

in the community is felt, and that such instructors must be had at any price. True, there are occasional exceptions to be met, as is shown by some of the correspondence you have recently published and by the remarks of certain members of the Board, but such persons exist to represent a state of affairs which the modern world long since outgrew. No one can be blamed for being in these or any other matters prudent and reasonably economical, but to quibble over an increase of ten or a dozen cents a day in the salary of a teacher who has charge of from thirty to sixty young lives is not economy, but meanness; as a public policy it is neither economical nor just, but is penurious and suicidal. Yet there are some persons who will spend hundreds a year in dress and fine equipage, and amusements of one kind and another for themselves and families, who think it monstrous to pay an educated lady the paltry pittance of three or four hundred dollars a year for qualifying their sons and daughters for an honourable and useful life. Fortunately, such persons are not numerous, but the world would be richer if there were less. Nowhere can our people afford to be so lavish in expenditure as in our splendid schools. No community can afford to weigh money against the intellectual and moral life of our children. Not on the basis of dollars and cents, but on that of the dignity of her profession and importance of her services to the community is the teachers remuneration to be gauged. It is time this whole matter was settled, and settled on the line of what is just and right.—*Tax Payer, in the London Free Press.*

RECIPROCITY; THE AMERICAN MISAPPREHENSIONS. — Mr. George Hague, writing to the *Commercial Bulletin*, of New York, says: "The well-known fairness of the *Bulletin* in

discussing international and commercial questions, emboldens me to crave a line or two of space for comment on your article respecting Canada. The old reciprocity treaty, being one in natural products, did not affect the trade of Canada with Great Britain at all. But Unrestricted Reciprocity would simply mean admitting a large variety of manufactured goods from the United States free, while imposing a duty on the very same articles when imported from the Mother Country. To suppose that Great Britain would quietly submit to this is preposterous. It would be dishonourable and unreasonable in Canada to ask it. It could not be done. It is against common sense and against all the laws that govern the intercourse of dependencies with the Mother Country. It would, moreover, necessitate the assimilation of our tariff to yours. The American people are not such fools as to allow us to import European goods at a lower tariff than theirs, and then to send them across the border free. But in an assimilation of tariffs how could we expect to have a voice equal to that of the United States, which outnumbers us twelve to one. Our tariff would therefore be made for us at Washington. If our tariff were made at Washington, we might just as well have all our laws made there. This is where the charge of disloyalty comes in. In the one case, a disloyalty to Great Britain, and in the other, disloyalty to ourselves as a practically self-governing people. The truth is, there are the most extraordinary misapprehensions on your side about this country. Americans have a fixed impression that Canada is slow, unprogressive and unenterprising. The exact contrary is the fact. Since the Declaration of Independence, your population has increased twenty-fold; our population has increased thirty-five fold. Since the war of 1812, your