

LP  
F5012  
18--G7

THREE BRIEF ADDRESSES BY PRINCIPAL GRANT ON  
THE DUTY OF THE LEGISLATURE TO THE  
COLLEGES OF THE PROVINCE.

PUBLISHED BY REQUEST OF THE RESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE  
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

1. AT CONVOCATION, ON "UNIVERSITY DAY."

It seems to me that at present there is a cheering prospect of continuous development before our institutions of higher learning. Wealth is beginning to show that it is awakening to a sense of its duty and privilege to foster them as the fountain heads of all that dignifies and sweetens life, and so far as the colleges are concerned there is an almost entire absence of those feelings of jealousy and hatred that once found expression in scornful and bitter words on both sides. Anything that would reawaken those feelings should surely be avoided; and it is solely because a proposal recently made by Mr. Mulock, Vice-Chancellor of Toronto University, is certain if pressed, to reawaken them, that I take the liberty of uttering a note of warning. Like every other College in the old and new worlds, University College is in need of additional funds. The field of the knowable is boundless, and every College is ready to spend millions on its staff, on laboratories, on libraries and on original work. Doubtless, too, the money would be well spent. But when Harvard, Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, Johns Hopkins and the other great colleges of the United States, or when Dalhousie, McGill, Victoria and Trinity are in need of additional funds, they appeal to the public, explaining fully why and what for the money is needed and a response more or less satisfactory is sure to be made. Each institution has a constituency that believes in it and is willing to prove its faith by its works. Instead of following this excellent example, my friend Mr. Mulock proposes that the Government of this Province should give to University College all the money that may be required by it; that is, that the friends of other colleges who have voluntarily and at a great sacrifice, and for what seemed to them good and sufficient reasons, brought their favourite colleges to such a standard as to compel universal recognition, should now be forced by law to give more money to extend, they may think needlessly, an institution which, however excellent, may not commend itself to them as embodying the highest university ideal. A proposal so manifestly unjust cannot be seriously considered. It was evidently made in ignorance of the facts of the case. The chief reason assigned was that the various denominations support Queen's, Victoria, Trinity and the other colleges, and therefore that the Province should support University College. I would like to ask what the Province amounts to apart from all the denominations. Aside from this, the assertion is inaccurate. The church with which we are historically and honorably connected is not responsible for the maintenance of Queen's as a faculty of arts and science, that is, for the same work that is done in University College. The church gives an annual grant to the Faculty of Theology, and to that Faculty only; for all other expenditure we have to depend on fees and on the liberality of those classes of the people who believe in us, for one reason or another. As a matter of fact our great friends have been the people of this city and county, without respect to creed, and the members of the Presbyterian Church in Ontario and Quebec. All honor to that Church for starting Queen's. It did so because, after repeated efforts, it failed in its attempts to make what is now Toronto University broad enough for more denominations than one. With subsequent contests we have nothing to do. It would be worse than a waste of time to revive their memories. We cannot return to the year 1840 or 1850 or 1860 or 1870, and it is well that we cannot. We have to do with the position of to-day. What is that position? Why simply this. That no one now dreams that one college is sufficient