

The drifting elements in our Divinity Halls would be brought to a stand-still by the stern requirement: Once a summer student, always a summer student. Such a procedure would, we think, fairly meet Cynie's objection.

As regards the other matter to which he refers, it is well to remember that the original motion concerning post-graduate work in the mission-field embraced *a full year*, instead of six months. The motion was plainly the outcome of an endeavor to respond to the winter famine cry. The same can hardly be said of the amendment, which was eventually carried. It requires "six months' labor in the mission field from all students who have completed their attendance at College previous to their ordination to a pastoral charge, except in cases in which a corresponding period of labor has been rendered in the winter half-year during their course of study." Now, by this amendment we are allowed to proceed to the mission field immediately after graduation in April; and accordingly when our six months of service have elapsed winter will not have commenced. The provision therefore fails to afford any adequate help in the direction of supplying mission fields throughout the entire year. Of course if the amendment means nothing—that is, if it is not really a modification of the original motion—and if we are expected to spend six months in the *winter* field, then we are practically bound to service for a year and not six months; for, during the intervening summer we should be obliged to keep ourselves free from any permanent settlement, and in order to do so would naturally obtain work from the Home Mission Committee. We cannot help thinking that some mistake was inadvertently made in the matter. Perhaps the mover of the amendment can give us light.

In the meantime, our columns are open to further discussion. We are aware that our Toronto friend, *Knoxonian*, after a perusal of the expressed opinions in a college contemporary, and "after reading,"—as he puts it—"between the lines," thinks he can recognize in the students of to-day a tendency to discuss measures concerning their own interests a little more freely than is advisable. But, much as we value the friendly hints of *Knoxonian*, we are inclined to believe that the fathers and brethren would no more think of disregarding entirely the opinions of those whose service in the home mission field they appear to esteem so highly, than they would think of disregarding entirely the counsel and wishes of our foreign missionaries. A free ventilation of student opinion on this subject will do no harm.

---

Mr. John J. Forbes, First Year Theology, who is absent this session, through ill-health, writes from Matane, Que: "When I began to notice in the papers the usual signs of the re-awakening of College life, I must confess