

cannot but be beneficial. Without parading either their denominational preferences or their piety, they will show, as George Herbert expresses it, that—

“Who sweeps a room as for thy laws,
Makes that and th’ action fine.”

The following announcement was recently met with in an English paper: “‘Ethics for Undenominational Schools.’ One of the oldest and most eminent of German educationists, a pupil of the great educational philosopher, Herbart, has just published ‘Ethics for Undenominational Schools.’ The work will no doubt attract the attention of both legislators and educationists in England, as it has already done on the continent. The editor of the *School Board Chronicle* and a German scholar are engaged upon an English adaptation of the book.” There can scarcely be any well-grounded objection in principle to the teaching of ethics in public schools, provided the distinction be properly observed between ethics and dogmatics. When the grounds of moral obligation are dealt with, the *odium theologicum* will be very apt to make its appearance. The Germans are expert in solving gordian knots; whether the German philosopher Herbart will succeed in this instance time will show.

The teachers in our Public Schools next deserve our attention. Referring to the report of the Royal Commissioners, President Quain remarks that much complaint was made before the Commissioners of the want of efficient teachers in schools. Here the public are not without fault. The social position conceded to the schoolmaster is not proportioned to the importance of his office. His rank is so low that he feels himself in a measure compelled to take orders as a clergyman. With them he acquires the position in society allowed to a profession the duties of which he does not perform. What is thus said with regard to the teachers of the higher and middle class schools in Britain, will in some degree apply to the

teachers of our Public Schools. Not that they often take orders, or study law, or medicine so that, having raised their social position, they may remain teachers; but that, however they may really like teaching, they find that a teacher is too often treated with contempt by the shopkeeper, the clerk, the mechanic, the farmer, and sometimes by the day labourer, while the lawyer, the doctor and the minister are looked on with comparative respect. Mr. Hope says on this subject: “I am not very bitter over this grievance of our social position. I complain because my profession complains, but, personally, I have no great sympathy with those thin-skinned dominies who invoke Mrs. Grundy with alternate upbraidings and entreaties, demanding and beseeching her to make them gentlemen in the most select sense of the word. I have no very good will towards this divinity of the genteel world, and object to recognizing the principle that she can issue letters patent to this effect. The fact is that among dominies, as among men of all other professions, there are some who never could be made gentlemen by any ordinance of Mrs. Grundy, and some who never could be, or could be thought to be, except by fools and vulgar persons, anything else.” “While I am on this topic” he further observes, “I wish to say a word upon a notable scheme which certain philosophers have propounded for improving the social position of our profession. To this end all dominies are to band themselves together into a sort of union, and to stamp themselves with a hall mark of their own approbation, which, by a law luckily not yet obtained, it will be penal to counterfeit. If I understand the scheme aright, all present dominies of influence are to be bribed into concert by being stamped *gratis*, while all young dominies of the present and unfledged dominies of the future are to earn this stamp by undergoing an examination into their acquirements. I doubt much if this plan will exalt us more highly