

## WESTERN SUN

VINCENNES, OCTOBER 12, 1833.

At an election for Directors of the Wabash Insurance Company, on Monday last, the following gentlemen were elected:

*Sam'l. Judah, Wm. Burtch, John Moore,*

*Sam'l. Tomlinson, David S. Bonner, J. H.*

*Martin, John Law, Thos. J. Baily, and*

*John J. Neely, Esqrs.* And at the board of Directors, on Monday, *Sam'l. Judah*

*was unanimously elected President, and*

*John Ross unanimously elected Secretary.* I have heard with pleasure that the

deposits with the Company during the

past year has exceeded \$10,000. Its

operations have been beneficial to Vincennes

and its vicinity, and it would seem to the

stockholders, as far at least as to authorise

a dividend of \$2 50 for each \$5 paid in.

**PUBLIC DEPOSITES.**—In this day's pa-

per, I have given a document from the President giving his reasons for removing the public deposits from the Bank of the United States. Like all other public pa-

pers from him, the language is plain and forcible, and the reasons and facts given,

such as must satisfy all impartial minds,

and, indeed are unanswerable.

I had intended correcting some of the misstatements made by neighbor Caddington in the Gazette of last week, upon the subject of the Deposites, but presuming he will furnish his readers the paper from the President on the subject, have deemed it needless.

FOR THE WESTERN SUN.

EDUCATION.—NO. XII.

The Rule of Three' has been called the 'Golden Rule' of arithmetic. But, considered as a distinct rule of arithmetic, it is not only worthless, but, as it is usually presented, it is an imposition on the scholar. It is worthless; for all questions answered by it are just as easily answered by the use of rules learned for other purposes. It is an imposition on the scholar; for it seems to teach something both new and important while it does neither.

Let us examine a question such as is answered by the Rule of three. If 3 pounds of tea cost 5 dollars, what will 7 pounds cost at the same rate? Now, it is supposed, that, before scholars learn and use the Rule of Three, they will have learned the Four Ground Rules, Simple and Compound, as well as Reduction and Federal Money. And scholars must learn for other purposes that 7 pounds or articles of any kind will cost 7 times as much as one of the same; and that 1 pound or other article costs 1 third of what 3 pounds or articles cost; or, to divide the cost of 1 pound, and to multiply the price of 1 pound by 7 to find the cost of 7 pounds. \$5 00 divided by 3 is \$1 66 2/3 per pound; that sum multiplied by 7 is \$11 66 2/3 the cost of 7 pounds.

I ask now what need there is of any other rule for answering such a question than the common ones for dividing and multiplying applied with common sense?

And, when the scholar has learned the rule for stating to work by Rule of Three, so us to say—7 is to 3 so is the answer to 5; and has set 8 for the first, 7 for the second, and 5 for the third term; and then multiplied the second and third, and divided by the first,—what is gained? the process of working is not shortened. The reasons for the steps are seldom understood. I repeat; the thing as a distinct Rule in arithmetic is worthless.

If 5 bushels cost 75 cents, what cost 10 bushels? If 5 bushels cost 75 cents, 1 bushel costs 1 fifth of 75 cents; or 10 bushels cost 10 times 15 cents or 150 cents; divide by 5; then multiply by 10. Or, if 5 bushels cost 75 cents, twice 5 bushels cost twice 75 cents.

If 4 yards cost 9 dollars, what cost 6 yards? \$9 00 divided by 4 is \$2 25 per yard; and 6 yards is \$13 50 cents. Or, 6 yds. is once 4 yds. & 1/4 of 4 yds more; the cost will be \$9 and 1/4 of \$2 25—\$1 50 added to \$9 is \$13 50.

If 9 gallons cost \$1, what will 5 gallons cost? \$1 00 divided by 9 is \$0 11 4/9 per gallon; multiply that sum by 5 to find the cost of 5 gallons.

If 12 yards cost \$15, what cost 4 yards? 4 yards are 1/3 of 12 yds, therefore they will cost 1/3 of \$15 which is \$5. Or, divide \$15 00 by 12 to find the price of 1 yard, and then multiply by 4 to find the cost of 4 yards.

If 8 bushels cost \$12, how much can be bought for \$54? \$12 in \$14 is contained 4 and 1/2 times; then 4 and 1/2 times 8 bushels can be bought: 4 times 8 are 32; 4 of 8 is 1; 32 and 1 are 33 bushels. Or, \$12 divided by 8 is \$1 50 per bushel; \$54 divided by \$1 50 is 36, the number of bushels which could be bought at that rate.

I ask what is the advantage of the parade of terms and statements in the Rule of Three method of working?

The Rule of Three' as generally presented in arithmetics imposes on the scholars. Often a large part of the questions are such as admit of no more Rule of Three working than every question of mere multiplication or division: for they are answered by a single multiplying or dividing:—while every proper example for that rule requires both multiplying and dividing. Just such examples as have been worked by Multiplication or Division are here introduced to be worked by a new and long rule, as if it were the proper way to obtain the answers. Any one may be convinced of the correctness of this view by examining the sums under

the Rule of Three in most of the common arithmetics.

