each of the years, and produces the same as the annual average attendance for each year. Assuming the figures given in the Tables, the true average is 5½ for males, and 6¼ for females, which is a considerable decrease instead of an increase, as he thought. Were we to multiply the number of Schools (774) by his aggregate average, we would get 23,238, a number which would not leave room for the absentees necessarily occasioned by the average cases of sickness. The errors involved show not only a total want of taste and skill in statistics, but indicate a superficial knowledge only of common arithmetic.

"Table B.—Following the course I have adopted "with the preceding Table, we find—

	1	2	3
	1852.	1853.	Increase.
Number of Pupils studying English Grammar,	3,250	4,151	901
do. do. Geography,	2,727	3,668	940
do. do. History,	715	1,329	614
do. do. Book-Keeping,	249	806	857
do. do. Geometry,	99	181	82
do. do. Mensuration,	180	197	24
do. do. Land Surveying,	34	75	41
do. do. Navigation,	16	21	5
do. do. Algebra,	56	66	10
do. do. Other subjects not prescribed,	134	578	444
"Female pupils learning common needle work,	1,546	2,059	513
"Number of School Houses,	700	881	181
do. do. newly erected,	19	60	41

"All these results are gratifying, and none more "so than those which prove the due attention paid "to the elementary branches. I have not given "the corresponding totals of pupils learning spell-"ing, reading, writing, and arithmetic, for 1852 "and 1853, but the increase under these heads is "13,267, to which, if we add 2,284, the increase "in the number of those who are studying gram-"mar, geography, and history, we shall have 21,-"271, (or deducting 15,836, amount of increase in "total number of scholars,) 5,435 more pupils stu-"dying the elementary branches than in 1852; and "513 more girls learning needlework."

It is exceedingly difficult to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion as to the state of our Superintendent's mind when he penned the paragraph I have just quoted.

The tabular part is correctly taken from the Reports; but the other statements betray a state of mind and an ignorance of the first essential principle in arithmetic that are incomprehensible except on two suppositions—first, that the Superintendent is *politically clever* as politics go, or secondly, that he is incompetent. Either supposition is fatal to his prestige; and that is all that I labor to destroy by this special review of this part of his report. The halo of imaginary excellence by which some of you have surrounded him must be dissipated into its original nothingness, for it is incompatible with the attention due to the educational rights and interests of every child in the Province.

The objection that our Superintendent compares the results of twelve months in 1852 with those of six months in 1853 lies against the increase paraded in the extract. But it is to the false reasoning and calculations in the other part that I wish to invite special attention. Some of you, gentlemen, may recollect the extraordinary calculation of 2cwt. 1qr. 17lbs. at 17s. 6d. per cwt. made in 1844 by one of our Teachers of 14 years' standing, who made the amount £49 1s. 9d. as follows:—

2	1	17
		10
26	0	2
16	8	7
1	22	0
£49	1	9 Ans.

But, however absurd, it only betrayed the peculiarities exhibited by our Superintendent's calculations.

The whole paragraph is a tissue of nonsense which it is troublesome to dwell upon.

I have made the necessary corrections for the error of 10,000 in the increase of pupils attending school in 1853, discovered after the report had been laid before the Legislature.

Our Superintendent distinctly says that the increase in the number of pupils learning spelling, reading, writing and arithmetic, is 13,267, to which if we add 2284 for a certain other increase similarly calculated, we have as he states a total increase of 21,271 for 1853 in the number of pupils studying the elementary branches. Now however remarkable his manner of calculating and speaking of the increase of pupils may be, one can understand what he has said thus far, and the foundation; but when he goes on with an alternative and says, "on *deducting* 5,836, the amount of increase in the total number of scholars, we get 15,435 more pupils studying the elementary branches than in 1852," his language and the idea sought to be impressed overwhelm us with a sense of confusion and absurdity. On such reasoning and calculation, a Teacher who in 1852 had 15 pupils and in 1853 20 pupils, might say that in 1853 he had 50 more pupils in the elementary branches than in 1852, besides 120 in the higher branches. There might be nothing inconsistent in such a statement, on M. d'Avray's principles of calculation, however absurd it appears when tested by common sense. There is this further objection against the new method of calculation, that no Teacher having 20 boys learning to read, and the same 20 boys