

or thirty years of resolute government which is said to be Lord Salisbury's and would also no doubt be Mr. Balfour's prescription for the cure of Ireland's woes, would be bad for the nation, it would be worse for Ireland. It would be little less than a death-blow to the national aspiration for self-rule. As a matter of fact, however, we suppose the Irish leaders have little fear of the threatened coercion. They believe, no doubt, that the nation has now gone too far to draw back from the bestowment of Home Rule in some shape. Very likely they are reckoning, notwithstanding emphatic denials, upon their ability to obtain from a Conservative administration, under some other name, a measure containing all the essentials of the present Bill. Whether in this they are reckoning without their host or overestimating the power of obstruction is another question.

Among various questions related to the growth and usefulness of the Provincial University, which were touched upon by Vice-Chancellor Mulock in his interesting address at the Annual Commencement, two or three are worthy of special attention. His caution in respect to the danger of so increasing fees and expenses of various kinds as to put the advantages of the University out of reach of large classes of the people is especially timely. The strength of the arguments in favour of the maintenance of higher institutions of learning at the expense of the whole people is lessened just in proportion to the extent to which the opportunities afforded by the institutions are made difficult of attainment by the poorer classes. Should the University of Toronto tend to become at any time the college of the wealthy, its usefulness would decline in the same ratio, and its right to exist as a public institution would soon be vigorously challenged. With the Vice-Chancellor's plea in behalf of making larger provision from the public funds for the study of medical science, we cannot so readily concur. To the argument that the principle of State aid in the pursuit of bread-and-butter studies is already conceded in the case of the Agricultural College, the School of Practical Science, etc., it may be replied, in the first place, that the fact does not prove the principle to be sound, and any proposal to extend it in practice might logically lead to the reconsideration of the whole matter. A stronger reply is, however, at hand in the essentially different position in which the study of medical science is placed by the fact of the great popularity of the profession, and the further fact that this has led to the establishment of voluntary colleges for its special study, which are working under charters granted by the Provincial Legislature. It would certainly be unfair to institutions thus established by private enterprise and working on voluntary principles, that the same Legislature which charters them should maintain

a rival institution at the public expense, and so, to a certain extent, at the expense of the very persons who are thus exposed to unequal competition. But to take still higher ground, we maintain that it is a sound policy in all such matters that the State should encourage and stimulate private enterprise and philanthropy, rather than the opposite. It should not attempt to do for the people what they can better do for themselves. It is clear that in the long run the resources of voluntarism can accomplish much more in all such directions than is within the power of any Government. Experience proves that State institutions are not usually the best fitted for the development of that enthusiasm and devotion to hard work which are the main-springs of scientific progress.

The Presbyterian Assembly of the United States has scarcely pronounced its deliverance in the case of Dr. Briggs when the Canadian Assembly finds itself with a somewhat similar case upon its hands. We are not of the number of those who think that these questions of "heresy" concern the clergymen alone. Truth is the concern and the very highest concern of every man, and the question of the origin, nature and certainty of our possible knowledge of our relations to God and the hereafter is one which touches the most momentous of all the kinds and forms of truth to which our faculties stand in any way related. This being so, nothing can be more shallow than to dismiss the whole subject of "heresy" with a sneer, in the manner affected by some secular journals. Scarcely less superficial is the view of those who relegate all such matters to the ministers, as something entirely aside from or above the secular sphere and the range of lay thinking. Such questions as those discussed in Professor Campbell's lecture containing the statements to which exception is taken as being contrary to the standard of the Presbyterian Church are, as we have intimated, matters of the most vital interest to all men. They are questions of a kind which Protestants, who repudiate priestly absolutism, must claim it as the inalienable right and the most solemn duty of every man capable of independent thinking to investigate and decide for himself. We make no apology, therefore, for venturing at any time to discuss freely the merits of any such controversies as may arise. The one thing which we, of course, do not feel at liberty to do, is to intervene in the discussion so far as it is simply a matter of discipline between the suspected offenders and the creed laws of the particular Church with which they may be connected, and whose standards they have solemnly promised to accept and uphold. From this point of view no one who has read the utterances of either Dr. Briggs or Professor Campbell and compared them with the doctrinal standards of the

Presbyterian Church can doubt that they constitute *prima facie* cases for the courts of that Church to investigate.

The last remark suggests the very serious dilemma which must confront thoughtful members of that Church on the very threshold of every such investigation. It is evident on the one hand that the statements of the Confession to which ministers and professors have subscribed before entering upon the duties of their respective positions in the Presbyterian Church, are very clear and precise, and it seems very easy and fair, at first thought, to say that any such minister or professor who, after maturer study and thought, finds himself unable to accept and teach those doctrines, in the obvious meaning of the language of the subscribed standards, should at once withdraw from, at least, his official connection with the body. But, on the other hand, the question immediately arises: Is there, then, absolutely no room for liberty of thought and investigation within the boundaries of the Presbyterian Church? Were those who drew up the Confession and the other doctrinal standards of the Church so preternaturally wise or so divinely inspired that their interpretations of the teachings of Scripture, to which all alike appeal as the ultimate authority, are absolutely inerrant and infallible? Is it desirable and right that these standards should become a strait-jacket to prevent all free movement on the part of the searcher for truth, however able and sincere, so long as he remains in office in that denomination? Make, for the sake of argument, the not impossible supposition that a day may come when two-thirds or three-fourths of the adherents of the Church, including clergy and laity, shall have become convinced that the views of the advanced critics with reference to the nature and authority of the Bible, are at least as nearly correct as the teachings of the standards, will the minority still constitute the Church, and must the majority, who may claim to be still faithful Presbyterians holding and cherishing the essential principles and aims of Presbyterianism, consent to be unrepresented in the offices of the Church, if not excluded from its membership? The same inquiry is, of course, pertinent in regard to any other Church which maintains a written creed. We put the case, as it appears to us, with reference to that particular denomination, because these questions of discipline happen to be just now before it, and because its creed lines are perhaps drawn with more strictness, are certainly enforced with more rigour, than those of any other denomination, not excepting even the Church of England with its Articles and Rubric.

Two points connected with these questions present themselves here, but must be dismissed with a bare reference. One is the apparent arbitrariness of the mode