

for women—not whether women and men shall be educated at Universities together, but whether women shall be allowed to have a University education at all. Many of those who want the doors of the Provincial University and College thrown open to both sexes on the same conditions would rather have a separate institution of the same kind for women, but until such an institution is provided, or at least until there is some chance of getting one, they resent the injustice inflicted on those who are desirous of obtaining a University education and cannot get it.

We are told that there are only a few women applying for permission to attend lectures, and that as they have been excluded so long it will do no great harm to exclude them a little longer. To this I reply (1) that injustice is not less flagrant in its character when the sufferers are few than when they are many, and (2) that there is not the slightest chance of a separate institution like University College being at any future time established and endowed for the advantage of women. A moment's consideration will suffice to convince any thinking person of the correctness of this statement. We hear of proposals to have separate lecture rooms for women. Of what use would they be if we had them, unless we had professors to lecture in them? To talk of the present over-worked staff of the College repeating their lectures during the session is absurd, and if we had more money with which to pay additional salaries, the most pressing necessity is not separate lectures for women, but sub-division of the subjects taught.

It is useless to expect a Legislature composed of practical men to prefer a separate costly establishment to the more economical solution afforded by co-education. This may be matter for regret, but we have to deal with facts and situations as they present themselves. All that is needed just now in the way of alteration of the College is to set apart some room as a retiring-room for female students, just as is now done for female undergraduates during the currency of the University examinations. If the accommodation in the latter case is not what it ought to be, improve it and make it permanent. The whole cost need not exceed a very few hundred dollars, and the Senate is just as much responsible as the Council for seeing that we are no longer disgraced by defective arrangements for the accommodation of those who have an admitted right to be present at our examination halls.

Toronto, March 20.

WM. HOUSTON.

CO-EDUCATION! A CRITICISM.

To the Editor of the 'Varsity.

Permit me to comment upon the following extracts from your editorial on Co-Education:

1st. You say: 'We are opposed, in the abstract, to any system of co-education in college training. We long ago stated our position in this regard.' Now, Mr. Editor, either your memory is very short or you must suppose that of your readers is, else you would not venture to make this assertion. Everybody who has read the 'Varsity from its first publication is aware that, until very recently, it strongly advocated the claims of women to admission to University College. You are justly chargeable with the grossest inconsistency, for you cannot explain away the following quotations which I cite from the 'Varsity of the dates mentioned:—

'The Council has excluded by a single resolution a whole class of persons of whom it has never been shown that their presence would in any way injure the discipline of the College, or interfere with its purposes.'—Nov. 20, 1880.

'The only objection urged against co-education is that a want of discipline would be engendered by the mingling of the sexes. This objection, while unfair to the women, implies a want of control on the part of the men, and a lack of disciplinary ability in the lecturers. So many good reasons have been hitherto given in the 'Varsity for the co-education of the sexes and any objections to it so well answered that it is needless to go over the ground again now. But we would urge upon the students the necessity of obtaining signatures to the petition in circulation, etc.'—March 3, 1882.

These extracts are surely sufficient evidence that you are not now following the original policy of the 'Varsity, but going directly contrary to it. It would be interesting to your subscribers to know your reasons for this change. If you desire more evidence of the fact I am ready to submit it.

2nd. You say, 'Co-educationists have to a large extent abandoned abstraction and taken to statistics.' This is not the case. These statistics we have adduced—not, as your statements imply, to be used as fundamental arguments for the admission of women to University College—but only to show the utter groundlessness of the main objection which our opponents will persist in making to their admission, a differ-

ent thing entirely, as you will perceive. We, no less than our opponents, argue from general principles or abstractions. But it is an axiom in political and social science that statistics are of great use for the verification of deductions from general principles, or for the detection of errors in such deductions. Herein lies the difference between our opponents and us. We have verified our deductions by numerous statistics; your statements are not only unsupported, but are directly disproved by our statistics. The advocates of co-education are now precisely in the position of Galileo when he argued from general principles verified by experiment that two pound-weights of different specific gravity would fall from a height to the ground in the same time; the opponents of co-education are in the position of the several learned doctors who opposed Galileo on general principles only without troubling themselves about vulgar experiments. You know the result. The history of the Dark Ages is full of just such reasoning. But it is rather late now in the world's history for Drs. Eliot and Wilson to attempt to restore that method of argument.

3rd. You say, 'No statistics could be more misleading than those co-educationists have collected. They are mainly the reports of College presidents committed to the experiment, and there always remains the doubt whether such prejudiced inferences may not also be founded on ignorance.' Indeed! The coolness of these assumptions is unparalleled. Presidents White and Fairchild and Principal Grant are of course ignorant of what is doing in their own colleges, but Presidents Eliot and Wilson and the Editor of the 'Varsity can tell them all about it! Really, Mr. Editor, this is too much. You have surpassed yourself here, have you not?

4th. You say (but not in the editorial of '82), 'We believe the effect of the introduction of co-education upon College life and College feeling would be pernicious.' Now we would have your readers remember that this is a purely gratuitous assertion on your part, made in direct opposition to an overwhelming array of evidence. You add, 'Genuine College feeling, rightly understood, can grow up in freedom and perfection only among men alone and could not be participated in or understood by women.' How dreadful! Of course, Mr. Editor, we shall all straightway take it for granted that that only is 'genuine College feeling rightly understood,' which you pronounce to be such. And, of course, by a sort of divine prescience, possessed only by yourself, you know all about what University women are capable of participating in and understanding! How fortunate they are in having such an interpreter!

5th. After advocating the erection of an annex, you with your usual inconsistency and more than your usual exaggeration, go on to say that there is a practical difficulty involved in the admission of women to University College on account of the large additional expenditure that would be required. Now, Mr. Editor, you surely do not think to delude your readers by such buncombe as this! You must know that you are exaggerating here to the extent of creating a difficulty where none exists. You must give the mover and seconder of the resolution the credit of knowing something of the matter, and they stated that the expense involved in the introduction of the new order of things would be a very trifle. It is certain that the cost of changes necessary need not amount to more than three or four hundred dollars. You require a good deal of courage to attempt to make a mountain out of this mole-hill.

You regret that in the Legislature "nothing definite" was urged against the resolution. Does it not strike you as the probable cause of this fact that "nothing definite" or capable of standing the light of reason could, under the circumstances, be urged against it? True, you have given us something definite, but of the value of your objections I leave your readers to judge.

Very truly yours,

A. STEVENSON.

THE DEGREE OF LL.D.

To the Editor of the 'Varsity.

DEAR SIR,—As one of the sub-committee to whom was referred the question of the degree of LL.D., I trust I may be excused if I shortly state my views on the subject. In the first place, it seems to me that some of those who have already written upon this subject have gone out of their way to say unpleasant things about those who have already obtained the degree, abusing the men instead of the system. It is no discredit to a man to strive to obtain, in the way prescribed by the curriculum, the highest degree in the gift of the University, and if those who have obtained it have cast less lustre upon their Alma Mater than they have received from her, as is disparagingly asserted, the same remark will apply with equal force to the whole body of graduates, with, at all events, a few notable exceptions. The system is wrong because it offers a degree, which is through-