

among her graduates. Yet Trinity is still, constitutionally, a College with University powers. No longer a child, she is yet in the hands of her step-parents. The public, in looking for an expression of opinion from our University, finds itself answered in the actions of an unrepresentative Executive. Those through whom she truly speaks (however feeble their voice) are her Alumni—her natural governors, whose actions can alone really represent University feeling. It cannot find an exponent in the present management, who have hitherto misunderstood their capabilities in imagining that the voice of the self-constituted successors of a Church Committee—Trinity's honoured sponsors, but her sponsors only, her provisional guardians till she might speak for herself—could be mistaken by the Church public for University sentiment. The present Council is the outcome of an intentionally temporary board, and why perpetuate it, has been the question often asked, now that its *raison d'être* is gone? The graduates of Trinity are her chief shareholders, for their interest in her welfare is (to place it on the lowest grounds) practical and selfish. Their stake is their degree, the value of which is to be measured by the public estimate of their University's present status. Being the parties most interested in Trinity's welfare, those on whom the unrestricted policy of irresponsibility will indirectly act, they should long ago have been treated with more consideration than the past beneficiaries of a Church charity.

At length a move has been made by the authorities to encourage the graduates to renew the tie and share in her government. But not only should an occasional vacancy in the existing corporation be filled by the duly qualified graduates in convocation, but the whole board should now sit under the same authority. The election of a Chancellor on occasion, though vested in the members of convocation, is no concession—such a power conferring no representative functions. Nor ought we to seek our rights by an addition to the numbers of a board already somewhat unwieldy. Be it remembered that it is the existing system, not the composition of the present Council that we criticize. We do not for a moment dispute the honesty of purpose or the disinterested endeavours of the Corporation. Yet, if they as a whole had motives other than those that might actuate the controlling committee of (say) a Church of England Hospital—if individually and collectively they were the representa-

tive and responsible agents of their own university, not as a corporation, the outgrowth of the enthusiasm of churchmen engrafted till it has lost its identity, Trinity would not now be the rock of offence to a section of the church that founded it. Not that we believe, either, that the present authorities—the sub-trustees, as it were, of our various foundation funds—lack a fitting sense of obligation towards the Church Catholic—the contemplated beneficiary. But what *was* the united effort of those interested in a soundly-tempered higher education, has, from its constitutional infirmity become, not a Church University, but a party training school—a bone of contention in Church politics—a red rag for *odium theologicum*. The *personnel* of the present corporation we do not find any fault with, but we question the fairness and propriety of the constitution under which they act. In the abstract, an organized autocracy is bad. It would be better for the Church at large—better for Trinity, if—as they undoubtedly might—they held office as the delegates of convocation, rejuvenated by University blood. But apart from the rights of the question, such a change would infuse life and energy into her being, most essential to a new University in a new country. The policy of the Corporation has always been a sleepy one—that of ignoring opposition as being the men in possession, of easy indifference to the growth and requirements of the country—their *regime* that of "*otium cum dig.*" But the bare conviction, however honest, that the English University system is adapted to the wants of Canadians is not enough. A patient reliance on the efficiency of a single factor of success—mere orthodoxy—will never do. It has proved a conceit in the past to trust simply to the self-sufficiency of a system, and leave it to the loyalty of sympathizers to develop the necessary ingredients of progress, an active energy and interest in our behalf. Neither the Corporation of Trinity, nor her graduates, should forget that the constitutional separativeness of our University, without self-centred strength and activity, means isolation.

WHO?

Yes, who? Who is to fill the vacant Provostship? Since our last issue an appointment has been made, in the person of Rev. JOS. ALBERT LOBLEY, M.A., D.C.L., at present Principal of Bishop's College, Lennoxville. While

the choice was pending, and speculation was busy as to its result, we, in common with all other well-wishers of the College, looked on with a natural anxiety, and the decision arrived at by the Council and Corporation afforded us a very satisfactory relief. But when about to go to press with laudatory congratulations on the action of the "powers that be," the dampening news reaches us that the reverend gentleman has declined the appointment. As one of ripe scholarship, executive ability, and moderate theological views, he appears to be endowed with the particular qualifications suitable to our present needs, and to say that we regret his refusal scarce gives justice to our feelings on the matter. It is not ours to inquire the reasons which prompted such a course; but, while deeply regretting it, we can scarcely be surprised, in face of the manner in which his fitness has in some quarters been questioned. To some it seems his appointment was an eyesore; but even among these lynx-eyed watchers over our welfare, his scholarship and administrative powers were indisputable. It was his supposed theological views that constituted the stumbling-block. What wonder that, under existing circumstances, he should be loath to accept this position in the hitherto stormy Diocese of Toronto. See what an appearance the case presents to even a cursory glance! A gentleman, of the true Evangelical type, as depicted in England, approved by the representative men of that school of thought, finds himself far from being in unison with a body of extremists, who unwarrantably assume the name of his own party; and, though all his actions are characterized by the liberal moderation which the Mother Church now requires, he must be subjected to all the hue-and-cry of disapproval and adverse criticism—in some cases almost to be termed fanatical—of his nominal associates. That a compromise necessitates a mean, and not an extreme, seems a lesson by them yet unlearned. The most blatant are often mistaken for a majority, while they generally constitute a really unimportant minority; and we can readily see that, by a gentleman, moderate and unobtrusive, the noisy, wandering cackle of newspaper correspondents could easily be mistaken for a general expression of opinion on the part of those interested. Misrepresentation as to the manner of his appointment, and misstatements respecting himself, would doubtless greatly influence, if not absolutely prompt, his action in declining.