

The Educational Weekly.

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 19, 1885.

THE loss to the educational interests of this Province through the death of the late Principal Buchan, of Upper Canada College, is one that will be long felt, and one too, that will affect educational progress more seriously than will be readily recognized. We regret that we were not at our post at the time of his death to pay our sad tribute to his ability and to his worth. We had not the honor of an intimate acquaintance with him, but his character and his educational views were well known to us, and we regret that their influence has been lessened by his premature death—destroyed they can never be! The resolutions by which the Provincial Teachers' Association, the Senate of the University of Toronto, and the masters of Upper Canada, have expressed their respect for the memory of their late coadjutor, their sorrow for his early loss, and their sympathy with Mrs. Buchan and her family, are perfect manifestations of the esteem in which Mr. Buchan was held by the educational public. But the finest tribute of all is that which has come from his pupils, signed by all those who were under his influence during four years of principalship:—"We shall never cease to look back on the time spent under Mr. Buchan as the best of our school days. He always treated us with consideration, and manifested a kindly interest in us. He strove not only by precept, but more by example, to make us love and put in practice all that was true and noble and manly. His method of teaching was one well calculated to foster a taste for study where it already existed, and to beget one where it did not exist. With the low aim of simply preparing pupils for examinations he had nothing to do. His object was to send forth men with every part of their nature well developed, men who should be a credit to their masters, their college and their country." Such words express the truest reward which an educator should seek to win. Prizes, honors, scholarships—what are they to the building-up of character, to the development of all the latent faculties of the mind, one half of which our ordinary system of education never reaches, to the substitution of noble ideals for low ones, to the transforming of selfish motives into liberal and unselfish ones? We know that Principal Buchan retained a prize system in his own institution, because he was too wisely cautious a man to run counter to descended prejudices, and traditions which, if not noble, have value because of their associations. But had he lived and had the educational policy of the Province assured the permanent existence of the college, he would have made of Upper

Canada the Rugby of Ontario—a school where character should be the first thing aimed at, then conduct, then scholarship; and where scholarship should be considered, not the knowledge of many facts, but a power of the mind to think and act for itself.

IN the columns of a western contemporary we found the following:—"The students of the Toronto University—or at least a portion of them—do not, it seems, like the idea of young ladies attending the university, and when the seven who matriculated first appeared at a lecture they were hooted and jeered at by the greater number of the students. One of the young ladies was too nervous to stand the abuse and has declined to attend any further lectures, but the other six are properly enough bound not to be thrown out of their just rights by a crowd of rowdy hoodlums, who have not the common decency of coal-heavers, but who by the accident of birth, are able to wear tight pants and a cut-away coat. It is simply disgraceful that such conduct should be tolerated." We have enquired both of officers of the university and of students in attendance at the college, what justification, if any, there is in fact, for this severe criticism of alleged disgraceful conduct on the part of the students, and we have been assured that there is no foundation for it whatever. We shall pursue our enquiries further, and if we find the statements to be in any way justifiable we shall unhesitatingly say so. We announce this not from any desire to find fault with the character or tone of the conduct that obtains in University College, for we should be the first to defend our own *Alma Mater* from unjust attack; nor from any desire to defend co-education in University College, for we have never advocated it except as a temporary expedient, and believe that it is the duty of the legislature to provide for the higher education of women in a different manner. But the good name of University College is not to be trifled with, and if there be any young men in attendance there who so far forget gentlemanly manners, not to say principles of right, as to act as above described, then public disapprobation of their conduct cannot be too emphatically expressed. We sympathize as much as any with that juberant spirit of youth which leads to the jokes, the pranks, and the fun, of college life. But there are certain limits which must not be transgressed. When the general public is convened to meet professors, lecturers, senators, and students, on formal occasions, as at convocation or commencement, or as at the open meetings of the Literary Society, then the tin horns as well as the asin-

ine mouths of those who bray them, should be banished the public presence. No more lamentable spectacle has been seen since the foundation of the university than that at the last college convocation when the venerable president of the college, in presence of a vast host of ladies and gentlemen, invited guests, had to arise and rebuke the uproar by which the proceedings of the meeting were being interrupted. The matter rests with the students themselves. If the more sensible of them desire to free their reputation from the reproach of rowdyism, they can do so. Students, like other people, are governed by the public opinion of their fellows.

WE invite those who think that the teacher of the public school should be required to use the Bible as a text-book in his classes, and to teach biblical doctrine directly to his pupils, to ponder upon the following: It will be remembered that the Venerable Archdeacon Farrar, when in Toronto lately, preached a sermon to young men in the schoolhouse of St. James' Cathedral. An esteemed educational contemporary, that takes a deep interest in religious instruction in public schools, and if we mistake not, desires to promote it, has published a full report of that sermon. The inference is, that such teaching as the sermon contains is, in the opinion of our contemporary, suitable to the schoolroom. Now in the columns of another contemporary, also an advocate of religious instruction in the public schools, one of the most prominent clergymen of Toronto condemns the preaching of Dr. Farrar as "gross error under sweet and fascinating verbiage," labels Dr. Farrar himself as one of "the apostles of modern doubt and incipient scepticism," and states that "intelligent and devoted Christians listened with a feeling of pain" to the very sermon which our contemporary, first-mentioned, has thought best to publish. We do not in the least hold our contemporary responsible for the doctrinal teaching of the sermon, but we can scarcely be wrong in thinking that the editor would not have published it if his opinion of its character had been the same as that of the Toronto divine who calls the author of it an "apostle of incipient scepticism." With the disagreements of these good people we have nothing to do, but we cannot help wondering if Archdeacon Farrar should have the good fortune to become a Canadian school teacher when the School Act is amended so as to make religious instruction compulsory, how he would continue to satisfy his own conscience and have his teachings quoted with approval in educational journals, and at the same time meet the views of such people "as listened with pain" to his preaching in Toronto.