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By the time the Canadian government began collecting for the 1911 Census, Trinity College had already federated with the University of Toronto. It was a return to its origins for the school, but also a divergence from its founding principles—for although King’s College, the future University College at the University of Toronto, was Trinity’s precedent and shared Bishop John Strachan as its founder, Trinity was a reaction to the secularization of King’s in 1849. Anglicanism marked a categorical distinction between the schools and their functions, and federation in 1904 threatened to dissolve that identity of collegiate life. Though many students had by that time already begun actively resisting the Anglican yoke of the school, they still took pride in its insular dynamic. And despite the many benefits of federation, including a significantly larger budget and increased numbers of residents, the students and administration remained apprehensive. “The old order was being unceremoniously ushered out,” and what would the new one look like? ¹

Trinity would remain at its location on Queen Street, west of Bellwoods Avenue, the site of Trinity Bellwoods Park today, until after World War I. The distance between the newly federated schools, therefore, posed a geographical barrier that at once served to hinder a full amalgamation and also to incubate the sense of identity that the college brought into the federation from its years as an independent institution. Thomas Reed points out in A History of Trinity College 1852-1952 that federation, which followed the example of the Trinity Medical College when it merged with the U of T Faculty of Medicine in 1903, meant that Trinity itself would only be allowed to grant degrees in theology. ² There is a chance at this crossroads that the theological dimension of
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¹ Thomas A. Reed, ed., A History of Trinity College (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), 131.
² Ibid., 131-132.
education at Trinity would become its defining characteristic. This paper seeks to explain why it did not and how the prevalence of religion gave way to the dominance of the college’s own esoteric institutions. This would be the determining factor in preserving college identity after federation.

But what was the *Trinity College identity*? Today, the college is dominated by lingering traditions that its members uphold without the college’s enforcement and often with seeming indifference to the role that they played at the time of their creation. How, in 1911, did the college appear to others—to its newly federated partners, to the surrounding communities on Queen Street, to the alumni and to the current faculty—and how different was the truth of its on-the-ground identity?

This paper’s focus on 1911 is due to the availability of information from that year, including a general census of Canada (taken once every ten years), an important medical report on Toronto’s urban congestion, military attestation papers and many artifacts from within the college. Given significant differences between the cultures of Trinity and St. Hilda’s, the female college, (and a disproportionally small amount of material extant to archive the experience of students at St. Hilda’s), this paper only concentrates on the 81 male undergraduates enrolled in 1911 and named in the *University of Trinity College Year Book*. Finally, this paper demonstrates how the college maintained the white, Anglican and wealthy stereotype that persists to this day, as well as how it sometimes did so without real evidence to support it, as if it were wielding the identity against its
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3 These names might be found in many places, but most notably in the *Year Book*, in the matriculation register from the time and in convocation cards filled out for each student. These three share some information, but are unique in other respects. For example, while a student’s name can be found in any one of the three, only the *Year Book* and the convocation cards provide his field of study, only the *Year Book* and the register provide his hometown, only the register provides his father’s name, only the cards provide the minutiae of his degree, and so on. The *Year Book* is used here for it being an easily decipherable resource intended for public consumption and gives the best sense of each student in the context of his classmates.
new partners at the University and against encroaching Toronto as the city sprawled out onto its porch.

In the beginning…

Trinity College was founded one hundred sixty four years ago, and it was as much an anachronism then as its reputation would have it today. Envisioned as an old-world devotee of the Church of England, built on the rock of tradition and strict adherence to doctrine in the footsteps of Cambridge and Oxford, Trinity was a celebration of—what its founders considered the natural progression of—academia in the British Empire.⁴ An early supporter of the medical school at Trinity, Professor Henry Melville, writing in 1852, begins his book detailing the rise of the school with an introduction meticulously tracing the history of universities from Oxford up to his present, right here in Toronto. “Thus have we endeavoured to show,” he writes, “that the principle contended for, in the establishment of the Institution whose origin and progress form the subject of the following pages, is founded on the experience and wisdom of past ages.”⁵

