

especially in the case of Marshal Duras' campaign in the Rhenish Palatinate in 1689. Of Louis' personal character he adds: "His pride and egotism assumed the most odious forms. He maintained a bloody war along the whole frontier merely for the whims of his vanity. He banished, persecuted, and ruined his own subjects because they did not hold the same creed. He sanctioned by his example crimes utterly destructive of the foundation of civilized society, because they suited his passions. And at last he dragged the exhausted and already suffering people (of France) into misery for a mere dynastic purpose."

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY — ITS MANY LOSSES LAST YEAR.

[The touching address here printed, containing a tender and beautiful tribute to the dead, was delivered by Chancellor Sandford Fleming at the close, recently, of the last session of Queen's College, Kingston.—EDITOR.]

Members of Convocation.—It is a painful duty on my part, that on the meeting of Convocation this year, I feel called upon to allude to the serious losses recently experienced by this University. It would be equally a want of feeling as of proper respect to the memory of those who were officially related to this institution, and who, by their honorable and useful lives, have reflected honor on it, to omit on this occasion mention of their names, and fail to recognize the loss the University experiences by their places becoming vacant.

Although it is the inevitable fate of us all to pass from this earthly scene, we cannot be insensible to the departure of our fellow-workers to another sphere, especially when it is those whom we truly esteem.

Let me recall to your attention that seven years have not elapsed since a large number of the warmest friends of the University assembled in this hall to testify, in the spirit of reverent thankfulness, to the gratifying results, which the labors and efforts of the preceding half century had accomplished. The occasion was the Jubilee celebration of this seat of learning.

We, then, hopefully and full of trust, entering upon the second fifty years of its development, determined to spare no effort to extend its usefulness and to develop to the utmost its good influence on the youth of our country.

The great and deep interest felt in this proceeding was testified by the extraordinary attendance of those connected with us. The Hall was filled to the utmost corner, and crowds could not gain admission. The platform was also filled from end to end, and so it one could see many distinguished men who occupied high and honorable positions in the community—among these the representative of our gracious Sovereign. On that occasion, the Governor-General, Lord Stanley, by receiving an honorary degree, became identified with us; we had present likewise the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, the Premier of the Dominion, and others well known to us all.

In the address, which it was my duty on that occasion to deliver, it was no little satisfaction to me to allude to three of those present on the dais who were honorably associated with the founding of Queen's University—Sir John A. Macdonald, Mr. Rodrick M. Rose, and the Rev. Dr. Reid. There was a fourth name to which I referred, the venerable Dr. Cook, of Quebec, but who from the infirmity of years had been unable to undertake the journey to Kingston in order to be present with us on the occasion.

Since that date, December 18th, 1889, these four have passed away, with the late Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, Sir Alexander Campbell. Dr. Reid lived until last January. By his death, the last living link between the present life and condition of the University, and the day of its inception in 1839, was removed from earth forever.

These painful reflections have been suggested by other losses which we have experienced. The band of death has indeed touched us as a University, very heavily. Recently we have lost three trustees—Dr. Boulter, Rev. Dr. Laidlaw and Rev. D. J. Macdonnell. We have lost three professors—Rev. Dr. Williamson, Dr. Fenwick and Dr. Saunders. We have lost brilliant students, and we have lost staunch and true friends. Most of these losses have been experienced during the session we are this day closing. All who hear me will remember the familiar kindly face which, until now, has never been absent on occasions like the present. On the opening day of the session, October 1st, the remains of the Vice-Principal, the Rev. Dr. Williamson, were carried from this hall to their resting place.

Since then, scarcely a month has elapsed without witnessing the departure to the silent land of some friend intimately associated with college life. Dr. Williamson was soon followed by a most promising student, the editor of *Queen's College Journal*, James Stewart. In a short time the deaths of the Rev. Drs. Reid and Laidlaw were announced, then in succession we were bereft of the lamented Drs. Fenwick and Saunders, and almost at the same time, the pastor of St. Andrew's Church, Toronto, the Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, passed away. To add to the long list of those whose loss we were called upon to deplore, the present month has on record the demise of another greatly esteemed friend, who has frequently appeared on this platform. I refer to Rev. Dr. Carson, whom, although not officially connected with Queen's, we were permitted to consider one of ourselves.

