

disappointment to a great number of the graduates and many others of those present. The speakers treated almost entirely of the future of the College, and the abilities and usefulness of the present Provost. Far be it from me to belittle the importance of looking to the future, or to speak disparagingly of one with whom I have not the honour of a personal acquaintance, and of whom I can hear only praise and commendation, whether it comes from his own university in England, where he was looked upon, among distinguished scholars and eminent men, as a superior in intellect, and as a man of piety and learning, besides standing high in social attainments, or from this country, where the men, with whom he has had most to do, have already learned to look upon him with love and admiration; yet I, for one, and many others with me, would not forget that Trinity has a past and that a glorious one; nor could we forget that a great and good man—a man whose name need only have been mentioned at that meeting to raise such applause as was not heard throughout the whole evening—had but a few short months ago left our midst; and many at that meeting were incensed at the evident care with which the speakers avoided that name—the name of him who bore the burden and heat of the day. But it is not necessary here to sound the good man's praises; the readers of ROUGE ET NOIR know well what he was to Trinity—what care and attention he bestowed upon her from her earliest days, and how he spent the best thirty years of his life in her service, and this man to be wholly ignored at “a gathering of the friends of Trinity College!”

Some of the speeches indeed reminded one very much of that abortive attempt of some aspiring undergraduate which appeared in *The Mail* of a late date, so evident was the intention to court the favour of those who would not listen to our courtship were we to plead it on our bended knees.

I fully expect to see in the next number of *The Evangelical Churchman* an article with head lines somewhat like this: “A Mass Meeting of the Friends of Trinity.” “The Late Provost Treated with Silent Contempt.” “The Thirty Years of his Life Spent in Trinity's Service Wholly Ignored.”

But this was not the only defect. How was it that out of all our graduates only one was called upon to speak, who, as it were, on second thoughts, was asked if he would like to make a few remarks from the body of the Hall before the motion was put. It would certainly have looked better if some prominent graduate (there were many present) had been chosen as one of the speakers of the evening; then reassured “Prov.” would not have been overlooked; any graduate would have pointed to the excellent and speaking portrait of the old man, as it hung on the wall, a reproach to the speakers, and referred to him as, if not the founder of the College, certainly the foster-mother and the tender nurse of her early years; the choice of our founder to care for “The child of his old age;” the champion and defender of the Church in Canada. The greatest scholar, the most eminent theologian and the most conscientious and true man with whose influence our University, and the church at large in Canada has ever been blessed. But no graduate was called upon, the idea pervading the whole management seemingly being to evade the past—for what reason I do not know.

These were serious defects, or at least, appeared so to many who were present. Each speech, though doubtless good as far as it went, was a disappointment.

Instead of leaving a feeling of enthusiasm upon the audience, it left a blank sense of something lacking—almost a feeling of resentment, at least such was the effect upon me and, I believe, many others. Never, I trust, again will “the friends of Trinity” meet and wholly ignore the past and the great and good man who has so lately left us.

A GRADUATE WHO WAS DISAPPOINTED.

## ANOTHER GROWL.

*To the Editors of Rouge et Noir.*

DEAR SIRS,—

The circulation of our paper is chiefly, I know, among Trinity's graduates and friends, so that I shall not hesitate to say what I feel, and what I believe many other people feel, upon a question brought again into notice by the meeting in the Convocation Hall a few days ago. Much good work was done upon that evening for our dear old Alma Mater. The warm sympathy of the clergy was well represented in the person of Canon Carmichael, that of the laity by our old friend Chief Justice Hagarty. The fatherly protection of the Bishops was shown in the excellent speeches of their Lordships of Ontario, Niagara, and Toronto, with an encouraging letter from the Bishop of Montreal. We were informed of the nobly liberal response to the appeal for funds to found the new Professorships and build the Chapel. We were delighted to hear of the wonderful success of the Provost as an intellectual and spiritual guide. All this was interesting, gladdening, rousing. I have no fault to find with what was done. It was altogether excellent. But there was a great deal not done. There were several very significant omissions at that meeting, omissions not to be passed over in silence by any who observed them, especially by our paper with whose politics they are at direct variance, if its attitude remain what it was at the foundation. What was that position? Was it not this? The attitude of one protesting against two great evils. One—the genteel inactivity into which the College Fathers had sunk—with their ‘keep it dark’ policy, their apologetic and compromising tone towards those ‘enemies’ they seemed so much to dread,—appearing to have lost sight of the fact that Trinity was and is a protest against the non-religious education—not the ‘godless University’ against Trinity—and that ‘a blow once struck entails a battle’ and ‘a slip ingloriously out of sight procclaims a want of moral courage in the striker or *absit omen!* a weak cause.’ That was the first and primary evil against which our journal raised her voice,—yet not *hers*, but that of a large body of graduates speaking through her. This evil seems rapidly to be remedying itself. The Council have wakened up. *Rouge et Noir* can now afford to be quiet on that score.

The second evil is still in existence though partially remedied by recent statutes. It is the exclusion of graduates from any voice in the affairs of the University. Bishop Strachan's intention was to found a University on the English plan. Her corporation as then constituted was to take charge of her until she could walk without their help or with less of it. She has about four hundred graduates—yet their voice is barely permitted to be heard at all. They are looked upon much as boys who have left school—not as members of a University. The permission lately given them of electing two members of Corporation annually was a grand step in the right direction, but was only a step. Graduates