

any one rise and do so. The name may be submitted to us not even in the annual report of the Board, but in a supplementary report, indicating clearly that the Board itself has considered the name very hurriedly. Now I do not criticize this method. If it suits sister colleges and the Church, well and good. But when a gentleman tells us that "it is an inalienable right of the Assembly to appoint its professors of theology," I am tempted to enquire whether the appointment can be made only by such a method or what is the witness that history bears to the supposed "inalienable right?" Secondly, the principle of representation is Presbyterian, and therefore when there are hundreds of graduates most closely interested in the welfare of the University, it would be inconsistent to refuse them representation. To suppose that they might not act with perfect loyalty to the trust reposed in them shows ignorance of the men and of the gauntlet they must run before they can be elected. To suppose that they could do anything contrary to the true interests of the Church, is to ignore the fact that they must appoint as professors of theology only men who are ministers of the Church, who have signed her standards and who must sign them again on their election as professors.

The question asked by us in connection with the legislation of 1885 was this, would the main object contemplated in the establishment of Queen's be served by the proposed legislation or not? What was the main object? As stated, in many controversies through which Queen's has passed, it was to have a Christian university, a university controlled by religious men, men who would appoint the right kind of professors. Did the new clause threaten this object? In our opinion it would have—and I may say it is having—the opposite effect. It is helping instead of hindering the main object. We have only to consider the men who have been appointed to see that this is so. Two of them are leading laymen of the Church of England, another of the Baptist and a fourth of the Methodist Church, all of them men of the noblest Christian character and of whom, as sons of Queen's, we are all proud.

A member at this point rose and asked: "Who is the fifth?"

Principal Grant: It is quite impossible to answer this question, as the fifth will not be appointed till next year. Depend upon it, he will be a good man. My friend has evidently been reading the letter in this morning's paper, in which it is stated on the authority of a Toronto journal that two of our new trustees are Roman Catholics. The press is strong, but the laws of simple addition or of the multiplication table are stronger. Four times one are only four. I have mentioned our four. How can even a newspaper squeeze in two additional units of any denomination?

It is well to understand the position of the old Synod, that Queen's reported to, on this question of the appointment of professors of theology. The case of Morrin College in 1861 is very suggestive. Dr. Morrin himself appointed the first Principal and professor