

It is at present unfortunately true in most schools that much of the time of recitations has to be given to supplying the deficiencies of the textbook. It is also necessary to interpret the textbook, when any sensible person would think the textbook ought to be self-explanatory. The function of the textbook should be to fill in the spaces between the ideas obtained in the laboratory and to focus the mind of the pupil on essentials. If a textbook could be written with care, simplicity and completeness of its kind, the teacher would be relieved of the task of joining ideas together and elucidating statements, and could give his energy to the proper work of a recitation, which is the use of well stated facts and principles for the purpose of inspiring clear thinking and continued study.

Prof. W. J. Beal—As I mentioned yesterday in my paper, I have been 25 years doing my best to help plan a course of study including a course of botany, but we have been obliged to change yearly, or every once in a while, to accommodate the new ideas that come in by introduction of new members in the faculty, some going out and others coming in, and I have given up the problem as one that will never be settled. The existing faculty will adjust studies according to their own ideas, and I presume that is the way elsewhere. There will be constant fluctuations, and the different states and universities will have their own plans. For me to attempt at this time to block out what would seem a suitable course in botany for the state of New York would be folly.

Prof. C. G. Rogers—I would like to ask two questions of Dr Linville. Do you find it possible to secure from the pupils adequate work on *Vorticella* in the laboratory; and how far would you carry work in homology on crawfish?

Prof. Henry R. Linville—In the work on Protozoa I have not accomplished very much, I must acknowledge. I do not give