

him to breakfast. Such a thing, or anything like it, is unheard of here. Of course there are extenuating circumstances, such as the fact that so many of us live in boarding-houses, and that most of us have very little cash to spare. Probably the character of Canadian young men has also something to do with it.

I shall try to show later how some of these difficulties may be avoided, and they ought to be avoided, for nothing could have such a beneficial effect in improving men's manners than this constant playing of guest and host by men comparatively unknown to one another. The fact remains that in Toronto, beyond their personal friends, most of the undergraduates take no further interest in their fellows than to observe that such a one is a "plug," and will probably beat them in the class-lists, and that another is a "sport" who will probably get plucked. Some men even go through the University without making any permanent friendships. I know one graduate of about '85 who wishes that he had ordered his course differently, for he has now no old University friends and he was certainly by no means a "plug."

We have had Class dinners, and we have the immensely superior Arts dinner, but these functions do not, and cannot, take the place of ordinary, everyday, social intercourse. We have the *Conversazione*, patronized by some of the undergraduates, and the Class Socials which owe their existence to a body of students already mentioned. But it is not this kind of social life which we require. We want the daily mental contact of men at the age when they are fullest of their own ideas and readiest to adopt those of others. The object of a University should be to afford an opportunity for these men, overflowing with high ideals and high aspirations, to discuss, with others like them, subjects which occupy the attention of every man at some stage of his existence, and come to him in most cases when he first enters the world and goes up to the University. It is because the English universities afford this opportunity that they are centres of the most advanced thought of the time; and it is because Toronto University—perhaps all Canadian and American universities—do not afford it, that they are centres of nothing except, perhaps, football, which, though a very excellent thing in its way, can scarcely be said to constitute a University education.

The difficulties mentioned up to this point are to some extent avoidable, but before I go on to discuss remedies it may be well at least to mention an unavoidable evil, one which must ever impair the usefulness of the University:—I mean its location in Toronto. Situated in the capital of Ontario and a great business centre, it can never make its home a distinctively University town. Yet this is necessary to give the beneficial forces of a University their full play. We shall always be too much involved in and dominated by the political and industrial movements of the place to make possible that perfect centralization of thought, which alone can make a University a power in the land. A concrete example of this may be seen in the ever-to-be regretted lapse of the old rule about wearing gowns, which is, I believe, still on the statute books, but has become a dead letter. It is next to impossible for the undergraduates, who form so small a fraction of the city's population, to go about in a distinctive garb, and there are apparently insurmountable difficulties in the way of every other scheme to enforce this best of provisions for maintaining a proper spirit in the University.

This, however, is not the only evil which the location causes. It is only an outward and visible sign of many others. This paragraph is, however, only an ineffectual wail against fate, which, I hope, the rest of the article will not be considered to be.

Remedies for all but the last difficulty are to be found, and are, perhaps, not altogether visionary. The evil con-

nected with the curriculum can be done away, and doubtless will be when the Senate comes to realize that the mission of a University is to educate rather than to teach. But the Senate will never realize it until the undergraduates do, as they do not do to-day. Possibly a very large section, if not a majority of the students, prefer the curriculum as it stands, to one which would give some room for real education and not tie us down to mere learning, out of which we get little more culture than out of our early struggles with the alphabet and the multiplication table.

The remedy for the second defect in the existing state of affairs—the want of personal interest of the teachers in the taught—lies, of course, wholly under the control of the professors and lecturers. But it may be confidently said that the undergraduates would be most happy to aid any efforts toward a closer sympathy between them and their instructors. There are many of our professors whom we know (by report) to be men of broad culture and men whom it would be a pleasure for anyone to meet. To meet them would be especially interesting for the students who only know them as they appear in the lecture room, and have, unfortunately, no chance of making their acquaintance in any other capacity than that of sections of a peripatetic encyclopedia.

But the remedy for the want of interest of undergraduates in their fellows lies to a certain extent in their own power. Apparently the simplest way to obviate the difficulty is the extension of the residential system into a number of colleges, in each of which from one to two hundred students could live. The expense of such a plan is in the way, but this difficulty is not, to my mind, insuperable. As every undergraduate knows, the present Residence is the source of all the more important movements which take place, and is, in fact, the soul and centre of University life and spirit. Even it is not all that might be desired, apart from its size, which is ridiculous, considering the number of students attending the University. The general feeling that Residence is not all it might be, is evidenced by the fact that it is not full. This is not to be attributed to the cost of living there, for there must be hundreds of men who could easily afford it. The difficulty is the want of privacy. The value of a Residence turns on a very small matter, quite unconnected with the work of the University. This is whether all three meals are taken in the common dining-room or not. The system here in vogue transforms Residence into a mere boarding-house, with all the attendant objections on that class of home. The practice at Oxford is that a man has two meals in his rooms, and dines in hall, where he has to put in an appearance so many times a week. It is this system which should be adopted here. Even at our sister university, Trinity (so much despised by Toronto undergraduates), a man's room in the college is his castle. There he has his breakfast if he likes, and, if he wants to read or talk without interruption, he hangs out a universally-respected sign to that effect by "sporting his oak." In our Residence there is no such thing, and it is this want of privacy, not the expenses of living in Residence, that is the reason why there is not a larger demand for rooms in the historic building. The unpopularity of the present Residence has been attributed to the cost of living there, and the fact that it is seldom or never full has, therefore, been urged against the extension of the residential system. Granting the premiss, the conclusion is, perhaps, unavoidable. But if the other reason is accepted, the argument against the extension of the system falls to the ground, since the want of privacy is an easily curable evil, as witness the experience of other Universities.

The only way in which further residences can be procured and the curriculum shortened is by organized agita-