

following paragraph for the Protestant Committee on Education in Quebec, which still runs its schools on the payment by results system. Robert Lowe, the prominent statesman who earned a peerage in his labours as a reformer in the British Parliament, and who once thought to protect the treasury by advocating his once famous "New Code," was the father of the system of payment by results in England, just as the Rev. Dr. Mathews, of Quebec, may be looked upon as the father of the Quebec idea. Most people have a notion that there is now no such system in existence. But as one of our contemporaries says, there never was a greater mistake. "Whitehall still drives a roaring trade in results, and the volume of business is to be measured by tens of thousands of pounds. It is true that the article sold is not worth much when it is bought, and that in order to produce it other articles that are worth infinitely more are sacrificed, but the Department cannot bring itself to abandon this last trace of the most mischievous policy that was ever pursued in our national education. What is the consequence of our present system of making piecemeal instead of block grants? It is that schools are constantly tempted to take up more subjects than they can properly teach, a result which necessarily involves the neglect of subjects that might be successfully taught."

The multiplicity of suggestions in behalf of an improved school curriculum has been a "wearisomeness to the flesh" to hundreds of our most conscientiously industrious teachers, and the legitimacy or illegitimacy of any "new branch" suggested by the Department or other of our educational masters is never an unimportant

one to the educationist who knows no expediency. The utilitarian is always in the way of introducing sundry changes which the true educationists cannot but reject, though such rejection nearly always issues in the increasing popularity of the utilitarian and the overwhelming unpopularity of the true educationist, and yet it is strange that so few attempts have been made to improve the moral condition of our schools by the introduction of an improved moral drill or training, when there can be no question raised as to the legitimacy of such a reform. The lion in the way of a sound moral training in our schools is undoubtedly denominationalism, and it sometimes looks as if no remedy were possible, as long as the antagonisms of creed last. Would it not be possible, however, to have a committee appointed to formulate some kind of a programme which would be more satisfactory than the present haphazard listlessness?

One of our public men has lately said in connection with this matter: "As to the religious difficulty in education, the two parties always seemed to him to make two opposite mistakes. Those who took upon themselves to advocate what they called religious education, and almost always advocated it in respect of what they called dogmas and the distinctive element in religious teaching, did not care for it unless it was dogmatic and distinctive; and the other party were not content with denying that, but they went on to disparage religious education altogether, and said that they looked upon it as of very little importance or value, and would almost as soon it were left out. Neither of these views seemed to touch the essence of the matter. The teachers could approach it from an educational point of view, and would be able to throw a great deal of light upon the question.