

women—more lecture rooms—a large Library—a Provincial botanical, geological, mineralogical museum—a complete supply of mechanical apparatus—and means wherewith to pay a sufficient staff of the ablest men who can be procured as professors and lecturers—Then the University and University College would be a University and College indeed, of which any Canadian would be even more proud, than now.

The following Remonstrance has been sent to the Registrar to be read at the Senate meeting to-night. Many more names could have been obtained had it not been for the shortness of the notice:—

We, the undersigned graduates of the University of Toronto, do hereby beg to express our unfeigned regret that any motion should have been made in the Senate of the University towards the abolition of the Residence of University College.

We believe that such a motion would be contrary to the wishes of the large majority of graduates, and that if adopted, it would be prejudicial to the welfare of University College, and we earnestly hope that no such change will be carried out.

We would also respectfully request the Senate to consider that in a matter of such importance there should be some general demand expressed for the proposed change, and in the present instance there has been no such demand.

For these reasons we beg that the Senate will not accede to the proposition contained in the motion, or at least postpone its consideration until the wishes of the graduates be more fully ascertained.

GOODWIN GIBSON, M.A.	D. A. O'SULLIVAN, LL.B.
R. E. KINGSFORD, M.A., LL.B.	FRED. C. WADE, B.A.
A. H. MARSH, B.A., LL.B.	A. G. F. LAURENCE, B.A.
W. FITZGERALD, M.A.	WILLIAM COOK, B.A.
T. LANGFON, M.A., LL.B.	J. A. MCANDREW, B.A.
W. T. BOYD, M.A.	T. O. MILLIGAN, B.A.
I. F. SMITH, LL.B.	W. NICHOLAS MILLER, LL.B.
H. T. BULL, M.A.	T. D. DELAMERE, M.A.
DAVIDSON BLACK, M.A.	J. E. WHITE, M.B.
W. A. FOSTER, LL.B.	H. H. COLLIER, B.A.
J. C. HAMILTON, LL.B.	JAS. M. DUNCAN, B.A.
JOHN A. PATERSON, M.A.	WILLIAM CREELMAN, B.A.
WM. DAVIDSON, B.A.	EARNEST F. GUNTHER, B.A.
THOMAS HODGINS, M.A.	W. H. P. CLEMENT, B.A., LL.B.
GEO. M. EVANS, B.A.	H. W. MICKLE, B.A.
H. E. MORPHY.	W. F. MACLEAN, B.A.
B. E. BULL, B.A.	GEO. E. CASEY, B.A.

And others.

2nd January, 1883.

ABOLITION OF THE RESIDENCE.

To the Editor of the 'VARSITY.

Although ominous rumors have been current for some time past that an effort of the kind was likely to be made, nearly all University men will be surprised at the notice of motion given by Mr. Houston at the last meeting of the Senate. Perhaps an element in the surprise will be that the notice should come from the source it does, for Mr. Houston, while looked upon as a Reformer in University matters, has never had the reputation of being a Radical.

It is one of the evils attendant upon the present system of University legislation that an important resolution of this kind can be introduced and passed almost unnoticed by the public, and without any opportunity being given for full and fair discussion. This evil is particularly apparent in connection with this resolution. It is introduced after the vacation has begun, and, if I am not incorrectly informed, unless laid over until another meeting, the resolution can be passed at the meeting of the Senate on Friday evening. With the meetings of the Senate open to members of Convocation and representatives of the press, public attention would be called to its proceedings, and the importance of such a resolution as this more fully appreciated.

The purport of Mr. Houston's resolution is that for economical purposes the Residence should be abolished. Funds are required for other branches of the work of the University and College, and the

money spent in maintaining the Residence might better be applied in some other direction—and here we are met by another defect in the present system of management. How much is spent annually in carrying on the Residence? No detailed report of receipts and expenditures is given to the public, and we are therefore ignorant of what the deficit is. Surely it cannot be very large. The Steward's department is self-supporting, and the rent of the rooms, which must amount annually to at least \$800, is sufficient to pay for the 'wear and tear' on the building, with a large balance to go towards paying the Dean's salary. This gentleman receives, I believe, \$1,800 a year for his duties as classical tutor and Dean, \$1,000 for the former, \$800 for the latter office. It may reasonably be doubted whether a classical tutor holding that position alone could be secured for \$1,000 a year, and therefore if the office of Dean be abolished, the probabilities are that a classical tutor must be paid not less than \$1,500 a year, so that, in reality, the salary of the Dean should be considered as \$300 a year (with house rent free) rather than \$800, and with proper management this sum could be paid from the surplus of Residence rents, after all other expenses were deducted. Of course these figures are merely conjectural, but they cannot be far astray from the proper ones.

Where then is this ruinous drain that is being made upon the University Finances by the Residence? Even allowing that there is a deficit of say \$500 a year, such a trifling expenditure as this can form no real reason for the abolition of Residence unless it can be shown that its existence is injurious to the best interests of the College, or at any rate that it is doing no good. The real question is *not* the financial one at all. It is whether the Residence is advantageous or injurious to the College and to College life.

It seems strange that there can be any doubt upon this point. If the list of graduates who still take an interest in University matters is reviewed, it will be found that the great majority of them have lived in Residence. If the men who are living, or who have in the past lived in the Residence, are canvassed, scarcely one will be found who will not speak warmly of the benefit derived from Residence life. Those who are the most determined opponents of the Residence are those who know nothing about it—who have never lived there—and who therefore are not in a position to judge whether it is advantageous or not. All who have lived there are unanimous in its favor, and the reason for this is obvious. In Residence, and in Residence alone can true College life be found. Men there are thrown together daily. They are all placed upon the same level. There is a community of feelings and interests. The College is their home for the time being. Friendships are formed there that endure through life and that would never have been formed if the men had merely met at lectures and then separated. In after years, the years at College are remembered as many happy years, because they were spent at a place where pleasant companionship and sympathy of common aims and interests made life very agreeable. And then the numberless benefits to be derived from the help that one student can give another, the economy possible from the interchanging of books, the profit derived from being daily brought into contact with one another, and the enlargement of one's opinions resultant therefrom—all these are very important advantages to be derived from Residence life. Take away the Residence, and all this is gone. Students are condemned to live in boarding-houses. They meet only at lectures and never really know each other. There is nothing to bring them closely together or to give the College a permanent place in their affections. Is it strange then that as a rule non-residents take little interest in the College after graduating, while Residence men acquire a love for the institution which is never forgotten, and that it profits us in after years.

Many of the strongest opponents of the Residence, however, are such on the ground that the moral influence there is bad, and that it practically means moral ruin for a young man to be sent there. I may say that before going into the Residence to live I had some such idea as this myself. Rumors of the outrageous doings of Residence men had reached my ears, and I went there prepared to be an Ishmaelite. I found however, on living among them that Residence men were quite as good as any average forty men of the same class that one could select anywhere. I do not mean to say that they were or are all perfection, and that nothing objectionable was or is to be found. Men may be divided into three classes, the positively religious, the negatively moral and the positively bad. All these classes can generally be found in the Residence, in proportions varying in the different years. The proportion of the last class is no larger and probably no smaller than would upon the average be found among the same number of young men anywhere. Men may learn bad habits at the Residence. But would they not acquire the same habits if they were living in boarding houses or even at home? The restraints in Residence are greater than those in boarding houses. The former are subject to certain rules concerning hours, etc., that must be adhered to.