

WEDNESDAY, March 5.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PARDEE presented the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Railways.

Mr. GIBSON presented the eleventh report of the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

#### FIRST READINGS.

Mr. MOWAT—Bill to further improve the administration of the law.

#### QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS.

In reply to Mr. KERNS, the Minister of Education said it was not the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation amending the Public School Act, by providing for the election of trustees by ballot.

In reply to Mr. CARNEGIE, Mr. PARDEE said Mr. Taylor was appointed by Order in Council on the 15th December, 1881, as Crown Land Agent for Muskoka.

In reply to Mr. MERRICK, Mr. PARDEE said the amount of appropriation in the Estimates for the road between the townships of Armour and Strong was \$1,000 and subsequently \$200. The person's name under the amount expended was G. E. Gibbon. The amount expended was \$1,220. The extent of road made was over two miles.

Mr. MEREDITH asked whether any timber limits in the township of Awrey had been disposed of by the Government, and if so, what price was paid for them, and what was the area.

Mr. PARDEE replied that timber limit No. 39 in the township of Awrey was sold in October, 1872, to Mr. Richard Nagle, and that it was now held by Mr. T. G. Ross, of Quebec. The limit, which was 36 miles square, was sold for a bonus of \$1,800.

Mr. MEREDITH asked whether any appropriation had been or was intended to be made for that part of the Muskoka road on the line between the fourth and fifth concessions of the townships of Strong and Chapman from Denville to Maganettawan.

Mr. PARDEE stated that so far as he knew there was no Muskoka road situated as stated in the question; neither had any appropriation been made this year for a road between the fourth and fifth concessions, and he did not know that there was any intention to make such an appropriation.

Mr. MONK enquired whether George Paget was now employed by the Government, and whether he was one of the petitioners in the Muskoka election case.

Mr. PARDEE explained that Mr. Paget was employed as an assistant woodranger at \$5 per day. He believed he was a petitioner in the Muskoka election case.

#### CO-EDUCATION AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) moved, That inasmuch as the Senate of the Provincial University, having for several years admitted women to the University examinations and class lists, and inasmuch as a considerable number of women have availed themselves of the privilege, but labour under the disadvantage of not having access to any institution which affords tuition necessary in the higher years in the course; in the opinion of this House provision should be made for the admission of women to University College. In supporting the motion he said the question was not a new one to the House, he himself having brought it up previously when moving for the correspondence between the authorities of University College and the young ladies who had asked permission to attend lectures thereat. Some years ago, following in the wake of institutions in England and the United States, the University of Toronto established the system of local examinations for women—examinations in special groups of subjects. A large number of ladies in different parts of the country have availed themselves of the system, and the manner in which these examinations were passed amply show that the standard required by the University authorities was no barrier to young ladies undertaking the regular B. A. course. There is nothing in the University Act which prevents young ladies from taking the regular examinations in the arts faculty. Accordingly about 1877 women began to present themselves for the junior matriculation examination, and have ever since been entering the undergraduate course. Many of these ladies have passed the examinations in a highly honourable manner, have taken scholarships, and have shown themselves quite equal to compete in all respects with the young gentlemen. Even at the end of the first year, when they had not the advantage of attending lectures, they have competed successfully for honours with the gentlemen who have had the benefit of attending lectures. While that state of things might be true in the examinations of the junior matriculation and first year courses, yet as you progressed in that course the disadvantages of those who could not attend lectures would increase, and it can not be expected they can proceed further without being admitted to the same privileges as their male competitors. The question resolves itself into this, Are we to provide for young ladies desiring to attain this higher education the same facilities which young men have always enjoyed? or are we to say, through the University authorities, that we invite young ladies to pass the examinations, but that they must do this handicapped, must prepare for their examinations by private tuition, or in whatever way they can? What reason is urged why such a course as this latter is necessary? Simply, in the language of the college