The school was also the fulfillment of what the founders considered their uniquely spiritual task—a project awaiting realization, even if it was incongruous with the times and city that would receive it.⁶ In his study of the college’s inception, William Westfall describes the “elaborate procession [that] assembled in front of the Church of Saint George the Martyr, […] moved down John Street to Queen, where it turned to the west and continued for about a mile to an open field,” and that it was here that “this grand cavalcade of Anglicans was to celebrate the laying of the

---

⁵ Henry Melville, *The Rise and Progress of Trinity College, Toronto; With a Sketch of the Life of the Lord Bishop of Toronto, as Connected with Church Education in Canada* (Toronto: Henry Rowsell, 1852), 23.
cornerstone of Trinity College.”\textsuperscript{7} That “grand procession” made its pilgrimage in 1851, and in 1880 George Whitaker, the college’s first provost and one of its founders, still upheld its message with a rousing Jeremiad about how Trinity “stood as a beacon of religious purity amid ‘the Proteus-like infidelity of the times.’”\textsuperscript{8} Westfall writes, “All its instruction, both sacred and secular, was tempered by faith, it prepared both the laity and the clergy for active roles in the church,” and this is what Provost Whitaker means by the “‘priceless benefits of such an education as can be given only on Christian principles, and under the hallowed shelter of the Church of Christ.’”\textsuperscript{9}

Exercises in faith like the \textit{founding moment} or Whitaker’s sermon are the roots of the traditions at Trinity that hark to something out of the past and that have grown along with the college to determine its reputation up to the present.

These traditions, the appearance of the college, the demographic diversity of its body and the day-to-day manners of life within (and the influence of those outside) its walls, however, were as Protean as the infidelity with which Whitaker charged the world. The discussion of federation with the University of Toronto began decades before its consummation, first considered as an option at a time of intense reappraisal of the college’s guiding principles in the mid-1880s, almost immediately following W.E. Body being named Whitaker’s successor as provost. Reed writes:

At the time, 1884, federation was seriously considered at a meeting of the heads of Colleges […] Many students and supporters of Trinity were favourable to the proposed change; but the negotiations broke down and nothing was accomplished. Both Victoria and Trinity were not unfavorable to federation, but Provost Body was unable to obtain from the Government recognition of Trinity’s rights to continue religious teaching and her equality as an arts college with University College.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., 102.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{10} Thomas A. Reed, ed., \textit{A History of Trinity College} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), 90-91.
This passage indicates the on-going emphasis on the divinity program and its right to grant degrees, which would come to be the lingering prerogative of the college after federation. It also evidences the student body’s ambivalence toward keeping Trinity an insulated culture and upholding the religious bent of its early days.

The 1880s mark the first significant movement toward rendering Trinity as it would appear in 1911, with a lighter attitude toward the institution of the Church coupled with a heightened dedication to the institutions of the college. The decade brought forth the magazine Rouge et Noir, which would become the Trinity Review, and also ushered in an era of secularization, satire and sports. The Trinity College Literary Institute, which predates the college at the Diocletian Institute, began an era of less religious, more socially-aware debates, rooted in the events and politics of the outside world; as the readings of the Episkopon (sometimes written as Επίσκοπον or Episcopon), Trinity’s secret society dating to 1858, became more skeptical of the college itself under the guiding hand of Scribes\textsuperscript{11} such as the poet Archibald Lampman; and as the school began to display interest in forming an athletic association (eventually established in 1893) and to diversify its athletic activities to include more than just cricket.\textsuperscript{12}

**Church on the Rocks**

The trends that singled out the 1880s at Trinity College were not fully realized until the second decade of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century. In 1911, religion remained an acknowledged part of the college, but was almost ornamental when it came to the daily activities of the students. Attendance at chapel was no longer mandatory and the student body might be divided into two camps: those who

\textsuperscript{11} The leaders of the organization, who by the 1880s were undergraduates and not just divinity students, as they had been previously.

