

year students there are only four who have any notion of studying for the Church. Now, we may try his plan, and look for our profit. Suppose the first term two of these four come forward and attend this new institution. A minister, who is to act in the capacity of a Professor, is secured. The Professor and two students spend a long and wearisome winter. He gives his services free, except that his board must be paid while here, and his pulpit supplied. It is true this will not be much. But how much? If he receives eight hundred dollars annually from his congregation, the half of this is lost to the Presbytery to which he belongs; for though his pulpit is supplied, others are suffering, as there are no more ministers than are needed. So the Presbytery sustains the loss of four hundred dollars. His board will be over one hundred dollars. The cost, then, is over five hundred dollars. This is spent for two students during one term. Assist these students to the amount of one hundred dollars each, and they will support themselves comfortably at a University. So we see, in a pecuniary view, it is not profitable. We might have three the second term, but on the third, fall back on two again. Now, who will say that the instruction imparted here would be equal to what it is in Colleges where the Professors have made it their life's study? I hope my readers will banish such an idea from their minds, and join with me in saying it is better, by far, to support what is called "The Young Men's Scheme." If it is desirable to study in our own Province, why not study in our sister College? I see nothing to hinder us from uniting with them. We have a distinction, but not a difference. Our aim should be to strengthen and encourage that vine already planted in our land, and not to establish another, similar, but on a smaller scale than that which does exist.

D. C.

### ROBERT BURNS AND THE U. P. MINISTERS OF DUNDEE.

It is well known that Burns, in his lifetime, was the cause of angry controversy between the Old and New Light ministers of the West of Scotland. Now, nearly 100 years after, his very name promises to stir up strife between the U. P. ministers of the East of Scotland. It seems that the Rev. Fergus Ferguson, a young preacher of some poetic and a good deal of popular talent, preached lately against the life and writings of the great bard as unfavourable to religion and morality. The Rev. George Gilfillan, nothing loth at the prospect of a row, rushed to the defence; and has in consequence been specially "prayed for" at revival meetings in Dundee. It's a great pity that Burns should be fought over in this way. It is surely high time that the faults of his life were forgotten, and his works were allowed to speak for themselves. As to Mr. Gilfillan, our only wonder is that some of his strait-laced brethren have not excommunicated him long ago. A man who tries to see good in everybody and everything, in Walter Scott, Robert Burns, and such like, in ritualism, rationalism, and other deadly evils, must be a terrible sore to them. The following extract from a Sunday evening sermon, preached by him lately, will give some idea of his way of looking at things:—"Scotland," he said, "is still too much wedded to the past; it is too much priest-ridden and party-torn; and, peradventure, Dr. Johnson was not far wrong when he spoke of Scotchmen sometimes loving Scotland better than truth, and he might have added, Scotch formulas better than Christ's faith. In a speech I delivered this week at some popular gatherings here, I said, and may here repeat, that the best way of destroying the power of ritualism is by borrowing a little from it, introducing certain elements of beauty and harmony and elegance which it has caricatured and spoiled by excess; and I add that the way of destroying the power of rationalism also is by importing some of its thoughtful and liberal elements also into our too much creed-bound and hide-bound forms of belief. It has ever been the wisest policy to ward off revolution by a timely reform."