

never thought of Queen's in this connection, or thought of that institution simply as one to share the benefits of the general scheme. Situated in a retired part of the Dominion, famed for the advantages which its public streets afford to the student of botanical science, and far from the busy haunts of man, her plaintive voice has only been heard in appeals to the liberal supporters of other colleges, in strangely mingled tones that declared her now to be a theological institution, and now of a purely literary character, sometimes a true daughter of the Church, at others, a cosmopolitan University. The Presbyterian population of the Dominion that does know of Queen's existence is thus in a state of painful doubt, and the great ecclesiastical conundrum of the present day is "What is Queen's?"

The arguments of "J. M." and the Rev. Robert Campbell proceed on the assumption that Queen's University and College are institutions under the control of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. It may be well therefore to state that the General Assembly has absolutely no control over either of these institutions. The General Assembly does not appoint a single member to their governing boards, save a nominal Bursary and Scholarship Committee with no ruling powers. It has not the right of nominating a Professor even in the Faculty of Theology, but it does possess the right to contribute to the maintenance of such officers. It is not too much to say that the Ladies' Colleges in Brantford and Ottawa are more intimately connected with the General Assembly, than are the University and College at Kingston. One correspondent, "M," informs your readers that the establishment of the proposed Theological University would be a violation of the terms of union, inasmuch as Queen's University would not hold the same relation to the united Church that it held to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, before the union. But "M" knows very well that Queen's University now does not sustain that relation. By the detailed terms of union, which qualify the general principles of College connection, Queen's University was cut off from all connection with the Assembly, the representation which the Church formerly contributed to her governing body being discontinued.

The authorities of Queen's may say, "We are willing to resume connection with the Church," although I doubt the probability of such action on their part. But supposing them willing to make the offer, there are too many wicked voluntaries in the Church to make it at all likely that such an offer would be entertained. At the time of union the contracting parties plainly said, "We do not want Queen's University," and so its connection was severed. To overlook this fact of severance is what I have called disingenuousness. Save for the fact of its being Presbyterian, the University at Kingston is no more a part of the Church than are those at Toronto, Montreal and Halifax. To affiliate the colleges at Toronto, Montreal and Halifax with Queen's University would be to affiliate them with an institution which is local, not under any kind of Church control, and free to occupy, if it pleases, a position inimical to the teaching, the order and the prosperity of the Church. To ask for such affiliation is to presume too largely on the ignorance or the good-natured indifference of the General Assembly.

Knox College and the Colleges at Montreal, Halifax and Winnipeg are part and parcel of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, which has power to appoint and to discharge all their governing and teaching officials, to frame laws for their government, and, even if it pleases, to abolish the institutions themselves; and when these loyal daughters of the Church ask for means by which their students may receive the stamp of theological scholarship, it is not likely that they will be referred to a foreign institution, thus cutting off every B.D. and D.D., as such, from ecclesiastical connection, and making the value of such degrees to depend upon the weight (which I am far from despising) of an irresponsible body of men.

There is no possibility of so arranging the relation of Queen's University and College to the other Colleges as to settle the matter of Theological Degrees in that way. Queen's University does not belong to the Church, and the Church will not have it, even if it be willing to pass under the Assembly. The University under which the Colleges of the Church are to be affiliated must, consistently with the terms of their existence, be under the control of the General Assembly,

which control also will give to the degrees it confers their pre-eminent value. This being the case, the Assembly may either separate Queen's Theological Faculty from the University, and obtain University powers for it as a Theological University, at the same time assuming full control over that faculty, or it may obtain such powers for any other College, or it may do as the Committee on Theological Education recommended. The last is the only honourable course, being at the same time more simple and less expensive than any other. Speaking of expense, "M" bemoans the sad fate of prospective B.D.s and D.D.s in being called upon by "B" to pay fees for their honourable distinctions. Does Queen's College charge no fees, or was it a dream that took money out of my purse wherewith to aid in purchasing, for a very worthy man, a good degree from that institution?

"Surely 'B' must have been ignorant of the fact that of all who have pursued their theological studies at Queen's only five have succeeded in obtaining the title of Bachelor of Divinity." So says "M," with an air of amazement at "B's" effrontery in proposing to affiliate Queen's with the proposed University. Only five men have mastered a few chapters in Hebrew, the wordy Paley and the venerable Hill, the Tract Society's Bible Handbook by Angus, that pleasing compend that the late lamented Dr. Burns used to recommend to feeble students unable to digest more substantial food as *little Wharey*, and the paper-boarded Sunday school book (and excellent it is for such a purpose), Nassim's Story of the Kirk. What is the matter with the graduates of Queen's? I have seen many that could hold their own against students from any quarter. Can it be then that these text books, trifling and antiquated, or both, are to be mastered, as it has been whispered, just as a child masters the multiplication table, and that competitors failed because they did not know how many semi-colons there were in a page? If for no other end than that of improving the standard for B.D., by bringing it up to the requirements of men and of modern scholarship, and of teaching the Canadian world what kind of examination is the true test of scholarship, it is high time that the proposed University be established.

