

A.R.  
C.XII.  
Univ. of Toronto  
1867-1889

1889

ADDRESS  
OF  
WILLIAM MULOCK, M.A., M.P.,  
VICE-CHANCELLOR  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO,  
AT THE  
ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT,  
JUNE 7TH, 1889.

---

TORONTO :  
T. HILL & SON, CAXTON PRESS, COR. KING AND JARVIS STREETS.

1889.



ADDRESS

WILLIAM McLEOD M.A. M.T.

VICE-CHANCELLOR

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

ANNUAL COMMENCEMENT

TORONTO

PRINTED AND SOLD BY THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

# A D D R E S S

---

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :

A year ago I had the honor of testifying from this platform as to the extended and ever-extending usefulness of this great institution, and of showing how it continued to adapt itself to the educational requirements of the country. On that occasion I also furnished evidence of the ever-increasing confidence of the people of Ontario in this, their school for higher education.

As marks of progress, I was able to refer to the affiliation of the Royal College of Dental Surgeons for Ontario, to the success which had accompanied the first year of our restored Medical Faculty, and to promise that a Law Faculty would soon form part of our educational equipment.

It was also my most pleasing duty on that occasion to announce that this University, in its anxiety to widen its field of usefulness, had identified itself more closely with the great subject of Agriculture, by having established a course of study in the Science of Agriculture, created a degree for deserving candidates, affiliated the Ontario College at Guelph, and by having arranged for annual examinations of students, which examinations, I may add, have since been conducted, and have afforded satisfactory proofs as to the character of the instruction given at that institution.

These and other marks of progress must have given satisfaction to all friends of the Public School System of Ontario, of which this University is a part; for, by whatever name it be known, after all it is simply a part of the Public School System; and amongst those who rejoice at our success are to be found, I trust and believe, all true friends of higher education, even though identified with sister Universities.

Under these circumstances it is to be deplored that that regard for the public welfare, which alone is the mainspring of every movement of the University, has not been a sufficient

132167  
24/3/14

shield to us from unworthy attacks, but that that very success which has deservedly attended our fidelity to the public interest has given rise to an

#### Organized and Unprovoked Attack

upon this, the people's University, and that, too, by a sister institution.

To this attack, then, I am compelled to refer :—

First, then, let me say that the attack in question has come from the Rev. Dr. Grant, Principal of Queen's University, and was first openly begun by an address delivered by that gentleman on the 15th of February last before the Council of his University on the subject of matriculation examinations.

Referring to education, he prefaced his speech by an account of his doings during his travels, from which he had just returned. "I was taken," said he, "to see schools, academies, colleges, museums and laboratories all the way from England, South Africa, New Zealand and the Australias up to Hong Kong, China, and Japan, and every means was afforded me of studying the old subject under new light. I interviewed or was interviewed by heads of departments, inspectors, professors, teachers, and others connected with the work of education, and in comparing one view and system with another was obliged to think over the whole subject all the time I was away."

A person of such vast and varied educational experience, and who thought of not a mere fragment, but "of the whole subject of education," and not during a portion, merely, but "all" the time he was away, must, after such long and anxious thought, have returned with well-matured views as to the imperfections of our system and the proposed remedy.

And what are those imperfections? And what the proposed remedy?

Well, on that day Dr. Grant stated that the matriculation examinations in Ontario and Quebec were not equal to the standard in England, Australia or the best Universities in the States; that Queen's had for years done everything in its power to bring about a remedy; that Toronto University was the obstacle to progress; that Queen's had been obliged to lower the standard of its matriculation examination in order to be level with that of Toronto; and the great remedy for all this was common action on the part of the different Universities whereby

they would combine on thinking out, preparing and conducting a common matriculation examination, which system might be extended whereby examinations down to the end of the second year might be conducted by the combined action of the Universities.

Well, this was the well-matured scheme that was to solve the whole problem, thought out after inspections of all the schools, academies, colleges, museums and laboratories all the way from England, South Africa, New Zealand and the Australias up to Hong Kong, China, and Japan; after the learned author had been afforded every means of studying the old subject under new light; after interviews with heads of departments, inspectors, professors, teachers, and others; after comparison of one system with another, and thinking out the whole subject all around the globe.

And what means this scheme?

It is simply a proposition

#### To place under Denominational Control

at once a large portion of the Public School System of Ontario, with the prospect of extending that control until the whole system shall have passed beyond the reach of the people's responsible representatives and become an element of discord among our people to the destruction of the whole system.

