

THE 'VARSITY:

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF

EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY POLITICS AND EVENTS.

Vol. 2. No. 1.

October 14, 1881.

Price 5 cts.

With this number the second year of *The Varsity* commences. With our success, thus far, we have reason to be satisfied. On the graduates and undergraduates of the University the paper relies in a special manner; their sympathy and aid it will be our aim to deserve, that being the only condition on which either can be asked. Our labor, like theirs, is voluntary; and it is only by co-operation that success can be obtained.

A WRONG CALLING FOR REDRESS.

One of the conditions of competition for the Gilchrist Scholarship in the University of London is that no competitor shall be more than twenty-two years of age. On the 7th of June, 1880, Mr. Wm. Henry Huston, of this province, wrote to the provincial secretary, stating that by the first of May, 1881, when the applications were to be sent in, he would be less than twenty-two, while he would be three days over that age by the 20th of June, the date at which the examination was to commence. In reply he received from the acting assistant secretary of the Province the following letter, which is perfectly explicit:

TORONTO, 11th June, 1880.

SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 7th inst., respecting the age of candidates for the "Gilchrist Scholarship," and to inform you, in reply, that a candidate who has not completed his twenty-second year at the time of his application is eligible for the scholarship.

I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN H. USSHER,
Acting Ass't Sec'y.

W. H. HUSTON, Esq., Whitby.

Acting on this advice, Mr. Huston went to work and pursued his studies to such purpose that he came out 8th in the University of London Matriculation Class List, while one other Canadian competitor was 21st, and another 49th. To his amazement, however, the scholarship was not awarded to him, but to the next of the candidates just referred to, the reason assigned being that he was over age when he competed for it, the honor of winning the prize was carried off easily by Mr. Huston, while a less successful rival is allowed to reap the substantial reward.

If Mr. Huston's misfortune—for it is a real misfortune at his time of life to have had his evenings diverted for a whole year from professional work to a comparatively useless purpose—had been due to his own negligence in obtaining the necessary information as to the condition on which he has been disqualified, he would have been entitled to neither sympathy nor redress. The authorities of the University of London are not to be blamed, for the shortness of the time between Mr. Huston's request for information and the date of the reply he received from the provincial secretary's office shows that they were not consulted. Their decision, that the age limit must be determined by the date of examination, is a reasonable enough one, and they have a right to prescribe such a limit if they please. The entire blame must rest on the provincial secretary's office, and therefore if any redress is possible the Ontario Government should hold themselves liable to grant it. What form it should take must be left to the Government and Mr. Huston

themselves, but that he is entitled to some consideration in the matter is as clear as anything can be.

We may add, with respect to the Canadian candidates for the Gilchrist Scholarship this year, that Mr. Huston, who is at present on the staff of Pickering College, was trained at Whitby High School, and completed his collegiate course at University College, graduating at its conclusion in the University of Toronto. Mr. Howard Murray, who came next him, is an *alumnus* of Dalhousie College, Halifax, and Mr. George Ross, who stood third, is a student of University College, and an undergraduate of the University of Toronto.

PRESIDENT GARFIELD.

The intense sympathy felt by the civilized world for the late President, his family, and the American nation, aroused by his assassination and death, stands alone amid similar phenomena in history. Such sympathy, however, arose not from the circumstances of his death alone, however deplorable. The beheading of CHARLES I; the dagger of DAMIENS; the bomb of ROUSAKOFF; were violent expressions of hatred with an intelligible origin. The act of GUILTEAU, on the other hand, seems to have been entirely purposeless, or explicable only by reference to some of the most depraved passions of man. But, apart from such considerations, the world has hastened to recognize the fact that the death of GARFIELD has removed from the high office of ruler of a nation one who was essentially a MAN, whose career and character eminently fitted him for his position, and who was in thorough unison with the great people he governed.

It is always pleasing to contemplate the struggle of genius with the poverty and difficulties of early life; and to few men has it been granted to triumph so thoroughly over them as did GARFIELD. This is an aspect of his career which we can thoroughly appreciate and admire. A very large proportion of the young men of our University have had to contend with difficulties similar to those which beset GARFIELD in his youth. Those of us who have not experienced can at least understand them, and this fact accounts for the presence amongst us of a feeling of almost personal pride in his triumphs, and of deep sorrow for the premature and disastrous close of a brilliant career in the prime of its usefulness.

The details of GARFIELD's life have long since become a thrice-told tale. It is well known how, after a long and hard struggle, he succeeded in obtaining a thorough and broad education at two eastern colleges, taking his degree at WILLIAMS with honors in metaphysics. It is but fitting that we should extend to the college of which he was so distinguished an *alumnus* our sympathy, and our regret that he was not spared to achieve even greater things.

GARFIELD was remarkable for a rare and equable combination of mental qualities rather than for an extraordinary development in any one exclusive direction. He was not a specialist. As a soldier he possessed good, though not extraordinary, ability; he was not a profound scholar nor a brilliant statesman. But a union in him of the qualities that make the soldier, the scholar, the statesman, and perhaps even the poet, rendered him a man of very great power. His career has been frequently compared with that of ABRAHAM LINCOLN, and in many points it is strikingly parallel. But he was a man of far broader and clearer perceptions than LINCOLN, as he was also undoubtedly of far higher moral character.

The speeches of the late President show that there was a strong poetical element in his mind, which frequently found expression in bold