

or less lesion of the pleura. Sitting sideways to writing, likewise—foolishly recommended by some—is really sitting with a more or less twisted spine, protracted continuance in which position naturally disturbs the nervous system, particularly when accompanied with earnest brain-work. Moreover, when so seated, the work is looked at from a false angle of vision, analogous to holding an object askew to examine it."

In his instructions for holding the pen, which are excellent, he recommends a very simple expedient to preserve the penholder in its proper position with relation to the fore and middle fingers: it is to place an India-rubber band round the three, between the first and second joints. He considers "an angle of from 48° to 52° sufficient slope for any kind of hand;" but it is interesting to know that in the English civil service

"the angle preferred is that from 70° to 80° , with very round turns." In regard to slope, he lays it down as an axiom that "up-strokes and down-strokes ought to slope alike." It will be interesting to our readers to notice how far the series of head-line copy books they have in use will conform to this. A very simple test he gives is to turn the copy up side down. One of the points in which we think he is in error is as to the direction from which the light should come; he says it should come from the front or from the left hand, we think it should come from the right hand or from the front, so that the shadow should not interfere with the work.

We have said enough to shew that this little book is a thoroughly practical one, and will be useful in the hands of anyone who wishes to acquire the art of writing a good, plain, readable hand.

A LETTER FROM A CORRESPONDENT OF THE HAMILTON *SPECTATOR* ON "THE SCHOOL BOOK QUESTION."

To the Editor of the Spectator.

SIR,—The recent revelations made by Mr. Warwick, the Toronto publisher, furnish any additional proof that even the most dubious might require of the existence, "not only of a ring, but of a ring within a ring." Let us hope that the day is not far distant when the Minister of Education may be able to exclaim, "One thing I know, whereas I was blind, now I see." Surely it does not need much penetration to perceive that the Torontonians Board of School Book Compilers in the present, as in the past, merely avail themselves of the "casual advantages" of their official position. There is no real merit in any of their compilations, yet, with brazen effrontery, their only stock in trade, they arrogate to themselves the credit due to the authors whom they mutilate. The time was when the authorized list embraced "Sangster's Arithmetic," "Sangster's Algebra," "Sangster's Chemistry," "Sangster's Statics," "Sangster's Hydrostatics," etc., etc., and the gifted compiler reaped a

"golden harvest of royalty," but were he to issue a school-book now, there would be "none so poor to do him reverence." The beggars at present on horseback are now flooding the market with compilations from "Hamblin Smith's" mathematical works, and laying French and German authors on factoring under heavy contributions, while Stoddart's Mental Arithmetic has also been largely pillaged. To these efforts of genius are, of course, attached sequences in the shape of the inevitable keys, the real object being to grab all the "royalty" possible, and as "on horror's head horrors accumulate," we have now inflicted on us, "Hughes' Calisthenics," "Hughes' Mistakes in Teaching," "Hughes' How to Secure and Retain Attention," etc., etc., *ad nauseam*, compiled from American professional works. We may yet anticipate "Tilley's Book-keeping" and "Ross on Dictation." What have we done to deserve such punishment?

How is it that none of the Central Committee ever discovered their abilities as com-