

vancing modern civilization and refinement. True manliness is wanting in boys not favoured with the society of girls, and womanly dignity is absent in girls removed from the society of the other sex. Boys without sisters are usually less cultivated than those who, in this respect, have been more fortunate. Girls without brothers often assume a tone of conversation and roughness of manner the reverse of what is feminine. Does not each sex admire good qualities in the other? Does not each cultivate such a character as will secure the respect of the other? The young man who is ungentelemanly is not popular with intelligent young ladies. The young woman who is given to trifling, and who is deficient in womanly refinement, is not esteemed by right-thinking young men. In a well-conducted school a self-restraint is cultivated which brings out the good qualities of both sexes. Boys, when taught with girls, leave off rudeness; and the finer shadings of female character cannot be secured without the stimulus of the opposite sex. A young woman educated with young men never forgets her sex. The "strong minded" women who have brought the question of women's rights into disrepute are not the result of co-education.

Why should not our opponents be consistent and carry their principles further? Why not have separate churches for the sexes? What about the joint system at holiday parties, social gatherings, promenade concerts, etc.? The refinement in a girl's manner is generally the reflex of her company at home and after school hours. The logic of experience brings convincing arguments in favour of the superior moral results of the joint system. The evil of boarding establishments for young ladies has made hundreds of English mothers, who were trained in them, prefer a different training for their daughters. Boston now speaks of moral and social im-

provement resulting from the co-education of the sexes. Cornell University has adopted the system, and its learned President, Andrew D. White, states that modesty and womanly dignity are promoted in consequence. A distinguished writer in the *Contemporary Review* states that no institutions in the United States have a higher moral tone than the High Schools of Pennsylvania, where the sexes are taught together. The refinement, industry, and moral principle of the students of Oberlin College, Ohio, have been acknowledged, yet the system has been followed there for half a century. Antioch College has no clandestine meetings and correspondence such as often are to be found under the plan of seclusion. After nine or ten years' experience of co-education at Ann Arbor, the former opponents of the innovation admit their error. This system prevails in nearly all the Western States. Spain still clings to the secluded method; and France is only beginning to see her errors. In Italy, the birth-place of the system of separation, indications of improvement are now visible. Germany has moved slowly in this matter, and the result of her system, on the character of the people, is very suggestive. The German system has been condemned by many of the educational writers of that country. Jean Paul Richter remarks: "I will guarantee nothing in a school where girls are taught alone."

But why go out of Canada for proofs? On the co-educating principle have been trained ninety-nine per cent. of the wives and mothers that make happy thousands of happy homes. Is not the moral character high of the hundreds of young women who attend our High Schools? Is their womanly dignity inferior to that of the young women whose training costs their wealthy parents hundreds of dollars a year? Every one by viewing his own acquaintances can determine the case for himself.