

plers before 1871? Stranger still, that the "Directing Mind" never taught the system which is now his hobby. Perhaps he had not then had access to "Hamblyn Smith's Arithmetic" or gobbled up the works of "the great masters of analysis," which probably formed a prominent feature in the disinterested present of the "Rivington Firm." Is it not singular that men whose official duties should demand the full occupation of their time can find leisure, without neglecting those duties, to manufacture three or four books a year, any one of which, if they really were the authors, would take a longer time to compose? But the authorship nuisance is comparatively trifling to the injury which these theoretical hobby-riders are inflicting on the cause of Education, through the medium of "Entrance, Intermediate, and First and Third Class Examination Questions" prepared exclusively by themselves, the chief papers being framed specially to match the favourite conundrums appearing in the aforesaid publications, thus cunningly enforcing their sale and causing the "royalty" to flow into the exchequer. At the ensuing July examinations we may expect that, as on a former occasion, the Natural Philosophy and Chemistry papers accidentally corresponded with the ground gone over by Kirkland, so the Factoring and Synthetic Division demanded in the forthcoming Algebra papers will, by an equally surprising coincidence, be identical with the contents of the "Hand Book of Algebra" and thereby enforce its sale. The natural result of this vicious "Tammany" arrangement is to be seen in the teaching which now characterizes the majority of our High Schools, and which neither comprehends the theory nor the practice of Mathematics. I have seen pupils stumbling in Symmetrical Factoring who failed in long division. They could prate that if four men could do a piece of work in 8 days, one man would require 4 times as long, because that style of Analysis matched the "Directing Mind's" second-hand hobby,

but they could not tell why in extracting the n th root of a number they put a dot over the unit figure and over every n th figure of the series reckoned from it. Cube root they totally failed in, neither could they tell me why they squared the diameter and multiplied it by .7854 to find the area of a circle, and so on "ad infinitum." Nor are the teachers who now obtain Second Class Provincial certificates, or even First Class, much better posted (of course there are exceptions). How many of them could tell what ought to be paid for 6 per cent. stock so as to realize n per cent. How many could tell why the surface of a sphere equals the area of four great circles, or why, to find its volume, the cube of the diameter must be multiplied by .5236? Do they understand logarithms, the binomial theorem, indeterminate equations, permutations, etc.? No! but they understand analysis and can actually solve sums involving purchasing by the yard or pound and selling at an advance, including the hobby fraud of using a yard stick an inch short, or a pound weight an ounce light, because these are "type questions," pronounced to be the correct thing by the "Directing Mind" and the "vegetators that live in a fool's paradise." Of course in such excellent Collegiate Institutions as those of Hamilton and St. Catharines with a splendid staff of teachers, the instruction no doubt is thorough, and these remarks will not apply to them, but in the case of the majority of our High Schools "cram" is in full blast and will continue so long as the present system prevails, giving unscrupulous book-compilers the exclusive preparation of the examination questions that are framed for special purposes in which "royalty" forms the chief ingredient. Is it possible that the Minister of Education is the only man in Ontario that cannot see the gross improprieties herein pointed out?

Faithfully yours,

INSPECTOR.