

tician, remarked that upon examination, Miss Watson's work was found to be erroneous and unsatisfactory. Perhaps you think I am about to attempt the refutation of these statements. Not so. I regard the fact that though girls can and do successfully compete with boys in mathematics, yet, that having arrived at years of discretion, they have sufficient strength of mind to shun this unhappy subject, as one of the best proofs that could be given of their common sense. Do not run away with the idea that I am speaking in disparagement of the mathematical sciences. While I well know it is right and necessary that the high cliffs should be scaled, that lofty towers should be erected, that the high masts should be mounted; I am glad to know that my friend is tilling the soil, or gathering flowers upon the grassy slopes—so I am pleased that young ladies choose rather to gather the pearls of thought in the world of literature, than to scale the dizzy heights of higher mathematics.

Miss Watson died at the early age of 22 years. Under the circumstances, I think it was the wisest course she could pursue. Should any young lady present be turning her ambitious eyes towards the field of mathematics, I trust Miss Watson's unfortunate career will constrain her to desist. You ask then, ladies and gentlemen, do I consider the intellect of woman equal to that of man? I go one step farther, and say I consider it to be superior. With your kind permission, I will present the subject in a thoroughly practical manner. Place a man and a woman in equally trying circumstances say, for instance, that Johnnie demands a story, baby is fractious and must be amused, and there are twenty-four yards of bias ruffling to be cut out at one and the same time; and I am willing to allow your representative man to be the

most thoroughly conscientious Christian man you can find, while any average woman will do to represent the other side. Who do you suppose will pass the afternoon with the greatest serenity of mind, and cut out the bias frills with mathematical accuracy? I leave the answer to this conundrum to the attentive listener. If you say the man has had no previous practice in cutting out bias frills, why I would not be unkind: I am willing to allow him to substitute the putting up of a stove for the frills. Take the simple operation of putting up a stove alone, and even with his wife's superintendence, direction and help, I would like to see the man who would maintain throughout an affable and polite demeanour. In the words of Betsy Prig, the friend and partner of Dickens' illustrious character, the immortal Sairey Gamp, I would simply say, "I don't believe there aint no sich." Again I maintain that in debate, woman is superior to man. Listen to an argument between a man and his wife, as to whose fault it was that the coal fire went out in the night. The clear, true and forcible manner in which the woman puts forward her side of the question will at once convince you of this fact.

Again I argue that the reasoning power of woman is superior to that of man. Let any woman reason with her husband as to the propriety of such conduct, for instance, as remaining in the billiard or club-room till two o'clock in the morning—if I mistake not, he will find discretion to be the better part of valour, and change the topic of conversation as soon as may be. From a business point of view also, I think it must be admitted that woman takes precedence of man: Send a man to match a skein of embroidery-silk or to buy baby a dress, what will be the result? In nine cases out of ten the embroidery-silk will be of the wrong shade, and baby's dress