would continue after their undergraduate to pursue a degree in divinity and those who would not. Furthermore, the body was no longer homogenously Anglican. The 1911 Canadian Census displays the minority of the school that did not come from Anglican families that, though dwarfed by the percentage of those who did, would probably not have attended the school at all prior to this point, opting instead for one of the alternatives offered in the city, such as Victoria College for Methodists or St. Michael’s for Catholics. The following figure depicts the religious constitution of the college:

Fig. 1:

![Religious constitution of undergraduate males at Trinity College in 1911.](image)

Though this graph provides a helpful sense of who was enrolled at Trinity in 1911, it is misleading for its lack of information on how these students might have practiced their religion or if they did at all. For one thing, the census often records the religion of family members as the same as the family head. Indeed, it might be assumed that young men within the average age bracket of 16 to 22 might have formed their own opinions, might not consider themselves
practicing *anything*, or might even feel a kind of rebellious will to oppose their parents and the administration of the school. In the Episkopon volume of the 1911-1912 academic year, one student is admonished for his rebellious flirtations with atheism:

Young Martin thought he would be  
A scoffing atheist  
So in the chapel bowed no knee  
Nor said his prayers, I wist […]\(^\text{13}\)

Here, the resistance to the founding identity of Trinity becomes a spectacle. Verses like this would have been read publicly at an extremely popular recitation known as a “reading,” where the students would come together to mock themselves and their colleagues for silly things they had done during the year.

It is worth noting that the genre behind these “readings” is the Christian sermon, and the very idea of the institution, which claims special connection to a god-like figure called the “Venerable Father,” is a caricature of the Church. Founded by a student of divinity only six years after the college itself, Episkopon was not intended to be blasphemous, but rather light-hearted, exaggerating the comical aspects of life in a strictly religious school. Even as the organization shifted away from a conscious parody of the Church, the traces of its influences remained. Epsikopon is highly controversial today, but was an enshrined part of the college in 1911 and volumes like this constitute a largely untapped resource for investigating the times.

\(^{13}\) John G. Althouse, *ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ* volume 50, 1912, Episkopon Fonds, Trinity College Archives, Trinity College at the University of Toronto, 69.
Returning to the significance of religion, another question to be put to fig. 1 is how the administration juggled its student body and how they reacted to the potential threat federation posed for the religious identity of the college. Reed discusses an event sometime before the 1911-1912 academic year when:

A request from the students that attendance at chapel service be purely voluntary was presented to the Corporation […] The reply of that body was that in its opinion “present regulations are reasonable, wise, salutary, and every resident student of the college, being also a member of the Church of England, should conform willingly.”14

A follow-up to this matter—the matter of how the “request” played out, whereby Corporation eventually either ceded to the request or else amended their policy on compulsory chapel attendance of their own volition—comes in the Scribe’s introduction to the 1911-1912 Episkopon reading, where John G. Althouse (himself a Methodist), writes:

14 Thomas A. Reed, ed., A History of Trinity College (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), 142.
Then the Father observed “[…] The present generation of my sons at Trinity are proud and eager for change, but the old order still maintains its ancient sway. They have resented the time-honoured chapel system, but the porter still marks the absentees and the Dean still keeps the lists. True—chapels are no longer compulsory—the students are not compelled, they only have to.”

These examples indicate how the Anglican identity of Trinity College might have persisted on paper in the census and to outside observers, but could still be challenged from within. The spirit for public displays of tradition remained as enthusiastic as it was at the ritual of the cornerstone laying in 1851, but the impetus had changed—they were no longer driven by religious devotion, but instead by collegiate culture.

