always felt so thankful for all you have done in teaching me to talk. It gives us great pleasure to talk to our precious little boy. He understands if I say 'Baby, don't,' when he pulls my hair. He can say 'papa,' is six months old, and weighs twenty pounds." This last is one of those exceptional cases, which we earnestly wish were more numerous among congenital deaf-mutes, that sometimes reward the long patient labor and ingenuity of the teacher. Among hundreds, I have found but few such. It will be noticed that even in this case, where there is both a disposition and an effort to make the most of her acquired speech, signs are necessary to supplement the best she can do with vocal utterance. I have refrained from an expression of opinion on this subject, preferring to give the testimony of persons who are unquestionably competent. The statements quoted were given without the knowledge of the use I should make of them. In view of such testimony, how any honest person can say that the sign-language is incapable of the expression of thought and abstract ideas is incomprehensible. I have never known an individual who endeavored to acquire this language to make such a statement. Even Mr. Engelsman, if he had witnessed at the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf last summer, as many others did, the translation into the sign-language of the philosophical essay by Mrs. Alice Noyes Smith, simultaneously and concurrently with its reading by its author, would have pronounced it a marvel of exactness, force, and beauty. The sign-language is with that lady vernacular, as she was born and reared with the deaf. Added to this, she has enjoyed the training of her father, Dr. J. L. Noyes, superintendent of the Minnesota Institution for the Deaf, who is, I think, the one most discriminating, critical, and precise master of its language. Mrs. Smith stated that to her this language had all the ease, elegance, and force of spoken language.

In July, 1889, there assembled in the city of Paris, France, a world's congress of the deaf, to consider subjects relating to the welfare of their class, and take such action as might seem to be promotive thereof. This congress was the first of its kind. Its members comprised delegates from France, America, Belgium, England, Ireland, Australia, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany, Poland, and Turkey. They also represented all methods of instructing the deaf, in each of which some of them had received their education. If any company of persons could be expected to speak earnestly and frankly on subjects pertaining to the deaf, it would surely be such a one as this congress. The congress remained in session one week, discussing various questions pertaining to their class. At its conclusion the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted: —

"Whereas the Milan Congress, sitting in solemn conclave, had decided that all deaf-mutes could be taught to speak, and that the pure oral system was superior to all others; whereas, under the influence excited by so august and important a body, changes have been made in some institutions which have a strong bearing on the immediate and future welfare of the deaf; whereas we, though we believe in the utility of the oral system to a certain extent, know that the conclusions arrived at by said congress are arbitrary and unwarranted by experience and facts: resolved, that the system known as the American combined system, which approves of the use of both articulation and signs as the only means by which the greatest number of the deaf can be reached, and the greatest amount of good done, is the best; that we deprecate all such arrangements as aim at the introduction of the oral system in its purest form, and the consequent exclusion of deaf-mute teachers, who have proved themselves fitted for the position; that the above be published to the world as the sentiments of the deaf-mutes gathered from all nations, in the congress held at Paris, July 11–18, 1889."

Such evidence as this is not to be lightly esteemed. It should be duly considered that *for* the deaf-mute there is no such thing as articulation, though there is articulation *by* the deaf; for, while he may utter distinct articulate sounds for others to receive, he cannot receive them himself, and is consequently thrown back upon the visible movements of the superficial parts of the organs of voice, which are chiefly the lips. Some mouths are so constructed that many of the movements of the tongue and teeth can also be perceived, but this is by no means frequently the case: hence what is so often spoken of as articulation, and is really such to the hearing, is only a lip-sign to the deaf; and there arises the question, which is better, — the small indistinct signs formed by the lips, which represent nothing but sounds, which have no existence for the deaf, or the large, rapid, concise, and ideographic signs made by the hands and arms? Which the preference of the deaf is, need not be asked; for it is universally the fact, and notorious, that deaf-mutes who have been taught by the lip method, and have been shielded from the "contaminating influence of signs" (!) more closely than they have from disease, when opportunity offers, take to signs as naturally as ducklets to the water. They are usually such adepts in the sign-language, that it is obvious to the discriminating observer that they are "old hands at the bellows." It would be as sensible to tell a rustic to blear his eyes on Broadway, or a boy to blear his at the circus, or a belle to wear dark goggles in a millinery-store, as to inhibit the deaf-mute using signs when he meets other deaf-mutes, if he has something to narrate. When fish will not swim in the water, and birds will not fly in the air, we may expect the deaf-mute to disuse signs as a means of interchange of thought. These statements are not made because of objection or opposition to teaching deaf-mutes to articulate or to read lip signs, for to some of them this ability is at times very useful. I have one of the largest companies of deaf-mutes in the world, receiving such instruction, and I purpose maintaining it in the future as I have done for more than twenty years, during which time I have assigned a thousand of them to teachers for such training. These facts are here set forth that justice may be done the deaf, of whom complaint is often made that they do not do better, by persons who fail to duly appreciate the difficulties they encounter. It should not be a wonder that they do no better, but that they do so well.

PHILIP G. GILLETT.

NOTES AND NEWS.

Symons's Meteorological Magazine for November contains a climatological table for the British Empire for 1889. The highest temperature in the shade was 109°, at Adelaide, on Jan. 13. For five years Adelaide has recorded the highest temperature in the shade, reaching 112.4° in 1886. It had also the highest temperature in the sun, 170.7°, and was the driest station during the year, having a mean humidity of 63 per cent. The lowest shade temperature was recorded at Winnipeg, on Feb. 23, — 42.6°. Only once does any other station come within twenty degrees of it. It had also the greatest range in the year, the greatest mean daily range (24.5°), the lowest mean temperature, and the least rainfall (14.95 inches). The highest mean temperature was 80.5°, at Bombay; and the greatest rainfall, 73.79 inches, at Trinidad. London was the most cloudy and the dampest station, the mean humidity being 81 per cent. The brightest station was Malta, which had little more than half the cloud of London.