ASSISTANTS-GRADE D.	Picard, John 118	20 25	GRADE E.		COUNTY OF YAR	HOUT	 II
Foster, L. 85 14 07		to 60	McGIII Mary 19	0 11 15 1 22 50	GRADE B		
Whelman, E. 67 11 08	Sheelhan, Daniel 120	29 75	McKuy, Mary 10	DO 1850 (G. Adams J. Blackadar	81 120	\$40 17 59 60
	GRADE E.	[Newell, Mr. M. 10 Swale, M. L. 10)1 18 78)1 18 78	A. Blackadar	112	65 55
CO. OF RICHMOND.	•	22 50	ASSISTANTS - GRADE		II. Condon	120	છ છ
				10 60	J. Crosby G. Churchill	113} 107	°56 30 30 83
GRADE B.	125 7 00 0	7 87			W Crosby	95	47 12
McNeil, M. J. T. 1134 56 30	T TO 1 TOP 1 11 10 10 1	9 50	COUNTY OF VICTOR	UA.	T. Christia	121 121	60 00
McDonald, Angus 118 58 50		22 30	GRADE A		A. Gayton S. Hilton	60	29 76 53 00
McLean, Angus 334 16 62	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		McLean, T S.		T. Hilton	106	53 00
McRae, Wm. 113 50 05	25 (2.1 2)11		GRADE II.		J. Killam A Lent	121 121	00 00
McQuarrie, Hec. 21 60 00	134 . (01 . 101)	22 50	Campbell, Macle. 11 *McDonald, Peter 10	14 68 83 H	A Lent B Rogers	119	69 00
McLain, Donald 121 60 00	24 27 44 2544 2 45 044 4	7 87	McDonald, Murd. 11	10 67 60	A. Smith G. Sparling N. Sanders	121 120	00 00 50 50
McKenzie, Michael 114 50 50	137 33 4 110 6	21 95	McKenzie, Alex 11	14 66 60 15 87 20	N Sunders	83	47 67
McDonald, John 121 60 00	McCabe, Mary 121	22 50	McLean, Donald	5 42 15	GRADE C		
McKenzie, Michael 144 50 50	100 0	22 30	McNell, E. P. 1:	21 00 00	J Aubo	78	29 00 44 25
McDonald, John 121 60 00		0 57	GRADE C		A. Bingay E. Brown	119 120	44 25
McLean, Angus 354 17 65	1		Buchannan, Ewen 12 McDonald, M. B 11	21 45 00 12 41 65	II. Christie	120	44 82 82 83 83 83 40 90
GRADE C.	ASSISTANTS—GRADE I		McDonald, Angus 11	12 41 65	II. Christie *M. Crosby	112	65 63
Royd, Donald 117 43 50	Beranger, John 121	20 00	McDonald, John 11	12 42 00 1	II. Cann W. Durkee L. Flint	112 110 121 116j	40 90 40 00
Ferguson, Rodk. 1121 45 00	·		McIver, Henry 12 *McKay, Angus 11 McKay, Angus 8	12 55 50	*L Flint	1163	60 00 51 77
Haywood, M. A. 120 44 62	COUNTY OF SHELBURN	t.	*McKay, Angus 11 McKay, Angus 8 McKenzle, Niel, (no return) McLean, Sarah 10	12 & 50 55 31 62	M. Goudey M. Hilton	123° 1181	44 62
Madden, Sarah 115 42 75	GRADE A.		McLean, Sarah 10	10 37 20	J. Harrison	120	44 07 44 62
McKay, John 121 45 00	McDonald, C R. 115	Į	TRELEGG, NORTHRU	0 37 20 21 00 00	C. Hilton E. Hilton E. Page	120°	44 62 86 44
McKinnon, M. E. 112 41 65	ORADE B.	1	McLeod, Malc. 11 McLeod, Malc 11	20 44 63	E. lillon E. l'ago	121 01	45 00 93 68
Morrison, Alex. 121 45 00		539.67	McLeod, John 1:			90	22 68 36 80
McPherson, S. 121 45 00	DeVine, M. E 100	40 CA I	OMONTHUM Allow 10	18 13 LA	W. Robbins	65	24 17
McLeod, John 121 45 00	Donne, J. H. 101 Johnson, J. W. 99	49 10	McMillan, Duncan 10 Morrison, John 12 McNell, John H. 12 Newton, James 8 Roll John 11	00 37 20 1 21 45 00	C. Hilton E. Hilton E. Page D Potier W. Robbins A. Robbins M. Rogers E. Stubbert	90 65 118 120	24 17 43 88 44 62
