

Newfoundland's commissioner at the late Fisheries Exhibition, whose means of information none will question, Sir Ambrose Shea, sets down her area at forty-five thousand square miles. Her acreage of twenty millions and odd approaches near to that of England without Wales. The shore line is greatly irregular, and at one point so deeply indented as almost to cut the island into two parts, as to leave only a narrow neck, two to three miles across, called Come-by-chance, to link the former province, now the peninsula of Avalon, with the main land. It is reckoned to be two thousand miles in length, and provides frequent and excellent harbours. The mariner defines Newfoundland's position as lying between the forty-sixth and fiftieth parallels of north latitude, and between the degrees of longitude fifty-two and fifty-nine west of Greenwich. To the eye strategic she fronts the St. Lawrence, guards either entrance to the Gulf, and holds the key of British North America as approached from the Atlantic. A geologist would tell you, contrary to what has sometimes been surmised and said, that the debris of the river has had little or nothing to do with her formation; that, rather, she is one with her continent in structure, and, long before our day, was rifted from it by glacier action, more probably by volcanic upheaval, of which traces are everywhere to be found. Scanning the map, you may say roughly that her outline is that of a triangle. A line along the south coast, from Cape Race west, gives you its base. Upon it drop a perpendicular from Cape Norman, and you have a right-angle at Cape Ray. Join Norman with Race and you draw an hypotenuse along which glides a current from Baffin's Bay, rich with freight, which "yields to England," says Bacon, speaking of the Newfoundland of his day, "more wealth than all the mines of Peru and Mexico yield to Spain." T. B. BROWNING.

CO-EDUCATION IN UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

"A Bystander" in the last number of THE WEEK repeats his oft-reiterated and somewhat stereotyped warnings against the evils of co-education, the occasion of his remarks being the fact that the Legislative Assembly of the Province is about to be asked to insist on the door of the provincial college being opened to women as the door of the provincial university has been for the past seven years. To those who have read the distinguished publicist's past utterances on this vexed question it is needless to say that he contents himself with dogmatizing on the subject, and that he does not throw upon it a single ray of light that is likely to be helpful to those on whom will shortly be cast the responsibility of deciding the matter. It is equally needless to remind all who take any interest in the question that the time for dogmatizing about it has gone by never to return. The opponents of co-education are everywhere placed on the defensive, and each succeeding year brings perceptibly nearer the time when the college that persists in excluding women from its lecture halls will be regarded as a fossil anachronism.

"As a general system, co-education may safely be pronounced a failure," says "A Bystander." I say that the assertion is simply ludicrous, and I challenge him to the proof. The only apology for it which he offers in his article is a reference to what is taking place at Cornell, and the citation of President Eliot, of Harvard, as an authority; and both of these are easily disposed of. Dr. Eliot never had any experience of co-education himself, so far as I am aware, and if he cannot give us the testimony of experience then his opinion is not evidence, any more than "Bystander's" own opinion is. By way of contrast to both let me cite the views of Horace Bushnell, who should be accepted by "Bystander" as a disinterested observer, seeing that he is as strongly opposed as any one can be to the "sexual revolution," the dread of which throws so many minds nowadays off their balance. I quote from the opening sentences of a book written to prove that woman suffrage is a "reform against nature," which was published in 1869, and the date of which is very significant. After speaking of the manner in which "the whole male half of the race, having power to do it, have been piling weights of disability and depression on the other half," Mr. Bushnell says:—

We have made a good and right beginning already in the matter of education, and the beneficent results that come along with our new codes of training are even a surprise to us; compelling us to rectify a great many foolish prejudices that we supposed to be sanctioned, as inevitable wisdom, by long ages of experience. The joining, for example, of the two sexes in common studies and a common college life—what could be more un-university-like, and, morally speaking, more absurd? And, as far as the young women are concerned, what could be more unwomanly and really more improper? I confess, with some mortification, that when the thing was first done, I was not a little shocked, even by the rumour of it. But, when by-and-by some fifteen years ago (i.e., in 1854), I drifted into Oberlin and spent a Sunday there, I had a new chapter opened that has cost me the loss of a considerable cargo of wise opinions, all scattered in loose wreck never again to be gathered. I found that the old church-idea of a college (*collegium*), where youths of the male sex were gathered to the cloisters of their male teachers, the monks, and where any sight or thought of a woman approaching the place was conceived to be a profanation, was itself a dismal imposture, and a kind of total lie against everything most beneficent in the bisexual order of our existence. I

