

OPEN LETTERS.

Women's Work and Wages.

THE act of the school board of St. Paul, Minnesota, in 1892, declaring that henceforth the same wages should be paid to teachers of both sexes in the public schools of that city, attracted much attention. I believe that it is the first experiment of the kind made in this country. It is certainly the first case in which a city has taken this step, though it may be that in this country, as in England, the same equalizing of pay has been put in operation in private or endowed schools, and in other isolated cases.

The question of why women receive less wages than men in the same employments has been exciting a great deal of attention of late, and is evidently destined to excite even more as time goes on. An interesting contribution to the discussion was made in "The Forum" some months ago by Mr. Carroll D. Wright, who cited many valuable statistics bearing upon it. He showed from the census returns for Massachusetts that there are now few lines of remunerative employment which are not open to women; that in domestic service she dominates the field; that in the trades she divides the field with the men in the proportion of nearly 1 to 2; and that in professional life "there is hardly a single field where we do not find her occupied, whether we turn to religion, medicine, literature, art, music, the drama, education, or science." As for wages, she is advancing in remuneration all along the line. Singers, artists, and other professional women are, in Mr. Wright's opinion, paid as well as men, or if not, "their compensation does not excite the sympathy or interest of the public."

In clerical work women are steadily occupying more of the field, and in some instances are receiving the same pay that men receive for like work. In the departments at Washington there is no distinction as to sex in the payment for clerkships. The women do not as a rule secure such high clerkships as the men, but for those which they obtain they receive equal pay with the men. In employments of lower grades, like type-writing, telegraphing, telephone-operating, bookkeeping, and the like, women are coming more and more to possess the field, and to regulate the price of their own labor by the law of supply and demand, while the men are leaving it for other and better-paying fields. In factory labor Mr. Wright showed by statistics that the wages of men and women are becoming equalized, and that, in the higher grades of work, requiring the most skill, the men and women are receiving about the same pay for the same work.

Mr. Wright gave several reasons why in most occupations women receive less wages than men, and why, in his opinion, they will continue to receive them in spite of social or economic or legislative considerations. In brief, these are, that woman is an entirely new economic factor in the industrial system; that she occupies a lower standard both in physical features and in mental demands; that she has an insufficient equip-

ment for life-work, due largely to matrimonial hopes; that she lacks the influence which comes from combination and association; and finally, that the entrance of women to the industrial field has created a supply out of proportion to the demand.

This idea that women could raise their wages by the aid of trade-unions has been advocated with much force and plausibility in England by Mr. Sidney Webb, but it has failed to meet the approval of one of the most zealous friends of women's work and condition, and one of the clearest economic writers of the day, Mrs. Millicent Garrett Fawcett, who maintained, in an article in "The Economic Journal," that the cardinal fact regulating wages is the productiveness of the most productive kind of labor within the reach of each individual laborer. A man laborer of any grade has to be paid as much as he could earn in other employments that he would be able to take up. Because he has a wider training than a woman has, he has more of such employments to look to, and can, consequently, demand higher pay. "What women most want," said Mrs. Fawcett, "is more training, to enable them to pursue more skilled handicrafts, and a larger number of professional occupations."

On the question of equal compensation for school-teachers of both sexes, Mrs. Fawcett had some interesting facts to contribute. She said she had "always regarded it as an error, both in principle and in tactics, to advise women under all circumstances to demand the same wages for the same work as men," adding:

The London School Board pays its women teachers less than its men teachers, but the number of women applying for the posts is considerably in excess of the number required; whereas it is, I am told, difficult to get men enough to fill the vacancies for male teachers. The cry, "The same wages for the same work," is very plausible, but it is proved to be impossible of achievement when the economic conditions of the two sexes are so widely different.

Mrs. Fawcett gave an instance of the way in which the equal-pay experiment worked in an English school, which I trust will not prove to be a precedent for the St. Paul experiment. The governors of an endowed school in Hertfordshire started with the good intention of giving the same wages for the same work to all their teachers, whether men or women.

The result was that the women, attracted by the to them exceptionally favorable terms, were exceptionally well qualified for the work, while the men were mere average specimens of their profession. The equality was, therefore, only nominal; the same money bought a better article in the female labor market than it did in the male labor market.

This would have been a satisfactory outcome had it been true that women could in all cases do the work of men in the conduct of the school. The fact that women cannot in many cases do the work of men, even if mentally qualified for it, is too often overlooked in the consideration of the problem. So long as the supply of men for certain work is less than the supply

of women for the same work, the latter will have to be content with less wages than the former in all cases in which the work cannot be done entirely by women.

B.

Wanted—Specialists in Church Music.

