

women run less risk of overtaxed brains than the weak men. . . Have we never heard of the worn appearance of high wranglers and other prizemen—of energies (male energies) slackened for life because of one great strain—of Cambridge parlance about senior wranglers killing so many men who tried to keep up with them—of brain fevers and deaths among too zealous male students—of things that would give rise to fifty Dr. Clarkes if only they happened to be girls?"

Is not the health of the girls attending our High and Public Schools as good as that of the boys? Do not those girls who work hard and pass the 'intermediate' examinations enjoy as good a state of health as those who never reach that far? Much more injury is done to female health by the midnight masquerade and skating carnival than by excessive study of chemistry or of algebra. The earnest female student will exhibit the joyous laughter of true happiness, sleep soundly, and have no unpleasant dreams, while the one who has no mental stimulus, but dreamy, sham amusements, will find no tonic to remove the monotony of a dull, objectless life.

IV. Co-education will secure for females a training of a more thorough and less superficial character.

It does not follow that woman's course of study should be very different from man's because her mental characteristics are different. If a difference of sex should demand a different intellectual food, why should it not also require different physical diet? The mental, like the nutritive process, is alike for men and women. The intellectual appetite craves for the same food, and what invigorates the mind in the one sex will have a similar effect with the other. To prescribe bread and meat for man, and sweets for woman, would physically weaken and destroy the latter. Such a course would not be more absurd

than to supply boys with all the solid branches of an education and to limit girls to the so-called accomplishments. We train boys with some regard to their strong and weak faculties; with girl a different plan has been fashionable. We find woman possessing more strongly marked sensibility, acuteness, perception, and imagination, with a weaker nervous organization, and less power of reflection and concentration. The custom has been to give her such a training as will only intensify her weaknesses. She has been denied those more severe studies that would check the imaginative and emotional tendencies. She reasons badly, and therefore she must abstain from mathematics! She may lack in accuracy of thought and expression, and, of course, she must have nothing to do with mental philosophy and languages! With a nervous system, prone to ready expression of sympathy and indignation, we must take care that she can read with pleasure the sensational novel, and that alone. To educate a boy on such false principles would injure, if not destroy, his mental powers. When we train a girl so irrationally, and see the only rational result, we simply say "what a weak creature is woman!"

In condemning the defective character of woman's culture I utter no new complaint. Seventy years ago, Sydney Smith, in the *Edinburgh Review*, pointed out the utter folly of confining female education to music and drawing. Half a century afterwards, J. Stuart Mill deplored the same folly which the brilliant essayist so forcibly condemned before. Lately, Chief Justice Moss, at the University Convocation, Toronto, eloquently alluded to the false character of the education which so many were striving to give their daughters, and his remarks were quoted with approval by the press in all parts of the Province.