

nection between this abhorred thing and a State teaching service. Even teachers have shared this feeling, and although anxious to see their work placed on a secure and dignified basis, have not wished that it should be differentiated by peculiar public marks from other professions. While, however, the open avowal of a vital connection between the teaching service and the State is evaded, in that very connection lies the real explanation of everything that has thus far been done to maintain the service. The support of normal schools by public funds, the public examination of teachers, State diplomas, State supervision, and so on, are all declarations that something far more abiding and uniform than the law of supply and demand regulates, and must regulate, the work of the schools. If this were not a profound and well recognized truth, every other trade and profession would be clamouring against what is already done for teachers as class legislation.

The drift of events during the last ten years, especially the passion for organized effort which has developed on every hand, has done much to allay undue sensitiveness as to caste and distinctions, and meanwhile the evils arising from the partial recognition of the public responsibility for an efficient teaching service have had their effect. We have at least passed the *laissez faire* stage, and are now quite ready to consider what the State should do, that it has not done, to render the service which it almost monopolizes decently remunerative and permanent. Practically, at this time, the State has the monopoly of elementary instruction among us, and if it does not do the work well it injures itself and defrauds everybody. We may be positively sure that no work is well done in this world, least of all in this American world, which pays only a miserable pittance and offers no chance for securing a com-

petence. How far this charge can be made against the work of public instruction in this country it is difficult to say, the scale of salaries here being more variable than anywhere else, with the possible exception of England. In Massachusetts, for example, the average is high, viz.: for men \$108.85 per month and for women \$45.93, with an average school year of 8.55 months. This gives an average annual salary for men of \$930.66 and for women of \$392.70. In North Carolina, on the contrary, the average salary for men is only \$24.57 a month and for women \$21.95, with an average school year of 3.17 months. This gives an average annual income for public school service of \$77.88 for men and \$69.58 for women. In the one State, the service has the essential characteristics of a recognized, well-defined profession; in the other it is largely a make-shift for eking out an uncertain income. Between these extremes there is almost every possible gradation. Obviously the policies that are practicable in one State are out of the question in another.

It must be admitted, however, that few States afford an average salary sufficient to insure living expenses and a fair margin for the future. Until this level is reached the service lacks a most important element, whether security or efficiency be considered. It is the recognition of this weak point that is giving strength to the movement in certain States for securing teachers' pensions. This movement follows the precedent of all foreign nations in which public instruction is treated as a State service. It is perhaps not wise to reason too closely from such precedents to our own country, the conditions of labour, the standards of living, and the purchasing power of money being so dissimilar; nevertheless, we can hardly fail to find profitable suggestion in the consideration of the status