

The report of 1885 was adopted, but we delayed taking action until we had fully considered other suggested improvements. In 1889 we went to Parliament for an Act which was so brief that it was quoted in full in many newspapers, and which you will find in the *Presbyterian Review* of last Thursday. The two points on which we had reported to the Assembly of 1885, it was seen when the Bill was being drawn, involved two others; first, that the five additional trustees appointed by the Council need not be Presbyterians, and therefore, of course, they could not be asked to sign the Confession of Faith; secondly, that it would be best to abolish this requirement in the case of the other trustees, seeing that it had been in abeyance as far back as could be remembered. In olden times you are aware that great importance was attached to subscription of formulas. The oftener they were signed the greater the obligation was felt to be. A man could hardly enter on the duties of a hog-reeve unless he first took the communion and signed some formula. That sort of thing is now felt by all but peculiarly constituted men to be an absurdity. But note, the obligation of the charter that twenty seven trustees must be Presbyterian ministers, elders or members in full communion remained in force. There must thus be still on the Board of Queen's twelve ministers who have signed the Confession and fifteen elders or members in full communion. In fact all that was done was to bring our law into conformity with our own practice, and with the practice that obtains in every other Board of the Church! When we went to Parliament for our Act the question of jurisdiction led to its getting the widest publicity. Some able constitutional lawyers maintained that we should have gone to the Provincial Legislature instead of to Parliament. But while this point was discussed with the greatest keenness, no one objected to a single clause on its merits. Not a few members of the House of Commons were leading members of Assembly, and none of them made any objection. No man who took the slightest interest in Queen's could be ignorant of the measure, and though we were then collecting our endowment, no one made it an excuse for not giving!

What accordingly was the nature of our report to the Assembly in 1889? I quote the Section bearing on the matter:—

"LEGISLATION.

"The report for 1885 contained the following paragraphs." These having been given as quoted above, the report proceeded: "Although the Assembly adopted the report, no action was taken in the premises by the Board. It was considered wise to delay so that the new Act might embrace all the amendments that might be considered necessary for some time. Last year, however, it was decided to ask for legislation on the two points referred to in the report of 1885, and also to obtain power to hold real estate in any province of the Dominion. Having been obliged in 1882 to go to