This is the reverend gentleman's idea of educational progress; and because this University, true to the Public School System of Ontario is unwilling to jeopardize it by countenancing a scheme for placing it under the jurisdiction of denominational or other Universities, he charges us as being obstacles to progress.

Why this well-matured scheme had scarcely been given to the public before Dr. Grant proceeded to attack and finally to abandon it in favor of another.

If our silence in respect of this scheme justified him in characterizing this University as being an obstacle to progress, what ought he to say of himself, who had dealt his scheme a fatal blow by abandoning it in favor of the view of his Professor, Dr. Dupuis? a view, he tells us, presented to the public in 1886, prior to the circumnavigation of the globe by the reverend gentleman. It certainly is a great compliment to Dr. Dupuis (unless it may be that his view was really Dr. Grant's) that his plan is now preferred by Dr. Grant to that proposed by

himself after the exhaustive but now confessedly profitless research in the educational store-houses of the world. And what is the

#### Latest Proposition of Dr. Grant?

They come so fast that it becomes necessary to identify them by reference to the dates of their births and deaths. That of the 15th of February last, after a feeble struggle for existence, met its death on the 27th of May (ten days ago) at the hand of its parent Dr. Grant, who at the same time adopted Dr. Dupuis' scheme of May, 1886, which thus on the 27th of May was recognized by and became Dr. Grant's. I have not heard whether this one has been abandoned, and shall therefore assume that it has not; though I shall be prepared to see it meet the fate of its predecessor so soon as Dr. Grant becomes convinced that

#### The Principle of Denominational Control

over any part of our Public School System will not be assented to by the people of Ontario.

Dr. Dupuis' scheme, as reported by Dr. Grant, is in the direction of there being a leaving or final examination for the High Schools or Collegiate Institutes, those passing such examinations being entitled to register as matriculants in the Universities. This is not a novel proposition either in Ontario or elsewhere. The idea has taken practical shape, in various ways, in various countries.

Any difficulty in the way of its application in Ontario would only arise in case an attempt be made to impair our Public School System by vesting control of any part of that system in other than a duly responsible body. So far from this University opposing the adoption of a general scheme, founded on sound principles, I may say that it would heartily co-operate in order to the attainment of so desirable a result.

To return now to the grave charges so lightly made by the reverend gentleman against the matriculation requirements and by innuendo against the general scholarship of this University:—

The question of matriculation, involving as it does the prescription by experts of subjects and methods of examination, including various details, can only be fully and profitably discussed before a body of teachers. It certainly cannot be settled upon the public platform nor by *organised agitation*, which novel methods have for the first time been introduced by Dr. Grant in the course

of his repeated attacks upon the University : attacks I may say received in silence up to the present time by the Senate, and by our staff ; who, animated by true love for the great cause of education, devote their whole energy to the proper discharge of their duties.

However, let me say that the Council of Queen's have done me the honor of forwarding to me copies of Dr. Grant's address, with the request that I shall give my attention to the subject, and this must be my apology for now proceeding somewhat in detail to consider the issue presented by Dr. Grant. The Legislature, as you are aware, has imposed upon the Senate the duty of prescribing the work required for entrance into this University, and the Senate has thoroughly revised this course of study at regular intervals after full consultation with the teachers and others.

The last revision of the matriculation curriculum took place in 1884, the curriculum then framed to continue in force until 1890 ; and this is the curriculum against which Dr. Grant makes the serious charges to which I have referred.

Now let me tell you what steps were taken by the Senate of this University in the

#### Preparation of this Curriculum.

First, then, in 1884 we took our curriculum then in force, using it as the foundation of the one about to be prepared, and referred the matter to the Board of Arts Studies, with instructions to draft a curriculum. That Board entered upon its duties, invited suggestions from all the professors, lecturers and teachers in the College, and consulted the representatives of the High School teachers and others engaged in the teaching profession ; and after several months' careful consideration of the question, reported a draft matriculation curriculum to the Senate. Well, the Senate did not yet adopt the report of the Board ; but in October, 1884, sent a copy of the draft to the head master of every High School and Collegiate Institute in Ontario with a circular letter inviting suggestions, and waited for nearly three months to receive the views of the teachers, and then proceeded to consider, and did consider all suggestions with which the teachers had favoured us ; and then, and only then, finally adopted the curriculum in question, being that in force and to continue in force until 1890, and the one which Dr. Grant says he was compelled to follow, and that

in doing so Queen's was obliged to lower the standard of its matriculation examinations.

