

oral recitation now ; it would not be called on for written recitation then. The severe, constant, daily discipline and practice would, all the same, have been undergone ; and the master would have disposed of his work during school-hours.

Of course, this daily exercise in writing should not be a substitute for the special work in English, but only an auxiliary to it. The main point is to make the pen an indispensable tool, to keep the pupil using it till it is as familiar to his hand as a hammer or saw is to a carpenter. And if in ad-

dition to this constant and stringently corrected elementary work, the school-boys can be led to read a great deal of standard English literature, not with any notion of emulating it, or even of analyzing it critically, a task which may be left for maturer years, there need be no fear as to the quality of their preparation. The Harvard committee has pointed out the correct way so plainly and so forcibly that there can be no excuse for schools which fail to perform this modest, but absolutely essential work.—*Public Opinion.*

STATE TEXT-BOOKS.

AT the recent meeting of the Pennsylvania State Association of School Directors, Mr. William McGeorge, Jr., of Cynwydd, Montgomery county, discussed the question, "Should the State Control and Publish School Text-Books?" He said, in part :

What does this question presuppose and involve? It may mean either that the state edits, manufactures and supplies text-books ; or that the state simply selects them. Whichever horn of the dilemma its advocates may take, they are thereby making one of the most deadly assaults possible upon the integrity and efficiency of our school system.

It is amazing that this book question can be seriously proposed so near the beginning of the twentieth century, even if there were no experience to draw upon. But what can it mean to-day, in the face of the unanimous testimony of the school men of Vermont, and Maryland, and California, and Oregon, and Minnesota, and Indiana—everywhere that it has been tried—to the effect that the working of such laws in any form produces evil, and only evil results.

How has "uniformity" worked where it has been tried? If human testimony is worth anything, the educators who have watched the working of these books should know them. Hear what they say. One superintendent in Minnesota says : "Our text-book system has retarded the true progress of the schools." Another : "If every trial exhausts some tempting form of error, then truly the experience of this state should deter others from experimenting in the school-book business." Still another : "I do not think state uniformity is desirable ; the books are not uniform here, as the state books have been laid aside for something better." And so on, indefinitely.

Hon. B. G. Northrup, ex-secretary of Connecticut State Board of Education, says : "The lessons of experience are decisive upon this point. The states which have tried this sovereign remedy of enforced uniformity have found it worse than the disease. Wherever such a law has been fairly tried it has soon been repealed."

Ex-State Supt. Henry Rabb, of Illinois, says : "It has been frequently tried in other states, and uniformly