

they all narrow themselves down to a criticism, more or less hostile, of the church as the students find it. They are by no means entirely free from fault, but the writer is in accord with what seems to be the general opinion, namely, that the blame is in large measure to be laid upon the churches themselves. Assuredly an annual welcome is extended to the incoming students. They are given gratis the use of the gallery, perhaps; but seemingly their presence or absence at the weekly services is largely a matter of indifference within the church itself. How many of the students, for example, dream of taking a sitting in the church of their choice, or are ever invited to share the pew of a member of the congregation? How many of the city ministers regard the student members and adherents of their flock as being within the sphere of their pastoral duties? Then on the other side there is the matter of preaching; it may possibly be that sermons of a kind best adapted to the needs of an ordinary congregation are not very attractive to university men and women, or vice versa. But it may fairly be inferred that any minister of any denomination whose sermons proved regularly to be vitally interesting to students would, with no special effort on his part, find his church crowded at every service. This, we are told, has been actually proven to be the case in Kingston a few years ago.

This from the point of view of the University itself. On the other hand we must be careful to do full justice to the city ministers, who without exception, are big-hearted, earnest Christian men who are doing their utmost to meet the conditions that present themselves in their particular work. In some cases there are doubtless practical reasons why they are unable to do more for the students than are doing. In others it may not be expedient to make a bid for a large student attendance; the interests of the congregation must, of course, be considered first. Then there are few of the city ministers who could attempt single-handed to extend their pastoral offices to include the students. These and other things are to be said on the side of the church. But it still remains that the facts as above stated must call forth the anxious solicitation of every city clergyman and church-worker, and of the students and professors of the University alike. It is a matter of the most serious moment that we should be sending out year by year a hundred or more University-trained men and women who, if not out of sympathy with, are at least disinterested in, the services and work of the Christian church. It is not so much that the spiritual life of the students is necessarily hereby destroyed; on the contrary we believe that, on the whole, that side of our university life is in a reasonably healthy condition. The loss is seemingly greater on the side of the church. It is difficult to estimate how vast and rich would be the results within the church if we were able instead to send out a body of graduates almost solidly in heartiest sympathy with every ideal and activity of the church, and among them a fair percentage of trained church-workers, who during their college course have taken a first-hand interest and share in the various organizations of the church. What would not such a corps of university-trained Christian laymen be worth to the church?