Now let me say that in response to our circular invitations for suggestions or objections sent to every head master, not one single master complained of the lowness of the standard, and that the only real objections from any master were not that the proposed standard was too low, but that it was too high; one head master in very strong language protesting against the proposed advanced character of our classical work. Perhaps you wish to know who this strong objector was? I will tell you. It was Dr. Knight, then and now the head master of the Kingston Collegiate Institute, a distinguished graduate of Queen's, the gentleman who for many years has had charge of one of the principal preparatory schools for students seeking to enter Queen's, a member of the Council of Queen's, a person eminently qualified to know what had been the matriculation requirements of that institution. Well, this gentleman, not satisfied with lodging with us the protest of himself, one of the governing body of Queen's, against the advanced character of our proposed classical course, favored us with the opinion of the Classical Professor in Queen's; and what was his opinion? Was it that we were lowering the standard? No. It was that the opinion of this protesting gentleman was fully concurred in by the Professor of Classics in Queen's.

Well, our Senate gave every consideration to these views, and again consulted experts, and finally decided in favor of the views of the great body of teachers, refusing to yield to this demand from Queen's to lower the character of our matriculation requirements. Having thus failed to induce us by these protests to lower our classical standard to his level, Dr. Grant complains that it is too low. What would his cry have been had we yielded to his wishes? But Dr. Grant may say: "What about English and mathematics?" Well, on these points I have been favored with some evidence by Mr. Embree, head master of the Parkdale Collegiate Institute. Mr. Embree, I may say, is a member of our Senate, elected thereto by the High School teachers of Ontario, so that he is specially recognized as qualified to voice the opinion of the teachers of Ontario upon educational matters. Well, a couple of days ago I received a communication from Mr. Embree, which may be instructive. Mr. Embree, an experi-



enced educationalist, determined to test practically Dr. Grant's professed desire to improve matriculation standards, and accordingly submitted to some of his pupils the English grammar questions used by Queen's in their matriculation last year, with the result, as stated in his own words, as follows :—

There are four grades or divisions of Form I, the highest or fourth grade doing third class work.

The English grammar questions (that is those at Queen's) were given to the first or lowest grade of the school, and from the results obtained a large number of the class would obtain 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. on the paper, but as I have mislaid the results I cannot give definite information.

After reading this statement I asked him if he had submitted our English questions for 1888 to these same pupils, when he replied that he had not, for the simple reason that our questions were so advanced that he knew none of the pupils would be able to do anything at all with them.

So, here we have it, on the authority of one of the leading head masters of Ontario, the trusted representative of the High School teachers in Ontario, that so simple and elementary are the requirements of Queen's in respect of English grammar, that a large number of the pupils in the lowest grade of one of the institutes is able to pass Queen's matriculation in English grammar.

Manifestly, it is none too soon for Dr. Grant to give his attention to the subject of matriculation standards.

But he says : " what about mathematics ? "

Surely an institution like Queen's, which professes to attach so much importance to the rudiments of education, will apply proper examination tests, at least to the subject of arithmetic.

Well, on this point let me again quote from Mr. Embree :—

To the second or lowest grade but one the first seven of the arithmetic questions (meaning those used at Queen's matriculation last year) were given with the following results :—

Four pupils got correct solutions to seven.

Nine pupils got correct solutions to six.

Eleven pupils got correct solutions to five.

Eleven pupils got correct solutions to four.

Two pupils got correct solutions to three.

Two pupils got correct solutions to two.

Well, Mr. Embree submitted to these same pupils the arithmetic papers at our examination last year, with what result? Here are Mr. Embree's words :—

I had almost forgotten that the test was made more complete by giving to the same class the first seven questions set for Toronto University matriculation, year 1888.

No. of pupils who had correct solutions to 7.....0			
" " " 6.....0			
" " " 5.....0			
" " " 4.....0			
" " " 3.....0			
" " " 2.....0			
" " " 1.....6			

Now, compare the results :—37 out of 39 pupils in the next but lowest class in Mr. Embree's school succeeded in passing on the arithmetic paper set for Queen's matriculation last year, and every one of these same pupils failed to pass on our paper ; only six of them were able to answer a single question each, all the rest totally failing to answer even a single question.

Again, I quite concur with Dr. Grant when he admits that his standard is too low. What weight can be given to Dr. Grant's contention as to his alleged high standard of 33 per cent., when pupils of the lowest and next to the lowest grades in our Collegiate Institutes can pass his matriculation, whilst the candidates are not sufficiently advanced to enter even upon the study of the matriculation work for this University until they have reached the fifth or next to the highest grade of such schools as the Parkdale Collegiate Institute?

