

took exception to the use that had been made of column *B* to show the growth of the oral method in America on the ground that the pupils referred to in column *B* were not taught "*wholly*" by the oral method. He said:"

"Inasmuch as a majority of these pupils are in combined system schools, attend chapel exercises conducted in the sign-language, and mingle freely with manually taught pupils out of school hours, while many of their teachers do not hesitate on occasion to make a sign or spell a word by the manual alphabet in the schoolroom as an adjunct of their oral instruction, it does not seem to us correct to say that they are 'taught wholly by oral methods'."

The importance of the resolution passed in 1892 by the Speech Association now became obvious, for the Annals' statistics had proved to be misleading. They gave us neither the number taught wholly by the oral method, nor the number taught in part, so that we really had no statistics at all by which to measure the growth of the oral method.

Under these circumstances the Association, in 1899, began to collect speech statistics for itself.

It was found that the schools very readily responded to enquiries and seemed to be willing and even anxious to give the fullest information concerning their speech work. Among other questions asked, the schools were requested to return the number of pupils who were taught by speech, without the use of the sign-language or manual alphabet, as it was thought that this would bring out the number taught by the oral method.

Difficulties, however, soon appeared, as pupils were returned under this head who were using the sign language and manual alphabet freely out of school hours, and who received instruction through the sign-language in chapel exercises, workshop instruction, etc. In these cases the use of speech was practically confined to the school room, and this was not at all what the oralists understood by "oral method."

If there is anything that is characteristic of the oral