

Educational Weekly

VOL. III.

THURSDAY, JUNE 17TH, 1886.

Number 76.

The Educational Weekly

Edited by T. ARNOLD HAULTAIN, M.A.

TERMS: Two Dollars per annum. Clubs of three, \$5.00. Clubs of five at \$1.60 each, or the five for \$8.00. Clubs of twenty at \$1.50 each, or the twenty for \$30.00.

New subscriptions may begin at any time during the year.

Payment, when sent by mail, should be made by post-office order or registered letter. Money sent in unregistered letters will be at the risk of the senders.

The date at the right of the name on the address label shows to what date the subscription is paid. The change of this date to a later one is receipt for remittance.

Subscribers desiring their papers discontinued are requested to give the publishers timely notification.

In ordering a change of address, or the discontinuance of the paper, the name of the post-office to which the paper is sent should always be given.

Rates of advertising will be sent on application.

Business communications and communications intended for the Editor should be on separate papers.

PUBLISHED BY

THE GRIP PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.,
TORONTO, CANADA.

JAMES V. WRIGHT, *General Manager.*

TORONTO, JUNE 17, 1886.

ON page 371 will be found the names of some graduates of the University of Toronto who have distinguished themselves at the University of Johns Hopkins. Some of our readers may be ignorant of the method and character of the work performed in this splendid educational establishment. The following extract from the *Critic* may, therefore, be not out of place in these columns:—

“From the beginning, the authorities of the Johns Hopkins have recognized the importance of encouraging original investigation, and have been liberal in their grants for laboratories, apparatus, books and everything necessary for carrying on the higher work. They have also provided means for publishing the results. Journals of mathematics, philology, history, bio-

logy and chemistry are maintained, and in their pages are found recorded the chief investigations carried on by members of the university. The starting of these publications was a necessity, for the reason that special journals devoted to the subject were not in existence in the country, and there was no place in which articles on these subjects could be sure of publication. To investigate and not publish the results is not more profitable than hiding wealth in a stocking. The only way in which the investigator can prove to his own satisfaction and that of others that his work is good, is by submitting it to the criticism of the world. If it is bad he will soon find it out, and the sooner he finds it out the better. It cannot be denied that much good work has been done at Johns Hopkins during the past ten years, and there can be but little doubt that at least as much will be done during the next ten years. Regarding the future, there is every promise of a steady, healthy growth. The critical period is over. The University is an established fact. Much is still needed to perfect it—more teachers, more buildings, more books, more apparatus. The fund is not unlimited. It amounts to about three and a half million dollars. It takes more money to equip and maintain a university than is required for a college. As compared with the resources of even the smaller foreign universities, those of Johns Hopkins are far from large. The one thing which the University has most to fear in the future is the reputation which it enjoys of being rich. This will tend to divert bequests, for, whatever may be the foundation for the assertion that ‘to him who hath shall be given,’ the rule doesn’t always work in the case of universities.”

It is now nearly a year since the Senate resolved to abolish scholarships and medals at the University of Toronto. Radical as the measure seemed at the time, it was in reality moulded upon one that has been in effect for many years at universities so conservative in their tendencies as Oxford and Cambridge. The Senate of

the University of Toronto has created in the fourth year three classes of honours instead of two. Those who obtain first-class honours will be men who have gained a percentage high enough to entitle them to a medal. Private scholarships still exist.

One of the most formidable objections to scholarships lies in this, that the revenue of the University, most inadequate as it is, has been diverted in that way from its proper functions. This objection cannot be urged against scholarships given by private persons, whose liberality can never be displayed more easily than in aiding the intellectual development of a young country.

The chief argument in favour of the retention of them is based upon the fact that needy students have found the assistance derived from scholarships very useful, sometimes indispensable, though it is probably true that in the greater number of cases scholarships have found their way into the hands of students who have not needed them in the least. Yet even granting that in all cases they have assisted poverty-stricken students, we do not think the chief objections to their preservation removed. Learning should be sought for itself—not for any ulterior purpose. Like virtue it should be its own reward. When a university sets scholarships and medals before students as rewards it is placing before them an ulterior object to that of learning, and, in the form of scholarships, in a very mercenary form. Just so far as these detract from the true purport of university education, they are wrong and hurtful. If opponents of the recent change could prove that this is never the effect of them, their case would be stronger, but this they have never succeeded in doing, in fact, they have never attempted to do. But as far as the University of Toronto is concerned, nothing, while its revenue remains so small, would justify the expenditure of it in that direction because it needs it all for what (in opposition to scholarships and medals) we may call “necessaries.”—*Communicated.*