

(6) *The Council of University College.* The work in the Arts subjects not taught by the University, viz.: Greek, Latin, etc. as named above, is handed over to the control of the colleges. At present there are only two Arts Colleges in the University, University and Victoria Colleges, though it is likely that Trinity will soon, and that McMaster will ultimately, join us. A college like Victoria is wholly free from State control, and of control by the University, except that it must charge the same fees for tuition as does University College. As the Senate prescribes the subjects upon which students shall be examined the colleges are compelled in some degree to proceed on the lines laid down by the Senate; otherwise they are free to do their own work in their own way. University College, like the University of Toronto, is a State institution, and is not separated financially from the University, for the two still have a common purse. It is the colleges that receive the fees of students, no fees being payable for attendance upon University lectures in Arts by those enrolled in one or other of the colleges. The Council of University College is composed of its professors and associate professors. It has rather wider powers than has the University Council. It can enact statutes, and of course it collects large sums in fees.

At first view the number of bodies in authority within the University seems bewildering. There is, however, a valid reason for the existence of each, and I greatly doubt whether any future scheme of reorganization will seriously affect the main lines upon which the government of the University now proceeds. The ultimate control of patronage must rest with the Government so long as the University remains a State institution, and it is unlikely ever to be anything else. The direct appointment and control of members of the teaching staff by the Government gives, in fact, to the professors much greater liberty than they would have if they were controlled in any way by their colleagues on one or other of the Councils, or by the Senate. The system is working fairly well. Perhaps the Senate has become too large and unwieldy, but this is corrected in practice, because only those really interested in the educational work of the University attend regularly its meetings. In regard to the requirements imposed for degrees, the Senate has usually exercised a wise conservatism and the representatives of the teaching Faculty have, I think, almost always received the consideration to which they were entitled.

The University has in fact a good and workable constitution. If the machinery creaks occasionally, what machinery does not? Some changes I should myself like to see, but they are of a minor character. Our constitution is well suited to our needs and under it we are really making very rapid progress.

### THE CALENDAR.

- Thursday, February 14.—  
 5 p.m.—Y.M.C.A.  
 8 p.m.—Inter College Club, Y.M.C.A. building.  
 Friday, February 15.—  
 4 p.m.—Philosophical Society.  
 8 p.m.—Queen's-Varsity Debate—Conservatory of Music.  
 8.15 p.m.—Varsity vs. Wellingtons.  
 Saturday, February 16.—  
 3 p.m.—Lecture by Prof. Cody—Chemical Building.  
 Sunday, February 17.—  
 3.30 p.m.—Students' Sermon. Students' Union.  
 Monday, February 18.—  
 4 p.m.—Modern Language Club.—Room 4.  
 4 p.m.—Oriental Association.

### CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of VARSITY.

SIR,—The following news item appeared a few days ago in the *New York Post*:

"CHAMPAIGN, Ill., January 24.—At a special meeting yesterday of trustees of the University of Illinois, the McKay resolution providing for abolishment of tuition fees was passed. This action was taken after spirited debate. The trustees will ask the Legislature to grant the university a special appropriation of \$35,000 to take the place of tuition fees."

I send you this item on account of the side light which it casts upon the university question in Ontario. It is, in its way, a contribution to the discussion of the financial position of our own university; a question which I am pleased to see has been so ably treated in your editorial columns during the present session.

The hearing of the action of the authorities of the University of Illinois on the situation here is obvious. That University, like our own, is a state institution, and very properly looks to the state for financial support. Moreover, it would appear that in the State of Illinois the idea that a University is a luxury for the rich has so far yielded to more enlightened views, as to warrant the trustees in demanding that its doors should be thrown open to poor and rich alike. By their action they declare, in fact, that university education is the privilege of all, just as public and high school education is with us, that the maintenance of the highest standard of instruction vitally concerns the state, and should be freely and adequately maintained by the state.

The sum involved (\$35,000) is, curiously enough, almost exactly the amount contributed in fees by our undergraduate students to the income of the university of Toronto. Unfortunately, with us there is no question just now as to whether tuition fees shall be abolished or even diminished. The whole tendency has been in the opposite direction. The fees have gradually risen from \$10 a year in the early times to their present proportions, and in the aggregate they amount to more than one third of the annual income. The first question to be settled in Ontario is whether the university shall receive *any* additional state aid. Perhaps we shall rise in time to the level of enlightenment prevailing in the State of Illinois, but meanwhile there is much missionary work to be done by graduates and undergraduates in dispelling the darkness which prevails in the public mind regarding the relation of university education to the prosperity and progress of the country as a whole.

Yours truly,

W. H. FRASER.

University of Toronto, Feb. 1, 1901.

### MR. T. A. RUSSELL'S ADDRESS.

Last Thursday the Political Science Club was addressed by Mr. T. A. Russell, Secretary of the Manufacturers' Association. The audience, though appreciative, was not as large as Mr. Russell and his subject, "The Problem of Railway Rates in Canada," deserved. Mr. Russell first discussed some of the difficulties that lie in the way of securing redress from existing conditions. He showed that the matter is one of almost universal interest, as every industry is more or less dependent on the rapid, safe and economical conveyance of its products to its markets. Proportional mileage rates, uniform throughout the country, appear simple, but American transportation complications make such an arrangement impossible. Mr. Russell suggested that under present conditions a railway commission was the only remedy available. A general discussion of the subject followed Mr. Russell's most interesting address.