

but severe rebuke to those who opposed co-education "without moving a finger in the direction of obtaining separate college instruction for young ladies."

Mere talk is cheap; the world will never be reformed by talking about it. If the opponents of co-education would have us believe in their sincerity, let them leave off talking and go to doing. If they do not like the present state of affairs they have the same liberty to petition the Legislature to change it that others had to petition them to produce it. Meantime a measure of justice has been secured to those who had thus far been deprived of it, and who would probably be deprived of it for a long time to come, if their dependence had been on their professed friends of the objecting persuasion.

It is in vain for Mr. McGillivray to attempt to make out that injustice has been done by this step to young women who do not wish to attend University College. For they need not attend if they do not wish to do so; there is no compulsion in the matter. Let them ask their friends to obtain an annex for them if they can. They cannot expect the Legislature to act on the question until it is brought before them. The recent action of our legislators was in response to an appeal for relief from what was then an undoubted present injustice. This does not preclude them from considering any other case of injustice, real or imaginary, that may be brought before them. As for the four ladies whom Mr. McGillivray speaks of, I do not doubt their sincerity. Yet, I know women, and men, too, who would be University graduates if it were not for some reason or other. In general their reasons are similar to those which prevented a certain gentleman from entering the army, 'an it were not for these vile guns I myself would be a soldier.'

With a placidity which breathes of innocence and delightful simplicity, Mr. McGillivray proceeds to 'cut away' as worthless the evidence of 'Drs. White and Fairchild, and a few others.' At the same time with a dutiful submissiveness worthy of the schoolmen of the Middle Ages, he accepts without questioning the unsupported assertions of Drs. Elliott and Wilson. Mr. McGillivray tells us that Dr. Wilson says that President White has been absent for long periods from his College. Very well, what of that? One would think he would still know much more of what is going on in Cornell than Drs. Elliott and Wilson can tell him.

Mr. McGillivray says that 'the Sage endowment necessitated the establishment of co-education.' This is not a fair statement of the case; it is a distortion of the facts. I quote directly from official papers of Cornell University:

'The founder of Sage College attached but one condition to his gift: that "INSTRUCTION SHALL BE AFFORDED TO YOUNG WOMEN BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY, AS BROAD AND AS THOROUGH AS THAT AFFORDED TO YOUNG MEN."'

The capitals are the University's. The endowment did not 'necessitate' anything; it was conditional on something; a different matter entirely. A committee was appointed, and after exhaustive enquiries reported in favour of accepting the endowment and the condition. They then adopted co-education, 1st, because it is unobjectionable; 2nd, because it is much more economical than separate education.

Mr. McGillivray in his last paragraph asks why, in comparing the two systems, I do not give weight to the opinions of Drs. Wilson and Eliot, who have tried separate education, equally to that I attach to the opinions of Drs. White and Fairchild, who have tried co-education. I answer: I was not comparing the two systems. The point I set out to prove, and which I did prove, was the baselessness of the assertion that 'due order and discipline' would be endangered by the admission of women to University College. As evidence on this point the *experience* of Drs. White and Fairchild and others is worth everything; the *opinion* of Drs. Eliot and Wilson is worth nothing.

Mr. McGillivray speaks in a contemptuous tone of Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and other State Universities as 'small, minor institutions.' He compared them the other night at the debate to 'our second rate High Schools.' How great a man then must he be who is an undergraduate of TORONTO UNIVERSITY! How much greater he who is a graduate! Ye gods and little fishes! probably University College, London, is also a second-rate high school! A German proverb says; 'There are people on the other side of the mountain.' I commend this proverb to the notice of Mr. McGillivray, and to that of any other Toronto graduate or undergraduate who may chance to be afflicted with a too exalted estimate of the greatness of his own University. But the fact is all such objections are irrelevant in this discussion. The question is not at all as to the mental attainments, but as to the age of the students who will meet in our College halls. There is no evidence that the average age of the poor unfortunate students of Michigan University differs from that of those in our own institution. And so collapses the mighty argu-

ment which Dr. Wilson and Mr. McGillivray have with great labour worked up out of this material for lack of better.

Very truly yours,

A. STEVENSON.

Toronto, April 1, 1884.

### ELECTION NIGHT.

To the Editor of the 'Varsity.

In the admirable report of the proceedings on election night given in your last issue, there appeared one short sentence, the insertion of which is to be regretted, inasmuch as it placed the gentlemen therein mentioned in a rather unfair and discreditable light when we consider the very important duties which they were called upon to fulfil on that night. The general committee, if I am rightly informed, appointed Messrs. J. F. Brown and D. C. Little to guard the passage through the door to the voting-room, that the voters might pass through no faster than they could be disposed of; and to style them captains of Rugby teams and to represent Mr. Brown as manfully leading up the heavy brigade, brings them into positions which they could not in all fairness hold. However we are glad to be able to state that these gentlemen discharged their duties fairly and faithfully, and that Mr. Brown when off duty, in no way identified himself with inside chargers, but when the spirit moved him put forth his strong arm without reference to party, and showed himself directly opposed to obstruction and rowdiness of every description. Moreover, we can scarcely believe that the insiders who were trotted all over the room at the will of their opponents, formed a representative team composed of chosen men, who were expected to make general opposition to all outsiders; who had undoubtedly a thoroughly organized company, with definite plans of defence, but firmly resolved, in accordance with the old and ever to be observed principles of the party, not to take the initiative in any act that had the semblance of unfair play, and it is not too much to add that they proved themselves loyal standard-bearers of order and fair play. The attacks made were on individuals who started crowding, and were not directed indiscriminately against all party opponents, but all who wished to await their turn and pass through quietly were unmolested; while at the same time a great number of the inside party deserve credit for discountenancing the general disorder and rowdiness which prevailed at the preceding election. Again, we believe the corner was occupied not by men who proposed merely to take up space, but by gentlemen who wished to pass through at the earliest opportunity, with the exception of a few who volunteered to stand the heat and endeavor to stem the crush from without, thereby assisting others to pass through without being injured. The charge of unfairness cannot be brought against the outside party, and if in a few instances they proceeded to excess they may be readily excused when we consider the complete flooring they received last year at the hands of their opponents, and the feeling of resentment was undoubtedly the reason why one and all of them engaged in the struggle this year with all their strength and vigor, though still some were evidently disappointed at the absence of some of the most prominent partisans in the struggle last year, and the 'Argonauts' were contented with taking a bird's-eye view of the situation without sharing the glory of passing through the same ordeal as their friends.

It would be unfair to pay no tribute of praise to the extraordinary good nature and amusing complacency of those who received such rough handling in skirmishes in which they evidently engaged with no other object than that of having what they considered genuine sport, and we are most happy to state that they got entertained to their heart's content. We are sure that all have reason to feel satisfied with the general order on that night, when we take into consideration the fact that the patience and temper of an intending voter are tried to the extent of straining every muscle for at least a couple of hours to place himself in front of a passage only wide enough to squeeze through, and often, when he has almost reached the desired spot to find himself thrust back by the eager and excited throng pressed together on every side. Yet great in proportion must be his pleasure and pride when the wonderful feat has been accomplished.

'OUTSIDE.'

### "THE ORIGIN OF MORAL EVIL."

To the Editor of the 'Varsity.

DEAR SIR,—In your issue of March 29th, I notice an article entitled "The Origin of Moral Evil." In a note appended to that article you