

It is not our province to argue the question whether or not God can cure cancer. It is our duty, however, to say that He does cure it through the well-thought-out methods of the surgeon. We say with Sir Mitchell Banks that we can cure cancers in almost every instance if we get them early enough and remove them carefully. God puts his approval upon this by granting the happy result to this method.

We know that when a man has a contraction of the pyloric opening and he is in very poor health as the result, God says, "I will grant my favor on the method devised by the surgeon of performing a gastro-enterostomy." We can recall the example of a very devout minister of the Gospel who underwent the operation, with the happiest result. He knew the limitations of prayer, and that it was, indeed, wrong to ask God to interfere with His own laws.

The ship at sea is overtaken by a terrible storm. Every man is at his post. The ship is wisely steered, the rigging is properly cared for, the engines are made the objects of the closest attention, and the result is that shipwreck is averted, and the lives on board are saved. The proper means are rewarded with success.

Why do not those people who talk so glibly about faith healing pray that the patient may be enabled to do without food? Just as well pray that the patient might do without quinine in his attack of ague.

The sooner the church leaves the healing of disease, medical and surgical, to the medical profession the better it will be for the church. Just the other day Rev. Canon Henson, of Westminster Abbey, took the sane and sound position that medical science had made its great strides since its complete emancipation from theological entanglements. He thought it incredible that there should be a return to "the old bondage."

He formulated his views in the following four propositions: (1) "Faith healing" appears to be coextensive and coeval with religion itself. It is nowise distinctive of Christianity. (2) "Faith healing" appears to have no necessary connection with moral excellence either in the "healers" or in those whom they "heal." It is throughout non-moral, and cannot, therefore, have any proper relation with Christianity. (3) "Faith healing" appears to be limited in its efficacy, which could hardly be the case if it were really the direct Divine response to human faith. Only some forms of disease are capable of being cured by "faith." (4) "Faith healing" appears to be identical in all but name with healing by means of suggestion, and therefore offers no real exception to the known procedures of nature.

When faith healing becomes a matter of commercialism, as it is