

of theology in Morrin, and he named all the trustees save two. He then went to the Synod and asked it to accept the College as one of its training schools for ministers, and to accept the privilege of electing two trustees. The Synod gratefully acceded to his wishes. This Church has gone farther. It has instructed its congregations in the Presbytery of Quebec to send their contributions to Morrin College. And last Saturday, half an hour before our report was read, Morrin College submitted its report, and a motion to receive and adopt it was unanimously agreed to, while from all quarters well-deserved testimony was paid to the memory of the noble man who was its Professor of Theology till his death. Now, I believe that the Church acted wisely in accepting Dr. Morrin's College under the constitution he designed for it, that the Assembly acted wisely in showing to the same College a further measure of good-will, and that we would do well to accept a similar gift from any patriotic Christian man—say in Vancouver or Victoria, but why should the gentleman, whose zeal for "the inalienable right of the Assembly" makes him lift up his testimony when Queen's is concerned, be dumb when the case of any other college comes before the house? In a country so vast as this and in a Church composed of sections of somewhat different traditions, there must be reasonable forbearance with and trust in each other. We must, above all, remember that we are a Canadian and an historic Church, and that we must allow our institutions to develop in accordance with the genius and spirit of the past as well as the necessities of the present. Queen's is developing out of the rich and generous soil of Canadian Presbyterianism, in which it originated, into the great Christian University—for Christianity is wider than Presbyterianism—that its founders contemplated, a Christian University that students of all Churches are attracted to, that all denominations who know anything of its work are proud of, a university that was a protest for freedom to begin with, that has done good work since, and that every broad-minded educationist wishes to see prosper, because he knows well that such a university may be even more needed in the not very distant future than it was needed in the past. These are days in which almost all Christians are longing and praying for a greater measure of union than has yet been accomplished. We frankly acknowledge the members of other Churches as brethren. We do so practically in many ways. Is it not one good way to give them the share in the management of our University to which they are entitled? Then, should union be accomplished, the other Churches will find that in this particular we have anticipated the formal act of union, and feel that they enter into the possession of what they already had in earnest.

Moderator, I am anxious not to take up too much time, but I may recapitulate briefly before drawing my argument to its conclusion.

I have proved that Mr. Clark has taken a wrong course; that he has not studied the Act of Union; that he is apparently ignorant of what previous General Assemblies have done; that he has not