

often be a policy of waste. It is certainly not true to say that it is a matter of indifference to an employer whether many inefficient laborers are engaged at low wages or a smaller number of efficient laborers at a more adequate wage—although many employers are short-sighted enough for their own interests not to see how this can be. It is absolutely untrue that, where only one laborer can be employed, one inefficient laborer at a low wage is as economical as a skilled laborer at a higher wage; for, in the first case, the work may not be done at all. Wages are, according to Adam Smith, for the encouragement of industry; and all experience goes to show that the well-paid laborer is not merely absolutely, but relatively as well, the more productive of the two. There is certainly a false economy in low wages and a decided economic importance to be attached to what the Scottish Reformers, when they drew up the Book of Discipline, on which not merely the school system of Scotland, but the school systems of the United States and Canada have been based, called "an honest stipend"; and the economy of high wages becomes the more apparent the more the reliance which must be placed on the worker. In the commonest manual labor, where the laborers work under direction, it may possibly be a matter of indifference whether cheap labor or dear is hired; but the greater the demands made on the mental and the moral nature of the worker, the more nearly is it true that low wages show a low standard of efficiency and that the inefficiency is due to the low wages. Wages are "for the encouragement of industry," and, where the encouragement is wanting, the industry will fail. The standard of efficiency in any trade or industry or profession falls where the wages which are for the encouragement of industry are falling, or do not advance as quickly as in similar professions. For

a time custom and habit, professional pride or personal devotion, may prevent the decline of the standard; but, in the long run, a poorly paid profession will have a low standard. There may be many other reasons for men entering the particular trade or profession, and yet it remains true that, when in any calling the rate of remuneration falls off relatively to other and similar callings, the standard of efficiency also falls. The newcomers who are attracted to the profession are not of the same quality, nor have they as high qualifications as their predecessors. So, in one way and another, the standard of the profession falls—following the rate of wages.

It is perhaps a matter of doubt whether average wages are rising or falling in the profession of teaching. Some insist, indignantly or with lamentations, that the standard for the remuneration of teachers has fallen considerably; and others, more hopeful, chronicle with triumph any slight improvement. In the lack of precise information it would be useless to attempt to decide the dispute; and, moreover, it is unnecessary; for on two essential points there is practical agreement. Wages of teachers have not risen so fast nor so far as wages in other employments; and, at the present day, for the common-school teacher there are not, as there used to be, any prizes in the profession. Wages and salaries may be higher and the general conditions of teaching may be better than they were fifty—even twenty—years ago; but if the improvement has not kept pace with the improvement in other callings, requiring similar skill and ability, the net attractiveness of the profession has diminished. The importance of the second point can hardly be overestimated. Wage theorists insist that, in estimating the net attractiveness of any trade or profession, we must take account of the chances that offer of