While this all was playing out, however, the country and college were also on the doorstep of war. World War I began three years after the 1911 census, when almost all of the undergraduates discussed here had cycled out of the institution. However, a significant number of students enlisted prior the declaration of war, in some cases immediately upon graduating, even naming “Trinity College” as their current address on attestation forms. The following graph depicts the number of undergraduate males who enlisted (a majority), with a distinction made between those who enlisted prior to the beginning of the war in 1914 and those who enlisted in 1914 or after:
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15 John G. Althouse, ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ volume 50, 1912, Episkopon Fonds, Trinity College Archives, Trinity College at the University of Toronto, 9-10.
This figure displays a worldly and political awareness in the students of the college at this time, which is enlightening in the context of what Watson writes in the *Trinity Review* centennial edition, *Trinity 1854-1952*, where he discusses how the institution was not a hermetic incubator and could indeed be shaken by war:

> We who had gone up to College just before the outbreak and were there through the war years, had no notion, of course, that we were watching the end of an era, much less the nexus between the old and the new. But we did have a chance to contrast the life of Trinity in peace with that of a Trinity having its ideals and institution put to the test of war.\(^{17}\)

This observation is corroborated by the focus of the Trinity College Literary Institute on socially relevant subjects in their debates, as preserved in the TCLI book of minutes for 1897-1913. For

---

\(^{17}\) Andrew Watson, ed, *Trinity 1852-1952* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), 112.
example, the resolution for the third debate of the 1911-1912 academic year reads, “[Be it resolved that:] commerce between nations is the greatest safe-guard of peace.”

Hindsight shows the 1911 census to be on the edge of monumental cultural and political changes. At home in Trinity, however, it also marks a definitive shift in the lives of dozens of young men, both as the war divides their lives into “then” and “since,” and as it divides their home at college into “old” and “new,” into compulsory chapel and optional, into financial freedom and wartime limitations, and into Queens Street and Queen’s Park.

**Junior Old Boys’ Club or Just Boys Being Boys?**

In the time between the 1880s and 1911, the dedication of Trinity’s students to its institutions only grew. Exponentially increasing enthusiasm for the TCLI, the Review, Episkopon, the athletic association, as well as the many balls hosted by the college and its numerous other clubs and gatherings marked these decades as significantly formative. And yet, to look at the executive boards of these bodies is to notice that they were all largely dominated by a select few. The turnover of positions between years appears to have been largely determined by the personal relationships between the people involved, often betraying a degree of nepotism. With this in mind, one might question how representative these institutions actually are of the college as a whole—whether the activities of these few somehow represent the disposition of the many, or if these well-archived materials only truly archive a portion of the experience of being a student in 1911.

The best example is John George Althouse and his contemporaries. Althouse was 22 years-old in 1911, a senior studying classics and the future Director of Education for Ontario. He came
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18 TCLI Minutes, Series 1: Administrative Records, 1897-1913, Box 3, folder 4, The Trinity College Archives, Trinity College at the University of Trinity, 544-545.
from London, ON., where his small Methodist family was well-off, his father earning a large annual salary of $4000 as a public school principal.

*fig. 4*


His case is unique, for while the stereotype about Trinity’s students being from wealthy families persists, census information regarding the living conditions of these young men reveal many to be the sons of unexceptional farmers, humble clergymen, train station “baggagemasters,” cobblers and so on, and also reveal a surprising number to be orphans or to not have a father. Althouse saw a certain virtue in wealth and manliness, however, and held his classmates up to his level. The 1911-1912 Episkopon reading, and particularly his scribal introduction, evidences this: “I soon caught sight of Stent and Palmer, selecting corsets, and of Collip and Cleall at a counter whereon bargains in hosiery and garters were displayed. A little farther on I beheld Gillan and Cooper-Ellis buying 12½ cent ties and 5 cent collars.”

If cross-referenced with the census information for the students he mentions, this insult becomes pretty biting, given that Collip, Cleal and Gillan are all

20 John G. Althouse, ἘΠΙΣΚΟΠΙΩΝ volume 50, 1912, Episkopon Fonds, Trinity College Archives, Trinity College at the University of Toronto, 1.
from homes where the head is unskilled, implying that their resources are limited, and Stent’s father is unemployed. Though Althouse judged others against himself, his case is exceptional; while rising to Trinity’s loftiest heights, his wealthy, educated and comfortable upbringing made him a social minority at the same time as being a religious minority, accounting for the single Methodist (1.2%) in fig. 1 above. He also would not go on to serve in the military, unlike many of his colleagues.

