

the class of meat specified at the prices at which they took their contracts. The Government proposed to furnish the unfortunate lunatics, deaf, dumb, and blind, with the same quality of meat which they would use at their own table. It is the hon. Speaker's duty to see beyond the possibility of a doubt that these unfortunates are furnished with proper food, and the Government, of which he was a member, would not take the responsibility of having the matter left in doubt, no matter what the cost may be. Naturally the Government were anxious to keep the expenses down, but the maintenance account of public institutions had rapidly increased, and probably would, and it was the desire of the Government not to increase the expenses unnecessarily. He found by referring to the public accounts from 1874 to 1881 the average contract price of prime beef supplied to the institutions in London, Hamilton, and Toronto was \$4 53 per hundred pounds. Prime beef could not be furnished at this price. For a beeve of 1,200 pounds live weight the average price was 41 cents per pound, or \$51. The cost of slaughtering, etc., would make the total cost \$56. From this \$10 for hide and tallow brings the cost to \$46. A beeve of 1,200 live weight, dressed 730 pounds of beef, which brought the cost of the meat to six cents per pound, without making any allowance for profits on capital or any other necessary expense. These figures prove that for some time past meat has been supplied to the public institutions at nearly two cents per pound less than it must have cost the contractor. This explained the increase in the cost of supply, and the Government did not see their way clear to reduce the expenditure by returning to the old system. In every case the Government had employed only men of experience and sound judgment and their services had proved most satisfactory.

The motion for the return was carried.

CO-EDUCATION.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) moved for a return showing what applications have been made by females for admission to any of the lectures of University College for the session of 1881-2, and the results of such applications, together with copies of all correspondence in connection therewith. He had learned, he said, since placing the notice on the paper, that this was a more important matter than he had at first supposed. The full and ample privilege of taking advantage of secondary education had led to the difficulty of the admission of ladies to University College. When the secondary education was wanting it was not likely to further the application of ladies to the colleges. But the secondary system had been taken advantage of by the young ladies whom they had seen passing the examination at the University with marked success. The number of those ladies who had passed the entrance examination to the University of Toronto was in all 54, of which Brantford furnished 9, Hamilton 7, St. Catharines, St. Mary's, Bowmanville, and Oshawa 5 each; London, Woodstock, Welland, and Port Hope 2 each, and a number of other places one each. These were now undergraduates of that institution. Of these 46 had passed the first examination only, five had passed the first year examination, while three only had passed the second year examination. These young ladies represented the High Schools of the Province generally, and if the class list was examined it would be found that on the whole the standing of ladies was better than their male competitors. One young lady from St. Catharines had been the recipient of two scholarships, another from Hamilton took the scholarship in modern languages, and still another, he thought, from Elora, had done likewise. This subject was a matter, he thought, which must sooner or later receive serious consideration. So far as the faculty of the University was concerned every possible advantage had been afforded to ladies. Under a provision for a special course for ladies, made in 1878 by the Senate of the University of Toronto, 22 candidates residing outside of Toronto were examined; in 1879, 24; in 1880, 37; and in 1881, 51 were examined. A higher special course for ladies was also prescribed by the Senate, in the first year's course of which, however, very few had availed themselves, though there was an indication that ladies would avail themselves of this course to a larger extent in the future. In 1880 one young lady in that course was examined, and in 1881 four. These figures, he thought, demonstrated that nothing but a full participation in the courses of the University would satisfy the ladies. What were the difficulties in the way? The Senate of the University had removed certain restrictions which applied to male candidates in the way of winning scholarships and medals, and in doing this the ladies contended that, impliedly, the college authorities laid down the principle that ladies should not be permitted to attend the lectures in any stage of their course. This position, he thought, had been taken advisedly. The position presented to the ladies was this:—There was a point in the course which anyone, either male or female would find it difficult to pass unless they had the benefit of the lectures. Some of those ladies who had passed creditable examinations in the first and second years had been applying for admission to the lectures at the College, together with the male students in the undergraduates' course. He knew that both the College authorities and those seeking admission to the lectures had manifested a desire to reach that which was on the whole most beneficial. At the same time the College authorities had concluded that it would be against the good discipline of the institution should anything like co-education be attempted. Two questions suggested themselves. First the legal, and secondly, the expediency question. The ladies had not assumed that they had the legal right, or that the authorities could not prevent them, nor on the other hand had the authorities taken the position that they had the power to exclude them. It might be argued successfully that there was nothing in the Act to empower the College authorities to prohibit the ladies from attending the lectures, and it would be well for the Government to consider if the rights of the ladies were not in the direction he had indicated. On the ground of expediency one of the reasons given was that if ladies were admitted at all, in a short time the numbers taking advantage of the privilege would approximate to the number of male students now at the College. He did not think this would be so. Many now