The bereavements which the University has sustained have come home to us all. We have lost earnest students, tried and faithful trustees, professors of rare endowments, one whose professional career extended over the unprecedentedly long period of fifty-three years, and whose mature life was given unstintedly to this seat of learning, while the other two Professors passed away in the zenith of their professional fame. Yesterday we paid respectful tribute to their memory, by placing lasting memorials on the walls to tell to unborn generations how much these men were esteemed by those among whom they lived and labored. While personally I would like to speak in the most tender manner of each of our deceased friends, I am denied this sad satisfaction by the limited time at my disposal. I will, however, deliver to you a message from the Governor-General, with which I am specially charged. His Excellency, on his own and on Her Excellency's behalf, desires me to express the grief both feel in this our day of trial. Their Excellencies extend to Queen's University the deepest sympathy; they join with us in our mourning for the departed, and bow with us in humble and reverent submission to the will of our Almighty Father.

Naturally our minds are directed within the University, but if we look out upon the world around us we see everywhere evidences of the fleeting character of time. In every sphere of human affairs an all-pervading change is apparent. There is no exemption from the universal record—from the family of our sovereign on the throne to the humblest of her subjects, the touch of the hand of death is felt from time to time. If one by one, the links with the past are broken, this should only awaken fresh energy and call forth new efforts to strive earnestly and wisely, each one of us, to do our work while we are privileged to labor, and as God gives us strength to perform it.

It is true that we have passed through a season of shadow, but as in physical life, the shades of night are succeeded by the dawn of day, we may hopefully look forward to a return of sunshine. We must continually remember, however, that while the life of the individual is transitory, the existence of a University is without cessation. The opening of each new session brings with it the elements of perennial youth with the

germs of increasing strength and renewed manhood. Voids, from time to time, will occur in the ranks, but the obligation rests upon the younger men to be ready to fill them as they are formed.

Perchance I see in the gallery to-day the successors of some of those who are on the platform. On all such students is entailed the important duty of diligently preparing to fill any station to which they may in due time be called.

The records of death to which I have referred, include the names of men who have endeared themselves to all by every noble quality. Our lives are richer and better from having had such men amongst us, and for having had them so long we are profoundly thankful. The influence their lives have exercised on generations of graduates, cannot die. In men so influenced we may have implicit trust, and I cannot but think that the honor of the University, and its continued usefulness, is safe in their hands."

MAY A RULING ELDER BE MOD- ERATOR IN A CHURCH COURT?

MR. EDITOR,—This question is again before the Church by injunction of the Supreme Court last year. I am not going to trouble you with my views on that subject, but one fact ought to be known. About twelve years ago overtures reached the General Assembly, (these I cannot now lay my hands upon) asking for a change from the "wont and use" of the Church. The Assembly did not consider them, but sent them to the committee which at the time were charged with revising the Book of Forms, when they were fully and carefully considered, with the result that in all cases the statement in the Book is, "The Moderator is an ordained minister."

I find the following sentence in an article I then gave to the public in one of our Church papers, which assigns a reason for this action: "The sub-committee on Revision have determined that until the matter has been discussed by the Supreme Court and the practice hitherto (obtaining) has been constitutionally changed, it would not be right to introduce a new practice in the Revised book."

On this understanding the Book of Forms was adopted, and approved in this particular provision. But the constitutional mode of effecting a change, viz., by overture, was and is still left open, if such a change be desired by any ministers and elders. Nothing, however, has since been done in this direction, so that when the Presbyteries of Whitby, Owen Sound and Hamilton recently appointed a ruling elder their Moderator, they clearly departed from the practice as recognized in the Church. Now the matter has come up for discussion, and I hope it will be carefully considered and not hastily disposed of at next General Assembly. Let the matter be constitutionally settled under the Barrier Act. Theoretically there may be difficulties, but I feel sure that practically every church court will see to it that its Moderator is a man fit for the office. Still a change may affect one other practice of our Church: that of appointing every member of Presbytery (not only ministers) on the roll Moderator by rotation for six months or a year unless he feels himself unfit for the position or does not desire it. The parity so dear to some will thus be practically affected. Allow me to refer to a personal matter in this connection. I have been for forty-two years almost an ordained minister, and have been connected with three Presbyteries; but I have not once held the office of Moderator of Presbytery in order of rotation for the usual term. Shall I complain of want of parity? Others doubtless are in like case.

