

"Let us speak not in a spirit of defiance, but in a spirit of love, let us eschew all needless expressions which may give offence; above all let us remember that the grand object which we have in view is the discovery of the wisest methods of work, the strengthening of peace, the firmer cohesion of the members of the Body. By this course our very differences will serve to bring out more clearly the unity of our faith, and our diversities of thought will be at once a safeguard and protest against any narrowing of the limits which define the membership of our branch of the Catholic Church.—BISHOP MACLAGAN.

TRINITY COLLEGE AND P. E. D. S.

THE *Mail* of the 25th ult. contains a copy of a long correspondence between the Hon. G. W. ALLAN, Chancellor of Trinity College, and Mr. N. W. HOYLES, Sec. of the P. E. D. S. (now Wycliffe College), relating to certain negotiations for union. The letters leave a painful impression on the mind. There seems on one side to have been a frank, even generous, movement to secure union, and on the other, a determination to frustrate negotiations leading to it, and at the same time, a desire to avoid this being known to the public. The Bishop of Toronto was formally authorized by a resolution of the Council of Trinity College, on the 14th May, 1879, to open negotiations for union with the new Divinity School. A discussion took place as to the terms the Bishop should offer, but it was decided not to trammel the Bishop with conditions. That is especially to be noted. At the same meeting an arrangement was made for altering the Statutes of Trinity in order to provide for a representation from among the supporters of the P. E. D. S., in case the Bishop's efforts succeeded in bringing about the desired union. On the 29th June the Bishop reported that he had great regret in announcing that after a formal interview with the board of the P. E. D. S., he saw no ground for hoping for any present response favourable to such amalgamation, and his lordship concluded his report in these words:—"The determination of the school board in the meantime to maintain their institution in its independence appears to me, in view of the cordial willingness shown by our corporation to grant all fair and reasonable concessions, to throw upon the managers of the Divinity School the onus that attaches to the failure of these negotiations." Some time after this, certain proposals were sent to the Bursar of Trinity College from the P. E. D. S., to be laid before the Council. It appears that after these proposals were delivered, a special meeting of the Council was held, but as it was called exclusively for special business, and the P. E. D. S. proposals did not fall within the scope of that business, the proposals did not come under discussion, they, in fact, were not even put before the meeting. Every person of experience knows that at a Special meeting of any committee, it is not in order to take up other business. But the board of the P. E. D. S. suddenly withdrew these proposals before another meeting of the Council of Trinity; thus they never were formally presented to the Council of Trinity, indeed, the fact of such proposals being in existence when withdrawn, was unknown to the members of the Trinity College Council. These are the chief facts of this unfortunate controversy:—1st, A formal authorization of the Bishop on behalf of Trinity College to treat for union with the P. E. D. S. 2nd, A resolution not to bind him down to any terms and conditions. 3rd, The Bishop's formal interview with the P. E. D. S. to carry out his mission. 4th, The utter failure of the Bishop to obtain from the Board of the P. E. D. S. even grounds for hoping for success. 5th, The Bishop's formal report to Trinity College Council of such

