

approach, and throughout the investigation, gave evidence of a desire to learn the truth. I have already stated that these pages are written because of the wretched condition of the school. The course of studies is by no means elaborate. When compared with that of similar institutions of Boston, Philadelphia and New York it pales into insignificance. The New York (city) institution for the Blind is a member of the university of the state of New York, and the literary standing of the pupils is determined by the Regent examinations. These examinations are planned to meet the requirements of the schools of the state. Mr. Walt, the Principal, assures the public that not a single rule is relaxed in favor of the blind. All questions are answered in writing and within a time limit. Notwithstanding this the Blind carried off the honors of the state. The course comprises languages, (Ancient and Modern,)—Algebra, Geometry, Physics and many other branches not dreamed of at Brantford. The Perkins Institution, Boston, and that at Overbrook, a suburb of Philadelphia, show a similar marked superiority over the Ontario Institution. Not a single pupil beginning and ending his school course in the O.I.B., could come anywhere near passing the Public School Leaving Examination. There is no reason why blind children of Ontario should be the inferiors of their seeing brothers and sisters if the Blind of New York are actually able to outdo theirs.

This method of comparison is made, not because I desire to contrast Institutions. I am showing, and have shown that the O.I.B. is not what it ought to be. The Inspector of Prisons and Charities endeavored to belittle Mr. Beal and myself by stating that we had no experience with other Institutions. I refer him to the annual report of the above mentioned Institutes for 1890, the year in which

my "An Appeal for the Blind" was written, reminding the public at the same time that Dr. Chamberlain is no more fit to inspect a school for the Blind than a poodle is to be a parish priest.

The mediocrity, even worse, of the literary work done is by no means the only reason why I have criticized the O.I.B. It is not by any means the most important reason. Mr. Beal made charges last June and they were amply sustained before the commission. I charge here as I charged a year ago, that A. H. Dymond, by his stupidity, his blundering, his lack of heart, his indifference to the rights of others, his total ignorance of the fitness of things has transformed the Institution into a moral quagmire, a destroyer rather than a developer. I cannot say what I want to say. When I asked a physician if there was any technical name for the practice that prevailed amongst the male pupils for years, he answered, "You will have to call it sexual perversion. That means many things." Children seven or eight years of age enter the Institution healthy and innocent, but leave it a few years later blasted because they were herded with seniors who had been similarly poisoned, or who were vicious before entering the school. A. H. Dymond must be held responsible for this awful state of affairs, for no one rules in that school but him.

For the benefit of those who have not read "An appeal for the blind," the writer's main charges may be briefly stated, as follows:

1. Too much attention is given to making a park of the premises.
2. The dormitories are over-crowded and unfurnished.
3. The closets are antiquated and inadequate.
4. The pupils have no sitting room in all the building.
5. Manual labor is discredited by being used as a punishment.