

We have never seen a copy of the *Lin Ching Advertiser*, but if such a paper is published, and if the Honanese are as much interested in "Births, Marriages, Deaths" as Canadians, it might have had the following:—

BORN.—At the Canadian Presbyterian Mission Compound, Lin Ching, Dec. 19th, the wife of Rev. Jonathan Goforth of a son.

The letter which brought the above item, dated Dec. 26th, was received just as the last form of this issue was ready for press. We make room for another paragraph. Mr. Goforth's tone was so cheerful that we forgot to remonstrate with him for sending a duplicate copy of his "Second Tour in Honan" to the *Presbyterian Review*. But all contributors, home and foreign, should know that the MONTHLY will publish nothing that has already appeared in the newspapers. A newspaper, because of its much wider circulation, may publish from a magazine, but it would be editorial folly for a magazine to reprint from a newspaper. For this reason Mr. Goforth's "Second Tour," a duplicate of which was sent to the *Review*, did not appear in the MONTHLY.

The Literary Society has had another public meeting. It was a decided success—"so the folks say." The evening was unfavorable, but the weather never has any effect on a Knox "public." Convocation Hall was crowded. Rev. S. Lyle, Hamilton, made an acceptable chairman. Singing of glees and a quartette, a short essay on Tennyson by W. D. Kerswell, and the recitation of that somewhat overworked selection, "Lasca" by Prof. Neff, occupied the first hour. "Lasca" has been recited so often in Toronto within the past two or three years that hoof-marks of that "sea of steers" may be found in every hall and lecture-room in the city, and, on this occasion, the encore "that would not be put by" was a tribute to Prof. Neff's excellent style. Perhaps the chief interest of the meeting centred in the debate on "Should the Confession of Faith be revised?" The case for revision was argued by W. Muir and T. M. Logie; in opposition were J. Drummond and J. A. Macdonald, the latter taking the place of T. H. Rogers, whose sudden illness prevented him shewing face.

The debate was pronounced worthy of older heads. The audience gave the speakers the closest attention, and displayed an interest in the question, an appreciation of fine points and a knowledge of the whole subject for which some are not disposed to give the laity credit. The revision arguments were well presented. Nothing radical was proposed. The system of doctrine was accepted, preterition, election, elect infants and all. Indeed, the progressives poured some hot shot into the ranks of their friends, exposing the fallacy in argument of many ardent revisionists—in New York presbytery e.g.—and their rank and blundering Arminianism. They argued for revision, however, and made out a case—so the chairman said—against the Confession as being too long, too metaphysical, too scholastic, too indefinite, too disproportionate in doctrine. All these charges the defenders of conservatism combatted, some of them with success. But they had head winds all the way, and a heavy sea, and when the captain took his bearings he decided that the good old ship, that has weathered so many tempestuous storms, should be lightened.