

mation of Scales" come none too soon in Sangster's. The time spent in dealing with those scales whose radices differ from ours will assuredly not be lost, as when pupils return to the common or decimal notation, they will be found a great deal more precise and accurate in their computations. A great deal more prominence is given to L. S. and D. Why the pupils attending our Public Schools should be compelled to spend a great portion of their time in dealing with a system of money which is seldom or never heard of outside of the School room, and which it has been proposed to abolish altogether, both in Great Britain and in this country, it is difficult to imagine. In the elementary work now authorized, although the author in his preface states that "especial care has been taken to adapt the book in every respect to the wants of the junior pupils in the schools," we find that the questions for exercise in the different rules are not so simple and interesting to young minds as they might be rendered. Think of putting a question like the following in simple subtraction: A basket contained oranges, nuts and eggs, in all 1769; there were 1696 oranges and nuts and eggs. How many more nuts were there than oranges? and expecting pupils in the first and second classes to master it. The reason why I select this question is because I once had a 3rd class teacher bring it to me for solution, she being unable to do it by simple subtraction. And the book abounds with such questions—questions calculated to puzzle and perplex older heads. In many cases, too, there is a studied brevity and obscurity, instead of rendering the operations of arithmetic simple and perspicuous. Although the pupil may happen to perform mechanically the operations intended, he frequently knows nothing at all of the principle and object of his calculations. It is

true the teacher is expected to explain and supplement the Text Book, but in a crowded and promiscuous school, with new subjects and what not to teach, he cannot afford time to give the necessary explanation to each individual. And why should it be necessary? Why should not our Text Books on Arithmetic be so explicit as to render the object and meaning of every question clear and well defined, even to the youthful understanding? Why should not questions, circumstances and objects be selected as arithmetical exercises which are familiar to the young, and calculated to awaken their curiosity and attention? Echo answers why? Talk of perspicuity! Our Arithmetics are a mere conglomeration of questions, explanations, rules and reasons of rules, huddled together at random, in direct contrariety to the principle that "exercises and lessons be so constructed and arranged as to stamp a ready impress and produce a well defined idea upon the minds of the youth." It is much to be regretted that the pupil, when called upon to engage in the business of real life, has almost the whole of his arithmetical processes to study over again, and to reinvestigate the foundation and principles of his operations in their application to the transactions in which he may be engaged. Why? Because his Text Books were compiled in such an abstract manner as to defeat their own object. He was unable to perceive the drift of his own operations, or the foundation of rules by which his after calculations were to be performed, and consequently was like one walking in the dark, and the teacher having such an immense amount of Christian Morals, Civil Government, Chemistry, Botany and Physiology to elucidate, was compelled to leave him walking in the darkness.

(To be continued.)