

THE 'VARSITY:

A WEEKLY REVIEW OF

EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY POLITICS AND EVENTS.

VOL. IV. No. 3.

Oct. 20, 1883.

Price 10 cents.

PRINCIPAL GRANT'S SPEECH.

The remarks of the Rev. Mr. Grant, of Queen's University, Kingston, respecting the proposed further endowment to University College, are worthy of discussion. On the principle that there is nothing like taking time by the forelock, even before the application is made, Mr. Grant is kind enough to tell us he is going to object to it. He says also, that the sentiments which he has uttered are not only his own but also those of the heads of other denominational colleges. As Mr. Grant's individual utterances they would deserve respectful consideration, but when he is, as it were, the mouthpiece of others, what he asserts demands careful examination, and, if possible, dignified refutation. Let us take his position as defined by himself. He says other colleges (naming some as instances), when they require funds 'appeal to the public, explaining fully why and what for the money is needed. Each institution has a constituency that believes in it and is willing to prove its faith by its works—so a response more or less satisfactory is sure to be made.' Mr. Grant further says 'the chief reason assigned (for the proposal to apply for further State aid for University College) was that the various denominations support Queen's, Victoria, Trinity, and the other colleges, and therefore that the Province should support University College.' He says that 'this assertion is inaccurate'—that is, applying it to the instance of Queen's—it is inaccurate to say that the Presbyterian Church supports that college. Therefore, the Presbyterian Church is not the only constituency from which Queen's draws its support. What then is the source? Let Mr. Grant answer. 'The church with which we are historically and honorably connected . . . gives an annual grant to the faculty of theology, and to that faculty only. For all other expenditure we have to depend on fees and on the liberality of those classes of the people who believe in us. For one reason or another, as a matter of fact, our great friends have been the people of this city and county (Kingston and Frontenac), without respect to creed, and the members of the Presbyterian Church in Ontario and Quebec.'

We suppose that this is the best statement Mr. Grant could make. It amounts to this: Queen's is a Presbyterian College located at Kingston, and Kingston people, as might be expected, for the sake of cheapness or proximity, send their sons there. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same definition applies to Victoria. With less reason it applies to Trinity, as here the existence of University College supplies the element of proximity, and the sole *locus standi* is sectarianism. The existence of the other smaller colleges is attributable to the same causes as Mr. Grant alleges for Queen's.

Now, what has Mr. Grant to say about the claim of University College. He calls the proposal to aid it by further State aid 'manifestly unjust.' It is unjust, because it asks 'that the friends of other colleges who have voluntarily and at great sacrifice, and for what seemed to them good and sufficient reasons, brought their favorite colleges to such a standard as to compel universal recognition, should now be forced by law to give more money to extend, they may think needlessly, an institution that, however excellent, does not commend itself to them as embodying the highest university idea.' Applying these words to University College and Mr. Grant, Mr. Grant says University College should not get more public funds, because, as he alleges, the Presbyterians and the Kingston supporters of Queen's believe that a non-sectarian college at Toronto is not the highest University idea, while a college of Kingston, with a Presbyterian

Theological Faculty, is exactly the highest university idea. As Mr. Grant says he knows what the other heads think, we suppose the authorities of Trinity think a high Anglican sectarian college is also the highest University idea,—and so on, through each of the denominational colleges. Now, which is right?

Is the view which Dr. Grant and his supporters take of the 'highest University idea' correct or not? He must in fairness admit that if Queen's is necessary, Victoria is also necessary, and so also are Trinity and the other smaller colleges. If they are necessary, it means a multiplication of colleges. It is generally admitted that to have such a state of things is an evil, not a benefit. It leads to unhealthy competition for support. It involves the payment of smaller salaries, and, as a general rule, of the employment of second-rate men as professors and tutors. To overcome these difficulties an appeal has to be made to denominational influences. The condition on which denominational assistance is given can only be one—and that is, that the teaching of the college shall have the impress of the views of the denomination which mainly supports it. Mr. Grant seems to wish it to be inferred that the Theological Department is the only unmixed Presbyterian element in Queen's, that the Arts and Science are more Catholic. If such be the case, we are glad to hear it, but we doubt whether the Presbyterians, as a denomination, will be so ready with their contributions when they understand that this is so. Mr. Grant is on the horns of a dilemma. Either his college is denominational or it is not. If it is, then its foundation is narrow just as that of all denominational colleges is. If it is not, then he has no right to claim the Presbyterian support *per se*.

The position of the friends of University College is very plain. They intend to do exactly what Mr. Grant says they ought to do, 'appeal to the public, explaining fully why and for what the money is needed.' By 'public' the sectarian colleges mean their own denomination—by 'public' University College means the people. Mr. Grant says: 'I would like to ask what the Province amounts to, apart from all the denominations.' It is true; but for that reason shall each denomination go on in its own system for all time to come, independently of all others? Is that the 'highest University idea?' Surely not. The practice of his own college shows that such a narrow-minded principle does not influence his actions. What then can he urge. He is driven to the other element. 'Every one now admits that Ontario not only has, but it needs, several colleges, and the only question is whether these all should be in Toronto or not.' We are sorry to see a gentleman of Mr. Grant's undoubted ability and reputation forced to raise a local cry. It is too much the case that local jealousy is easily roused, and the Principal of Queen's University when discussing what is best to be done for education, should be superior to evoking such a petty spirit.

Can there be two honest opinions as to whether it is not for the best interests of Ontario to have at all events one college wealthy enough to attract first-rate ability—not appealing to the narrow ground of sectarianism for support but open to every man—no matter what his creed. Such is the *raison d'être* of University College. It is not all it might be because of want of means—but surely it approaches more nearly to the 'highest university idea' than the colleges Mr. Grant speaks of. If that is the test, University College may well be willing to stand or fall by it. No matter whether a man lives in Sarnia or London, or Hamilton or Kingston or Cornwall, the infallible principles of truth are the same, and the general common sense of the