

THE ' VARSITY:

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF

EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY POLITICS AND EVENTS.

Vol. 1. No. 25

April 9, 1881.

Price 5 cts.

THE UNIVERSITY ELECTIONS.

It is satisfactory to note the interest which is taken by a large number of the graduates in the pending election of three members of the University Senate. Whatever may be the motive which induces any *alumnus* to interest himself in his *Alma Mater*, the fact that he does so interest himself is matter for felicitation. For this reason Convocation acted wisely some months ago in declining to adopt the recommendation of its Committee on Legislation, looking to triennial instead of annual elections to the Senate. Many graduates would, to all appearance, forget their connexion with the University were they not reminded of it once a year by the circulars sent out by candidates for their suffrages.

The Legislature took a long step last session in the right direction when it admitted Bachelors of Arts and Science to membership in Convocation without any period of probation. What is most wanted now for the University is to get rid of the apathy which acts as an incubus on the large body known as "Convocation," and the best way to effect this is to secure the infusion of young as well as new blood. Graduates fresh from examination, and still bright from friction with others in the college class room and Literary Society meetings, are the best possible material out of which to form an active corporation. Convocation should show the Senate the way in all university legislation, and if the young graduates will only do what they can to establish this natural and beneficial relationship between the two bodies, there will be less reason for Convocation hereafter to complain of want of harmony between it and the Senate.

The only candidates whose names have yet been made public in connexion with the present election are T. W. Taylor, LL.B., L. McFarlane, M.B., W. G. Falconbridge, M.A., and I. B. McQuesten, M.A. The first two are candidates for re-election, the last two are new men. The only one of the four who does not reside in Toronto is Mr. McQuesten, whose residence is in Hamilton. Whatever the result of the contest this year, there will be three good men sent to represent Convocation on the Senate.

WHICH IS THE BEST?

There are two prevalent university types in Canada, to one or other of which each institution conforms. The one may be described as a college conferring degrees on its own students, or a university training its own graduates according as it is viewed from the teaching or the examining side. The other is a university pure and simple, having nothing to do with the work of teaching, and confining its efforts to examining candidates for degrees who have been taught in affiliated colleges, or who may never have attended college at all.

To the first of these types belong all the universities in Nova Scotia except the University of Halifax, the University of New Brunswick, all the Universities of Quebec, and all the Universities of Ontario, except the University of Toronto. To the latter belong—putting them in chronological order—the Universities of Toronto, Halifax, and Manitoba. These three institutions are avowedly modelled on the University of London, which has no teaching faculty, and which examines candidates irrespective of whether they have ever attended any college or not. What is enacted there is a certain amount of scholarship as ascertained by written examinations, whenever and wherever the candidates may have acquired the necessary knowledge of a literary and scientific character. What is required in universities like Edinburgh, Queen's,

or Victoria, is that the candidate shall, as a *conditio sine qua non*, have attended lectures in the college which examines him for a degree.

There has been much controversy as to which of these university types is the best and most useful. London University was created in England to supply a felt want, namely, that of an institution which should be in a position to grant degrees to certain colleges in England, including Owen's College, which had no university powers of their own and were unable to get them. Its degrees admittedly hold a high value on the academical exchange. They are eagerly sought after, and are second in prestige to none in the world. But there has been a complaint that by having one university to examine all the students from various colleges, the tendency is to reduce all the teaching in these colleges to a dead level uniformity, and discourage originality on the part of individual professors in their own departments. This and other motives operated to induce Owen's College to ask university powers for itself, a request which has not yet been granted, though the agitation has led to the establishment of a new university more closely analogous to London than to Edinburgh. This is the Victoria University, which is intended, like London, to confer degrees on students from different affiliated colleges, while, unlike London, it requires attendance on the lectures of some college of recognized standing.

The controversy over university types has broken out recently in Nova Scotia, with special reference to the condition of matters in that Province. Five years ago the Legislature, with a view to promoting higher education, established the University of Halifax, a purely degree-conferring institution, the object being to provide a common standard which the other six universities might accept, and to which they might eventually subject their students. Discouraged by want of success in this direction, and influenced by denominational pressure, the Legislature seems to be about to abolish the University of Halifax and restore, or rather continue, the grants to the denominational colleges, each of which has university powers. To discuss the question of State aid is beyond the scope of this paper, the object being merely to call attention to a controversy which may yet have to be participated in nearer home. There are many educationists in Nova Scotia who contend that the degree-conferring college is the most useful kind of university, but the ablest exponents of this view are Prof. Macgregor, of Dalhousie College, and Prof. Schurman, of Acadia College, both of whom have written letters on the subject to the daily papers, and both of whom are alumni of London University. They both allege that the theory of that University is very defective, and that in practice the operation of the system is increasingly pernicious. They point, by way of proof, to the restiveness which led the faculty of Owen's College to seek university powers of its own, and to a growing feeling of irksomeness amongst the professors of University College, London, under the restraints imposed upon them.

There is no use of concealing the fact that a somewhat similar feeling is to be met with in and about University College, Toronto, and beyond all question that feeling would have been far stronger by this time than it is had the practice not been so constant of appointing University College professors as examiners in the University of Toronto. This is clearly a subject on which it is unsafe and useless to dogmatize. For this reason I regret the tone of the letters by Professors Macgregor and Schurman, able as they are. When they assume to speak from their own knowledge, they leave themselves open to the objection that their experience has been limited and their knowledge equally so. When they