

# QUEEN'S COLLEGE \* JOURNAL.

VOL. XVII.

KINGSTON, CANADA, APRIL 25th, 1890.

No. II.

## QUEEN'S COLLEGE JOURNAL

Published by the ALMA MATER SOCIETY of Queen's University in TWELVE FORTNIGHTLY NUMBERS during the Academic year.

JAMES BINNIE, B.A., - - - *Editor.*  
 DAN. R. DRUMMOND, B.A., - - - *Managing Editor.*  
 ROBT. S. MINNES, B.A., - - - *Business Manager.*

The annual subscription is \$1.00, payable before the end of January.

All literary contributions should be addressed to the Editor, Drawer 1104, Kingston, Ont.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to the Business Manager.

WHILE thanking our subscribers who have responded with promptness to the appeals of the business manager, we would again request those who have not yet paid their subscriptions to do so at once. There will be just one more number issued during the present session; and as we are anxious that the business of the JOURNAL be satisfactorily completed by the close of the term, it is necessary that every delinquent subscriber remit the amount of his subscription with the alacrity which we are expected to show in meeting our liabilities. The officers of the staff for next year are appointed, and we wish to clear every obstacle from their way, as their ambition is to make next year's JOURNAL an unprecedented success.

\* \* \*

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH. By Rev. Prof. McLaren: Toronto: Presbyterian News Co., pp. 51. Price 25c.

This is an interesting lecture on a subject which is attracting considerable attention at the present time. The pamphlet also contains, in an appendix, three letters by Rev. John Langtry, M.A., D.C.L., in which he criticises the views expressed in the lecture, or at least the views which he thinks are expressed in it. There are also three letters by the author in reply to this criticism.

To the extent to which each of these gentlemen may be regarded as voicing the views of the body to which he belongs, the pamphlet deserves thoughtful perusal.

On most of the points involved the author makes his meaning perfectly clear, but there are one or two points on which additional light would have been welcomed by many. Had the author made explicit *why* a religious organization, such, for example, as the Presbyterian Church, should refuse to admit to its fold any one whom it believes to be a member of Christ's fold, he would have removed a serious difficulty from many minds. For ex-

ample, had he shown why "the initial rite of the Christian Church" should not be left "both as to its subjects and mode an open question." His lecture would have been much more unanswerable than it is. We think many will fail to see why that should not be decided as the question of circumcision was in the Apostolic church. There is a question we would like to ask the author. In his remarks on the "ideal church," he seems to admit that we should aim to have but one visible church in each country. Does he think that church *must* be the Presbyterian? We are sorry to observe traces of the *odium theologicum* in some of the letters in the appendix. Anything in the direction of sneering or sarcasm is surely out of place in discussing such a subject.

"Down at your own fireside  
 With the evil tongue and the evil ear,  
 For each is at war with mankind."

\* \* \*

The fight for the independence of Victoria University is waxing hotter, and federation seems as far off as ever. The anti-federationists are carrying the war into Africa, and have actually launched a weekly publication to announce their views and to repel attack. This step was caused by the refusal of the *Christian Guardian*, the organ of the Methodist Church in Canada, to publish any correspondence antagonistic to the principle of federation as adopted by the General Conference of 1886 by a very narrow majority, holding, by way of justification, that such a discussion would be both disloyal and fanatical. This extraordinary position drove the rebellious and sinful minority to publish what the *Guardian* is pleased to dub "the banner of open rebellion," called *Methodist Topics*, which is making sad havoc in the already greatly thinned ranks of the federationists, and in general raising considerable commotion. The *Topics* ridicules the idea that because a measure is once adopted it should be counted treasonable to advocate reconsideration, even though the measure was a beneficial one and strongly supported. The *Guardian* receives a pretty lively shaking up for the course its editor has lately taken, and extracts from earlier issues of the same publication, under the present editor, are quoted which can hardly be reconciled to the arbitrary and dogmatic utterances of the last few years in regard to the principle at issue. Our hearty sympathy is with the *Topics* and its supporters. We never have been in sympathy with federation, still less do we favor absorption.

\* \* \*

As the end of a University course is education, it is very important to decide how to so pursue one's course as to gain the fullest benefit from it. To a faithful student two ways present themselves. The one is to rigidly ad-