And yet, despite being unrepresentative of the college demographic, Althouse was the representative for the college’s institutions. For one thing, he was Head of Arts, which at the time was an undergraduate position equivalent to the Head of College, a position reserved for students of divinity. His H of C counterpart was named “Dixon,” whom Althouse himself names in his own Episkopon reading—“Woe unto thee, Dixon, cock of the roost, head of college […].”21 It is remarkable that Althouse was Scribe at the same time as being Head of Arts, but he was also president of the “Athletic”22 (T.C.A.A.A.) and even uses Episkopon to rebuke the football and hockey players who would have been under his authority:

For a time I feared the football team would break its long record of reverses, but the first encounter with a real team laid my fears at rest. Similarly in hockey: lack of conditioning, no real enthusiasm and devotion to social functions conspired to maintain Trinity’s reputation of ‘good losers.’23

On top of that he was on the editorial board of the Trinity Review, where he had been since his second year, a member of the Historical Club, and regularly supplied the “oratorical entertainment” at the TCLI.24 Interestingly, and also pointing to the nepotistic tendencies of these organizations,

21 Ibid., 15.
22 Thomas A. Reed, ed., A History of Trinity College (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952), 287.
23 John G. Althouse, ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩΝ volume 50, 1912, Episkopon Fonds, Trinity College Archives, Trinity College at the University of Toronto, 10.
24 TCLI Minutes, Series 1: Administrative Records, 1897-1913, Box 3, folder 4, The Trinity College Archives, Trinity College at the University of Trinity, 540.
Althouse would name his editor-in-chief at the *Review*, Sinclair M. Adams, as his scribal successor. What is eerily similar between these young men—and also between them and Adam’s scribal successor, Frank Gahan—is that all three were classics majors from London and had held positions on most of the significant boards at Trinity. If there is not a pattern in what the student body was looking for in its representatives, there was certainly one that its representatives strove to establish among themselves.

The case study of Althouse and his small autocracy encapsulates multiple trends of Trinity’s culture in 1911 while also posing many questions about how daily life might have been. Althouse’s voice is the loudest to speak today through the numerous artifacts that preserve his name, but it is difficult to say truly if his voice should be taken as speaking for his peers.

**From Althouse to Flophouse**

In the same way one might take a single figure to represent an entire body, one might take a single perspective to ignore its angles. The evolution of Trinity, whether it tried to isolate itself from the world or not, was always also playing out in the real world. When in 1851 the “grand procession” marched west along Queen St. until it was almost in the country at Bellwoods Ave., they were surrounded by lush, large plots of land and the promise of an affluent future. By 1911 the city dominated; Trinity was nuzzled in among the Provincial Lunatic Asylum, the Central Prison and a reformatory, and was at the crux of the poor-to-slum districts that Charles Hastings, Medical Officer of Health for Toronto, labeled Zone 3—comprised mainly of Polish, “Hebrew,” Swedish and Russian residents—and Zone 5 in his 1911 Report, immediately to the south and east.
respectively. In the southwest the Massey-Harris factory drudged on, and rail lines branched like arteries westward out of the city core and cut up their path along the way. The following two maps, extracted from a 1913 Goads Fire Insurance Plan, show Trinity College and its surroundings, the first depicting the poor-to-slum districts that Hastings identified and the second featuring some of the uninviting landmarks mentioned above:

*fig. 5*
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“Queen Street West,” Watson writes, “[...] lay in the midst of the slums of an industrialized city. What had once been the elegant isolation of half-country was now the location of dime movies, foreign newsstands, and pawn shops, all crowding on the property of Trinity College.”

Federation, which included the prospect of moving closer to King’s College at Queen’s Park, was a way out, but it would take over two decades for the college to relocate. For now, Trinity would be “slumming” it.

