

in England, is mainly one of fact. Unfortunately the facts are in dispute. If anarchist plots against the lives of foreign statesmen are actually being hatched and matured on British soil, the Government owe it to their own as well as to foreign nations to take stern measures to put a stop to such outrages. That is, we understand, Lord Salisbury's contention. If, on the other hand, as the Government declares, there is not only no evidence that any such plotting is going on, beyond what is under the strict surveillance of the police, but that foreign immigration of an undesirable kind is on the decrease, they probably do wisely to refuse to curtail the freedom of asylum which has so long been the glory of England. The Government is no doubt running a serious risk in acting on its conviction in this matter, since, if at any time it should unfortunately happen that some foul crime perpetrated in a friendly foreign country could be proved to have been planned on English soil, the outburst of popular resentment would well-nigh sweep the Government from power.

It is easy to darken counsel with words without knowledge, touching the strange, irregular contest which has begun between China and Japan, yet the topic invites discussion. The facts concerning the origin and merits of the quarrel do not seem to be as yet sufficiently well known to warrant an independent judgment as to which is the aggressor. Many of us were no doubt rather predisposed to favour the Japanese, as the cleverer, the most interesting, and the more progressive people, and especially as the party claiming to be animated by a reforming spirit and purpose, while the Chinese seem rather to fall back upon sovereign and absolute rights. Yet one's enthusiasm in favour of this view is seriously weakened by the fact, for such it appears to be, that the Corsicans themselves fail to recognize in their aggressive neighbour a national deliverer. If, on the other hand, there be even a modicum of ground for the suspicion that the Japanese Government is simply forcing the quarrel for the sake of winning popularity among the Japanese jingoes, with a view to the effect upon the approaching election, every sentiment of justice and humanity recoils from so detestable a motive. Some allowance must, we suppose, be made, from a military point of view, for the tactics of two combatants who are both manoeuvring for coigns of vantage, from which to move the moment war is formally declared, but surely Japan should be far enough advanced in civilization by this time to understand that the sinking of transports, sailing under a foreign flag, thus ruthlessly slaying and drowning thousands who were practically defenceless, is contrary to even military morals. If to this is added the unspeakable atrocity of refusing quarter and shooting struggling sailors and soldiers in the water, the Japanese will

quickly forfeit all claims to Western sympathy, and write themselves down as still unmitigated barbarians.

Professor Martha F. Crow, in the July *Forum*, makes a valuable contribution to the discussion of the question of the co-education of the sexes, a question which, by the way, notwithstanding there is much to be said on both sides, seems to be rapidly settling itself on this continent. There are now scattered thickly over the United States and less thickly in Canada, ladies of good education and large experience of life, many of them mothers of families, who were themselves educated in "mixed" colleges. It is natural to place a very high value upon the matured opinions of these wives and mothers, seeing that they are in an exceptionally favourable position for forming a judgment, as knowing by experience that whereof they affirm. Acting on this view, Professor Foote examined the roll of the Association of College Alumnae of the United States, and finding that among the more than sixteen hundred members of this Association there are 160 women who graduated before 1875, and are to-day about forty years old, many of them having sons and daughters of college age, she wrote to each of these, and to a few who graduated a little later, making a total list of 180 married women, asking from each a frank and unbiassed expression of opinion on the subject. One hundred and thirty-three immediately responded. Of these, one hundred and nine declared themselves distinctly in favour of co-education, only three distinctly favoured separate schools for the sexes, while twenty were guarded in their expressions and made careful reservations. Extracts from many of the letters are published, giving an interesting variety of reasons in support of the opinions expressed.

There is of course room for a good deal of question as to the absolute value of these opinions. There is the natural predilection, by which many would be unconsciously swayed, in favour of the method under which they were themselves educated. There is, again, the probability that the writers may represent, to a certain extent, a class, inasmuch as many of them may have been themselves led, by a species of natural selection, to the kind of school to which they were by home-training or early environment predisposed. We can readily believe that the same inquiries, addressed to the same number of ladies of equal culture and intelligence, who had been themselves educated in separate institutions, might call forth at least as large a preponderance of equally pronounced opinions in favour of the separate system. The writer of this note must, however, confess himself somewhat surprised at the large majority of those who unhesitatingly declared, as a result of their own observation and experience of the

actual working of mixed schools, their readiness to send their own children, especially their own daughters, to similar institutions, for when he has himself put that crucial question from time to time to a limited number of married ladies thus qualified to form opinions of value, the greater number of answers elicited have been quite emphatically on the other side.

Two or three points may, perhaps, be regarded as well-nigh settled. Very few competent educators, who have had experience of mixed classes, will, we believe, deny that in most respects the presence of the two sexes in the same class-room, after a certain stage of attainment has been reached, is decidedly beneficial to both. The question thus becomes largely one of age, degree of culture, and, above all, of greater or less opportunities outside of the class-room for cultivating the familiarity whose effect is proverbial and, in such a case, undesirable. Another fact of interest is that the old argument based on supposed instability, mental or physical, or both, on the part of the weaker sex, to stand the strain of years of hard reading, seems to have been quietly abandoned, disproved again and again by the indisputable evidence of facts. One other point is worthy of note. One of the reasons given by some of Professor Foote's correspondents for preferring mixed colleges for their daughters has undoubtedly truth and force. This is the fact, that in women's colleges the work is "apt to be either of lower grade than is arranged for men, because they are considered unequal to men in brain-power, or else it is even more taxing than men would tolerate, because a certain professor recognizes that they are eager and willing students." One corollary that is pointed out by several seems to be irresistible. If co-education has come to stay, the lady professors must soon take their places in equal rank and fair proportion beside those of the sterner sex in the co-educating colleges and universities.

THE STRIKE AND THE RAILWAYS.

There is no larger question in modern political and industrial life than that which was thrust so prominently before the American public by the recent strike; we therefore make no apology for returning to it. When Mr. Stead said to an interviewer that the railway system is the "Achilles heel" of modern capitalism, he presented in a striking figure one side of the great industrial quarrel. But it was only one side of it. If it be true, or till now seemed to be true, that the railway system, so vital to the activities and the very life of modern society, presents a vulnerable spot in the organism through which the weapon of insurrectionary labour might, if unrestrained, pierce to the very heart of its antagonist, it is no less true that the railway, on the other