I purpose next to speak of the organization of schools so as to admit of teaching in the manner necessary to train scholars on the plan already sketched out.

LOCKE.

APPOINTMENT BY THE PRESIDENT.

R. B. TANEY, Esq., was yesterday appointed Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. On accepting this appointment, Mr. Taney resigned the office of Attorney General.—*Col. Sentinel*, Oct. 5.

We copy the following sensible article from the New-Albany (Indiana) Gazette. The view taken of the determination to remove the deposits is temperate and just, and is highly creditable to the Editor, who may be ranked with the unwavering opponents of the administration:

### THE DEPOSITES.

Much has been said in the party papers about the policy of removing the government deposits from the Bank of the United States. Like all other public papers from him, the language is plain and forcible, and the reasons and facts given, such as must satisfy all impartial minds, and, indeed are unanswerable.

I had intended correcting some of the misstatements made by neighbor Caddington in the Gazette of last week, upon the subject of the Deposites, but presuming he will furnish his readers the paper from the President on the subject, have deemed it needless.

FOR THE WESTERN SUN.

EDUCATION.—NO. XII.

The Rule of Three' has been called the 'Golden Rule' of arithmetic. But, considered as a distinct rule of arithmetic, it is not only worthless, but, as it is usually presented, it is an imposition on the scholar. It is worthless; for all questions answered by it are just as easily answered by the use of rules learned for other purposes. It is an imposition on the scholar; for it seems to teach something both new and important while it does neither.

Let us examine a question such as is answered by the Rule of three. If 3 pounds of tea cost 5 dollars, what will 7 pounds cost at the same rate? Now, it is supposed, that, before scholars learn and use the Rule of Three, they will have learned the Four Ground Rules, Simple and Compound, as well as Reduction and Federal Money. And scholars must learn for other purposes that 7 pounds or articles of any kind will cost 7 times as much as one of the same; and that 1 pound or other article costs 1 third of what 3 pounds or articles cost; or, to divide the cost of 1 pound, and to multiply the price of 1 pound by 7 to find the cost of 7 pounds. \$5 00 divided by 3 is \$1 66 2/3 per pound; that sum multiplied by 7 is \$11 66 2/3 the cost of 7 pounds.

I ask now what need there is of any other rule for answering such a question than the common ones for dividing and multiplying applied with common sense?

And, when the scholar has learned the rule for stating to work by Rule of Three, so us to say—7 is to 3 so is the answer to 5; and has set 8 for the first, 7 for the second, and 5 for the third term; and then multiplied the second and third, and divided by the first,—what is gained? the process of working is not shortened. The reasons for the steps are seldom understood. I repeat; the thing as a distinct Rule in arithmetic is worthless.

If 5 bushels cost 75 cents, what cost 10 bushels? If 5 bushels cost 75 cents, 1 bushel costs 1 fifth of 75 cents; or 10 bushels cost 10 times 15 cents or 150 cents; divide by 5; then multiply by 10. Or, if 5 bushels cost 75 cents, twice 5 bushels cost twice 75 cents.

If 4 yards cost 9 dollars, what cost 6 yards? \$9 00 divided by 4 is \$2 25 per yard; and 6 yards is \$13 50 cents. Or, 6 yds. is once 4 yds. & 1/4 of 4 yds more; the cost will be \$9 and 1/4 of \$2 25—\$1 50 added to \$9 is \$13 50.

If 9 gallons cost \$1, what will 5 gallons cost? \$1 00 divided by 9 is \$0 11 4/9 per gallon; multiply that sum by 5 to find the cost of 5 gallons.

If 12 yards cost \$15, what cost 4 yards? 4 yards are 1/3 of 12 yds, therefore they will cost 1/3 of \$15 which is \$5. Or, divide \$15 00 by 12 to find the price of 1 yard, and then multiply by 4 to find the cost of 4 yards.

If 8 bushels cost \$12, how much can be bought for \$54? \$12 in \$14 is contained 4 and 1/2 times; then 4 and 1/2 times 8 bushels can be bought: 4 times 8 are 32; 4 of 8 is 1; 32 and 1 are 33 bushels. Or, \$12 divided by 8 is \$1 50 per bushel; \$54 divided by \$1 50 is 36, the number of bushels which could be bought at that rate.

I ask what is the advantage of the parade of terms and statements in the Rule of Three method of working?

The Rule of Three' as generally presented in arithmetics imposes on the scholars. Often a large part of the questions are such as admit of no more Rule of Three working than every question of mere multiplication or division: for they are answered by a single multiplying or dividing:—while every proper example for that rule requires both multiplying and dividing. Just such examples as have been worked by Multiplication or Division are here introduced to be worked by a new and long rule, as if it were the proper way to obtain the answers. Any one may be convinced of the correctness of this view by examining the sums under

Bacon is scarce, particularly Hams.

