

jects in life. The differences in subjects for the proper mental development of the sexes will be found very few. In Boston the course of study for girls has been made nearly the same as that for boys, and lately a meeting of head-mistresses in England unanimously favoured the opinion that Latin, so generally regarded as a boys' subject, should form the basis of higher education for females.

V. Co-education is preferable on moral grounds.

The advocates of separate institutions are often ready to admit that the other plan secures a more thorough education, and that in ladies' colleges the prevailing tendency has been towards superficiality, but they contend that womanly qualities and high moral excellence cannot be cultivated where girls are taught with boys. To say that a system is immoral in its effects forms a bold assertion, and if true, no possible advantages in other respects should justify its continuance. Are those who admit that a system promotes greater efficiency aware what follows from such an admission? Are they aware that there exists an inseparable connection between thoroughness and morality and sloppiness and immorality? Where laxity appears, there numerous other defects follow in its train. The good teacher secures efficiency by no harsh exercise of authority or incentives at variance with sound moral principles. His pupils will study from the confidence they repose in one that should be worthy of their respect. Moral influences are the most powerful agencies which a teacher can employ to promote intellectual progress. When the teacher of high qualifications knows how to use them, he cultivates moral excellence in his pupils. He must necessarily make good scholars at the same time. If he does not make good scholars the highest incentives (moral incentives) are wanting, and in a

school or college where thoroughness and efficiency are not found, there, *cæteris paribus*, the highest moral tone is wanting in the discipline and modes of instruction. Are we to understand that the best behaved pupils in our schools are not necessarily diligent? If a girl is given to frivolity, will she be improved by being placed at a ladies' college where the influence for study may be of a less potent character? Which of the hard-working girls of our schools incline to immorality? It is evident, industry in a school elevates the moral tone by giving girls as well as boys something good to think of, and an institution where careful application to study is not promoted, will also be found, if closely examined, defective in the cultivation of character.

The idea of separate institutions for women did not, I think, arise from any intelligent consciousness of a diversity in the moral development of the female mind. It is a relic of the middle ages. Priests alone at that time constituted the educated classes, and the only high seats of learning were the monasteries. When the human mind burst its shackles during the 16th century, the existing system was modified to suit the advanced requirements of the age. With the growth of intelligence grew up the great schools of England and of other lands. Soon was seen the advantage of having the other half of the race, the female sex, educated, and the secluded system was adopted. Since it had been the custom to separate man from the outside world to develop piety, it was also regarded as necessary to separate woman from association with man, in order that she might receive a better intellectual and moral training. If seclusion and separation have not tended to promote holiness, how can they produce morality which should be based on religion?

The moral influences of the sexes upon one another have been among the most powerful instruments for ad-