

"It was a matter of necessity that the control of such an institution should be in the hands of some trustworthy and responsible body." With regard also to the election of professors, the founders did not entrust it to the Synod. The Synod indeed was far above any vulgar desire for patronage. They felt that a large public body like itself was not the one best calculated to decide on such matters, and therefore they gave the patronage to a carefully-selected body of trustees. They also gave very large powers, as regards educational questions, to the professors or Senate. They made the University, as far as possible, self-governing.

From the first, Queen's had the advantage of the representative principle. The congregations of the Church sent up names of laymen whom they thought most suitable to be trustees, and from that list the Board made its annual election.

At the union it was found that this could not be insisted on, and also that the time had come to recognize the graduates. Accordingly the Council was created, and that step succeeded so well that in 1885 it was felt that another should be taken, and that the Council should elect five of its members as trustees in addition to the original twenty-seven. It was involved in this change that five men who need not be Presbyterians might take part in electing professors of theology, and to some men this seems extraordinary. It did not seem so to us, and for these reasons: First, the Church that the Moderator yesterday very properly styled the mother of us all, the Church of Scotland, while always clear on the point that professors of theology should sign her standards, has never taken the position that the General Assembly should have the patronage of the chairs. In Edinburgh University this patronage was exercised till recently by the Town Council. The court that now appoints has still, Dr Gray informs me, a majority nominated by the Town Council. Not one of the members is necessarily a Presbyterian. If we are to judge by results, the method is as satisfactory as the modern method adopted by the Free Church. This Church, however, has not followed the Free Church method in any of its colleges, though some people fancy that it has. With us the Boards really appoint and the Assembly has only a nominal power. In the Free Church the Presbyteries invariably nominate and the Assembly selects from those who are nominated. The method followed in Queen's gives more real power to the General Assembly than that which is followed by Knox and Montreal. We appoint in April, after having obtained leave, in the last case, from the previous General Assembly, and so the Assembly that meets in June following has two months in which to consider the claims of the person appointed, and therefore full time, should there ever be need of doing so, to prepare a motion of disapproval. In the other colleges five minutes may be all that is allowed us in which to consider the name recommended by the Board, and while, theoretically, every member of Assembly has the right to object or to submit another name, I would like to see