

as well as the *prejudices* that prevailed. In towns, the Dame's School sprang into existence at an early day, as is shown by the fact that in 1791, three of the twelve schools at Shelburne were taught by women.

The fact however remains that the past century has witnessed a marvellous advance in the intellectual training of the women of our country, and could Bishop Inglis behold the bright young faces that pour from the doors of our Provincial Normal School at the close of each session, he would regard with wonder the day when it was found impossible to secure female teachers, even to instruct the younger children of the poor.

It is manifestly impossible in an article such as this to enter into the details of school history in all the settlements which sprang into existence as the country was opened up. In the case of the more important towns and villages, schools were provided by local effort almost from the very first, but in many other instances the circumstances of the people were such that without assistance they could not have provided schools for their children for years.

This Province will ever owe a debt of gratitude to the S. P. G. for the public services rendered by the school masters in its employ.

The list of these old pioneer teachers given below comprises only the names of those engaged in teaching previous to the year 1800, but it shows that even at this early period schools established through the instrumentality of the Society were in operation in all the principal centres of the province.

The dates given in the second column refer to the year in which the first school was opened at the places named.

Carleton.	1784	Benjamin Snow, Timothy Fletcher Wetmore. William Burton.
Campobello.	1790	James Berry.
St. Andrews.	1786	Samuel J. Andrews, James Berry.
Kingston.	1797	Jesse Hoyt, Edmund Finn.
Norton.	1795	Ozias Ansley.
Springfield.	1798	William Brasier Hayes.
Sussex Vale.	1792	Elkanah Morton, Jeremiah Regan.
Fort Cumberland.	1774	Mr. Porter.
Westmoreland.	1792	John Dunn, James Watson, Theodore Valteau.
Gagetown.	1790	Anthony Narraway, S. R. Clark, Anthony Tyrrill, Samuel Morton.
Maugerville.	1789	Walter Dibblee, J. D. Beardsley, William Simpson.
Burton.	1798	Simeon Lugin.
Fredericton.	1798	Matthew Brannen (African school).
Woodstock.	1795	James Yorke.

Many of those whose names appear in this list after retiring from school teaching filled important positions in the Province and nearly all were men of usefulness and influence in their respective communi-

ties. Did time suffice very interesting biographical sketches might be given of each, but it must here suffice to say that the names of the old teachers fill an honorable place in the local records of the places where they labored, whilst their numerous descendants have in the great majority of cases proved not unworthy of their forefathers.

During the next twenty-five or thirty years the S. P. G. gradually extended the sphere of its operations, at the same time increasing the number of school-masters in its employ to about forty.

The establishment of the Madras system of schools and its wonderful development under the fostering care of Governors G. Stracey Smyth and Sir Howard Douglas, in a measure rendered the aid heretofore given by the S. P. G. no longer needful, and it was accordingly withdrawn about the year 1836.

For the REVIEW.]

#### "The Teaching of Ethics in Schools."

By REV. E. P. HURLEY.

All teachers, and many beside, will feel deeply indebted to Professor Murray, of Dalhousie, for his able and interesting paper on "The Teaching of Ethics in Schools," which appeared in the December number of the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW. No one who realizes his responsibility as an instructor of youth can fail to note the many important points to which he alludes and which he emphasizes with earnestness. The position he holds as a teacher, and the reputation he bears as a scholar, must of themselves give weight and evidence of truth to all he writes or utters in the interests of sound education. For these reasons, if for no others, I should like to direct attention to a few sentences in his paper which, in my judgment, are calculated to inculcate what I believe would eventually be found to be unsound principles in the science of ethical instruction.

The Professor begins his paper by telling us that the present discussion "relates entirely to the *knowledge* of the right." But what is the basis of this knowledge of the right? "A set of current opinions," the Professor would answer. And these are employed, some in answering to the "why" in ethical science, and the others in "teaching rules of good conduct, correct actions of justice," etc. So far, indeed, few would be in a hurry to dissent from anything in the paper, for it implies no more than that the foundation on which ethical science rests is by no means a thoroughly settled one. The criterion of a moral act is a most difficult one to determine, but not every one will agree with the Professor that the "why" of an ethical fact ought not to be given to children until "the student has become *familiar* (italics mine) with self-reflection."

All ethical instruction, according to Professor Murray, may be divided into two kinds, the one answering the "why" of ethical facts, the other teaching "the rules of good conduct," etc.; and the end of this second kind of teaching, as he well says, should be "the practice of right acts." But what is to determine the righteousness of any act if not the answer to the ethical "why?" With Professor Murray practice is every thing, the "why" and "knowledge of what is right, what wrong, is only of secondary importance."

Now, practice is an element in the formation of conscience.