

# THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT.

(NEW SERIES.)

Vol. II.]

TORONTO, MARCH, 1883.

[No. 3.

## EDITORIAL JOTTINGS.

THE correspondence which has appeared in our columns on the college led to another brief correspondence between the editor and the College Board ending in our presence at a recent meeting of the Board in Montreal. In view of that meeting, then in prospect, we added no comments last month on the subjects of correspondence, we give them now.

The manifest and unhappy differences between our corresponding professor and the Board cannot be further discussed in our columns, at least at present. When the annual reports are submitted to the corporation that subject no doubt will be before the members. It would be unfair to all for us to formulate an opinion now; two remarks, however, may be suffered. Prof. Fenwick's late absence from the meetings of the College Board has been by him explained, we do not say whether satisfactory or no. His fellowship with any individual church, so far as the corporation statutes are concerned, forms no part of the agreement. The personalities of those questions, therefore, are not subjects for discussion with us; and correspondence on those points must cease. Then as to the permanent location of the college, whilst Prof. Fenwick declares the Montreal location to have been tentative, the Board evidently view the question as no longer an open one, and they are acting distinctly on that understanding. It is no secret that the present editor's personal opinion has been against the permanent location of the College in Montreal. That opinion is still held without a misgiving. At the same time we freely confess the inexorable logic of facts appears to be against—not the correctness of the opinion, time only can settle that, but against the practicability thereof. The will and the means are in Montreal, the western friends themselves willed it so to be, and the opportunity for change seems gone by. We regret,

that regret avails nothing, it is folly to shape action or inaction by vain regrets, the facts of the case must be accepted, and Montreal to all present appearances keeps the College. Whether it shall be an institution under local patronage and guidance depends upon the interest our churches manifest in its rule and support. It is all nonsense to talk of Montreal influence when other influences are willingly *nil*, unless it be in the direction of fault finding. Let other influences by work and will make themselves felt, and then there will be no danger of the College being a merely local interest; only thus can the work be done, and the denomination made to progress as its principles deserve. This we know the Board earnestly desires.

The Board felt aggrieved at the insertion of Prof. Fenwick's first letter and our editorial comment thereon, especially the latter as it endorsed the suggestion of a commission of enquiry, which commission in business and political circles would be considered as tantamount to an expressed want of confidence, suggesting at least charges against the management. Business principles and political customs are largely based upon mutual distrust; were words as good as bonds we should not need notes and covenants; to some extent creed subscriptions partake of the same character. Congregational Christianity is nothing unless it proves mutual trust to be stronger than provisos against suspected brethren. To us, therefore, in presence of acknowledged misunderstanding, a commission free from former influences meant and means simply a go-between, to present all sides and thus restore confidence. We protest against the practices and customs of the business and political world, as such, guiding us in our brotherly communion. We should never have endorsed an insinuation against the good faith of the Board, Prof. Fenwick disavows any such intention, and we had not the fear of the busi-