the merits of the case, and report the result. They went further, and even declared that they would march no farther unless their complaints were attended to.—*Farther* is, however, often figuratively used of "logical" distance, to give a vivid idea; as, To proceed a step farther would be to commence revolution.

As a specimen of a very imperfect paper on the subject we have selected the following:—

ENGLISH GRAMMAR.—GRADE C.—ANSWERS BY MR. A. L.

1. When a noun of multitude conveys unity of idea the verb and pronoun should be singular.
2. A plural verb. As the people were coming.
7. An adverb.
9. Relative pronoun, Demonstrative pronoun, and Distributive adjective pronoun.
10. No.

Verb.	Indic. present, 3rd sing.	Indic. past, 3rd sing.	Past Participle.
Sit,	Sit,	Set,	Sitten,
Set,	Set,	Set,	Setten,
Rise,	Rise,	Rose,	Risen,
Raise.	Raise.	Rose.	Raisen.

This candidate judiciously avoids the parsing exercise. We have not met with the text-book in which the parts of sit, set, &c., are given as here specified.

QUESTIONS ON TEACHING.—GRADE B.

Candidates in Grade B. (Male First) were asked the following questions in reference to Teaching:—

1. Supposing you have half an hour daily to devote to an advanced Grammar Class numbering 25, what method would you adopt in order to secure the most rapid progress possible, and at the same time to be sure that each lesson was thoroughly learned and clearly understood by every pupil?
2. State the various steps you would take to secure good spelling, and give your reasons for each.
3. What relative importance do you attach to declamation as a part of school work? Give your reasons.
4. Give an outline of the manner in which you would explain Compound Addition to a class of beginners.

We have selected the two following papers from among the number submitted. They exhibit careful study and preparation on the part of their authors, and may be read with profit by Teachers commencing the profession.

ANSWERS BY MR. J. E. A.—ON TEACHING.

1. In addition to the lesson to be recited from the text book, I would give them parsing and analysis to be done in tabular form. I would cause them to give examples under each lesson also; and to be sure that all are profiting by the lesson, I would question those upon it who appear to be dullest and least interested in it.
2. I would require a number of sentences to be spelled, as well as some of the most difficult *wordes*, in every reading lesson. I would also cause the pupils to write on their slates sentences when dictated to them. I would require them to spell sentences; because often the most mistakes are made in spelling the simplest words. I would require them to write, because sometimes those who spell quite well orally make many mistakes in writing.
3. If properly conducted, it is of vast importance in connection with teaching reading; because it helps the child, when depending upon his memory, and not having the book before him, to enter into the spirit of the piece, and to deliver it in a more natural manner.
4. I would first refer them back to Simple Addition, and show them that in it the numbers are all of one name. I would then show them that the numbers to be added are of different names, but that a certain number of the less is equal to one of the greater, and proceed in much the same way as in showing them the principles of Simple Addition, showing them that a certain number of pence make a shilling, in the same way as ten units make one ten.

ANSWERS BY MR. A. M'E.—ON TEACHING.

1. I would present them with the subject, first claiming attention by means of an oral lesson. From what they already knew of the subject I would proceed to draw out their minds to new conclusions of their own. I would make the various answers (the result of the diversity of minds) add interest to the lesson. As soon as I had found that the principles of the lessons were understood, I would place in their hands books containing those principles, and compare the result with that evolved from themselves by my aid. I would cause them to commit the lesson to memory. Next day it would be reviewed, and another proceeded with in the same way. I would encourage the friendly correction of errors, and make that part of each lesson; I mean errors made by themselves. The result I would occasionally cause them to commit to writing.

2. I would associate the learning of spelling with that of reading in its earlier stages. I would cause the sense of sight to assist the sense of hearing by giving many dictation exercises, and causing them to be correctly corrected. I would, lastly, call special attention to the anomalies of the English language.
3. Very much importance, as it tends to improve the reading, and to store the mind with beautiful thoughts and their ready use.
4. I would show them that the first right hand column, being added, might amount to enough to contain some of next higher denomination, and perhaps some remainder; if so, I would put each in its place or proper column. So with the rest.

As a contrast to these we shall give one of an opposite character:—

ANSWERS BY MR. J. R. T.—ON TEACHING.

1. I would call out the class, give them the questions.
2. I would make them write sentences—the Teacher is to call up the class and read a sentence, and they are required to write it down on their slates.
3. To lead the children to the comprehension of the operation of dividing one number by another. It also gives them a great deal of confidence.

We must confess to some doubts as to this intimate connexion between declamation and "the operation of dividing one number by another."

CORRESPONDENCE.

KING'S COLLEGE, WINDSOR, Nov. 23, 1868.
For the Journal of Education.

Mr. Editor,—In the October No. of the *Journal*, just received by me, there is an interesting criticism on a trigonometrical demonstration of mine. The criticism affords a very good illustration of a mental failing which, I fear, extensively prevails in Nova Scotia, but which, I am confident, the operation of the present excellent school bill will yearly diminish. This failing is to regard everything, which is not *at once* obvious to the untrained intellect, as perfectly useless or egregiously wrong. To subject itself to strenuous, and, if necessary, long-continued effort to master its difficulties, and so place itself in the only position where it can fairly judge or even possess the right of expressing an opinion regarding anything, may be the law of mental discipline for an ordinary mind, but is, of course, beyond the necessities of the "finest people in the world." And yet even they—by ignoring this law—will be certain occasionally to commit the blunder of "A Teacher," who intrepidly undertakes to confute the reasoning of a demonstration not *one* step of which he comprehends.

That his objections to my proof should occur to one unacquainted with the inductive method in mathematics, or who should examine it superficially, I was prepared for, but I thought that I had made such provision for this as would reduce the objector to silence, if it did not produce conviction. "A Teacher" may observe that in one part of the demonstration I speak of the *usual* method of inductive proof. Now my object in inserting the word "usual" was to point out to those unacquainted with this method the fact that it is commonly employed for the establishment of such results; and that if they were anxious to understand it, they could find it enunciated in the ordinary text-books. If "A Teacher" had accordingly taken the pains to look into this method he would there find a full solution of his difficulties, but his letter furnishes conclusive evidence that up to the time when it was written he considered such a small piece of research as wholly needless, if not derogatory, to his intelligence. But now to proceed to the objections themselves.

"The argument," he says, "seems to me insufficient on two grounds. In the first place the law of expansion should include co-efficients as well as exponents, and if, as in the present case, the form of the co-efficients gives no plain intimation of such a law—the fact that the law does nevertheless obtain should be clearly pointed out." There are two trifling points which have been overlooked by "A Teacher," otherwise he would not have penned the above sentence. The first point is, that the law of the co-efficients and the law of exponents are not the same, that the one is not dependent in any way upon the other, and that the fact of their mutual independence *necessitates* a separate investigation for the discovery of such. Thus, in the case of the binomial theorem we have—

$$(1 + x)^n = 1 + nx + \frac{n(n-1)}{1.2}x^2 + \&c.$$

Here we perceive that the law of exponents in the expansion is the simplest possible, and is quite independent of the exponent of the binomial, by which, however, the value of all co-efficients, except the first and last, is regulated. Accordingly, a mathematician in discussing this theorem would, in the first place, ascertain the law of exponents, and having determined it, he would then proceed to the discovery of the law of co-efficients. That at any rate is the order I have preserved in the proof under review, and