

L 11
E 45

Educational Weekly

VOL. IV. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14TH, 1886. Number 91.

The Educational Weekly,
Edited by T. ARNOLD HAULTAIN, M.A.

TERMS: Two Dollars per annum. Clubs of three, \$5.00. Clubs of five at \$1.60 each, or the five for \$8.00. Clubs of twenty at \$1.50 each, or the twenty for \$30.00.

New subscriptions may begin at any time during the year.

Payment, when sent by mail, should be made by post-office order or registered letter. Money sent in unregistered letters will be at the risk of the senders.

The date at the right of the name on the address label shows to what date the subscription is paid. The change of this date to a later one is a receipt for remittance.

Subscribers desiring their papers to be discontinued are requested to give the publishers timely notification.

In ordering a change of address, or the discontinuance of the paper, the name of the post-office to which the paper is sent should always be given.

Rates of advertising will be sent on application.

Business communications and communications intended for the Editor should be on separate papers.

PUBLISHED BY

THE GRIP PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.,
TORONTO, CANADA.

JAMES V. WRIGHT, *General Manager.*

TORONTO, OCTOBER 14, 1886.

MR. HOUSTON'S vigorous letter on women's education and women's health will be interesting to many of our readers—indeed the subject is one of the most interesting and important of the day.

Neither Dr. Withers-Moore nor Mr. Houston are altogether right, nor are they altogether wrong. Dr. Withers-Moore says higher education unfits women for maternal duties, and quotes high authorities to prove it. Mr. Houston says higher education does not unfit them (whether maternal duties are women's "proper function" or not we need not here discuss), and quotes statistics to prove his position. No doubt a higher education could be so conducted as that it would improve rather than injure the health of women; but no doubt also higher education does sometimes affect the health of many women, and both Dr. Withers-Moore and Mr. Houston can point to instances to support each of these positions.

Where both are wrong, we venture to think, is in failing to recognize a most important element of the problem.—Have not the women of the upper classes led for generations a life very different from that of the men of their own rank? a less wholesome life? The men have walked, ran, jumped, rowed, played football and cricket, contested in annual athletic sports till they were seventeen or eighteen, perhaps till they were twenty-four or twenty-five. And after this, even if they entered close offices or engaged in wearing vocations, at all events they dressed fairly sensibly, went out in all weathers, and indulged in a certain amount of out-door exercise. The women, on the contrary, at fifteen or sixteen had to give up their skipping, and climbing, and "cross-tag"-playing, and take to those two dreadful occupations, with the equally dreadful names—deportment and calisthenics. And as to their dress—appearance seems the only thing to be considered.

It is this that has unfitted women for higher education. It is not the higher education that ruins them for maternal duties.

It is a fact as lamentable as it is undeniable that, in the vast majority of cases, the women of our best classes of society sacrifice health to appearance. Any work on Gynecology will be found to uphold the assertion, and our Gynecologists are the best judges of these matters. Assuredly their tastes are high and refined; their sensibilities delicate; feelings exquisitely sensitive; their intellects cultured in the best sense of the term. And to all these attributes the men of the present day owe perhaps all those finer traits by which they differ from the men of barbarous ages. But the fact remains: physically women are not as strong as Nature intended they should be.

"MORE than half the population of Canada," says an exchange, "get a living by cultivating the land. The whole population by the census of 1882 was 4,324,810, which, at a rate of 5 persons to

a family, would give 864,962 adult males. Of these 464,025 are classed as occupiers of land, 403,491 being owners, 75,245 tenants and 3,289 employees. The occupiers of 10 acres and under numbered 75,286, between 11 and 50 acres, 93,325; between 51 and 100 acres, 156,672; between 101 and 200 acres, 102,243, and over 200 acres, 36,499. Although more than half the people are farmers and the families of farmers, we never heard any complaint about an over production of wheat, or potatoes, or butter, or eggs."

There is an argument concealed in the last sentence. It is practically impossible that there should be an over-production of wheat. Wheat is a necessity of life, and the market for wheat is the whole civilized world. The supply can practically never exceed the demand. The more wheat there is, the cheaper it becomes, and the more people are supplied with more and better food. The price of wheat is the chief controlling factor of the price of all other commodities. Too low it could not go.

It would be hardly necessary to state these facts—facts to be found in some form or another in any work on Political Economy—if the sentences quoted above did not contain an important truth for us from an educational standpoint. The fact is Canada can afford to give up far more than fifty per cent. of her population to agricultural pursuits. It is because so many are tempted from these pursuits that we find the learned professions overcrowded. There cannot be an over-production of wheat, potatoes, etc.; but there can be an over-production of clergymen, lawyers, doctors, and teachers. These latter can cater for the wants of only some four million people; farmers can cater for the wants of all Europe in addition to all America. Two hundred millions of people are ready to buy wheat—Canadian wheat if they can get it; only four millions of people can use Canadian clergymen, lawyers, doctors, or teachers. But on this subject we shall have much to say in a future issue.