

To maintain these schools they would tax the property of the entire community.

But the right of a state to take a single dime of one man's property to educate another man's child rests on the right of self-preservation—the right of the state to live.

Ignorance is dangerous to free institutions. Some parents on account of poverty cannot educate their children; some by reason of ignorance, heedlessness, or avarice, will not. For these the state, unwilling to rear within itself a class that may work its ruin, establishes schools; but still the carelessness or the covetousness of parents keep many children out of them.

If a rich man or a powerful corporation decline to pay the school tax, the state, by process of law, collects it.

Resting on the inalienable right of self-preservation, and asserting that education is necessary to the perpetuity of free government, it demands a portion of the property for the support of the schools. The right to make this demand and to enforce it cannot be successfully questioned. Rights have respect to ends. The end which the state seeks is the rearing of intelligent citizens. For the attainment of this end it is not enough that opportunities for education be afforded, they must be improved.

If in seeking its end the state will not be baffled by the millionaire's refusal to pay the tax, shall it be defeated by the greed of parents, or the truant fancies of idle, untrained youth?

Compulsory education is a phrase of unpleasant sound. It grates on ears accustomed to harangues about liberty; but where short of it can a state that begins to support public schools stop? Taxing all to maintain free schools for the sake of its own security, must it not also for the same security insist that all shall in some way be educated?—*Connecticut School Journal*.

5. EVILS OF OVERSTUDY.

In the above-named city, so famous for excellent schools, there is one called the Public Latin School, which has been considered the best school in the country, and which is attended by 250 youths. The father of one of these, perceiving the amount of study required of his son, looked into the matter and found that the boys were required to study five hours a day in school and three hours at home, making 8 hours study a day for six days in the week. It is a great blessing that the Sabbath is observed in Boston, or the whole seven days might have been equally crammed with studies.

Being convinced that such severe and continuous mental labor was injurious to youth, and that there should be at least, one day for play in the week, this parent drew up a petition to the School Committee, setting forth the facts, and asking for Saturday as a holiday, except one Saturday in the month which is set apart for public exercises. This petition was signed by 203 parents of boys in the school, and endorsed by 153 of the best physicians of Boston, and sixty-five clergymen of all denominations. This imposing array of influence will doubtless secure its object, and, probably, draw the attention of other cities to a matter of so much consequence.

The opinions which some of the physicians appended are specially worthy the attention of all who have to do with schools in any part of the world.

Dr. Clement A. Walker, Superintendent of the City Hospital for the Insane, says: "I cannot doubt that the modern system of forcing the tender brain of youth lays the foundation for the brain and nervous disorders of after years—the cases of melancholia and paralysis, softening of the brain, and kindred diseases becoming so fearfully prevalent. Lessons that require more than two hours of study out of school are too long. I have been a teacher, and I think I know." Dr. Daniel V. Foltz says: "I have had two sons complete the Latin School course of instruction, and both had ruined constitutions as the consequence. One sleeps in Mount Auburn, and the other was obliged to leave college without finishing the course, and has never been able to resume his studies. Both are melancholy comments on the overtaxing, exhausting system of instruction pursued." Dr. E. B. Moore says: "I am of the opinion that no lessons should be assigned to scholars out of school, leaving it voluntary with each to study or rest. I have a son now in the insane asylum, the result of excessive study and disappointed ambition." Dr. George W. Gray says: "I wish that in all of our schools the pupil might be made to remember less—and think and reflect more. Our minds, like our stomachs, can digest just so much and any over spoils the whole, especially is it so with the young—before the mind becomes matured." Dr. Peter D. Walsh says: "The result is an over-taxed brain, a dwarfed body, a weakened intellect, a variety of diseases, and a premature grave." Dr. Joseph H. Warren says: "I now cordially sign the above, as I can see the ill effects on our son, now attending this school, from the long continued drill required in study without sufficient rest for

mind or body." Dr. Charles C. Street says: "And for the same reason I am fully convinced that no school should be allowed to have a session on Saturday." Dr. Arthur H. Nichols says: "From my own experience, having spent six years at Boston Latin School, I can bear witness to the fact that the constant indoor confinement of the boys often results in serious and permanent injury to health." Dr. George A. Stuart says: "Of late years the majority of diseases seem to have assumed a nervous type, which in most cases may be traced to over-taxation of the mental powers of the young, both male and female. To quote a countryman of mine, 'It is well enough to teach the idea how to shoot, but dinna use too big a gun.'" Dr. Alfred C. Garrett says: "I must heartily approve this step, as two of my boys have been in this school. The study out of school hours ought to be abolished. Dr. Carl Booth says: "I would not allow my own child to study more than three hours a day. If a child cannot in this time acquire the wisdom of any professor ordinarily spoken either such child, teacher or teachers, must be idiots." Dr. J. B. Treadwell says: "Hundreds of pupils of our public schools are ruined in health every year; this I know from personal observation. I take great pleasure in aiding any scheme for reducing the hours of study." Dr. Howard F. Damon says: "The amount of vital power has its limits, and these limits in my judgment, are far exceeded by the present system of over-tasking the pupils in our public schools, and especially in the Public Latin School.

6. OBJECTION TO LEARNING LESSONS AT HOME.

An English paper complains of the practice of requiring pupils to prepare school lessons at home, as a serious and unnecessary interference with the comfort of the fireside. It claims that a child's evenings should be given to relaxation and family pleasures, and that these should not be trampled upon by school tasks. The practice of assigning home lessons is also condemned by many eminent physicians as prejudicial to health. This subject has also received the attention of the school authorities in many of our cities, and regulations to guard against the overtaxing of pupils have been enacted. In Boston, teachers are forbidden to assign lessons requiring home study to pupils in the primary schools and to girls in the grammar schools, and not more than one hour's home study can be daily required of the boys in the grammar schools and in the three lower classes in the high schools. It is also a peremptory rule that pupils shall not be required to study at recess. It is true that these rules are not always observed, but they show a praiseworthy effort to check what is a recognized evil. The recitations and exercises of the pupils in our upper schools consume so great a portion of the regular school hours that little time is left for study. The time spent by grammar and high school pupils in school in the preparation of lessons does not exceed, on an average two hours a day. Of course, the necessary amount of study cannot be compassed in this brief time, and, as a result, one or more lessons are prepared out of school; and this leads to excess in study. We often hear of frail girls studying until ten and eleven o'clock at night to meet school requirements, and we more often wonder that sensible parents permit it.

7. DRAWING IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

This is one of the live questions of the day, which we hope to keep constantly before our readers. The public, including many school officers, need to be enlightened on the very great importance of teaching drawing in schools of every grade; while teachers need advice and counsel in respect to the best and most available methods and apparatus of instruction. There is a good deal of discussion in progress at home and abroad respecting the wisest and most efficient plans for cultivating the eye and the hand in the art of drawing, and consequently we invite experienced teachers in Connecticut, and at a distance, to give us their views upon this subject. The Legislature of this State last year came near passing a law (in accordance with a recommendation from Gov. English) which should place drawing among the obligatory studies of the common schools. If the General Assembly of next year should take such a step, it would be essential at once that the right view should be widely disseminated.

Among recent expressions of opinion, we call attention to the following:

1. The recent report of Mr. Parish, City Superintendent of Schools in New Haven, in the last of which (for 1870) he claims that it is fully established by the experience of New Haven that elementary drawing can be taught as well as other branches by the ordinary teachers in the public schools.

2. The recent reports of B. G. Northrup, which have repeatedly dwelt upon this subject in an earnest manner. The report for 1870 is especially worthy to be consulted.