

It is not of course intended to dispute for one instant the legal power of the authorities to make what regulations they please, but in everything what is perfectly within legal right is not always equity. In law this is a thoroughly recognized principle, which, however, has not found its way, except in a very imperfect form, into College matters. In addition to this the purely legal is not always the expedient. Custom is always, we believe, recognized as an unwritten law, and the changing of one thoroughly established with so little ceremony is not conducive to harmony and good feeling. The manner was complained of as much as the matter. We feel convinced that had a college meeting been called and the subject laid before the men in a friendly way the authorities would have been met half way. There was every disposition to co-operate with them in such a matter as keeping a certain amount of order in Convocation and had the policy indicated been pursued it would have met with every gratifying success. Of this we are sure. But there is a certain element in human nature which revolts at having distasteful measures forced upon it without some little previous preparation. It was not as if there had been a continual opposition to any new measures introduced. Many of them have been already some of them most distasteful, which have yet been acquiesced in from the very wish to avoid unpleasant feelings. But to rely on this acquiescence for the complete overturning of an established custom was hardly fair. We believe that the measure was in all good faith. From after information we are inclined to believe that it was based upon an entire misconception of remarks made some time ago. But this emphasizes still more what we would say, namely: That had the method of placing the matter before the whole college in a conciliatory spirit been resorted to this misapprehension would have been cleared away and some agreement could have been easily arrived at. The course pursued showed a considerable want of tact, and either an ignorance or a disregard of others' feelings which is somewhat surprising.

---

IT is not necessary that we should take upon ourselves to do battle for Principal Grant, or to defend the position that he has taken up with regard to University College, to apply for further State aid. He has already answered such criticisms as had been made upon him, in a second speech delivered a few days since. We are only concerned with the indirect attack made upon Trinity by the *'Varsity*.

We have on more than one occasion remonstrated against a very marked tendency of our contemporary to have recourse to abuse instead of sound argument. To such a tendency we must again strongly object, as being entirely out of place. In the issue of October 20, the *'Varsity* politely tells us that our whole *locus standi* is sectarianism; that Trinity College is only a high Angli-

can sectarian college. Surely the *'Varsity*, when "discussing what is best to be done for education," should stand by its own advice to Principal Grant and "be superior to evoking such a petty spirit." The position which our cotemporary so patiently endeavors to misrepresent is simply this:—

We hold that the highest University idea cannot be realized while Christian literature, Christian thought, Christian history are excluded from the University curriculum. To all fair arguments against this position we are willing and glad to listen; but to decline the argument by the short and easy method of stamping the position as sectarianism is too obvious a confession of weakness. Call you this sectarian? Why, it would remain absolutely the same and unchanged if every sect in Christendom were reabsorbed into a new organic unity to-morrow. Sectarian it may be, upon the *in us a non lucendo* principle, because the existence of sects and divisions hinders its most complete realization, but on no other. Our cotemporary endeavors, in vain, to draw the red herring of sectarianism across a trail, the real direction of which is becoming daily more and clear to the people of this province, to whatever church body they belong. Let our cotemporary address itself to the task which the representative of University College cannot evade, the task of proving that in a Christian community the highest idea of a University can be realized when the name of Christian philosophy, the dictates of Christian ethics, the revelation of Christian faith, nay, the life and teaching of the Lord Himself, are ignominiously excluded from the circle of the sciences which it is the function of a University to teach and to extend. Why is this unique movement in human society, this regeneration of human thought, this life of lives on which men have never refused to fasten their gaze, even when they have withheld their homage? Why are all these unworthy to find a place in higher education, alongside of the great philosophies and exploits of the pre-Christian world? Of course, the existence of divisions amongst Christians adds to the difficulty of carrying out this ideal in the best possible way. This is but one of the many evils of the present state of Christianity, which, becoming clearly understood, and forming in the noblest and best minds, in each separated Christian body, an ardent passion for a close organic unity, which finds expression on every side, and is one of the most hopeful signs of our times. The imperfection, however, lies, not in the "highest University idea" itself, but in certain temporary and peculiar conditions of the Christian society around us. It would surely be as wise to banish Christianity altogether from the world because it had been a source of sectarianism, as to banish Christian instruction from Universities because of certain difficulties which attend its introduction in the most satisfactory form. There are many signs that the gradual decadence of Christianity in the Dominion will be the inevitable result of a purely secular system of