

very little disturbance in the way of temptations from study. The sensible student too, on his part, has generally, with a few pardonable exceptions, tried to resist all allurements however strong. Why? Because he knows what he is here for. So as a general thing, the man who pays attention to his business, goes through his whole course and graduates, having only a slight acquaintance with only a few people of the village. Moreover the students are not connected with the village in *any christian work*. It is true that some attempt has been made to get the band of mission workers into a concert of action with the church; but the only practical connection between the two is that of harmony. The institutions have their own bible classes, and the three schools come together in college chapel on Wednesday evening and have their own prayer meeting. No one from the church comes among the students or is expected to come to do evangelistic work. *The Church does no pastoral labor on the "Hill."* When a student is sick or in trouble his pastoral care is left entirely to professor and fellow-student. Very few of the students have even a bowing acquaintance with the village pastor and we suppose that, in so large a church and among so many students, this cannot be otherwise.

If then there is no bond between the students and the church, either in the way of regular social intercourse, pastoral labor, or christian work, and if in the nature of things a fusing of the two bodies is impossible, then what is the sense of talking about the wickedness of severing the two? The christian students of the three institutions have been, and must continue to be, practically a church by themselves.

Another objection may be raised, which at first glance looks more serious. "Your meeting on the hill," says our objector, "will be an *opposition* meeting," and that is just where he makes a mistake. An opposition meeting—except opposition to Beelzebub—is just what our meeting must not and will not be. Of course it will take the students from the evening service of the church, and they have a right to take themselves away. The church gets along without their audience and noise during the summer vacation, and all the other churches in the provinces have to do without the advantages and disadvantages of their presence all the time. But while the students themselves are all withdrawn, their service should not be, must not be an "opposition" service. It should be,

must be FOR THE "INSTITUTIONS" ONLY. From the very nature of the service nobody can be unwelcome, still nobody must be invited. As in the village church it is understood that *everybody* is invited, so to this service it must be understood that, except those for whom it is specially assigned, *nobody* is invited. Those who would leave their own meeting to come to ours, should understand clearly that we believe they ought to get up and go out and go home to their own meeting, not because we do *not* want them, but because their own church *does* want them and has a right to want them.

We speak thus strongly because we believe the church is a sacred organization, with scriptural services and scriptural ordinances, and let every man, small and great, beware of laying upon her his unholy schismatic hands. The services we propose must be so conducted that they will be "opposition" services no more than our prayer-meetings are in opposition to the village prayer-meetings, or than one bible class in S. S. is in opposition to another.

It is the conviction of every one interested, whom it has been our privilege to talk with, that the proposed services would be the very best thing for the spiritual prosperity of the institutions. No one can regularly adapt biblical truth to the wants of the students like the clerical members of our own Faculty. It is needless to say more. The earnest conviction of the whole body of students, altogether free as it is from that turbulent spirit which characterizes anarchic risings—this unanimous earnest conviction—is itself almost proof enough. The Faculty, we think, are of one mind with ourselves, and we repeat with fresh expectation that among the probabilities of the near future, are religious services every Sabbath evening in Assembly Hall.

THERE is a dangerous logic(?) abroad. It is a kind of private, unconscious science; for the owner of doctrine acquired by this process can neither explain nor understand the grounds of his own belief. The danger lies mainly on one side. The man who uses the instrument in question as his test of truth may not often call truth falsehood, but he will very often think falsehood is truth. Here the mischief lies. He will receive what is false and hug it for the truth.

This dangerous logic is the logic of consistency. In moral life consistency has proved to be "a jewel," and