

THE 'VARSITY:

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF

EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY POLITICS AND EVENTS.

Vol. 1. No. 5.

November 13, 1880.

Price 5 cts.

CO-EDUCATION IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

The paragraph devoted to this question in the November number of the *Bystander* must be my excuse for reverting to it in the *'Varsity*. In my former contribution, I took the ground that young women who are undergraduates in the University of Toronto should be allowed to attend lectures in University College if they desire to do so, and I propose now to enforce this view by a few additional considerations.

We are all interested in knowing what an educationist of such eminence as Prof. Goldwin Smith thinks about any educational problem, but I humbly submit that, in discussing University topics, he would do more good if he would master for himself, and impress on his readers, the distinction between 'Toronto University' and 'University College.' He would not confound 'Victoria University' with 'Owens' College,' and if he were to do so in discussing matters connected with either of them, he would inevitably land himself in confusion, as he does in the paragraph above referred to. It is not correct to say that, 'at Toronto University the co-education movement has come to a crisis,' for, as a matter of fact, the question of co-education has been so successfully fought out in connection with the University, that the softer sex occupies the more advantageous position of the two. Not only can girls come up, as of right, to every examination open to boys, but there are special local examinations instituted by the Senate for girls, to which boys are not admitted. Believing this arrangement to be unfair to the boys and objectionable on other grounds, I hope to see the local examinations thrown open, before long, to both sexes, but meanwhile I am safe in saying that, in so far as the Provincial University is concerned, the advocates of women's rights have nothing more to ask.

If any one is disposed to say that this confounding of the University with the College is a trifling matter, I answer that it can easily be shown to be nothing of the sort. Those who have, for some years past, been striving to remove the obstacles from the path of girls who are seeking to procure a higher education for themselves, knew perfectly well what they were about. They knew that it would be much easier to pave the way for their admission to the University examinations than to the College lectures, and, as the institutions are quite distinct in their academical management they naturally and properly attempted the easiest part of their task first. Their success there will only embolden them to press the case still further, until girls are either admitted to University College or have provided for their exclusive use a similar institution. Any person who knows much about the politics of Ontario does not need to be told that the chances of seeing a College, the counterpart of University College, provided for girls is of the slimmest kind; and it is simply preposterous to say that, in view of this fact, the sex of an applicant must forever debar her from attendance at lectures in the only affiliated institution which teaches the University curriculum for the third and fourth years.

During the past five years a large number of young ladies have passed the junior matriculation examination and thus become undergraduates of the University of Toronto. Several of them have passed the first year or senior matriculation examination, and are therefore of second year standing, and one lady has passed the second year examination and is now in her third year. Since my former article appeared, I have been informed that she applied some time ago for admission to University College, and was refused on the ground that the Council did not consider it compatible with due order and discipline that young men and young women should attend lectures together. I can only say that I regret this decision very much for the sake of University College, no less than of those ladies who would, by attending it, be put in a much better position to earn their own living, as many of them have to do. The matter, however, is fortunately not likely to end with this one refusal.

Mr. Goldwin Smith says that if expediency is opposed to the admission of women to University College 'there can be no plea for it on the ground of right.' This is a most unfair statement of the case. How can it be known whether expediency is opposed to their admission or not until the experiment has been tried? The experience of other institu-

tions is of some value, but certainly that experience tells as strongly in favor of their admission as of their rejection. If women were admitted, and if their attendance were found to be incompatible with due order and discipline, there might be some ground for subordinating the 'right' of a class to expediency. Only a session or two ago, two young ladies attended Prof. Croft's lectures on chemistry in the School of Practical Science, and their presence in the lecture-room created no unusual disturbance. On the same plea Mr. Smith might as reasonably oppose the co-education of young men and young women in our High Schools, and yet I doubt if there is a High School master in the Province who would not prefer a mixed class to one made up of either sex alone, as a mere matter of 'order and discipline.' On this point I can speak from experience, and I am sure that many others will endorse what I have said. Nor is the citation irrelevant, for in attendance at the same High School are frequently to be found male and female students of all ages from twenty to thirty.

Mr. Smith correctly points out that the subject involves these three distinct questions: (1). Ought women to receive a higher education than they receive at present? (2). Ought they to receive the same education as men? (3). Ought they to receive it in the same place as men? In answering these questions he leaves it to be clearly understood that he would not be content with answering the last in the negative. He seems to think that because the sphere of woman's usefulness, happiness, and dignity is domestic, and not public or professional—life, a knowledge of classics, modern languages, natural sciences, mental and moral philosophy, or mathematics must in some way militate against her becoming a wife or a mother, apparently by giving her a dislike to 'matrimony and maternity.' It is difficult, in discussing of the simple question, whether female undergraduates of the Provincial University shall have a right to get their education in the Provincial College affiliated with it, to read such a sentiment with patience. Mr. Smith says 'the barriers of artificial privilege ought to fall,' and this is precisely what I am advocating. He must know that thousands of women are, at the present moment, engaged in public school teaching in Ontario, and yet he would debar them from the hope of rising higher in their profession. Unfortunately for some women—and these not the least worthy or honored of the sex—they are compelled to fight life's battle alone, and those who are opposed to the removal of one serious obstacle out of the way of this class may rest assured that some more valid reason must be given than has yet been given for the maintenance of this 'barrier of artificial privilege,' if its existence is to be long continued.

The legal right of any woman to be admitted to University College when she has complied with the Statutory requirements is a matter which will, in all probability, be determined some day by one of the Superior Courts should the Council persist in the refusal. On that aspect of the case I would like to say a few words, but the length of this article forbids.

WM. HOUSTON.

COMMUNICATIONS.

'UNIVERSITY OF ONTARIO.'

To the Editor of the *'Varsity*.

In the report of the Committee on Legislation, to be considered at the next meeting of Convocation, is to be found the following clause:—

"The Committee beg also to report that, as the University of Toronto is in fact the Provincial University, and is usually so designated, that it would be proper for its name to be changed to that of The University of Ontario."

The introduction of the second *that* in this sentence is evidence of the haste with which the Committee had dealt with the matter, but, without stopping to be hypercritical on a point of grammatical construction, I hope I may be allowed to say that, with all due respect to the members of the Committee, I think their recommendation a highly improper one. The only reason assigned for the proposed change is that the University of Toronto is the Provincial University and is usually so designated. This is quite true, but it appears to me no good reason