

occasion, and these were—how inspectors should examine schools, so as to know their exact state in regard to spelling, writing, reading, and arithmetic. As to spelling, he did not believe in oral examinations, and preferred dictation and the writing of a short narrative. He would also lay much stress in this way upon good or correct writing, to such an extent as to make letters distinct. He did not quite approve of the "standard" system. He then referred to writing, and said it was impossible to form a proper estimate of it from close examination of one copy, and preferred to have specimens classified and their merits determined upon by comparison with acknowledged standards. In reference to arithmetic, he gave some of his own experience in this department, and said he was in the way of using papers of four grades. Reading, he considered, might be said to consist of pronunciation, emphasis, and intonation, and though he did not think it was a matter in which he could point out what was to be done, he thought it was one in which much might be done by emulation.—In reply to a question, he (Professor Robins) said, in speaking of a pupil who had correctly spelled ninety-three out of one hundred words, he referred to the average pupil. He did not, in arithmetic, allow any merit for questions right in the mode of operation but wrong in the mechanical working. He held the opinion that correctness was the principal thing in arithmetic, although some of the members thought he drew the line too hard in this respect. (Applause.)

Rev. Dr. Ryerson gave the history of the Professor, paying a very high compliment to that gentleman's ability and the brilliant course he had pursued in his scholastic career.—Mr. Hunter moved, seconded by Mr. McCallum, a cordial vote of thanks to Professor Robins, which was cordially passed.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.—Mr. Lewis, Toronto, read a paper upon the "Higher Education of Women." Not only did men of the highest ability demand the higher education of women, he said, but women of what he considered abilities equal to those of the other sex also demanded that right. The advantages of education were not those of a class, for it was now recognized that wherever the great mind existed there these advantages ought to be expended. Why, then, refuse it to women? He said that women had proved themselves equal to men in every department of science and literature, and even if it were granted that they were not, this was no reason why the highest educational advantages should not be offered to them. He argued that it was not a question of ability, but of expediency. He thought the present system of things made woman in some ways the next thing to a serf, for no man could exercise the same power over another man as he could over his wife. This state of things began when mere animal force was the ruling power—when might was right. They did not now exercise their powers in such a great degree, but they still shut women out from all the well-paid situations in life on the plea that they were not fit to occupy these places, and that home was their proper sphere. This latter point he granted; but that should not shut her out from all the mental acquirements to which men were admitted. An ill-educated wife was the greatest drawback to advancement a man could have; the offspring were at a loss from having but one proper model to copy from; and the wife was likely to discourage in her children the culture of the mind, in preference to the mere outward decoration of the body. The supremacy of an aristocratic family connection had ceased to rule, an aristocracy of money was taking that place in these western climes; but an aristocracy of intellect was the highest imaginable state of civilization, and in this women must have a part, and be admitted to any office of usefulness and honour for which they were qualified. Women ought no more to be educated so as to fit them for wives than men were merely educated for husbands; and though we heard much of the former being the case, we never hear anything of the latter. There was nothing that men could urge against the opening of all positions in the world and the church to women but prejudice. If women think fit to speak the sentiments we enjoy so much when they write them, what had men to urge against it? Christianity needed new forces to battle with sin and vice, and why not accept the help of woman, than whom there was no power greater, among those of her own sex? She alone had an intuitive knowledge of the finer feelings of women, and knew how to gain her confidence, when the words of advice spoken by a man fell harshly upon her ear. He approved of the admission of women into the medical profession, and accounted for the opposition of medical men to this from the fact that they were afraid of the competition thus offered to them. Trades-unionists themselves had not exceeded them in their endeavours to have things all their own way, nor yet in the disgraceful course adopted to gain this end. The solution offered to the question—"What is a woman to do to make a living?"—was "Marry." This, he considered, was degrading that sacred institution, as well as the name of women. He placed no limit to

the liberties which should be given to women as to what part they may play in the politics of the country, any more than in the other spheres. He believed their influence would purify and refine politics, as it had already done society and religion. He did not quite go the length of advocating the opening up of political situations to women, but he argued that if women showed themselves equal or superior to men in any sphere, they ought to be selected in accordance with their fitness, and not be rejected in defiance of this because of their sex. He was loudly applauded on sitting down, as well as at various times throughout the reading of the paper.—Mr. E. H. Stowe, of Toronto, moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Lewis for his able and interesting paper; and Miss Sherlock, of New York, seconded the motion, which was carried with great enthusiasm. The meeting then adjourned.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT.—The first business on the programme was the reading of the financial statement by the treasurer, which showed the total income for the year to be \$135 93; expenditures, \$76 95; and cash on hand, \$58 98. From this, it appears that the society is in quite a flourishing condition in a financial respect, and compares very favourably with former years. The report was received and adopted.

NEW REGULATIONS AND LIMIT TABLES.—Mr. S. McAllister, Toronto, read a paper on this subject, saying, as he introduced it, that it was not altogether a pleasant subject, in so far as he had to speak of the superiors of the department not altogether favourably. He criticised the way in which they laid down the regulation with regard to the ventilation of schools, and also as to the training of teachers. He approved of the lengthening of the vacations in high schools, and wished the same could be done in public schools. He considered the limit table was impracticable, and even in most cases impossible, with regard to the disposition of time to each subject, in which he would have a number of reforms, though he, at the same time, approved of many. He also objected to granting certificates to Normal School students before they had attained sufficient experience in the Model School.—Mr. Fotheringham proposed a vote of thanks to Mr. McAllister for his very able essay, which, being seconded, was carried unanimously.—After some remarks by several members, Dr. Crowe expressed the opinion that the public examinations were an actual nuisance. After commenting upon writing on paper by children, the time given to each subject, he said he approved of teaching by object lessons. He objected to the model schools, and said the fact was that they were no models at all; for it was impossible that the model could be carried out in practice.—Mr. Deerness thought that putting a limit to the time of attending the model schools was putting a damper upon ability, and took objection to the way in which first-class certificates were granted to those "keeping" schools under third-class certificates for five years.—Mr. Monro said he knew of teachers who had obtained first-class certificates under a recommendation from trustees who could not sign their own name.—Mr. Hunter thought the Normal Schools must have vastly improved since a late report, if six months attendance at them was equal to five years' practical teaching.—Mr. McIntosh said it was a mistake to say that the system of the model schools was a fixed thing, and that teachers were bound to act strictly in accordance with the models there laid down. They were to adopt the principle only so far as practicable. He had found himself immensely helped by the experience he had gained at the Normal School.—Mr. Fotheringham, while believing in keeping by the laws laid down by the Board, was not quite in favour of the style of things with regard to the holidays. He thought the holidays ought all to be given in the summer time, as many boys, especially in the country, could attend only in the winter time, and he thought they should be allowed to have as much advantage as possible.—Mr. Alexander objected to the carrying out the limit time-table in its rigidity, and thought more should be left to the good sense of the teacher, seeing that the state of perfection attained in a certain class was the best criterion of the time to be spent upon the subjects taught in it. He defended the Normal School, and said that only those who had had the advantage of being there could speak regarding it with authority. He also considered the value of the Model School very great.—Mr. McCallum thought the teachers really were allowed a little liberty with regard to the limit time-table. He had his opinion regarding the Normal School, and thought no man had anything to say against that institution, beyond hoping that it would progress with the age.—Mr. Glashan thought a matter which ought to have had more attention was to teach children how to learn; and he held that in this respect the limit time-table was no help. He defended model schools, and said they were not properly understood. He said there was a great difference between the lower classes in towns and in the country; in fact there was no lower classes in the country.—Mr. Mackinnon said he found a difficulty with farmers