attending the College had the various professions in view, and while he did not say that the ladies should be excluded from any of the professions—(hear, hear)—still it was unlikely that many lady students would be found anxious to compete with men in the professions. He would be sorry to see the Law Society besieged by ladies seeking admission to his profession, nor did he think that likely. He thought, however, that the medical profession was one (loud laughter) in which ladies might be more successful, and one to which they were better adapted than any other. But apart from that question there was, in his opinion, considerable reason why ladies should be allowed to take this higher course of education. No one could deny that it was of the utmost importance that so large a percentage of our population, which had in many instances more time than the other sex, should have the privilege to devote that spare time to the acquirement of this higher education. Sooner or later they must have a college specially for the superior education of women. But in the meantime he was not sure that the course pursued by the college authorities was one which prudence would dictate. He was one who thought that no practical difficulty would arise from the attendance of ladies at the lectures. By the correspondence which he had seen, the college authorities evinced a decided anxiety to afford facilities for the higher education of women, and looked forward to the time when a proper building, with a lady principal, in the neighbourhood of the University, would be established for the purpose of imparting an education similar to that taught in the University. He was not finding fault with the decision of the College Council, but he was of opinion that the matter demanded further consideration than it had yet received. Year by year the number of female undergraduates would increase, and candidates of that sex would establish more completely their ability to compete with the male sex in obtaining honour standings and scholarships in the different years. The matter would some day force itself upon the attention of the Government, and it was, therefore, exceedingly desirable, if the Government concluded that the college authorities had reached a true conclusion in the matter, that then they should have in view the establishing of a separate college for the purpose of remedying the existing state of affairs. (Cheers).

Mr. McLAUGHLIN said they should first ask what was the purpose of education. It was in order that citizens of the State might be better citizens and better fitted to discharge their duties in life. In order that the obligations to the State should be fulfilled it was necessary to have the co-education of both mind and body. The identical co-education of the sexes was, he thought, undesirable first because they found a difference of mind between the two sexes. He believed there was a sex in mind. The first acts of volition on the part of a little girl—nursing a doll, etc.—pointed to maternity and home, while a boy will roll his hoop and drive his wooden horse. If that was true, he claimed that the education of the two sexes should not be the same. On that ground he was opposed to co-education. Girls and young ladies were unable to grapple with mathematics and metaphysics as well as boys. At a recent entrance examination out of twelve boys seven passed in mathematics, and out of twenty-seven girls only five passed in mathematics. In other words, 58 per cent. of the boys passed to 13 per cent. of the girls. These were facts which made them ask was it wise that there should be identical co-education of boys and girls, and of course if they admitted girls to College they would be subjected to the same course of study as the boys. Another reason for the position he took was that the aim in life of woman was different from that of man. At Colleges young men were fitted for politics, medicine, law, civil engineering, etc., and the subjects in the Universities were selected with a view to these callings. He could not agree with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Gibson) that women should step out from the sphere for which God intended them. He objected to co-education of the sexes, because women were physically unequal to men. In order that he might establish this fact he read from the report of the Provincial Secretary for 1880, where it was stated that 822 males died of consumption in the Province during that year, while 1,183 females died from the same cause during the same time. In other words, it was found that the mortality of females over males was 53 per cent. Consumption was a disease engendered and fostered by exhaustive study to the neglect of physical exercise. It was the experience of all who had paid attention to the matter, that where women were put into competition with men they exhibited an excessive amount of ambition to excel. It was therefore apparent that if girls were asked to enter upon the same course as the boys in regard to educational matters, they were being asked to undertake an unequal task. Everyone who had had any college experience would know that the ability to win medals and honours was not the result of superior intelligence, but of superior physical endurance, and this being the case, it would be wrong for the Government to ask young ladies to submit themselves to the same course and the same examinations to obtain the higher education to which they were justly entitled. In 1872 a Bill was introduced into the English House of Commons to limit the hours of labour for girls, on the ground that they were not physically capable of labouring for the same number of hours as boys. In the United States—the land *par excellence* of ladies' rights, the land where ladies were clamouring to enter the political and all other arenas—they found the higher education of women pushed to a greater extent than in any other country. But what had been the result. The first thing striking a visitor to that country was that their women were not possessed of that beauty, symmetry, and development that continental women possessed. The deterioration might in some cases be attributable to hygienic causes, but much of it was doubtless due to their system of education. In England the higher education of ladies was amply provided for, but not by throwing open University Colleges, which had been in existence for the male sex. A large number of colleges, specially for women, had been in existence for a number of years, and their number was on the increase. In these institutions they did not impose a course as severe as that placed upon matriculants at Oxford or Cambridge, but their studies were allotted in subjects of a more elementary character, and