

Some wag, in the hall,
Had pinned up: 'Know all!
No lecture to-day—V—d—r's missen!'

The lecture in French is
Delivered to benches;
English is 'consecrated by age.'
They tack History on,
'Tis a mystery! 'Pon
My life, it's enough to enrage!

Let us hope that in time
What I sing of in rhyme,
Will be spoken of plainly in prose;
And that soon in this place
They'll give 'right about face'
To those who on students impose!

—AL FRESCO.

Communications.

HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

To the Editor of the 'Varsity.

SIR,—I hope you will allow me space for a few "last words" on this vexed question. Before replying to your own comments on my last letter, let me say to all who appeal to the results of experience from Dr. Wilson and a "Bystander" down, that their persistent refusal to discuss the present practice of the University College, London, wears an appearance of singularity, if not of want of candour. They have in the course of this controversy been over and over again reminded that female under-graduates of the University of London are allowed to attend lectures in the University College on precisely the same terms as male undergraduates; that women were admitted to the University Examinations before they were admitted to the College Lectures; that when they were admitted to the latter, the intention was to keep the sexes separate and duplicate courses; that the Professors in University College found the work too burdensome; that instead of turning the female students away they took the more sensible course of delivering single courses of lectures to mixed classes; and, that women have now the full privileges of the institution, including the use of the library and laboratories, without labouring under any disability except such as may have been imposed on them by nature. So far as I know, the change in University College, London, has been productive of no evil effects on either sex separately, or on the institution as a whole; why should a similar change in the practice of the University College, Toronto, which is its academical antitype be productive of any different result? Are young Canadian men and women less worthy of being trusted in each other's society than young English men and women? I positively decline to believe it.

Between myself and you the issue is a very simple one, and I am quite ready to have it appealed to the *ipsissima verba* of the Act of Parliament, either in the columns of the *Varsity* or in the High Court of Justice. That question is not, as you put it, whether those who framed the statute "ever contemplated the admission of women to the University College," but whether they ever contemplated the exclusion of women from University College. If the intention had been to exclude them, nothing could have been easier. Parliament desired to exclude women from the political franchise, and in fulfilment of this desire, we find in the Elections Act the prohibition: "No woman shall be allowed to vote." Parliament desired to exclude women from the municipal franchise, and accordingly we read in the Municipal Act: "The right of voting at Municipal Elections shall belong to the following persons, being males of the full age of twenty-one years." Parliament did not desire to exclude women from the educational franchise, and therefore we find with the Education Act no such prohibition. Nor can this be the result of any oversight, because since women have been in the habit of exercising this franchise, the Act relating to Public Schools has been amended a dozen, if not a score of times.

The purpose of the Legislature with respect to the attendance of women at University College can be ascertained only by reading the Act of Parliament, which brought the institutions into existence. This was the "Toronto University (Amendment) Act of 1852," the first part of which contains the constitution of the University of Toronto, and the second part the constitution of University College,

the two institutions into which the former "University of Toronto" was divided. A comparison of these two parts shows that the terms used in them are similar, and that whatever the intention was as to the admission of women into the University, there is no reason to infer any different intention as to the admission of women into the College. The first part speaks of "candidates" for degrees, scholarships, prizes, or certificates of honor; of "candidates" for examination; of "persons" attending affiliated Colleges; of "students" of the former University of Toronto; of "holders" of scholarships; and of University "Scholars." The second part speaks of the "students" of University College; of "persons" attending lectures in the College; and of the "founders" of scholarships, fellowships, lectureships, and professorships. There is not a word to indicate an intention to prevent women from attending lectures, any more than to prevent them from endowing lectureships. Would a bequest or a donation for the latter purpose have been refused if it had come from a woman?

If the intentions of the Legislature with respect to the University of Toronto and University College were the same, then women should have been either excluded from both or admitted to both. The Senate years ago, under the Vice-Chancellorship of so eminent a lawyer as the late Chief Justice Moss, admitted women to more than the privileges enjoyed by men in the University; where is the statutory enactment which authorizes the Council to refuse to women the same privileges granted to men in the College? I am as certain that the Legislature would have refused to expressly exclude women in 1852, had such a course been proposed, as I am certain that the present Legislature will expressly include them at no distant day, if the indication recently given of its wish in the matter is disregarded. To assert anything else of either Parliament would be to cast an injurious and gratuitous imputation on a public and responsible body.

I am aware the Council is by law empowered to make statutes "for the good government, discipline, conduct, and regulation" of the College, but is it reasonable to infer that the presence of men and women in the same lecture-room, listening to lectures by the same professor, was contemplated by Parliament as necessarily involving breaches of discipline? The practice has not produced any such results in Michigan University, in Cornell University, in Queen's College, or in London University College. Why should it make discipline harder to be maintained in University College, Toronto? This is the question which the Council of University College will have to answer either in the Courts or Legislature, should the unmistakable will of the latter be ignored by the academical authorities. I say this in the way of prediction, not of threat; and I say it because I know that the friends of the rejected applicants, believing firmly in their legal rights, are determined to leave no stone unturned to secure them. It is best that there should be no misunderstanding on this point, for an ostrich-like policy now on the part of those who have the settlement of the question in their own hands can lead only to injurious conflicts hereafter.

WM. HOUSTON.

Toronto, May 23.

MODERN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT.

To the Editor of the 'Varsity.

DEAR SIR,—Your correspondents in dealing with the Modern Language question, seem to have entirely ignored the fact that there are more than two languages embraced in that department; in their enthusiasm for amendments in the sub-divisions of French and German, as too frequently happens, they forget to give due prominence to other sub-divisions, equally important. According to a statement made with regard to the financial standing of the University, it was intended to give two fellowships to this course. The one in French and German has already been established, and as a matter of interest and curiosity—if for nothing else—it might be worthy of explanation, why a similar favour has not been conferred on their sister branches. For, is there any department in which a student would be more desirous of pursuing a post-graduate course than in that of English and History? Nor can we help believing that there is sufficient need of it. Without wishing for a moment to make any disparaging remarks on the teaching of these branches, may it not safely be said, that there is a large majority of students, whose course in English Literature, in addition to attendance of lectures, consists of little more than the reading of poems presented on the curriculum, and a cramming perusal of Craik. In the case of composition we cannot be persuaded that twelve or thirteen lectures, without the slightest practice, are sufficient for acquiring a thorough mastery of Rhetoric, and the person who possesses the honour of being the best English writer in University College, has not necessarily attained to that degree of literary excellence which a foreigner might justly expect.