

primary distinction is that of Ordinary and Honour subjects, the former implying a continuation of a somewhat broad general education, the latter a more special devotion to higher studies of specialties. The ordinary student is required in the third and fourth years to take two or three subjects as imperative, and is allowed his choice with respect to others, but must take four in all, along with some special work known as an "additional department." The honour student is required to take only three ordinary subjects in the third year and two in the fourth, and may devote all the rest of his time to that in which he is a candidate for honours. The honour classes are small—from two or three to six or seven men—yet a large amount of time has to be given to them, and it would scarcely be possible to duplicate these lectures. For this reason there seems no alternative in the case of lady candidates for honours, except attendance in the same classes with men. In the ordinary work, on the other hand, it would be possible to provide separate lectures in some of the subjects, probably not in others, unless by the aid of additional teachers. It so happens also that some of our professors are disposed to try the experiment of mixed classes, while others would much prefer separate classes. In these circumstances it may be well to aim at certain ordinary classes for women leading up to the final examinations, leaving others to be taken as mixed classes. This approaches to the method of the older English universities. Should we be unable to give any choice in the matter, I should dread the responsibility involved, as in that case this would certainly prove very onerous and might become disastrous; but if there were a choice, so that it might be said to any lady student:—"You are free to pursue your whole education in separate classes, but free also in other subjects to take mixed classes," I should feel that the weight of social and moral responsibility

would be greatly diminished, and I think this is also the feeling of the greater number of my colleagues. I confess that in case of any *faux pas* or *mésalliance* such as we sometimes hear of in connection with mixed education, I should, in the case of *compulsory* co-education, feel myself morally disgraced, and that is a risk which I do not propose to incur on any consideration whatever.

As to the question of expense, there is something to be said on both sides. If we are to have mixed classes in the honour subjects only, in the third and fourth years, the expense for these will be inconsiderable. If we are to have mixed classes in the ordinary subjects, or several of them, it would be greater. We shall require larger and better rooms for several of the classes, proper waiting rooms, and a salary for a lady superintendent. As to this last requirement, I may state here that in the conduct of the classes so far, we have been much indebted to the kindness of the honorary secretary and secretary of the Ladies' Educational association, who have given us the benefit of their presence and of their guidance in many matters of some consequence to the comfort and convenience of the students, and that we are also indebted to the forethought of Mr. Redpath, who provided special retiring rooms for lady students in the museum. My estimate is that a sum of \$25,000 would enable the board of governors to provide for the mixed classes, and I wish to offer to zealous co-educationists the opportunity to present us with this sum in the course of next year. It certainly cannot be afforded out of the general funds of the university. On the other hand, to furnish the means to carry forward to the degree such of the students as may desire separate classes, will require another endowment of \$50,000, and to do the whole of the ordinary work in that way a somewhat larger sum might be profitably used. I may add, however, that either of these expenditures, whether for rooms or