entire failure. 6th, The sending of certain proposals by the P. E. D. S. to the Bursar of Trinity College. 7th, The sudden and unexplained withdrawal of the P. E. D. S. proposals before they could be laid before the Council of Trinity, and before their purport was officially known. Now it can hardly be believed, but it is none the less true, that the Divinity School Board, by their secretary, has publicly denied that any such negotiations were opened by Trinity College, and further, that the only proposals for union emanated from themselves. The way this matter is stated by the secretary of the P. E. D. S. is the painful part of it—it is so disingenuous. The reader will specially have noted that a point was made by Trinity College in not defining terms and conditions, in order to avoid trammelling the Bishop in his negotiations with the P. E. D. S. Now the denial of the secretary of the P. E. D. S. takes this quibbling form: "they cannot find that any resolution was ever passed by Trinity College defining terms of union!" In a sharply contested law suit such a plea might be urged by a not over scrupulous counsel, but the Bench would certainly expose the equivocation. The secretary of the P. E. D. S. even goes further, after the Board had had a long interview, a formal interview, a special interview with the Bishop to hear him as the accredited and specially commissioned ambassador from Trinity College Council, after his business had been discussed at length, the business of negotiating for a union of the two colleges, the secretary of the Board of the P. E. D. S. has actually stated that "they are unable to find that the Bishop of Toronto was formally authorized to open negotiations with the Divinity School." This, too, after not only this special interview had been formally held, but after Chancellor ALLAN had officially informed the P. E. D. S. "that the Bishop had been formally authorized to open negotiations." One thing we will affirm, the Churchmen of Canada, fair minded men of all parties, are not prepared to believe that the Hon. G. W. ALLAN, Chancellor of Trinity College, and his Lordship the Bishop of Toronto, are capable of making statements which are untrue. Mr. HOYLES, Secretary of the Board of the P. E. D. S., has not done that institution any service by reflecting upon the honour, the truthfulness, and the good faith of the Bishop of Toronto, Chancellor ALLAN, and the Council of Trinity College. And further, we would say that any institution is propped up with very rotten timber which is supported by insinuations against the integrity of men like Chancellor ALLAN, upon whose honour hitherto not even slander has dared to breathe. But, as POPE says, "all looks yellow to the jaundiced eye." When the Bishop of Toronto states that Trinity College was cordially willing to grant to the P. E. D. S. "all fair and reasonable concessions," and that "the onus that attaches to the failure of his negotiations" for union is thrown by him "upon the managers of the Divinity School," that formal statement and that reproach remain fixed and accepted facts in the judgment and in the history of the Church in Canada. We are fully assured that there are honourable, Christian-minded men on the Board of Wycliffe College who do not approve of the style of correspondence adopted in their name; they are not willing to be thought capable of such discourtesy. We, therefore, expect to see such explanations given, and such withdrawals as will efface this stain from the annals of the Church.

Ask all your friends to subscribe for the DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

BEING DEAD YET SPEAKETH.

A HIGHLY prominent, and since the death of Canon MILLER, the most influential member of the Evangelical party in the English Church, has been removed by the translation of Archdeacon PREST, of Durham, from the militant to the triumphant Church.

Differing in some points widely from the late Archdeacon, we have all the more pleasure, melancholy though it be, in bearing our most earnest, most grateful testimony to the value of such a life as his to the Church he loved so well, served so faithfully, and defended so gallantly against those foes who here in Canada are even courted by a small section of that party to which he was attached. A life like his serves well to illustrate, the utter lack of definite, didactic meaning in a party name, how indeed men may be grouped under a party flag, whose differences are wider in scope, more diverse in tendency, more irreconcilable in motive, than those which exist between them and others who rally round another and apparently an unfriendly standard. The Evangelical banner was held aloft by the late Archdeacon, but not as is done here by a small section of those who bear this name as a symbol of division, of strife based upon suspicion, of party cavilling or party manœuvring, but as a flag for grouping together in Church work, all who were loyal to the Church of England and determined to fight manfully her battles against those sectarian and latitudinarian enemies who, under the cloak of spiritual affinity, creep into the camp of the Church to breed disorder.

An English Church paper says: "The Church of England has lost, in the removal of Archdeacon PREST, of Durham, one who has been for years foremost in every good work in his own diocese. Quiet, gentle, and unassuming in manner; patient, calm, and unruffled in discussion; clear and temperate in judgment; firm and definite in his convictions; unflinching in his decisions, never hastily formed; with a legal and methodical mind, which led him cautiously to weigh every argument on either side; thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Protestant Reformation; with his inner life continually fed by close communion and intercourse with his SAVIOUR—for he was markedly a man of prayer—no wonder that he exercised an influence second to none over the whole of the Evangelical portion of our Church in the north of England. It is not too much to say that he, more than any other man, was the means of saving nearly every school in the diocese for the Church of England and religious education. He was chairman of the Gateshead School Board from the passing of the last Education Act. Even in that most radical of boroughs his position was never once disputed, and he secured both what religious teaching is possible in board schools and fair play for all the Church schools of the town. Seeing the danger of many struggling schools in the diocese succumbing to board schools, he set on foot by his own efforts the "Poor School Fund." His appeals on its behalf were so nobly responded to that it saved every poor school in the diocese which had not at first succumbed, from falling out of the hands of the Church."

He saw, and determined to make England recognize, that the Church of England, as another distinguished Evangelical, Dean BALDWIN, put it, has an indefeasible claim to be the educator of the nation which brought it from the darkness of barbarism into the light of the Gospel. He determined to make England see that to wrest the work of