

THE 'VARSITY:

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF

EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY POLITICS AND EVENTS.

SPECIAL NUMBER.

January 5, 1883.

Price 5 cents.

We did not intend to have published any number this week, owing to its being Vacation, but we regard it as of so much importance that there should be a clear expression of opinion with regard to the motion to abolish the Residence, that we deem it better to publish the present issue. It is intended to furnish our subscribers and members of the Senate and Convocation with information of the proposed measure, and the opinion widely held regarding it. We believe we shall thus be faithful to our duty as a University and College paper.

The two communications which we publish in our columns set forth so fully the question of the inadvisability of abolishing the Residence that we can add nothing to them. We most heartily concur in the observations of our correspondents, and we are at a loss to understand what possible ground the mover of the motion can have had in bringing it before the notice of the Senate. If it is desirable to turn the College into a body without a soul, into a cramming machine without life, then the mover is right. If we wish to give our men an all-round training, one to fit them for the active, busy world in which most of them will live, then the mover is wrong. Between the two issues there can be only one choice. Going back to first principles, the object of education is to give a man knowledge. What knowledge? Book-knowledge? Certainly, but anything else? Surely, knowledge of the world. Where will he be grounded in it so well as in a College Residence, which is a world in itself. This is one view of the question. A College which only gives 'book learning' does only half, and the least important half of its work. Can anything more be done by a College which does not bring its men together? We believe not. We do not say that it is impossible for men who live during undergraduate life outside of their College to have an affection for it. Fortunately, experience teaches otherwise, and the non-resident students of University College are eminent for their attachment to their *Alma Mater* in spite of many obstacles. But we do say that such a feeling is strengthened and encouraged, if not absolutely kept alive, by a Residence.

We believe the result of abolishing the College Residence would be unfortunate for the men who go to the College. What would it be for the College itself? We believe utterly disastrous. If the men live in nothing but outlying boarding-houses here, there, and everywhere, how can they have the same feeling of affection and love for their College as they would have if it were their home? What associations can they have of it except those connected with work—work—work. Lecture after lecture—examination after examination—fag, fag, fag. The result would be that when they got the much-longed-for Degree, they would shake the dust from their feet, and turn from the old place as one associated only with the idea of a continual grind. In most cases, what would they care whether the place went on or not, when once it had served their turn? What claim would the institution have on them in after-life? What chance would it have of receiving their benefactions, their grateful sympathy, their affectionate allegiance? We believe very little. We think it says much for the non residents that they display the zeal and affection for the College which they undoubtedly do. But how much it would be increased if, instead of forty or fifty men in Residence, there were two or three hundred! Has the mover of

the present resolution considered this point? Surely, he cannot have done so. If he has, does it count for nothing with him?

We regret further that the motion should have come from the quarter it has. Mr. Houston was undoubtedly returned at the head of the poll on the last occasion, as a sort of representative University man who had taken much interest in the affairs of his old college; who had been active in Convocation, and who would probably assist in galvanizing the Senate into activity. But it is unfortunate that he should have made this move. To some extent it discredits his supporters and the supporters of that movement which has for its object the enlisting in the service of the University the practical assistance of her graduates. If this is the shape it is going to take, the University is better without it. We believe that Mr. Houston is animated by a sincere desire to do what he thinks is for the best interests of the University, but we do not think he has given this present proposition the full consideration it deserves. The supporters of the movement we have mentioned will moreover, we anticipate, be in some difficulty with this motion on record, as made by one of their own choice, unless it is withdrawn, which we hope it will be. We shall be as ready as ever to give Mr. Houston full credit for his zeal and energy.

We feel bound to do more than criticise. We feel it our duty to suggest, and the present moment is opportune. We have contended from the beginning that the course proposed by various members both of the Senate and Convocation was wrong. It consists briefly of a statement something similar to the following: 'Whereas the funds of the University and College are insufficient to enable them to do their work properly, let us abolish something'—the fair conclusion to be drawn then being that the University and College will be less efficient. What we have proposed—what we now urge—is this: We agree with the preamble, and continue 'let us unite in an appeal to the Legislature. Let us tell the country plainly and honestly what we want, and let everything else in the meantime be subordinate to this demand.' There seems to be a timid dread of taking this ground; why, we cannot understand. Unless the country is hopelessly given over to political hirelings surely this question is one on which all can agree. It can be kept out of the range of party warfare if properly approached. Is it a dread of the rival claims of Sectarian Colleges? There is a conclusive answer and a simple one: 'The College is not sectarian; every man, whatever his opinions, can go there; it is free to all. The sects and churches have a perfect right to have their own Colleges managed in their own way, if they choose to pay for them, but this is the College of the people.' We believe that this position is our true one, and for this reason we have regretted—nay, we have been alarmed by the spiritless proposals which have received too much acceptance. But this last proposal has gone too far; even our graduates, patient as they have shown themselves, will draw the line before that limit is reached.

The proper motion to have been made would have been for a larger Residence—one three times as large as the present one—a large Convocation Hall, an annex for the education of