

the public; and in its integrity, its sing' emindedness, its unselfishness must provoke the admiration of friends and foes alike.

Chosen to captain a difficult undertaking, and to defend an assailed cause, he did so manfully and truly; with what magnanimity and grace his enemies can best tell.

In what honour and affection he is held by many, particularly those who knew him best, was amply testified by his enthusiastic reception at our late Convocation.

But in regard to this, as well as to his learning and eminent fitness for the work he undertook, we can most fitly speak in "good Griffith's" words to Queen Katharine:—

"He was a scholar, and a wise and good one,
Exceeding wise, fair-spoken, and persuading.

And to the men that sought him sweet as summer."

In conclusion, we can only assure him that he carries into the quiet of his English retirement, the best wishes of the Institution which he championed so long and bravely, and loved and served so well.

THE PROVOSTSHIP.

The Bishop of Toronto and the Provost have returned from England. On Convocation Day His Lordship publicly announced that their joint efforts to procure from the Mother Country a good man and true, to succeed the Provost, had as yet been unfruitful.

The Provost stated that though he deeply regretted the parting, after nearly thirty years connection with our *Alma Mater*, still, in his advanced years, the kindness of his own College, in offering him congenial employment without his seeking, had led him to take advantage of an opportunity of retiring in favour of a younger and more energetic man. To choose such an one was the Provost's object in associating himself with the Bishop, but their failure hitherto has led the former, we understand, to return to us temporarily, leaving a *locum tenens* in charge of his parish. It was not, of course, to be expected that, relying solely on private means, however influential, the Provost's successor could easily be found. At present the almost daily growth and amplification of the English Universities demand all the learning and ability they develop—even now their resources are taxed. Again, the choice was necessarily restricted to one profession, and further, though unadvisedly, we venture to think, to those whose University career

and distinctions might fit them for the double duty of Provost and Professor of Divinity. Obviously, then, in their freedom of selection, our President and Provost were narrowly limited. Amongst those graduates, in Holy Orders, of classical attainments and Anglican views, whom, either a wish for parochial work or marriage, had led to accept livings, and to whom years had brought experience, yet had not dimmed their scholarship, was our future Provost to be found, and that without publicity—without even an advertisement of our need. From these and kindred causes, we presume, the late mission was unsuccessful.

Before further efforts are made towards importation, let us consider Trinity's requirements—her position. It is altogether unlikely that any clergyman of the attainments and talent of the Provost will be willing, when found, to come over and help us—to leave his country and sacrifice prospects—for the stipend at present attached to the office, while yet there is room and to spare for ability and energy at home. Indeed, it is too much to expect—nay, to ask.

The Provost's worth is only fully appreciated on the prospect of his immediate loss. A gentleman eminently adapted for the position in a newly founded Church University—oppressed by enemies from within and sectarian influence from without—the Provost established and maintained Trinity throughout its infancy in the true principles of religious government—our Collegiate system, the very details of our internal economy, we doubtless owe to him. This was the Provost's task, and he has permanently established our recognized characteristics. But work, however well begun, is but half done. Our present condition reminds us that in choosing the Provost's successor, one of administrative ability, youth, and an acquaintance with the country—native rather than acquired—should be preferred to a scholarly recluse. In a word, a Provost rather than a Professor; and at all hazards, if practicable, one whose combined duties will not tend to confuse Trinity College with its Divinity Class.

The latter consideration is, of course, of a purely financial character. A Professor of Divinity there must be; and as such he naturally takes our Divinity class in charge. Yet, however economical it may be that a Provost, in addition to his duties as such, though alone sufficient to occupy his whole attention, should fill at once the positions of Vice-Chancellor and

Professor of Divinity, Lecturer on the Divinity class, and (perchance) Archdeacon of the Diocese, still we hesitate to suppose that, in the event of the appointment of an additional Divinity Professor, the authorities will overlook the claims of the Arts Department in their selection of a Provost. Our Royal Charter does not stipulate that the Provost shall be a Professor of Divinity, nor yet does the Provincial Act on which it is founded—indeed, it does not seem to contemplate a two-fold duty. The University Statutes, which thus restrict the Provost's duties, are, we presume, purely arbitrary and so may be abrogated at will, if not, to some extent, already rendered effete by disuse. If then, it is granted that our position among the educational means of the Province is determined and our endowment secured, our religious leavening appreciated, and our College system understood by the educated public, our requirements become manifest. Theological giants—to borrow an expression—and educational dwarfs have, in past times, been conjured up in our midst by those who longed for an opportunity of knocking them down; and they have, to be sure, been demolished by their unnatural parents. But time has wrought a change. The moot-points in our system are no longer those of an experiment—such have become dead issues from the fruitlessness of fault-finding and the fact of our present existence. Trinity is as likely to act on extraneous advice in matters theological as her trustees are to prove without conscience in the discharge of their trust, and surrender her charter at the Rev. Mr. Rainsford's instance. The questions that now affect her are common to all the possible factors of a Provincial University. The matter, then, resolves itself to this: presuming that funds will be forthcoming to support a Professor of Divinity distinct from her Provost—for otherwise speculation is idle—her maturity demands one of a practical, energetic character at her head, while existing circumstances and the nature of her case now require, in addition, a man with natural tact and the faculty of popularizing her halls and extending her influence, rather than a controversialist who will merely advertise her orthodoxy by theological polemics and wage war with shadows at the expense of her more material welfare.

We have already drawn our readers' attention to the fact that the Provostship is not necessarily the perquisite of the Professor of Divinity. Trinity is committed to no such arrangement.