

that any graduate or undergraduate of that institution has any desire to see the denominational colleges crippled in the least. They are doing a very noble work with very inadequate means, and instead of being regarded with envy by the Toronto College are hailed as handmaidens in the good work. What, then, are the real facts of the case? University College has more students than it can accommodate. Men are crowding in from every quarter of the Dominion asking for education in science, in literature, and in technical knowledge of various kinds. So long as the old degree of B.A. was sufficient, the staff of professors was ample to meet its requirements. But now this can no longer be done. Men will not in this new country spend four years in a literary course pure and simple, and then two or three more in special studies. And the authorities of University College have been trying to meet the demand, and to give a training partly literary and partly scientific. This entails vast work, and the college, with its present staff, cannot efficiently perform the duties expected from it. The staff does not, and the authorities of the College do not, expect lighter work in future, but any one can see that while the staff has remained nearly permanent, and the students have increased within the last decade nearly 200 per cent., something must be done to provide additional teaching facilities.

This is the plain, unvarnished statement of the position and wants of University College, and the authorities of it are casting about them for means to meet the demands yearly increasing. Why this should cause dread to denominational colleges; why any cry should be raised for university consolidation, or a reduction of the colleges, or why the mere fact that the pressing needs of the college should be the signal for concentrated attacks upon her, and efforts to belittle her usefulness are questions which the promoters of such attacks can best answer. A discerning public needs only to know the facts; the remedy will come in due time.

It is somewhat remarkable that the agitation against any additional state aid to University College should have been inaugurated by the President of one of the denominational colleges, and actively taken up in succession by the Presidents and governing bodies of the others. Their great argument is in these words: the denominational colleges received endowments from their friends and graduates, and it is unjust to call upon these men to contribute indirectly to the further endowment of University College. Follow this argument to its legitimate conclusion, and the higher education of the country is to depend upon the voluntary contributions of the few. Will the friends of the denominational colleges assert that the Presbyterians, or Methodists, or Anglicans as a body contributed the noble, yet quite inadequate, endowment they now have? Will they assert that one family out of ten in their connections appears as a contributor to their endowment funds? Will they even assert that of the endowment they have, small though it is, 50 per cent. was contributed by their own graduates? And will they claim with any justice that 50 per cent. of the endowment, outside of the locality of the college, was contributed by other denominations? And will they assure us that any single man came voluntarily forward and gave them money from the sole and only desire of advancing higher education? They had a constituency to whom to appeal, and their stock argument was that the existence of their colleges was a church necessity; and on that ground the Allans, and Dows, and Gilmors, and Michies, and Carrutherses, and Moores, and Macdonalds, and Streets, and Strachans, paid down willingly their thousands, and galvanized life and health into the colleges which else would have perished most unfortunately.

But University College has no such *clientele*. The philanthropist in Canada is one of the coming race. Men now place their church in the foreground and support it; and if the graduates of denominational colleges have not contributed one half of their endowment, how is it that the friends of the denominational colleges so magnanimously throw the support of University College upon its graduates?

But what is a denominational college? The answer is, one whose governing body is composed of members of a single church, working in the interests of that church, and to gain credit with the general public, they declare that they are undenominational and will grant degrees to anybody. But does the practical working of the colleges bear this out, and to what extent? Will these colleges openly publish how many outside the locality in which they are situated, belong to other denominations than their own? Facts are stubborn things, and the class rolls of University College have shown in the past, and I cannot say whether they do not now show more Presbyterians than Queen's, more Methodists than Victoria, and more Anglicans than Trinity. The fact is the denominational colleges have adopted the very cry of the National College, and just as Disraeli sarcastically reminded the Peelites in 1845, 'they have stolen the clothes' of the National College men, and wearing them on public occasions appeal to everybody to witness their liberality, while privately the church has been the talisman which yielded them their richest returns.

Let the advocates of the non-denominational colleges then fully

understand that what they now gain of general support in students from other denominations has been the normal condition of University College since 1852; that the governing body of that college is wedded to no creed and no party shibboleth, and that it claims support from all because it is the representative of all.

The advocates of the denominational colleges pay but a poor compliment to the liberality of their patrons when they use the argument that having once contributed voluntarily they are unwilling to do so again. Rather will it be found the truth, that these men, rising above the mere narrow view of sectarianism, will welcome the efficient carrying out of a system of public instruction where all will contribute a little and the burden thus be the more lightly borne.

But, say the advocates of sectarianism, 'increase your fees, charge as much as we do, and you will have money enough.' An institution for the benefit of all and supported by the taxes of all should exact no fees. And the authorities of University College have recognized this fact, and not until absolute necessity compelled them did they exact one cent of fees.

But do the denominational colleges exact fees? I do not know it all do, but one in theory has a large fee charged, in practice not one cent is paid by anyone who can get a nomination on the endowment, and what is more, by the terms of the endowment this must continue forever, and this very feature has poured thousands of dollars into the hands of the managers of that institution.

Through you, then, I would ask a discriminating public to consider well the position of our only national college, and while wishing well to all the denominational colleges, let them not forget the position of another, which with very inadequate equipment and very arduous work to do, has claims upon their regard of the very highest kind.

SAMUEL WOODS.

Ottawa, Nov. 19th, 1883.

To the Editor of the 'Varsity.

In the last number of the *McGill University Gazette*, is published a report of our annual football match, in which information is asked regarding some of our players.

First:—The McGill men wish to know how it is that we allowed Duggan and Boyd to play with Toronto against us, Saturday, Oct. 27, when we suffered defeat. According to the rules of the Ontario Rugby Union, these men were not eligible for a position on our team, as they had played with the Torontos in the matches against Peterboro and Upper Canada College before our match with Toronto came on.

Second:—They ask how we reconcile our attempt to put on a fresh player in the middle of the game, and how we justify our refusal to put on the man we had agreed to a few minutes before. After our man got hurt nothing was said by either Hamilton or myself about putting on anyone until our spare man appeared on the field; then I asked Hamilton if he objected to our putting on a man instead of their putting off one. He said he did not. The game was proceeded with for a short time when Hamilton objected to our spare man, as he had not been playing before. Then, as the player he wished us to put on again had changed his clothes, I thought it better for him to put off a player in order to avoid further delay in the game. This he agreed to. After play was resumed two more of our men were compelled to retire on account of misfortunes which cannot be avoided on the football field, as the McGill men should know. Our opponents should have been pleased, rather than put out, about this, for they certainly would have had to lie down under a worse defeat than they received, had not these men been hurt. Those players (Duggan, McLaren and Vickers) are considered to be three of the best players in Toronto, and our team was very much weakened by their retiring, as was quite evident from the change the game took afterwards.

None of these three have been able to appear on the football field since.

Hoping this will satisfy our worthy opponents, I am yours,  
E. S. WIGLE, Capt. T.U.F.B.C.

## A MEETING

Of GRADUATES OF UNIVERSITIES will be held at the MEDICAL COUNCIL CHAMBERS, cor. BAY & RICHMOND STS.,  
On Saturday, December 1st, at 4 o'clock in the Afternoon.

For the purpose of considering the advisability of  
FORMING A UNIVERSITY CLUB.

Graduates in all departments are invited to be present.  
It is hoped that there will be a large representation from all Universities of Graduates interested in the scheme.