

THE 'VARSITY:

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF
EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY POLITICS AND EVENTS.

Vol. I. No. II.

December 25, 1880.

Price 5 cts.

UNIVERSITY REPRESENTATION.

Dr. Hodgins, in a recent issue of the 'Varsity, quoted historical precedents in favor of the representation of the University of Toronto in the Legislature. He pointed out an old Statute of Upper Canada which authorized any University which might afterwards be created to send, with the sanction of the Governor-in-Council, a representative to the Legislative Assembly. The University of King's College afterwards came into existence; the University of Toronto followed, but the provision of the law looking forward to University representation was never acted upon. The necessary Order-in-Council was never passed. Why, we are not informed; but it may safely be assumed that the inaction, in this particular, was the result of prudential motives. Dr. Strachan, to whom the University of King's College owed its existence, held an influential position and could probably have secured the representation which the Legislature had thought desirable if he had felt it prudent to exert his influence to bring about that result. The executive Government was, till 1840, in the hands of men favorably disposed towards the University of King's College, and any representative which the University would then have selected would have been favorable to the governing party. Anxious as all political parties are to strengthen themselves, in the Legislature, the party which held the reins of power, subject to a check being placed on the reins when Imperial interests came into play, neglected to vitalize the Act providing for University representation by issuing the necessary Order-in-Council. There can be no doubt that the inaction was based on prudential motives.

In 1849 the University of King's College gave place to the University of Toronto. Far from being a mere change of name, the whole character of the institution was changed. The Government which made this change was opposite in principle to that under which King's College had remained without Legislative representation; and yet, instead of treating the omission to issue the proclamation that would have erected a new constituency as an error, on the part of its predecessors, it followed in their footsteps. This law, Dr. Hodgins observes, retained its place on the Statute book till 1858; but it was suffered to remain a dead letter, for a period of thirty-nine years. All the Governments which existed, during that time, may be supposed to have acted in the interests of the University, as they understood them. And there is little reason to believe that they could have been mistaken. For myself, I am entirely without doubt on the subject.

That cannot be regarded as a precedent which never had any actuality; a form without vitality; a law which wanted the breath of the executive to vitalize it, and which was never inspired with life. This imperfect Act was a mere fancy, based on what had no existence at the time it was passed, and when the thing it was framed to anticipate was created, the Act was suffered to remain mere waste paper.

The English, Scotch and Irish precedents are real; but they are of no value unless it can be shown that they apply here. This has not been shown. The mere quotation of the fact proves nothing, one way or the other. It is quite possible that University representation may be a desirable thing in those countries and not here. This is, indeed, more than likely. The presumption is against the applicability of the English plan in Canada.

The University of Toronto has nothing to gain and possibly much to lose by a closer connection with politics. To give the University a representation in the Legislature would be to in-

volve it in political wrangles, and it might come, in some degree, to share the fate of the party which, for the time being, it espoused. From any closer connection with politics it would be sure to suffer. At present the appointment of a professor is almost certain to be discussed from a party point of view, merely because the appointment is in the Government. The result is that one of the two political parties becomes more or less hostile to the University. If it be alleged that the University needs, or may need, a special advocate in the Legislature, the answer is that, in case of real danger, such an advocate would be powerless for good, while his mere presence might inflame prejudice instead of allaying it. The University must rest its cause on the generous sentiment of the public, and the spontaneous efforts of its own sons.

P. V.

ON A POPULAR FALLACY.

THAT MEN SHOULD LIVE ONLY FOR THE FUTURE.

To us who live there should be no future. One only thing we have handfast and determined,—it is the present. One only thing Jove himself cannot make void, neither empty of scorn or delight, as it is of either,—one only thing—give it to men as a motto and grave it on their walls—*Quod fugiens hora semel vescit*,—that alone.

I do not say that a future is denied us. That would be ignorant and heretical. Eternity is always with us and shall be. Beyond life we live.

But how grasp this future? By ignoring it. Just as a man saves his life by losing it. This is not enigmatical. It is not even a paradox. We gain the future by laying all the grasp of the hand on the present. Therefore to us who live, life must be as there were no future.

Men have talked that one should live only for the future. They have deluded a world into their belief, which is also the most enervating of beliefs. They do not see with their eyes and hear with their ears the sight and the song of Homer and the tragedists. They know and know not that Shakespeare lived. For the greatest knew no future. That is why Homer has grasped all future time forevermore. If he had written for us he had lost us. But he sang only to the men of his present, therefore he has sung for us. And Aeschylus and Sophocles tried very hard to win their present palpable crown,—put on the breathing leaves. And therefore they have won a crown forever more, and put on leaves that shall not die again. Have ye not heard, has it not been told you, of the splendid waste and the seeming carelessness which the Englishman had of his wonderful plays? not because Shakespeare had no hope of future harvest,—but because he ignored it. Therefore Rossetti maligns his wisdom in calling it patience, and Swinburne puts immortality on unjust words. For Shakespeare had lived for the present. Therefore he lives.

For the gods hate him who grasps at the future. Proudly that man lifts his head, scorning delights and asking only for laborious days. Therefore the gods give him his desire. The curse is on his greed and he shall live laborious days forever. For the present is the wane of the past. Driven by the tide and the wind of a past this wave has an inevitable road. But the past is a bygone present which has given this present. Then why care for the morrow? Care not but regard the day, for to-day holds to-morrow in its womb. This is the sum, the present contains the future.

Mankind lives not for the future. They pretend to, ignorant that their future is a potential present. Only a few live for an actual future. And these are not the greatest of men, but only the most ambitious; also the most selfish. But mankind still does not gain the future, because they do not live for the best present. Debauchery is a bad present even if there were no future. And when the present springs out of the womb of the past, debauchery is a terrible present. If one possesses to-day he has also possessed yesterday. Let to-morrow take care of