

brethren. And we are convinced that if these facts could be fairly laid before the constituency of the Colonial Missionary Society, instead of annually reducing their grant, the Committee would soon be able to give us a sum equal to the whole of their present expenditure.

One thing is certain: if we are to carry on our work in Canada with any prospect of success, humanly speaking, we must have more money to do it with. We ought to have at least *ten thousand dollars* this year. Is it too much to hope for? Have we no rich friends in England who will make this rapidly rising Dominion their specialty, and direct their energies and wealth into this channel, for Christ's sake? Or must we look or help elsewhere?

---

An animated discussion has been going on for some time past, in the columns of the *Globe*, over the Rev. Mr. Macdonnell's position, and Prof. Young's defence of it, in speaking of the Confession of Faith as imposing "fetters" upon modern free thought. Prof. Young contends that "the subscription to the Confession of Faith, which is required as a condition of ordination in the Presbyterian Church of Canada, is by no means understood to imply that all the ministers in that Church believe every doctrinal statement contained in the Confession." In proof of which he says that it is well known that differences of opinion do actually exist among them concerning some of its Articles.

"What then, it may be asked," says Mr. Young, "does subscription mean? It cannot, in my opinion, be held to mean more than this—that the sub-

scriber accepts the general scheme of doctrine set forth in the documents to which he signifies his assent." It would be well, he thinks, if some form of words explicitly intimating this were used.

That, we are assured by some lifelong Arminians, and others, who have joined the Presbyterian Church, is the understanding with which they subscribed the Confession, and if, in getting into the fold, they have not entered by the door, but have "climbed up some other way," it is time they should know it.

Others, however, equally learned, vehemently oppose the Professor's position, and insist that the Confession is to be cordially accepted, and signed by every minister of the Church without any mental reservation whatever. When doctors thus differ, who is to decide? The way the matter looks to us is this—if the Confession is to be accepted, *ipsissimis verbis* the faith to be held and taught, we think there is good ground for Mr. Macdonnell's protest against imposing such "fetters;" if it is *not* to be so accepted, how much may one mentally reject, and of what value is signature to the Confession?

---

The *Guardian* vehemently denied our assertion that the Methodist Conference "holds in its hands all the property of the denomination," and charitably ascribed our statement to our "ignorance of Methodism." Mr. Robert Wilkes, on the other hand, speaking for the deputation of the Methodist Church that waited on the Attorney-General the other day, to protest against Mr. McLeod's Bill—among whom we notice the