I HAVE frequently been appealed to by churches for help in securing a competent and sympathetic manager for their music. What is wanted was thus expressed in one case:

Our church is hardly satisfied with our present music, more particularly as to its results in developing music in the congregation and among our young people. Can you direct our attention to an organist who is an earnest Christian and a good leader, who would take an interest in training the young voices in our Sunday-school, and in keeping the church music thoroughly in sympathy with the remainder of the service, and helpful to the worship of the congregation? To the right man we can offer an opportunity to do some good work, and reasonably good pay for it. The times are ripe for the man.

Many such expressions have come to me in letters and conversations. They all look the same way: Wanted—a Christian musician, trained, tactful, enthusiastic, bent upon stimulating and guiding the musical life of a parish so that it will contribute directly and powerfully to the prime objects of church life. A leading Western pastor says, "The need is great, and I imagine the demand will before long be strenuous."

Something should be done in the matter. We have seminaries for training pastors, schools for training lay teachers and helpers of various kinds, and numerous temporary classes and assemblies for studying all sorts of Christian work. But what about this uniquely effective arm of parish organization—the music? The problem is beset by undeniable difficulties—difficulties in the attitude of churches to their music, in the attitude of musical students not only to church music, but to Christian work in general, and in some of the practical details involved in any proposed solution. The following suggestions are feasible:

There is a noble opening for a school exclusively devoted to training *church musicians*. The conditions of admission should be simply genuine Christian enthusiasm, a declared intention to serve the musical needs of the churches, and reasonable musical aptitude. Courses should be provided for both organists and singers, but all should have minute discipline as leaders and teachers. The subjects taught should be (1) church music—theory and history—as a branch of Christian work; (2) sight-reading, as a stimulus to true musical sensitiveness, as an introduction to singing, and as a subject for popular instruction; (3) voice-building, with reference to both speaking and singing; (4) choral singing, as the central department of all music, especially of sacred music, to be extended to oratorio work, if possible; (5) harmony, for the organist an indispensable tool, for the singer a constant guide, and for all the key to the inner mysteries of musical construction; (6) analysis and criticism, both as an artistic discipline and for popular exposition; (7) organ-playing and solo-singing as specialties in church work. To these might be added several courses for more extended technical information and equipment.

The entire management should be in Christian hands. The aim should be immediate practical utility rather than artistic achievement. Instruction for those who do

not mean to be primarily church musicians should be left entirely to other schools. Courses should be so arranged as to permit students to accomplish much in a short time. Certificates should be granted for demonstrated attainments. To establish confidence and preclude misuse, the enterprise should be connected with some recognized institution, preferably a theological seminary, though sectarianism should be avoided.

That there is nothing like this now provided is, I think, a fact. Some of the teaching of what is called "church music" is only a menace to true devotional art. A different ideal, and a more radical specialization, are imperative for permanent success. Much might be added, if space permitted, to justify and fill out the outline of effort here suggested.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. *Waldo S. Pratt.*

The Australian Registry of Land Titles.

A REPLY TO MR. EDWARD ATKINSON'S ARTICLE IN THE CENTURY FOR FEBRUARY, 1892, BY THE DEAN OF THE LAW SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, AND PROFESSOR OF THE LAW OF REAL ESTATE AND CONVEYANCING.

THE objections to the adoption in the United States of the Australian registry of land titles are two:

(1) The Constitution of the United States forbids the United States, or any State, to deprive any person of property without due process of law; that is, without a course of legal proceedings including the establishment of a competent tribunal, the service of process requiring the appearance of all parties whose rights may be affected by the judgment in the particular cause, and an opportunity to such parties of a hearing before judgment. No indefeasible title could result in the United States from a public registry upon the Australian plan, for the title of an adverse claimant could not be concluded until the statutory period of limitation had barred his claim.

(2) The operation of the system would require the appointment of a large number of government employees, and it would compel the Government, national, State, or municipal, as the case might be, to engage in a business—that of insuring titles—which can be better and less expensively done by non-official agencies.

Registry laws requiring the recording in public offices of conveyances of, and liens and encumbrances upon, land have been in force in this country from the earliest colonial days. Any one who is familiar with the expense, delay, and danger of English conveyancing, and with the comparative inexpensiveness, speed, and safety of American conveyancing, will see the advantages of the American system, which practically compels the recording of all dealings with land *inter vivos* by postponing the unrecorded deed or lien to that which has been recorded, and which yet protects an unrecorded title against all parties having actual notice.

But the system is not perfect, because it does not cover devises or descents of land, and because there are dangers of false personation in acknowledgments, and of forgery, and because land is not as readily transferable as a ship or a share of corporate stock. The recording system should be amended in the following respects:

(1) All conveyances of, and encumbrances upon, land within each county of a State should be registered in the same public office.