THE CO-EDUCATION OF THE SEXES.

The title of this article formed the theme of a very excellent paper read by Mr. Buchan, High School Inspector, before the Ontario Teachers' Association.

Mr. Buchan, in introducing his subject, referred at some length to the contest recently so vigorously carried on in the United States between the advocates and opponents of the Co-Education of the Sexes. The grounds taken by the former are very clearly set forth by Mr. Buchan as follows :—

" I.   Boys and girls are brought up together in the same family, and men and women mingle in society ; co-education is therefore natural.

-- II.   Young people, if brought into daily contact with the opposite sex, are more likely to be free from illusions with regard to it than if the sexes are educated separately.

III.   The presence of the other sex in a class exercises a restraining influence as regards behaviour, and a stimulating influence as regards work.

IV.   The sexes are so similar in their mental powers that the same methods of training and the same subjects of study will benefit both.

These different arguments are discussed at some length and their fallacy completely exploded. The *simple* fact that it is *natural* for boys and girls—for men and women to mingle together cannot prove the *necessity* of their being educated together. The very constitution of both family and society throws the sexes together, and the fundamental constitution of the sexes makes it *natural* that they should intermingle, but how can the necessity of co-education be proved from a social relation that exists outside and beyond *any* system of education ? As Mr. Buchan puts it " If co-edu. cation means anything it means that because brother Tom splits firewood while sister Jane washes the dishes, and because, after they grow up, they go to parties together, therefore they ought to be taught quadratic equations together." It must be clear that the conclusion from such a premise would not be very logical.

So far as the second argument is con-