Thus you will see that there are examinations and examinations. Owing to the meagre character of the information furnished to the public, touching the conduct of the examinations of Queen's, it is difficult to expose

#### The Inaccuracy of Dr. Grant's Assertion,

that in adopting our standard he has been compelled to lower his ; but, fortunately, I have the testimony of a gentleman who is thoroughly familiar with the actual condition of matters relating to matriculation at both institutions at the period in question. A few extracts from his letter, which came to me unsolicited, will prove instructive.

Speaking of the rejected men, he says:—

In all my remembrance I never heard of any one being rejected at matriculation at Queen's, nor do I fancy any one else ever did.

Again he says, referring to Queen's matriculation:—

No papers were ever called for in English beyond the rudiments of English grammar, until after 1876.

And again:—

In those days students could not be induced to remain long enough at the High School to go over the work required at Toronto. Subjects like history and geography were not taught senior forms, because they were not needed for matriculation at Queen's, and hence it was impossible for any of the students to go to Toronto.

If all candidates so prepared were admitted as matriculants at Queen's, prior to Dr. Grant's adopting our curriculum, it would be difficult to understand how any change on his part could result in the lowering of such a standard.

If my informant be mistaken, Dr. Grant will, of course, correct him by promptly publishing statistics showing the number of candidates for matriculation yearly rejected at Queen's during the period in question.

If it turns out when these statistics are published, as of course they will be, that practically no candidates for matriculation have been rejected at Queen's, the proper inference to draw will be that in imitation of the practice obtaining at Glasgow, Dr. Grant's own University, there was no real matriculation examination in Queen's.

And, speaking of Glasgow, allow me to say, that it is not an uncommon thing for those opposed to raising the requirements of matriculation to cite to us Dr. Grant as being in favor of throwing open the doors to all comers. One gentleman informed me, that in discussing this question, Dr. Grant said:—

Let there be no entrance examinations, but let any one desiring to enter a University pay his guinea and register, as we do in Glasgow.

And yet he tells us that our entrance examination is inferior to that of the British Universities. We trust that a charitable public will pardon our unprogressiveness if in this practical age we still insist upon requiring of those seeking to enter this University, a substantial acquaintance with classics, mathematics, English, history and geography in preference to

### Dr. Grant's Tempting Guinea Test.

Being only the people's University, we still adhere to the view that there is no royal road to learning.

When a gentleman of Dr. Grant's eminence proclaims himself as

### In Favor of the Glasgow Policy

(partly abandoned of late, I believe, since he graduated), he does not thereby make easier the task of those who, recognizing the efficiency of our secondary schools, desire to fit in their work with ours, without unnecessary breaks or overlappings. Whatever success in this regard has been attained by this University has been attained in spite of, rather than by reason of his efforts.

Speaking of sister Universities reminds me of a letter which I received from a distinguished scholar, Charles Carpmael, M.A., of Cambridge, a wrangler of that institution and late Fellow of St. John's College, and now director of the Observatory. Mr. Carpmael, writing to me, refers to the visit to his observatory of Professor Simon Newcomb, a distinguished scholar, whose name is known not only on this continent, but throughout the whole scientific world, and who by reason of his connection with Johns Hopkins University, is in the best possible position to form a correct judgment upon the matter to which he refers.

Well, Mr. Carpmael, after referring with marked approval to our curriculum, he having been an examiner in this University for several years, proceeds to say:—

Towards the end of August, 1886, Professor Newcomb called on me at the Observatory. After going over the Observatory with me, he asked me whether I could introduce him to the Professor of Mathematics at the University, and on learning from me that he was out of town he expressed his regret, as he was anxious to make his acquaintance. He added that he looked upon the University of Toronto as the best mathematical school on the Continent, and particularly mentioned both Harvard and Yale as not coming up to it. He was acquainted with your curriculum, and with the requirements at matriculation, which he spoke of as superior to those at other Universities. In making the comparison he specially excepted Universities such as Johns Hopkins, where they have post graduate courses. I am, sir, yours very truly,

(Signed) CHARLES CARPMAEL, M.A.,

Late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

I confess it was with pride that I read such testimony coming from so high an authority as Prof. Newcomb, whilst his special reference to Prof. Loudon has great force in connection with the present discussion, from the fact that Prof. Loudon's University education was wholly acquired in Toronto University, the very institution which, in Dr. Grant's opinion, has failed to produce satisfactory results.

So much for Dr. Grant's reference to American Universities.