JOHN LAING.

Dundas, May 2, 1896.

"We are so related to each other that we are continually leaving impressions on those we touch. It is easier to do harm than good to other lives. There is a quality in the human soul which makes it take more readily, and retain more permanently, touches of sin than touches of holiness."

Teacher and Scholar.

BY REV. A. J. MARTIN, TORONTO.

MAY 24th, 1896. } JESUS TEACHING IN THE TEMPLE. { LUKE 21:14-19

GOLDEN TEXT.—LUKE 21:17

MEMORY VERSES.—17-19.

CATECHISM.—Q. 60.

HOME READINGS. *M.* John xii. 1-19. *T.* Luke xix. 29-48. *W.* Mat. xxi. 23-46. *Th.* Mat. xxii. 1-14. *F.* Mat. xxii. 15-46. *S.* Mat. 1:19. *Sab.* John xii. 20-50.

We commence this week the study of the events of the last few days of our Lord's earthly career. The importance of these events can be judged from the minuteness with which they are recorded. The incidents of the opening days of that last week are given in order in the Home readings. The first three days were occupied by our Lord in a last supreme effort, exerted in several ways, to induce the Jewish nation to accept Him as their Messiah. The triumphal entry, assuming the Lordship of the temple, His teachings, His questions and answers, His terrible denunciations were all designed to arouse and persuade the nation to accept Him. Our lesson gives the pith of His parabolic teachings during those days, its pungency and fitness to arouse slumbering consciences is apparent. Let us try to arrange our thoughts about "The Owner's Aim in Preparing his Vineyard," and "The Husbandmen's Unfaithfulness in Dealing with the Vineyard."

I. The Owner's Aim.—This is very apparent, not only from His sending again and again to the husbandmen that He might receive of the fruit of the vineyard, but also from the care he took in planting the vineyard, and fitting it up for turning out the finished products of the vine is it evident that He desired fruit. It is a customary thing in oriental lands, and, indeed, in many farming districts in our own land, for an owner to let out his property to others, receiving as rent a certain proportion of the increase of the field. This was the cause here. The vineyard had been planted and prepared in every way for the vintage and then was hired out for a portion of the fruit. We all know what Jesus intended to represent by the vineyard. Isaiah had written a complaint against "the vineyard of the Lord." His own people centuries before His time, and Jesus could not have chosen a comparison which could make plainer His mind. God's vineyard was His chosen people. Their knowledge of Him and of His law, all the rites and ceremonies of worship He had established, the religious ordinances and leaders He had provided were the preparations He had made for cultivating and gathering in the fruits of holiness from among His people. The priests and elders were the husbandmen to whom He had entrusted the care of that vineyard. The prophets and special messengers were the servants He had sent to stimulate the husbandmen to fidelity in order that fruit might be brought forth to God. Jesus was His last messenger; His only begotten Son. But it means us as well as the Jewish people. God has given us a Christian land, and Christian homes, Christian churches and a Christian ministry. What He looks for is fruit. Each of us is the husbandman of his own soul, and to each God looks for the proper return. Are we bringing forth fruit unto holiness or are we not?

II.—The Husbandmen's Unfaithfulness.—Though God sent His servants again and again, calling for fruit, the leaders of His people cared not. They were content to gratify their own pride of nationality, their own ambition and lust. How cruelly they dealt with God's servants their history tells us. For a suggestive summary read the closing verses of the 11th chapter of Hebrews. Finally there had come God's best beloved, His only Son. The chief priests and elders recognized the fact that if He were the Messiah, they were wrong; and must cease to be God's "husbandmen" even in name. Therefore, by a bold comparison, Jesus represents them as acting upon the principle recognized in law, that if the owner of certain property puts in no claim for a certain number of years, the holder of the property then is recognized as its owner. How fearful the charge, that through utter selfishness and indifference to God, these men deliberately rejected His Son. And that they did so is evidenced by the fact, that they perceived the import of Jesus' words, and redoubled their efforts to kill Him. How is it with each of us? Have we deliberately rejected God's Son to our eternal undoing? "While it is called to-day harden not your hearts."