president, that co-education would militate against

#### DUE ORDER AND DISCIPLINE.

These words, "due order and discipline," are no doubt used advisedly by the college authorities. There is not a word in the University College Act which warrants the authorities in excluding ladies from lectures, and it may be found that the authorities have assumed an authority which by law they are not entitled to, and proceedings at law may have to be taken to obtain these advantages for ladies by means of a *mandamus*. The speaker didn't propose to argue this question so much from any views he independently entertained as by presenting the experience of eminent educationists in this and other countries for some years past. Co-education in Ontario is no new thing, no novelty in Normal Schools and Collegiate Institutes and Model Schools, and it cannot be said those who are qualifying themselves for teachers are not as advanced in years and in discretion as those who ask and claim the advantage of attending University College. There is therefore no difference between those among whom co-education now exists and those for whom he claims it should be allowed in the college. The University of London, Eng., after which our college is modelled, has co-education pure and simple. Take the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge. At the latter place there are two colleges affording to women the same privileges as the other colleges afford to male students. Not only that, these ladies are admitted to all the examinations of the university. It is true the degree of B. A. is not conferred on ladies at Cambridge, but certificates are given which have the same value, and are practically the same as the degree. Results show ladies are able to pass the highest examinations very creditably. At one examination the eighth wrangler was a lady. Oxford has been somewhat behind in the matter of higher education, but still there are two colleges similar to those at Cambridge, although the ladies at the former were not admitted to the university examinations. Then there is Durham University, where ladies have already received the degree of B. A. Old England was much further advanced in this question than Canada, and we ought to take a leaf out of their book. Speaking of the United States, he said that in 1867 the condition of 311 universities were examined, and it was found that of them

#### 170 HAD GRANTED CO-EDUCATION

pure and simple. It is claimed by the opponents of co-education that the large majority of these 170 are western colleges. That is true to a certain extent; but still, in the Eastern States, there were many universities wherein co-education obtained. In New York, he mentioned Cornell, Columbia, and Syracuse, and one or two others. In Massachusetts, Boston University; and in Connecticut, the Wesleyan University, where one-third of the students were ladies. The speaker quoted from a report published twelve years ago by a committee of eminent educationists who were taking into consideration the adoption of co-education in Cornell University. The committee visited a large number of academies of New York and various other States of the Union. In that report the testimony of various principals of Schools was read, showing the system of co-education had worked not only not injuriously but most beneficially both to males and females. This testimony relates to academies and normal schools. But if co-education was successful in those institutions why should it not be successful in universities and colleges, the students of the one being of the same age, and of as much discretion as those in the other? The reason why co-education was tolerated in our normal schools and not in colleges was probably, he thought, because of the former being subject much more than the latter to public opinion. The speaker went on to quote from the report, showing that as much ability was manifested on the part of women as men to pursue difficult studies, and their health was equally as good. The Committee among other colleges visited Michigan University, a first-class college. They found sixty young ladies there twelve years ago studying in the different branches, arts, medicine, etc. The leading mathematician was a young woman, and one of the best Greek scholars was a young woman. The conduct of students had been greatly improved by the presence of ladies. Chief Justice Conley, of Michigan, said the admission of women had scarcely caused a ripple on the surface of university matters, and he had found

#### NO EVIL RESULTS WHATEVER

resulting from co-education at Michigan University. At this university the students are allowed to board wherever they like in the city and form whatever associations they desired, and he (the speaker) would favour such a system in regard to Toronto University. The result of the Committee's report was the adoption of co-education at Cornell 12 years ago. And how had the system worked there? The evidence all pointed to show that the new system had had the effect of raising the standard of scholarship. He referred to Harvard College with its annex for women. Although principal Elliot was hostile to co-education, yet he did not constitute the whole opinion of that college no more than Prof. Wilson reflected the opinion of college authorities in Toronto. The testimony of other professors at Harvard was greatly in favour of co-education.