

## COLLEGE MANAGEMENT.

To the Editors of ROUGE ET NOIR :

SIRS,—It cannot be denied that a College possessing University privileges under the control of the Church of England, but open to members of other religious bodies in which secular instruction shall not be dissociated from religious teaching, is indispensable.

The College calendar states that such were the objects for which the institution was founded, namely, for the purpose of imparting to the young men of this Province a liberal education, together with religious instruction, such education to be imparted at a moderate rate of expense. Lest it be thought that this is an interpolation of my own, I quote the following from the Calendar: "Enoch Turner, Esq., of Toronto, bequeathed to the College \$8,000, to be applied towards carrying on the charitable and holy purposes for which the College was incorporated." The corporation has, by accepting this legacy, bound itself to offer the aforesaid advantages of a religious and liberal education at a moderate charge, *i. e.*, a moderate charge for this country, and not in comparison with the charges of older foundations situated in more wealthy communities.

Let us see how far our corporation is discharging the obligations which it has incurred by accepting the above mentioned legacy, together with other gifts and legacies, and legacies given and bequeathed under similar conditions, specified or understood. What advantages does Trinity offer to the Church of England youth of either ample or moderate means compared with the advantages held out by other foundations, and what fees does it exact in return for its privileges?

Let us first consider the "charitableness" of the institution. The following are the scales of fees of the Canadian Universities:

	Fees per Annum.
University College, Toronto.....	\$20
McGill " Montreal .....	20
Victoria " Cobourg .....	40
Queen's " Kingston .....	40
King's " Windsor, N. S. ....	30
Bishop's " Lennoxville .....	*50
Trinity " Toronto.....	{ 55 for residents. 65 for non-residents.

Now the above is rather a bad showing for Trinity as regards its "charitableness." And by the way, Trinity charges \$16 for its degree, whereas most of the other colleges charge but \$5 and none of them anything like \$16. And what is the result of charging such high fees? Why it is this; namely, that our Church of England youth flock to the so called *Godless University* and to the *Dissenting Colleges*, because there, as I have shown, the fees are more moderate. Thus Trinity is deserted, because it does not conform to the "holy and charitable purposes" for which it was founded. But some one may say, "by

charging a higher fee we secure a better social class of students." Granting for the present that you do, is this, I ask, compatible with the "holy and charitable purposes" for which the College was founded? Is Trinity striving to establish an *Ecclesiastical Plutocracy*." But I do not believe, for my part, that you do secure a better class of men by charging high fees; for I venture to assert that if the fees were reduced by some 50 per cent. to-morrow, that not a single man would leave; and, on the contrary, the attendance upon our lectures would very soon be doubled, and the deficit made up. Again, granting for the sake of argument that you can get a better social class by extorting an exorbitant fee. What right have you to charge the students for what they themselves furnish, namely, social prestige?

And now let us consider what advantages you offer us? Possibly you may be justified in charging higher fees if you hold out to us better inducements than other Colleges do.

Let us first consider the case of the resident students. Now having so lately come into residence, I am not, of course, capable of saying so much concerning the advantages offered to inside men. But with regard to our Commissariat Department, I am informed that the steward is an adept at addition, but does not seem to understand subtraction as well, at any rate, if he does he effectually conceals his knowledge. For instance, when a man orders a certain quantity of coal he has sometimes to pay for a larger amount. But should we be required to pay extra for coal at all, considering that we pay \$4.75 per week for our board? Altogether the steward is quite as much of an autocrat in his way as are some of the professors, for he is amenable to nobody. As far as I myself am concerned, I may remark that short as has been my term of residence, I have twice experienced the neglect of the servants, for I was kept out of residence some days by the delay of the steward in preparing my rooms, although I had given timely notice of my coming. I may also remark incidentally that I had the pleasure of carrying my trunks up to my room, and making my own bed the first night of my residence in College; for the servants refused to perform the former office, and neglected the latter duty, although sufficient notice had been given. Now, when I repeat that our board bill amounts to \$4.75 per week for board alone, not including extras, a rate higher than that charged by any other College in Canada, you must admit that there is some ground for complaint, even for the residents.

But what about the unfortunate non-residents. Surely their lot is a hard one, as I can testify to. To begin with, they are charged \$10 more than the inside men for tuition. Now, what in the world is this charge based upon, is it because they enjoy fewer privileges than the residents? To begin with, there is no cloak room provided for them, or any place whatever in which they may keep their gowns, surplices, &c. You will say let them ask leave

\* Including use of library for purposes of reference.