

they knew right well its great importance and value in keeping those irrepressible youths in their proper place, who unhappily find their way into Colleges as into other walks of life.

Sir, I know of nothing that would cause my very blood to boil so quickly as to hear that the authority of that venerable court had been called in question, except, indeed, it be the reading of certain of Mr. Goldwin Smith's treasonable utterances. And, sir, is there not an analogy in these two cases in point, for can it be held to be less than treasonable to question the authority of an institution which has become venerable by age, and which has always been sanctioned by use and wont.

Does anyone question its utility? Sir, I could point to many distinguished men in Canada to-day, who have come under its somewhat stern yet benign influence, and who I doubt not would be the very first to acknowledge (were they appealed to) that no small share of the success which they have been able to achieve in their several spheres of active duty, has been due to the timely counsels and admonitions which they have received from the august and learned members of that court. Does any one call in question its justice? Sir, is it not a matter of history that the learned judges are wont to sit with the utmost patience, hearing evidence and listening with unwearied attention to arguments adduced by the learned counsel both pro and con? Again and again, when some poor Freshman, far from his parental home and in a thoroughly exhausted condition financially, through some act of youthful indiscretion rather than of positive moral obliquity, has found himself arraigned as a "prisoner at the bar," have not one or even more of the most learned and distinguished counsel present at once volunteered to conduct the case, and that without fee or reward. And, sir, what if said prisoner at the bar, after a fair and impartial trial, was found guilty by a jury of his peers, and the full penalty of his crime extracted from him? Yet, when he showed signs of repentance and reformation, have I not, time and again, seen his lordship, the judge, relax those stern lineaments of visage, and with learned counsel, jurors, constables, criers, and culprit, all join in enjoying themselves in some hospitable "den" over the good things furnished as the result of justice sternly meted out; while

they discussed the ways and means of securing another offender, into which discussion the former lawbreaker usually entered with the greatest eagerness?

Thus did we brethren dwell in unity—in the good days of old—and devise means to fleece one another. But he would have been voted *Asinus* who would have called in question the authority of that ever vigilant enemy of all evil-doers, that impartial dispenser of justice, and that great bulwark of virtue—the court.

OLD BOY.

I attended the Communion service held in St. Andrew's Church last Sunday, and I was somewhat astonished at what I found there. What has become of the old Scotch custom of fencing the tables, that dreadful ceremony by which all those who would partake of the elements with unrepented sin on their souls were warned that by so doing they but added to their damnation, that they committed "the sin against the Holy Ghost," and incurred the fate of the apostate Iscariot? Not those were warned who had sinned and repented, and had come to find relief, but those who were taking the Sacrament that they might seem saved, yet in their hearts were "full of envy, deceit, murder, backbiters, extortioners;" to these was shown in solemn tones the awful and unpardonable sin they were committing. Where has this dread rite gone?

Another thing that greatly shocked me was the youth of some of the communicants. This is not such a rite as baptism, whereby the parents consecrate their child to God, and vow to train it up in His fear, but the most solemn Sacrament of the Christian Church, a Holy Communion between the human and the divine, the full meaning of which no child can understand. Anyone who takes the Communion has indeed to satisfy the minister of his fitness, but the questions asked are such as any precocious child with a glib tongue can answer.

Why, too, is the bread cut into small pieces, one for each communicant? Was not the breaking of the bread more symbolic, more true to Scripture, more reverent in every way? Wherein lies the difference between the present mode and the Roman Catholic wafer—which all Presbyterians disdain and call a farce—save that in one case the congregation