learned, for the first time, what it means that the sexes, not merely as by two-and-two, but as a large open scale of society, have a complementary relation, existing as helps to each other, and that humanity is a disjointed creature running only to waste and disorder where they are put so far asunder as to leave either one or the other in a properly monastic and separate state. Here were gathered for instruction large numbers of pupils, male and female, pursuing their studies together in the same classes and lessons, under the same teachers; the young women deriving a more pronounced and positive character from association with young men in their studies, and the young men a closer and more receptive refinement and a more delicate habitual respect to what is in personal life, from their associations with young women. The discipline of the institution, watchful as it properly should be, was yet a kind of silence, and was practically null—being carried on virtually by the mutually qualifying and restraining powers of the sexes over each other. There was scarcely a single case of discipline, or almost never more than one, occurring in a year. In particular, there was no such thing known as an *esprit du corps* in deeds of mischief, no conspiracies against order and the faculty, no bold prominence in evil aspired to, no lying proudly done for the safety of the clan, no barbarities of hazing perpetrated. And so the ancient, traditional, hell-state of college life, and all the immense ruin of character propagated by the club-law of a stringently male or monastic association, was totally escaped and put away. What we see occurring always, where males are gathered in a society by themselves, whether in the prison, or the shop, or the school, or the army—every beginning of the *esprit du corps* in evil is kept under, stowed away, made impossible by the association of the gentler sex, who cannot co-operate in it, and cannot think of it with respect. And what so long ago was proved by this earliest experiment, has since been proved a dozen or twenty times over by other experiments under other forms of religion, as well as under all varieties of literary culture and social atmosphere. The experiment of joining the two sexes in the same studies, and composing in that manner the society of college life, has now been carried far enough I think, to show that it is the only plan which is really according to nature. Whether the colleges and universities of the old monastic type will change their organizations, so as to claim their advantages in the better way discovered, remains to be seen. Perhaps they would not do it if they could, and perhaps they can not do it if they would. It remains, in either case, to be seen whether they have benefits of any kind sufficient to compensate for their moral disadvantages, and so to keep them still in existence.

Thirty years ago Mr. Bushnell, an uncompromising opponent of the general movement so cordially disliked by "A Bystander," regarded the Oberlin experiment as an unqualified success. He adds that a score of more recent experiments of a similar kind had proved equally successful as far back as fifteen years ago. We have similar testimony, some of it even more emphatic, from keen, impartial and competent observers, many of whom have taught in, while some have presided over, colleges in which co-education has been fully tested. And yet, on the authority of Dr. Eliot, who does not appear to have ever taught a mixed class in his life, we are told that "as a general system, co-education may be pronounced a failure." Where has it ever failed after a fair trial? Not in Cornell, for, on "Bystander's" own admission, the attendance of women in that institution has risen to about fifty in fifteen years—a most encouraging success in view of the youth of the University, and the parental and other prejudices that had to be overcome by the ambitious girls. Not in Ann Arbor, where the attendance of women is much larger than it is at Cornell, though co-education has been permitted for a shorter period. From a report of the National Commission of Education, published in 1874—the latest to which at this writing I have access—I learn that ten years ago there were, in the United States over 120 universities and colleges in which co-education was practised; that in many of these the attendance of the sexes was nearly equal; that in some the female students were the more numerous, and that in not a few they numbered upwards of 100; in one case reaching 160. It is needless to cite testimony on this point, though there is plenty to be had.

The question at issue, with respect to University College, is an extremely simple one. The senate of the Provincial University has, ever since 1877, admitted women to its examinations. During these seven years ninety-five candidates have applied for leave to pass the matriculation examination, and no fewer than eighty-three—an unusually large proportion—have passed it. Of the latter number, sixty are at present of the standing of first-year, fifteen of second-year, and eight of third-year. None have ever yet attempted the third or fourth-year examinations, for the simple reason that in University College alone can tuition be obtained in subjects of those years, and its door is closed against them. As University College is, equally with Toronto University, a Provincial institution, supported entirely by public funds, which are the property of the whole people, and managed under the authority of a public Act of Parliament, not a private charter, the great injustice inflicted on deserving young women anxious to complete their education is too obvious to need emphasizing. They are not asking for permission to live in the college residence, but merely to attend the lectures of the professors, some of whom are, by the way, quite willing to have them in their lecture rooms. The great majority of the male students, nearly ninety per cent., now live in private boarding-houses, and female students can safely be permitted to do likewise, as in the case of the Normal School, where co-education of adults has been the rule for thirty years. There is no law against the admission of women to University College, except the will of a majority of the faculty, and that made up, with the sole exception of the President, of the least experienced members of it. What Mr. Gibson asks the Legislature to do is to declare that, as women are now admitted to the University examination-hall, they should be as freely admitted to the Col-