Pork and Beef are also scarce, and in good demand—no arrival from the Western country this week. Some New York beef has got in and is in good demand.

Indian Corn.—The demand for the Mexican market having abated, the article has fallen. We quote now, *in cars*, \$1 per bbl. shelled in sacks, 62 1/2 cts. per bushel.

### Hymenical.

MARRIED—On Tuesday the 9th Oct. 1833, by the Rev. Mr. Shaw, Mr. JAMES M. THORN, to Miss MARY ANN RAPER, both of Knox county, Indiana

### NOTICE

THE subscriber wishes to purchase THIRTY THOUSAND BUSHELS OF CORN, 60,000 STAVES, 20,000 HOOP POLES, 2,000 CORDS OF WOOD, AND A QUANTITY OF

### WHEAT.

For all of which he will give the highest market price.

He also wishes to employ 8 JOURNEYMEN COOPERS, and ONE GOOD MILLER, to whom liberal wages will be given.

H. D. WHEELER.

Vincennes, Oct. 12, 1833—37-3t

N. B. Come and pay without cost.—

All those who have notes or accounts may

discharge the same by the payment of any of the above articles; and all those who

have no standing debts and do not em-

brace this opportunity, may find their

notes and accounts in the officers hands

against the first of December next.

H. D. W.

Vincennes, Oct. 5, 1833—37-3t

Administrators' Notice.

ALL persons now indebted to me, by account, note or otherwise, are hereby informed that Doctor J. D. Woolverton is authorised to collect the same and without delay—any person therefore who neglects this notice until after the 10th of Nov. next, will not think hard if he has to settle with an officer.

E. McNAMEE.

Vincennes, Oct. 5, 1833—37-3t

Administrators' Notice.

LETTERS of administration have this day been granted to the undersigned on the estate of Christopher Johnston, (late of Daviess county,) deceased. Persons indebted to said estate will please make immediate payment; and those who have claims upon the same will file the same with the Clerk of the Daviess Probate Court duly authenticated, within one year from this date. The estate is solvent.

JAMES JOHNSTON, } Admr.

SAMUEL DIXON, } Admr.

Oct. 3, 1833—37-3t

Administrator's Notice.

NOTICE is hereby given, that I have taken out letters of administration on the estate of Wm. Reagan, (late of Martin county, Indiana,) deceased; all persons having claims against said estate are requested to present them immediately, and those who are indebted to said estate are requested to make immediate payment. The estate is probably insolvent.

RUFUS BROWN, Admr.

Mt. Pleasant, October 7, 1833—37-3t

John Knox, / Domestic Attachment.

Elijah Jerill.

NOTICE is hereby given, that a writ of Domestic Attachment was issued by me, James H. Cook, a Justice of the peace in and for the county of Knox, in the above case, which writ has this day been returned executed, and an inventory filed; and that on the 28th day of October, 1833, at my office in Harrison township, I will proceed to hear and decide upon said Attachment—of which the said Elijah Jerill, and all others concerned, will take notice.

JAMES H. COOK, J. P.

October 4, 1833—37-3t

John Knox, / Domestic Attachment.

Elijah Jerill.

NOTICE is hereby given, that a writ of Domestic Attachment was issued by me, James H. Cook, a Justice of the peace in and for the county of Knox, in the above case, which writ has this day been returned executed, and an inventory filed; and that on the 28th day of October, 1833, at my office in Harrison township, I will proceed to hear and decide upon said Attachment—of which the said Elijah Jerill, and all others concerned, will take notice.

JAMES H. COOK, J. P.

October 4, 1833—37-3t

John Knox, / Domestic Attachment.

Elijah Jerill.

NOTICE is hereby given, that a writ of Domestic Attachment was issued by me, James H. Cook, a Justice of the peace in and for the county of Knox, in the above case, which writ has this day been returned executed, and an inventory filed; and that on the 28th day of October, 1833, at my office in Harrison township, I will proceed to hear and decide upon said Attachment—of which the said Elijah Jerill, and all others concerned, will take notice.

JAMES H. COOK, J. P.

October 4, 1833—37-3t

John Knox, / Domestic Attachment.

Elijah Jerill.

NOTICE is hereby given, that a writ of Domestic Attachment was issued by me, James H. Cook, a Justice of the peace in and for the county of Knox, in the above case, which writ has this day been returned executed, and an inventory filed; and that on the 28th day of October, 1833, at my office in Harrison township, I will proceed to hear and decide upon said Attachment—of which the said Elijah Jerill, and all others concerned, will take notice.

JAMES H. COOK, J. P.

October 4, 1833—37-3t

John Knox, / Domestic Attachment.

Elijah Jerill.

NOTICE is hereby given, that a writ of Domestic Attachment was issued by me, James H. Cook, a Justice of the peace in and for the county of Knox, in the above case, which writ has this day been returned executed, and an inventory filed;