

sted by the Moderator and Clerk of the said Synod for the time being shall be sufficient evidence.

It was objected that in this clause we were asking legislative sanction to teach and to confirm our principles—that we were putting it in the power of the Legislature to alter our principles at any time; for the power that enacts can dis-enact. How would we like, it was asked, to pass a Bill in which for similar purposes the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church were introduced? The objectors alleged that the ends which we aimed at could be gained by another method than that proposed by us. After mature reflection the member of the Synod's Committee present in Toronto, judged that there was no impropriety in this clause, all that it contained being in their judgment nothing more than a declaration of our principles, which we did not ask powers to teach but to which we asked the Legislature to do that which we could not do for ourselves, namely, to bind the College property to them. This we believed could not be done in any other way than by an Act of Incorporation in which such a clause as this should be introduced. The object of specifying the Standards as they are in this clause with the provisoes which it contains was to guard us as much as possible from the interference of the civil Courts in the event of any dispute about the property. According to this clause it will be obvious that any enquiry which a civil Court could make into our principles would be limited to a simple matter of fact—to the avowed principles of the Church as defined in its recognised and specified Standards. On this view of the case the promoters of the Bill, deeming that this clause was an essential part of it resolved to defend it in Committee. They did so and it was carried. The whole Bill also was passed in Committee with only such amendments as the promoters themselves proposed, or consented to.

On the day following this event a short editorial article appeared in the Toronto *Daily Globe* entitled, "A Singular Scene." It is to be regretted that the writer of that article had so little regard to the facts of the case or to the reputation of the gentlemen appointed by the Church to promote the Bill. The scope of the article in question gives a most unfair representation of the character of the Bill, and is calculated to excite a most unfounded prejudice against the Free Church in this Province. It says that "the measure contains some of the most objectionable clauses which have ever been placed in any charter of a like kind, clauses worse even than those of the Catholic Colleges whose acts of incorporation have been so numerous and improper." Now the second is the only clause the Opposition seriously objected to, and which the promoters would not relinquish. We are at a loss to understand on what grounds it is open to this sweeping charge of the *Globe*. It cannot be denied that an "Act of Incorporation" of some kind is necessary; and any "Act" we conceive which binds the property to the Church in any form will not escape the difficulty urged against the specific clause of our Bill. We cannot separate the Church from its principles and doctrines. If we bind property to the Church we bind it to its principles and doctrines. In the event, therefore, of any dispute arising as to the possession of such property the Courts of law would have to determine who were entitled to it, by a reference to, and interpretation of, the principles and doctrines of the Church at the time the Act was passed. Without our second clause we make the civil courts the interpreters of our doctrines; with the clause we confine them to a simple matter of fact, namely to the Standards and the interpretation of them by the constitutional majority of the Synod.

Another allegation of the *Globe* is "that one of the clauses absolutely endeavours to define the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, and seeks to give the