

are confident that the Council will never seek to suppress legitimate discussion conducted in all honesty of purpose. The acts of public servants should court, not thwart searching enquiry. Both as a humble factor in our University system and as churchmen, we have the right of scrutinizing such acts—for the directorate of Trinity, as at present constituted, is the executive of a quondam-pensioner of the Church. We do not seek a public expression of opinion on their part, but we do not shrink from it—for as responsible agents they are aware of the value of a healthy opposition, and of the futility of attempting to stifle discussion. To repeat a former statement—and we have the courage of our convictions—we are of the deliberate opinion that the true solution of the "Church difficulties" (so far as they affect Trinity) is in separating her, not from her principles, but from her party—in making her sons, not her partizans, responsible for her actions and opinions. It is a false position to make her future dependent upon the ascendancy of her religious politics in a Synod. As a University she should appeal to the public—as a Divinity School to the Church. If the delegates of Convocation were responsible for her management, we would hear no more of a monopoly of endowment. Trinity would then be free to act and think as she thought best, and intrinsic worth would be recognized where party spirit was impossible.

We have wandered a little from our subject, but we take this opportunity of again sounding the keynote of our proposed policy. We had wished, after stating our opinions in our last issue, to forbear touching on this matter, and our consequent objection to the Constitution of our Council. Our apology now must be the threatened action of the authorities.

— What a marvellous improvement that new double Street car track is, upon the old much run-off, undulating, many switched arrangement.

CONFUSION OF TERMS.

"Not to confuse Trinity College with its Divinity Class." A former statement of our own, for want of a better, we give as our text. May the sermon and its "application" prove instructive to those for whom it is intended, and serve to dispel a very common though very absurd delusion. Some may fancy that, since our circulation is chiefly among our own graduates, an attempt, on our part, to enlighten those who are labouring under this false idea, is so much waste of space. Would that we could think so; and would that signs of the prevalence of such a notion in the minds of our very graduates and friends were fewer and less glaring!

That it should exist in the ranks of our enemies seems natural enough, for many obvious reasons—not the least of them being a policy of keeping well cemented the defensive alliance formed between the opponents of any but the Provincial University, and those who have sworn perpetual warfare against the principles and Principal of our Divinity School.

This is as might reasonably be expected; but when we see our own friends not only making no effort to clarify the spectacles through which our foes look at us, but coolly sanctioning the error by their own—to say the least—careless expressions, there is ample room for wonderment. As one out of many instances, look at the letters which have appeared in the daily Toronto papers during the last two months. First comes one from some officials of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School "solemnly, mournfully" declaring the necessity of washing their hands clean of any Bishop, who could state that he would not oppose a large majority of the Trinity College Council, and withdrawing all proposals of *amalgamation* with Trinity College! As well might Nashota propose an amalgamation with Oxford. The two Divinity Schools could, if they ever should see fit, unite, and possibly this is what was meant by the proposal (though a *Provost* of certain views

was one of the demands.) The language used meant something very different, however; and yet its ambiguity went unnoticed, and more than that, the letters in reply actually contained the same misleading expression. Here is a piece of one of them: "A strong desire was expressed that the Bishop of Toronto should endeavour to bring about the amalgamation of the P. E. D. S. with Trinity College," etc. The resolution quoted in the same letter is equally amazing (and this by the carefully moving corporation): "That Trinity College should become the only recognized Theological Divinity School of the Diocese of Toronto." Did they mean to express a desire that the University of Trinity College should become a Divinity School? Surely not. What would people think were the Senate of the University of Toronto, in order to get rid of Trinity Medical School, to resolve that University College should become the only recognized Medical School? Or if the faculty of T. M. S. should offer as one of their terms of amalgamation with the Toronto School of Medicine "that the successor to Prof. McCaul's Chair should hold certain medical views?"

Our corporation must not be startled if a petition should be presented from the homeopathists praying that a Provost should be selected of their medical opinions, or at all events *moderately* allopathic. If they presume to refuse, they may prepare to be well pulled asunder in the daily press. Letters in this strain may be looked for, "What has Trinity Medical School done? Her own sons condemn her. The people are sick of men who are always giving dose, dose, dose—as if that would save a single man. Of *this* sort of physic we have had enough and to spare. The whole people of the country cry out, 'We don't want dose, dose, dose—it can take care of itself—give us the sugar,' and signed "A Lover of Pills."

Where are our large band of lay graduates that they do not protest against being snubbed by those who would use Trinity as a shuttlecock