

ical arts, they will travel to the States or elsewhere. The fact of our having Dalhousie College to furnish young men with a thorough training in the Arts, not only preparatory to studying for the Church, but for the other professions and literary callings, is an additional strong reason why we require a Hall less than ever. The chief objection, as it presented itself to my mind, to our sending our young men to Scotland, was, that they required to decide, before entering the College, for the Church, otherwise they could not be sent with the promise of support from the Church—whereas, in most cases, I should take it as an indication of *proper concern* when looking forward to the ministry, not to be hasty in deciding, as we are forbidden to “lay hands suddenly” on any man.

ALEXANDER MCKAY.

Salt Springs, September.

The Project of a Divinity Hall.

AN article appeared in the September number of the *Record*, on this subject, which calls for a brief notice, as its tone and statements may give rise to much misapprehension. This would not have been the case had the subject been discussed simply on its merits and with reference to our circumstances. But as the writer takes up the position of an aggrieved Churchman, states that “the scheme was suddenly disclosed at the eleventh hour, at the ‘fag’ end of the session,” and slipped hurriedly through Court,” reiterates that it was “passed through Synod in a hasty and irregular manner,” and expresses a hope that “the business of the Church may be conducted in future in a more *open* and regular manner,” it is absolutely necessary that an emphatic denial be given to such charges, or the promoters of the scheme must be under the imputation of having plotted in order to burden the Church with an unnecessary Hall, three professors and £600 a year. The charges, if true, mean a great deal; if untrue, what are we to think of Mr. Philip? We must at the least think that he is very reckless in accusing the brethren, and that it would have been wiser had he inquired more into the facts of the case, and the usages of our Courts.

Now it is the fact that the project in question was brought before the Synod in precisely the same way as the Dalhousie College overture had been brought up three years previously and I challenge Mr. Philip or any other man to name a single scheme or measure which came before us in a different way ever since I have been a member of Court. It may be said that our mode of procedure is not good. I am willing to discuss that in its own place; but let us not mix up the special case before us with the general practice, and let not those who honestly followed the use and wont of Synod be charged with

irregularity, and worse. The overture was drawn up by a member of Court, submitted to all who were around him at the time, then sent to the Committee on Overtures, was examined and approved and then transmitted to the Clerk, who brought it up before the Synod in its order. But Mr. Philip and others “were altogether taken by surprise” when it was read. Why did they not say so? When people are so much surprised, they generally express themselves to that effect there and then. Why did he not move the postponement of the question for another year, or the adjournment of the debate? Instead of that, he entered on the discussion of the question, like everybody else, and it is only now that he discovers that he was “taken by surprise.” But it was “slipped so hurriedly through Court.” Mr. Philip must surely have forgotten. The whole of Saturday was occupied with the discussion, as the published minutes in the August *Record* show. True, we were a little hurried at the close of Saturday, but by whom? By Mr. Law, who again and again asked the Moderator to close that he might have a meeting of the Presbytery of Pictou, as Mr. Philip had induced him to leave the Court that afternoon to go to Truro with him. Still, though the whole day had been given to the subject, and every member present had spoken on it, no immediate decision was come to. It was deferred till Monday; Monday came, and Mr. Philip, who was so much interested in a measure of so much importance, was absent from his place,—was away at Truro attending to his own private or congregational business. But though Mr. Philip was absent, the minutes inform us that the Synod “resumed consideration of the overture,” and there being still no one who had found out that he had been taken by surprise, the Synod came to an *unanimous finding on the subject*.

Again, who supported the project when it was being discussed? Every Elder and almost every minister present, including all the seniors and those who had been longest in the country; while Mr. Philip was the only member who took decided ground against it, just as he had against a Foreign Mission, although we were committed to one. So that although “there was by no means unanimity of opinion at the Synod on this subject,” there was something very like it. We expect differences of opinion in every discussion, but when these do not take the form of a counter-motion, a protest, or even a request for delay, what are we to think of the course now taken and the charges made by Mr. Philip? Yes, far from there being any general ignorance of the proposed Hall, did not Mr. James Thompson state in Synod, that, as far as he knew, every subscriber to our Endowment Fund had understood that the Church would not halt with its work half done, but that it would establish a Divinity Curriculum whenever the country had a satisfactory Faculty