

our Public Schools?" says: "The foundation principle of the *moral responsibility of each for others* may be inculcated from the very first. The youngest pupil may begin to feel that his good or bad behavior has its power to aid or hinder the aggregate good of all. He may be made to comprehend that even if he choose to do wrong and take the consequences, he yet owes something to his companions, and that his individual pleasure does not always constitute an individual *right*. Too frequently the aim of education has seemed to be the development of the individual as an integer, rather than a part, and too frequently the question of right doing has seemed to be but a blind obedience to a promulgated law. If the boy can be trained to feel that on him is placed, to a certain degree, the responsibility for the good behavior of his comrades, he has taken a long step in the path that leads to good citizenship and intelligent voting." The point is well taken. The child cannot too soon be taught that he lives in a world in which, whether he will or no, all his conduct has a bearing upon the welfare of others. Not even a school-boy can "live unto himself." It is impossible for him, however earnestly he may desire it, to divest himself of his relations to others, or to escape responsibility for the duties growing out of those relations. To impress this truth upon the mind, in its practical aspects as presented in the microcosm of the school, or the family, is one of the most effective modes of developing the conscience, and so giving that moral training the need of which is so much felt in these days.

WE hope every teacher has read carefully and thoughtfully Mr. McHenry's able paper on the system of prize-giving. As we have said before we concur heartily with the views of the essayist in regard to the main point. So far as the giving of prizes and scholarships on the large scale at present adopted in Toronto and other universities, or, in fact, on any scale whatever, is concerned, Mr. McHenry's logic is unassailable. No one of the ends aimed at, or at least of the ends that should be aimed at, is, as Mr. McHenry shows, surely reached by these methods.

THE subject of motives upon which Mr. McHenry touches briefly but effectively, is one worthy of the deepest consideration. In it is involved, to a very great degree, the vexed question of moral training in the schools. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." The motives determine the character. Place a boy or girl, young men or women, during the most susceptible and plastic years of life systematically under the influence of selfish or sordid motives in the discharge of their daily duties, and it is utterly unreasonable to look for noble character as the outcome. It should, of course, be borne in mind that one motive may be lower than another without being necessarily wrong or vicious. Emulation is, as the essayist intimates, in its proper place and use, perfectly legitimate. As the result of a good deal of thought and experience during a score of years of teaching and school management, the writer evolved for his own guidance a set of rules something like the following:

Never, under any circumstances, appeal to a motive believed to be in itself wrong or bad.

Amongst legitimate motives, always appeal to the highest which can be made effective in the given case.

Strive constantly to bring to bear, in the case of individual pupils, motives in an ascending scale, passing from a lower to a higher as soon as the higher can be made available.

Every thoughtful parent and teacher knows that there are stages of intellectual and moral development at which the higher class of motives, such as a sense of duty, love of study, desire for usefulness, etc., are wholly inoperative. Fear, a very low motive, may be the only one effective in certain cases. In such cases it may be right to begin with, but degrading to continue. It will be superseded or discarded by the skilful parent or teacher at the earliest possible moment, and, as a rule, we believe that moment, under right influences, will come very soon. The hope of reward is a better one, and may be the best, in many cases, during the earlier stages of school life. So the desire to excel, the desire to please, the sense of duty, the pleasure attending the exercise of mental power, love of knowledge, love of others, etc., should follow. It is unnecessary to add that the operation of this principle would utterly discredit prize-giving in high schools and colleges.

A "PROFESSIONAL MAN," writing in the *Truro (N.S.) Sun*, says:

"In consequence of the exceedingly low salaries given to teachers in these Maritime Provinces, it is a fact that when young men find themselves school-teachers, they are compelled to step on to some other profession in order to make a living."

We fear it is a fact in other than the Maritime Provinces. When will parents and trustees learn that to pay salaries too low to keep good men in the profession—and they are often good men, though not the best teachers, who step out and up—is the worst economy? No one who is making his teaching a stepping-stone to some other profession can do his best work. One year with a wide-awake, enthusiastic, stimulating teacher, whose whole heart is in his work, is worth more to a child than three under one who is a mere hireling, a "routine" man, whose best thoughts, if he has any, are given to something else than his pupils and his work.

A GOOD deal is being said and written just now about the evil involved in the turning away of so many young men in the country from farming and other industrial pursuits to city and professional life. The mistake is certainly a great and disastrous one. But those who are throwing the blame upon the schools, and crying out against the "over-education" of the day, are, we are persuaded, on the wrong scent. The source of the evil lies farther back. It is in the false notions and restless ambitions of the age. It may be true that there is something in the education gained in our high schools and colleges which begets a disrelish for farming, as too generally carried on, and with the associations which now surround it. But the true remedy is not in less education, but in improved farming and country life. Agriculture, horticulture, stock-raising, etc., are really scientific pursuits. Why should they