The attitude of Trinity’s student body toward their surroundings was at once concerned and disappointed. Provost Whitaker’s disparaging comments about the “infidelity of the times,” made in 1880, were echoing among students by 1911, though with the word *ubiquitous* perhaps replacing “Proteus-like.” The very first debate of the year, held at the third regular meeting of the TCLI on
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October 20, 1911, discussed the resolution “[B.I.R.T.]: The co-partnership housing movement is the best solution of the slum problem.”27 The use of the word “problem” is especially telling here. The result of the debate was that “the negative won on the merits of speeches, the affirmative on the merits of the question,” but the Dean, who happened to be in attendance, also intervened to support the affirmative stance in both categories. It is certainly possible that the Dean’s presence at this particular debate and his interruption do not mean anything, but they might, on the other hand, demonstrate an invested interest in the topic. That the executive body would settle on this subject for their first event shows an awareness of what they and Hastings are calling a “problem” and an urgency to right it. The solution of “co-partnership housing” is one that Hastings himself proposes as “foremost among the successful plans,”28 suggesting that the students or faculty were aware of Hastings’s Report, published in July earlier that year. That said, the students’ motives for wanting to control the problem, one might imagine, are probably rooted in an aversion to the aesthetics of the slum and not a concern for the safety of others, as Hastings’s presumably are. Even for the less wealthy among Trinity’s students, what went on around Queen west at Bellwoods would probably have been surprising—a type of distinctly urban poverty unlike the rural one they would have known.

The changing neighborhood stood for an allegorical and literal expulsion from the Garden. Whether expressed in Bishop Strachan’s grand procession or Provost Whitaker’s sermon, the college was “dedicated to ‘the transcendent importance of religious training,’”29 which is a mission perfectly suited to strict, isolated conditions, but which could prove shaky against the passing of

27 TCLI Minutes, Series 1: Administrative Records, 1897-1913, Box 3, folder 4, The Trinity College Archives, Trinity College at the University of Trinity, 540.
time in a developing city. Following the intensely religious era that ended with Whitaker’s retirement in 1880, the twin prongs of religious relaxation and encroaching influences served to expose Trinity’s students to the full gamut of the moral spectrum. “The men stepped out of their cloisters and became more worldly.”30 What is evident from figs. 5 and 6 above is the lack of religious influences in the area: the few small churches that occupy the neighborhood blend in with the abundance of storefronts and—even if they could miraculously fit the whole population of the area—reveal just how diverse its citizens were. There are two Methodist churches, one Baptist and one Presbyterian. Unsurprisingly, Anglicanism was not a dominant force of the district, and by the late 1910s “no one heeded the ancient building that stood proudly on the north side of the street like the last survivor of an impoverished nobility.”31 It is wrong to assume that Trinity’s students were also isolated from their surroundings; the maps’ most prominent businesses are factories and breweries, and “[b]eer was to Trinity what nectar was to the Gods.”32 Which is to say, the shifting religious and social attitudes within the college are closely tied to the shifting milieu around it. An account of one without the other is deeply lacking, for Trinity is not an island.

Conclusion

Trinity College, still newly a part of the University of Toronto in 1911, was at a pivotal point in its history, moving forward in a backward direction; it emphasized tradition, it needed change and it was becoming increasingly aware of its surroundings as the myth laid down with the cornerstone began to show its seams. Students and faculty were becoming increasingly aware of the college’s resilience on the eve of war, in the pocket of a slum and even at odds with its own changing mores. The male undergraduate body of the time represents these trends well and in unique ways—

31 Ibid., 121.
32 Ibid., 93
sometimes by their cacophonous presence as it resounds through every archive box from the time, but other times by their silence as it reminds the historian looking back that they are there, too, if only tangled in the midst of the procession.

The question of religion, which once marked the definitive difference between Trinity and King’s, was by then becoming a marginal incongruity; instead, it was the students’ devotion to the college’s developing institutions that isolated the school. They were not wealthier than their contemporaries at King’s, nor were they especially more devout. They were, in many cases, just boys being boys—rowdy, travelling in gangs and often keeping their associations to others who spoke the same language, which is the shared language of tradition. A century later, Trinity is not too different: though religious subtexts continue to inform the way of life, they are rarely acknowledged. To this day, it is its institutions, not the church, that are truly built on a rock.
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