Let Queen's flourish as she deserves to do. Let her be a Mecca for all that love the pilgrimage to ancient shrines. She has got some of the Church's treasure; let her not seek to absorb all its learning and honour. If she is strong let her be merciful to the other Colleges, every one of which is not only a slavish institution of the Church, but, having no other faculty than that of Divinity, is compelled to outnumber by far the theologians of the Regal City. Let her not act the part of the dog in the manger, and because only five of her graduates have taken a B.D., imagine that two chapters of Chaldee and "little Wharey" are acquirements that cannot be tested outside her examination hall. Let her advocates also be honest, and confess that while Queen's Divinity Hall has but a quasi and irresponsible connection with the Church, Queen's University has none at all.

As "B" has preceded me and "D" will probably follow, I beg to sign myself

C.

THEOLOGICAL DEGREES.

MR. EDITOR, Whether a few more or less of our ministers receive the apparently much coveted earthly title and distinction of Doctor of Divinity, is not, in my humble judgment, of the smallest importance to the spiritual life and well-being of the Church at large, and probably there has been but little general interest felt in the matter. But the principles involved in this question, and the sentiments apparently entertained with regard to it, involve much that vitally affects us as a Church of Christ. However naturally disinclined I may be to obtrude my opinions upon this question, yet I feel constrained to notice the argument in its favour, used by your correspondent "B," in your issue of the 21st ult., and to endeavour to set forth the clear teaching of the divine Word with regard to it. My hope is that some one better fitted than myself may be led to speak faithfully as the occasion requires, and that with the Divine blessing great good may result, even a deepened spiritual life in students, ministers and people, and a more real separation from the spirit and policy of the world.

In support of this movement, your correspondent "B" says, "Such distinctions prevail in all other subjects of study, and in all other professions, and why not in theology?" And again (paragraph 4), "The confer-

ring of such Degrees, as proposed, would naturally be a great stimulus to theological education. Many of our young men are animated by the purest motives, and most honourable ambition. Some of them graduate in one or other of our Universities with the highest honours; they bring to the study of theology minds disciplined by the severest training; they are prepared to consecrate all their powers and sacrifice all their prospects of worldly preferment to the great work to which they have given themselves, and are willing to prepare themselves for it by the most devoted application to study; but in most of our Colleges there is no stimulus to pursue the same career of honourable ambition as that which they have hitherto pursued, save that which comes from a strong sense of duty, and an earnest desire to fit themselves for the obligations and responsibilities of ministerial life. Is it not desirable that all our institutions should be able to furnish the same incentive to study, and to designate a well-merited distinction in the same way?"

In order that I might not misstate your correspondent's position, I have given paragraph 4 at length. The obvious and only sense of it is, that in order to induce theological students to cultivate and consecrate all their powers to the service of their Lord, the Church is called upon to provide a stimulus more powerful than the love and approval, the honour and the glory, promised by the Church's Lord. As a servant, most unworthy, of that Lord, I cannot too strongly dissent from the principles and policy proposed and commended by your correspondent.

The reply I am compelled to make to those who support the present movement is this, that the truly spiritual man allows not, but hates, the spirit ambitious of earthly fame or distinction, whilst the man whose heart is fired with this ambition is not such as the Church of Christ should delight to honour.

I am persuaded beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the course proposed cannot meet with the approval of the great Founder of the Church, for it involves principles diametrically opposed to His life and teaching; and from whom, if not from her Head, ought the Church to look for guidance or for power. The great mistake that appears to me to characterize your correspondent's arguments is, confounding the Church with the world, not realizing the vast gulf that separates them. Amongst other evil consequences of this confusion of mind is, classing the ministry of the Gospel in the same category with the ordinary professions, that men of all religions, and of no religion at all, may successfully pursue. Motives of action esteemed by the world as admissible and even laudable, do doubtless prove a stimulus to success in the pursuit of earthly gain and distinction; but to the servant of Christ such motives are absolutely inadmissible, must be dethroned from his heart, or prove fatal to his real success. And what enlightened Christian would have it otherwise?

In matters connected with the real life and spiritual work of the Church, we enter the region of the unseen and the eternal. Powers and principles unknown to the ordinary professional man, are called into action, having their corresponding rewards and honours. But for these latter, the servant of the unseen Lord must be content to wait until He shall award them who alone can infallibly judge to whom they are due. To anticipate them is to usurp His prerogative, and to assume powers that of necessity cannot be delegated to the fallible judgment of men on earth. It may be said, and said truly, that the distinction and honours in question belong only to time, and are proposed for such acquirements as may be gauged by man. Such an avowal, which indeed is the only honest one, is, to my mind, of itself a sufficient reason why the Church of Christ should have nothing to do with their bestowment. The true nature, life and power of the Church is spiritual. "Our citizenship is in heaven." The object of the Church is to witness for Him whom the world rejected and crucified. The highest and most essential qualification for His work must be spiritual, and for the Church to single out for her special distinction, honour and reward, a qualification that has not necessarily anything spiritual connected with the possessor of it, would be singularly unwise and unjust—unwise, because exalting the lesser qualification, and therefore tending to mislead the ignorant and the unwise; unjust, because passing by the fittest and the worthiest. Terrible reversals of the decisions of the Church on earth will there be when He "who hath His eyes like unto a flame of fire," shall declare the