

THE METHODIST COLLEGE
TROUBLE.

THE Wesleyan body is engaged in a controversy that was thought to have been settled by the action of the Conference last year. It seems that there are not a few daring spirits who refuse to submit to the majority represented by that year's Conference in respect to the proposed closing of Victoria University, Cobourg, and the founding of a new College at Toronto. The quarrel, as an illustrious dramatic character says, "is a very pretty one as it stands." Amid a flood of words, more or less to the point, the main feature in the discussion is well nigh drowned out of sight. The Cobourg institution has University powers, it stands as its own ruler and master, its whole order, life and work, are absolutely under the managing control of the Wesleyan body. A religious society in such an institution enjoys an element of enormous strength, it controls the higher education of the Wesleyan people, it binds to a distinctly Wesleyan College an ever increasing number of graduates who, in the professions and higher ranks of business life, by loyalty and love to a Wesleyan Alma Mater, create an influence in favor of Methodism that is invaluable to the society. It is this attachment to Victoria that is giving such anxiety to those who wish to remove the College to Toronto for the purpose of entering into federal relations with the State University in that city. Those who object to Federation see that if Victoria came into such a scheme it would be like the union of the tiger and the young lady of nonsense rhyme, for Victoria would be so thoroughly overshadowed and controlled by the State University that it would be practically a mere school of divinity for Wesleyans, of which, practically, one already exists in that relation and condition. It does seem a strange proposal to found Victoria as an University within a stone's throw of a huge State University. We venture to say that the inevitable condition of such a conjunction would be the gradual dwindling down of the smaller one into a mere satellite of the larger, that, in fact, it would lead to the entire extinction of Victoria as an University. With this change would come such a depreciation of the educational status of Victoria as could not but result in grievous humiliation to the Methodist people, and a lowering of their influence over higher education. We who say this would, for material reasons, like to see an enlargement of the educational attractions of Toronto, and we know that some who strongly favor Victoria remaining at Cobourg have the same material preference. If the discussion could be freed from local feelings it would be more profitable and interesting. But "Jerusalem" now-a-days is where a man has property that is likely to be enhanced in value by his love for this sacred spot, so that this Methodist fight is, in the main, a struggle between Cobourg and Toronto, a few highly honorable exceptions being combatants who fight for the sake of the associations and honor of Alma Mater against self-interest and ambition. How far it will be in the interests of a religious body so earnest

as the Wesleyan to hand over a large portion of the culture of its students to men whom they will not appoint, whose views, which may be agnostic or otherwise, they cannot prevent being taught, is for that body to well consider. They would do well to reflect on the highly honorable record of their brethren at home who have established and maintained day schools to ensure the religious education of their children. We discussed this aspect of the question personally several times with the late Dr. Nelles, and his views we know to have been most decided against running the risk to which we refer. Still, we are ready to admit that this difficulty is not an insuperable objection to Federation, if Victoria is to be established and efficiently maintained as an University, with a complete faculty. But if that is done, what becomes of Federation, and if Federation means that the teaching of Victoria students shall be done by the State officers, the State University staff, what becomes of the University of Victoria? If Victoria is given powers to confer degrees as a Toronto institution, why should not all the other satellites of Toronto University have the same powers? They now covet them, have tried to get them, and, with the example of Victoria, they would soon be given them, with the result of causing such a muddle as would be a public scandal.

We would advise our neighbours to keep themselves cool, the agitators are stirring up such a heated controversy as may rupture the body so lately united, and, although the Church could not but be the gainer by such a quarrel, we prefer to grow by the conversion to the truth of those outside the visible pale rather than by their internal strifes.

THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL ON
THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

AFTER the late Conference had issued its letter Dr. Ryle, wrote to the Times protesting against it because he was not consulted. The Archbishop of Canterbury explained that Dr. Ryle was absent from the Conference, that the letter was very carefully discussed, paragraph by paragraph, and approved by every Bishop present, all except eight who were prevented by illness or pressing duties. It turns out that Dr. Ryle stood alone in objecting to the letter! The London Spectator in an article on this protest of Dr. Ryle's says, "The Bishop of Liverpool hates Popery; but what a Pope he would make! His protest against the Lambeth Encyclical breathes the very spirit of infallibility. The one glaring defect of the Encyclical against which Dr. Ryle protests is the omission of any distinct reference to the 'unhappy divisions about the Lord's Supper which threaten to break up the Established Church, unless speedily healed.' The divisions which he deprecates do seriously threaten to break up the Established Church of England. What remedy would he propose for the healing of our unhappy divisions? He leaves us in no doubt on that point. He desires 'some bold declaration that, with the utmost toleration, our Church will never read-

mit the Mass and auricular confession, or go behind the Reformation." In other words, Dr. Ryle would "make a solitude, and call it peace." The Church of England numbers about twenty thousand clergy. Of these, the school to which Dr. Ryle belongs cannot claim more than one-sixth; and what he modestly proposes is that the doctrine and worship of the Church of England should be pared down to the standard approved by himself and the Church association. He does not say this in so many words; but his language plainly implies it.

The question is,—first, as to the justice of his proposal; secondly, as to its bearing on the future of the Church of England. What does Dr. Ryle mean by "the Mass"? Has he got any definite idea in his head upon the subject? Does he think it means Transubstantiation? He protests against "going behind the Reformation." Good. But in the first Prayer-Book of the Reformation we read of the Lord's Supper, "commonly called the Mass." Will Dr. Ryle reply that the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. was condemned and superseded by the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.? Let him read the Act which gave legal sanction to the Second Book, and he will find it emphatically declared that the First book was compiled under the superintendence of the Holy Ghost, whereas the Second Book is declared to be a reluctant concession to the clamour of ill-informed and impatient agitators. The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. still stands as that of which Cranmer and his colleagues of the Reformation most approved. *It is Dr. Ryle, therefore, who seeks to "go behind the Reformation."* He draws his bow at a venture, but it is the leaders of the Reformation whom his arrow hits. But, to pass from words to things, what is it that Dr. Ryle wishes to see condemned under the word "Mass"? Does he mean the doctrine of the Real Presence, and anything that symbolises that doctrine? But that question has been settled by the Courts of Law. In "Ditcher v. Denison," and in "Sheppard v. Bennett," the Doctrine of the Real Presence has been ruled to be legal. It would seem, then, that Dr. Ryle would have had the Lambeth Conference go behind not only the Reformation, but the Courts of Law in addition, for the sake of narrowing the Church of England to the dimensions of the Church Association. If Dr. Ryle had more than a tyro's knowledge of the literature of the Reformation, he would not need to be told that such denunciations of the Mass to be met with there do not apply to the doctrine of the Presence in the sacrament at all, but to the corrupt accretions which gathered round that doctrine, such as Indulgences, Pardons, the sacrilegious sale of masses, and the like. Dr. Ryle may think that his own opinion ought to outweigh the judgment of the Reformers, but no fact of history is more certain than that the English Reformers with one voice asserted the fact of the Real Presence in the sacrament, while leaving the mode of the Presence undetermined. No body that we have heard of has ever proposed