Morrison, Norman 121 45 00	Mupro, J. H 112	55 55	Morrison, John 12 McNell, John H. 12	20 44 62	E. Stubbert	100	37 20
St. Zeph'rine, Lady 120 44 62				36 32 00	W. Robbins A. Robbins M. Rogers E. Stubbert O. Spinney A. Vannorden J. Westcott	60 117	37 20 22 30 43 60
St. Maurice, Lady 120 41 62	Bower, Margaret 115 Brettle, James 100	42 70 87 20	Sparling, Emma 13	i 45 00	0 11 (3100)	187	43 50 44 62
St. John, Lady 120 44 62	Covill, B. F. 67	24 90	GRADE D.		31. Woodworth	120	44 C2
St. Alexandrina, L. 120 44 62	Coffin, Adeline 84 Crowell, Eben 64	31 25	Sparling, Emma 12 McAulay, Hurd. 10 Campbell, Donald 11 McCharles, Fred. 11 McDermid, Hunter 11 McDonald Innec 11	07 35 36	M. Crosby GRADE D.	118	90.95
St. Claude, Lady 115 42 75	Hosne, CarrieT 1001	40 72	*Campbell, Donald 11 McCharles, Fred. 12	າ 20.00	G. D'Entremont	91	29 25 22 55 87 00
St. Euph., L. 115 115 75 00	Gibbons, John 27	39.80	*McDermid, (Eunice 1	21 40 00	E. Grant	112	37 00
St. Mary, Lady 115 42 75	Goodick, J D 102 Layers, A. H. 103	88 20	McDonald, James 10 Hart, Elizabeth 11	00 24 80 1 10 54 60	E. Goudey J. Gavel	118 114	28 35
Tooney, James 63 22 42	Lyle, Emilie 120j	41 81	McIver, Augus 10	6 3104	*M. Jackson	116	23 33
GRADE D.	Matheson, Wm 102 Matheson, Daniel 121	37.95	McKay, Norman 11	19 30 30	J. LeBlanc G. McDonald	63	22 10
	Nickerson, M. H. 191	37 00	Kerr. Dubean 19	19 36 36 04 25 78 21 30 00	T. Potier	93	22 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 2
	Taylor, Harriet 116				L. Sceley	121	30)
		40.72	McKinnou, Norman 10	80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 8	T. Potier L. Sceley M. Tedford A. Travis J. Vanenburg	118j 95	89 22 31 40 16 62
	*Atwood, Amsuda 791	19 72	Makingan Ingusta 36	21 30 00	J. Vanenburg	50	16 52
	Howker, Scretha 54	13.36 24.80	McKinnon, Joseph 17 *McLeonan, Fred. 6 *McLeod, Angus 17 McLeod, Donald 11 McLeod, John 11 *McKillian, Angus 17 *McKillian, Angus 11 *M	S 2909	CHANE V		
	Crowell, Letitia 100 Demstadt, Wm 108	24 80	McLeod, Donald	10 27 27	M. Bingay M. Gridley	20 58 70	15 (t) 14 37
	Donne, Augusta 100	26 27 24 80	McLcod, John 1	18 29 25	A. Holmer	70	13 00
	Porote, Pricoco.	17 65	Nicholson, Neil	18 39 00	L. Hilton	105	19 50
	Fox, Mary & & Golden, Thomas 111	27 52	MICACII, MITTAL 11	ii 29 00	E Surctto	107 61	26 50 11 37
	Harding, Allen 79	**************************************	McNell, Stephen McRitchle, Normon	24 54	ASSISTANTS-GRA	-	·
		25 50	*Ross, Aaron 1	14 37 66	A. Hilton	65	10.74
	elteynolds, Leander 117	36 67	GRADE E.		M. Jackson	15	2 48
	Snow, Deborah 100	24 80	McAulay, Jessio 10	96 19 70 (c) 20 25	W Cottons GRADE E	120 *	74 27
	Stalker, Susan 89 Swaine, Emeline 110	34 54 37 27 19 16		(c) 20 25 16 21 57	M. Cottran J. Doucette	114	14 87 14 13
	Thomas, isaac 58	19 16	*Smith, Sarah 10	US 26 77	M. Hersey	40 33	14 13 4 97
McDougal, Peter 10 2 48	Wilson, Letitia 116	23 15	Peppy, Charles 10	02 18 96	E. Hatfield	33	4 08
	<u> </u>				 		

