

pression. This is not so at present, e. g.: When we say eleven, there is nothing to suggest one, one. Twelve is another example, and thirteen, fourteen, and many succeeding expressions are illogical and imperfect in their suggestiveness of the numbers required.

Third.—Reduction in many forms will be found unnecessary. If I know a surface measurement to be 5.46 square inches, we will not require division by 144 to determine the number of square feet, but will know at once by inspection that 5.46 is the number of square feet contained in such surface.

Fourth.—Weights and measures of capacity have been so harmonized that when we know by measurement the volume of a vessel, we determine its capacity by inspection, and its weight by multiplying the volume with the specific gravity of the substance.

Many other examples might be advanced, but the above will be sufficient to show the immense advantage of using the octimal system of notation.

There is at present an agitation for the adoption of the French metric system, which, if adopted, will make an entire change in our units of weight and measurement. Moreover, the French system is ill-adapted to mechanical pursuits, besides rendering useless all our present graduated mechanical appliances.

The octimal system will secure to us all the theoretical advantages of the metric system, as well as adapt itself perfectly to all our mechanical appliances and operations, without any fundamental change in our unit of measurement of weight. Such a system, we feel assured, will become the notation of the future, inasmuch as it is the simplest and most practical method ever discovered.

W. J. SIPPRELL, B.A., B.D.,
Principal Columbian College.
J. G. DAVIDSON, B.A.,
Registrar.