Again, Dr. Grant says the Senate of this University blocks the way to improvements in Queen's as well as Toronto; and, what is of more consequence, in the whole educational system. In view of what I have stated, in view of all the other facts, I can safely leave that sweeping assertion to the arbitrament of the teaching profession, regretting that inaccuracy of statement should be resorted to for the purpose of impairing the usefulness of this institution.

As to our undergraduate work in comparison with that of Queen's, there is within reach

#### One Most Complete Test.

Every one knows that the one University of America which is fully recognised as the first and foremost institution in respect of post-graduate work is the Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore. There the best graduates of Canada and of most of the American Universities meet on common ground to continue their special work and compete for rewards.

That institution began its special post-graduate work in 1876, and I have referred to its latest available register, that for 1887-1888, and find that the graduates of ninety-three Canadian and American Universities were in attendance that year, including nine graduates of this University, and that of those nine five had been awarded fellowships and two had won scholarships; in all, seven out of nine of our graduates had on this common ground, in open competition with the distinguished graduates of ninety-two other Universities, American and Canadian, obtained those great distinguishing marks of their scholarship acquired at this University.

Why is it that no graduate of Queen's appears on the honor roll of Johns Hopkins University? Such is the fact. For the sake of Queen's and for the sake of the reputation of our Canadian

Universities, I wish it were otherwise ; but perhaps Queen's has a post-graduate course all its own. If the public had to do with Queen's, it would, I think, form a proper subject of inquiry whether Dr. Grant's administration were a source of strength to that institution, and the great cause of education generally.

But this is not the only common ground where our graduates come into contest with those of other institutions.

The name of Harvard is intimately associated with all that is progressive in University life ; and only on Tuesday last I received from Sir Daniel Wilson a letter, from which I quote the following :—

I have great pleasure in informing you that Mr. T. G. Hume, the first of our graduates who has taken the post-graduate course at Harvard, has maintained the honor of his *alma mater*, and carried off against all competitors the "Henry Bromfield Rogers" fellowship in ethics for the year 1889-90. He was an honor graduate in mental and moral philosophy in 1888, standing first in the first class.

And I have just heard that Mr. Saunders, who graduated with us only last year in honor physics, has recently obtained a fellowship in that department at Cornell University.

Can it be that a University bearing such fruits as these is so unprogressive as Dr. Grant alleges ?

Well, in proof that the general public have not formed so unfavorable an opinion of the work of this institution as has Dr. Grant, let me say that at the end of the year 1888 a discerning public had very emphatically pronounced an opinion upon that question, if any conclusion is to be drawn from the fact that at that period, as appears by official returns, but twenty-five of the graduates of Queen's occupied the responsible positions of High School teachers in Ontario, as against one hundred and sixty-seven graduates of this University. And so on I could, in various other ways, give conclusive proofs as to the satisfactory character of the work of this institution. I could point with pride to the successes of our many graduates in the various walks of life, but I have already exhausted your patience. In concluding then, let me say that the Senate is now about to undertake the preparation of a matriculation curriculum to come into operation when the present one expires in 1890 ; and we shall deem it our duty to seek for assistance in that work from the teachers in the Province, and other sources, and if the teachers feel prepared for a further

advance in matriculation requirements, I have no doubt that the Senate will give effect to their views, even if Queen's again protests. With regard to Dr. Grant's general charges, as appears manifest, one of his objects in attacking this University is to disturb our educational system in order to bring about such a state of affairs as will enable him, through his University or otherwise, largely to control the Public School system, then I doubt if the public will sympathise with such efforts.

We have not sought to interfere with Queen's. The general public, I admit, has no right to enquire into its affairs. Were we to seek to do so Dr. Grant would, doubtless, quickly plead exemption from criticism on the ground that his is a close corporation. And the force of such a contention would be irresistible. What can be thought, then, of the propriety of such an institution seeking to interfere with the public educational system, and that in order to its prejudice?

In marked contrast to such a policy I can point with just pride to the record of this University, which in evidence of the effect of sound scholarship has ever rejoiced at the progress of any of our educational institutions, and whose desire it has ever been to aid and encourage them to higher aspirations. That this broad and liberal spirit is appreciated by those whose judgment is of value, let me say that the American Association for the Advancement of Science, an association embracing the leading scientific men of America, recognizing the high character of the work of this University, has decided to conduct the deliberations of its annual meeting this summer within these walls, and I bespeak for them a welcome worthy of the University, of the City, of the Province, and of the Dominion; a welcome worthy of their cause, our cause, the people's cause—broad, liberal, honest education.