

over well provided with this world's goods, must either set about stirring up five ladies to take some interest in her aspirations, and they must be willing to advertise for five more candidates, guarantee their fees, and provide them with boarding-houses, or she must resign all hope of being recognized by the Senate. Now why should all these obstacles be thrown in the way of those women who desire to be educated and thoroughly cultured? Why should not the University, or at any rate the Government, do as much for them as it does for young men? It may be said that the University being only an examining body should not be required to enlarge the scope of its operations outside Toronto; but now that they have undertaken to do so, why not do it liberally and in a practical way? If the University Senate is not prepared to incur additional expense, why does not the Minister of Education come to their aid? It is our firm conviction that it would have been less burdensome upon the ladies of the outside cities and towns, and decidedly more convenient, if the Senate had named a certain number of places and stated that examinations would be held there next June, provided six names were given in, say six weeks before the examination, and the fees paid in advance. Suppose then that five had prepared themselves for examination, their labours would not be made futile, because they could be transferred in ample time from, say, a proposed Guelph or Woodstock list to a Hamilton or London one. There would be a certain stability about the scheme in that case which is entirely wanting in that just promulgated. Why should the culture of our young women be dependent upon the fashion, the caprice, the enterprise or want of enterprise, and the interest or lack of interest prevailing amongst the influential and well-to-do matrons of any locality. If female education be worth securing at all, it ought to be secured by firmly established arrangements, not made the sport of whim, or subjected in any way to vicissitude or chance. Moreover, the vital point—the teaching required by the female aspirant—is left altogether to hazard. Mr. Thomas Hughes recently admitted that there was a danger of the local University examinations giving rise to the notion that cramming to pass or for

honours was the sole object of study. This is a danger which must arise wherever the machinery of examination is afforded without the machinery for thorough instruction. Why should not University College be thrown open to female students, as M. Pernet bravely suggested at the Commencement last month. Young men, it is said, are trained there with a view to entering professions; women are not. But that argument lost all its force when Parliament decided that no instruction should be imparted in the College, specifically professional. It was the avowed purpose of the University Act to make it an academical institution for general culture of a higher character; and that being the case, we contend that its advantages should be accessible to all, irrespective of sex. The State having taken upon itself the task of training young men, and affording them a liberal education, is bound, on every principle of fairness, to do the same for our young women; and if any antiquated prejudice closes the doors of University College against them, the Government is in duty bound to provide like advantages for them elsewhere. Every one is ready to approve of a movement to secure some show of affording superior education for women. No one denies their intellectual capacity, their power of application, their eager desire to learn and be well-trained in language, science, art, and philosophy, or their aptitude and success in passing examinations whenever they have had the opportunity. With what justice, then, or on what principle, does the Government provide the means of training youths of the one sex, whilst it utterly neglects those of the other? It is true that the University endowment will not admit of any lavish expenditure, and we are far from blaming the Senate because they have made so meagre a beginning. But the opening of University College to female students would, instead of involving an additional outlay, absolutely increase the revenue by an increase in fees. It is our contention, in fine, that if it be the duty of the State to provide and superintend superior education for one sex, it is equally their duty to provide it for both sexes. It ought not to be 'left,' as a contemporary journal says; 'to the women themselves,' for that is surely reversing the order of nature and society, which usually requires self-help