SCIENCE AND LITERATURE IN GENERAL EDUCATION.

INVESTIGATION CS. CHAMMING

IN Mr. Farrar's volume of Essays on a Liberal Education is one contributed by Mr. J. M. Wilson, mathematical and natural science master in the celebrated Rugby School, which to our mind is one of the best contributions to the discussion of the vexed ques-tion of the relations of Science and Literature in general education that has been published.

In the course of his argument, Mr. Wilson makes some sugges-tions as to the spirit and method of teaching natural science in schools—a subject on which, he justly remarks, there is much misconception, and his suggestions are so eminently sensible and

conception, and his suggestions are so eminently sensible and practical, that we transcribe the following for the sake of commending both the spirit and the method to certain American teachers who flatter themselves that they are teaching science, and teaching it scientifically, while they are really doing neither.

This class of teachers is well represented in a fashionable young ladies' seminary that we have in mind. A pupil of this school—it ranks among the first in the country—one day remarked to us that she could not "endure" Botany. It was "perfectly horrid," she said. We knew her to be fond of flowers! why then should she last the study of them? A few questions solved the difficulty. Her first plunge into Botany (?) had been into the Linnen System of Classification, which she had been set to commit to memory! And all her study of the "horrid" science had resulted merely in the acquisition of a gibberish of audreas, acias, syniau, and so an, that would have frightened a disciple of Jessicu.

The extensive sale of the text-hook of Betany used in that school is proof that the "exquisite perversement" of its method is not disapproved in more than one school, and by more than one teacher. In fact, the greater part of our science teaching is, we fear, equally

In fact, the greater part of our science teaching is, we fear, equally unscientific.

"There are two different methods of teaching science. one, the method of authority. The first starts with the concrete and works up to the abstract; slarts with facts and ends with laws; begins with the known and proceeds to the unknown. The second starts with what we call the principles of the science; announces laws and includes the facts under them: declares the unknown and applies it to the known. The first demands faith, the second criticism. Of the two, the latter is the easier, and the former by far the betater. But the latter is seen in most text-books and is the method

on which many unscientific people ground their disapproval of science. What this former method is, and why it is the better, will be seen by the following remarks.

In the first place, then, knowledge must precede science: for science is nothing else but systematized experience and knowledge. In its extreme applications this principle is obvious enough: It would be absurd to teach boys classifications from minerals, or the science of experience of experience to be seen to the property of experience of experience by an investigation into the expense. power of experimental science by an investigation into the organic bases. A certain broad array of facts, must pre-exist before scientific methods can be applied, this order cannot be reversed. And this is illustrated by the profound analogy that exists between the growth of scientific knowledge in an individual and in the world. Generation after generation of men pussed away, and the world patiently accumulated experience and observation of facts: and then there sprang up in the world the uncontrollable desire to ascertain the sequences in nature, and to penetrate to the deep-lying principles of natural philosophy. And the same desire is based in the individual on the same kind of experience. Where there is wide knowledge of facts, science of some kind is sure to spring up. After centuries of experience the *Philosophiae Naturahe principia* were published.

And, secondly, this knowledge must be homogeneous with preand, secondly, this knowledge must be homogeneous with pre-existing knowledge. It is of no use to supply purely foreign facts; they must be such as the learner already knows something of, or be so similar in kind that his knowledge of them is equally secure -such that he can piece them in with his own fragmentary but wide-ning experience. It is to his existing knowledge, and to that alone that you must dig down to get a sure foundation. And the facts of science must reach continuously down and rest securely thereon. Otherwise you will be building a castle in the air. Here the Otherwise you will be building a cestle in the air. Hence the master's business is to take up the knowledge that already exists;