.

The suggestions regarding which there seemed to be most unanimity may be arranged in the following order:

That annual payments ought either to be not less than \$10, or that they be optional within the limits of \$5 and \$10.

That every woman engaged in teaching should be compelled to pay not less than \$2 per annum.

That the pension should be reckoned in proportion to amount of payment as well as years of service.

That no refund of payments should be