

the Board or of the President or of the Professors who were appointed by the Board. No religious tests could be applied. Should everything be above reproach at any one time in these regards that could give no assurance respecting the next appointments. We would not control and therefore we could not guarantee. And the necessity for such guarantees in Arts work relates itself to the very subjects about which a religious denomination becomes nervous: the relation of Science to religion, of Philosophy to religion, of Social Science and the Philosophy of History to the foundations of Christianity. All you would have left to McMaster would virtually be a school of languages. Any one who has passed through the critical stages of scientific theory with its tendency to put all the realms of experience under its categories, or through the sphere of philosophic thought in which the gaunt forms of pantheism and deism and countless other "isms" rear themselves, knows how much depends upon a student's appraisal of the professor and the answer to the question, "Does he still hold to the evangelical truths of Christianity?" And we would have no guarantee as to how that question could be answered. It is no answer to such an objection to say, "Never mind, toss them in; if they are strong enough they will come out, if they are not, let them go down." Such an answer misses the mark of the value of experience and the directional element in education. The experiences of Romanes, of Sir Oliver Lodge, and of others who waded through years of scepticism show that it is not a question of strength or of weakness. Our project as a denomination is to give Christ a fair chance to organize the life of the student and it would be short-sighted policy to neutralize our efforts. The soul assuredly must find its way but the experience of others can do much for it by way of direction, or we might as well throw up our hands in all missionary endeavor. Our denomination now is directly sensitive to the kind of professor who is appointed. Their sensitiveness could operate only indirectly under the changed conditions.

As to saving in expense, while it is important it has never been a deciding factor when principles seem to be involved; if it were, the heathen would never be reached with the gospel. I suppose Archibald Brutch need not have mortgaged his home if Baptists had been willing to accept \$600 a year from the Woodstock Council. The presumption is that no one could tell, after the closest theoretical examination, just what financial difference federation would make. To be sure of the result one would have to try it out. There are some indications, however, from the experiences of Victoria and Trinity, although it is to be expected that differences of computation would also be found in each case. It will be recalled that the Victoria professor who was quoted