

ably the leading student in the university, being one of the most prominent men in the crew and on other athletic teams. An alumnus of Cornell, writing from Ithaca, recently remarked, that last season in every Greek-letter fraternity at Cornell there was a group of men studying the English Bible. He added that this study was becoming a popular and permanent interest of undergraduate life. For two years an employed Bible secretary has been giving his entire time to the voluntary Bible work at Yale, while at Princeton, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Michigan, the University of Illinois, and other institutions, the equivalent of one employed man's time has been devoted to this student interest. The development of this activity among the large State institutions of the South and West is also of striking importance. In 1908-09, ten State institutions in those particular regions reported an actual attendance of 3,678 students in voluntary Bible classes, the superintending agency being the college Young Men's Christian Associations. This fact is a cause for reflection as one realizes that in most of these State universities no study of this nature is furnished in the curriculum."

All this, as more than one religious paper notes, does not support the conclusion that Christianity is declining in America. Not merely a moral renaissance but an actual revival of religion, so *The Century* thinks, is taking place. It says:

"The call is heard in many unexpected quarters. A daily newspaper, published in Wall Street, declares that there is nothing the country needs just now so much as a revival of old-fashioned religion. A daily paper, published in the interior, has taken every morning for a week the subjects of its leading editorial from the phrases of Paul's praise of love as the greatest thing in the world. The last Christmas number of a Western daily journal had a brilliant editorial three columns long upon 'The Holy Spirit,' written by one of the strong journalists of America, and full of the passion of a genuine religious faith. These are signs of the times. Men are thinking seriously and feeling deeply on these great themes of the inner life. Even those who have not philosophized much about it have the impression that help must come from this quarter in resisting the encroachments of the dominant materialism, and in bringing the people back to the ways of sanity and integrity."

The fact that *The Century* is devoting its pages to chronicling and advancing the cause of religion is noted as, in itself, a significant sign of the times. "Ordinarily," *The Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati) comments, "the churches, the preachers, and the religious journals are the only sources from which arguments for and exhortations to a general revival of religion are expected. It is, therefore very significant, reassuring, and encouraging to find this subject treated editorially, in a serious and sympathetic way, in a secular magazine of such wide circulation and influence as *The Century*. Incalculable promise lies in the willingness of such organs of public opinion and of the daily press to take up and put forward such a subject."

Our Nova Scotian friends covet workers from Ontario.

A press report says: "At a meeting of the ministers and representatives of the churches of New Glasgow, Stellarton and Westville, held at Stellarton, it was decided to hold a series of evangelistic services in the fall. Rev. Winchester and Rev. Mr. Murray, of Toronto, are the men most spoken of to conduct them. Both are big men, able men and men of the type in whose hands the meetings will be conducted in good old Presbyterian style—that is decently and in order."

DISSENTED FOR REASONS.

After the vote on the motion for Church Union was announced, Principal MacKay, D.D., asked leave to dissent from the finding of the General Assembly, for the following reasons: (1) That the church is not competent to take the step taken by this vote; (2) the vote was confusing, the issues at stake not being made clear to the assembly; (3) that the interests of the people are not in any way safeguarded by the decision arrived at. Those who signed were: John McKay, D.D., Vancouver; K. McLennan, Ph.D., Tiverton, Ont.; R. G. MacBeth, Paris, Ont.; Alex. MacGregor; J. J. Monds, Charlton Place, Ont.; D. B. Marsh, Springville, Ont.; D. A. McLean, Ripley, Ont.; J. R. Bell, Laurel, Ont.; T. C. James (elder) Charlottetown; W. M. Sedgewick (elder) Musquodoboit; Robert Campbell, D.D., Montreal; S. D. Robinson, Caledon, Ont.; Robert Johnson, Halifax; Murray MacLaren, St. John; G. M. Macdonnell (elder) Kingston; Jas. Wilson, Toronto; Jos. Whyte Rogers (elder) Toronto; A. L. Geggie, Toronto; A. E. Hannan, Thorndale, Ont.; L. B. Gibson, St. Stephen, N.B.; D. M. Fraser (elder) Vancouver; J. L. Oxeer, Bridgewater, N.S.; Alfred Bright, Ingersoll; Hugh McKellar, Midnapore, Alta.; W. J. West, Bluevale, Ont.; A. T. Laing (elder), Toronto; J. P. MacInnes, Harrow, Ont.; W. J. Fowler, Lower Musquodoboit; Jas. Henderson (elder) Lucknow; D. R. Drummond, Hamilton; D. D. McLeod, D.D., Barrie; W. G. Brown, Red Deer, Alta.; J. K. Henry, Tamworth, Ont.; Hugh Taylor, East Templeton, Que.; W. W. Craw, D.D., Creemore, Ont.; S. Stewart, Thamesville, Ont.; T. D. McCullough, Harrison, Ont.; J. D. MacGregor (senator) New Glasgow; Rod McKenzie, Stornoway, Que.; Jas. Muir (elder) Quebec; J. A. Stuart (elder) Montreal.

The Rev. W. J. Knox, Pembroke, recorded his dissent for the following reasons: "I desire to record my dissent because I think that the matter should go to the congregations without being prejudiced by a vote of the assembly."

Dr. E. Scott, Montreal, desired to dissent because the people have not had an opportunity of expressing their mind on the subject. The following also signed: A. M. Nairn (elder), Montreal; James Rodger (elder), Montreal; Frank Reid (elder), Simcoe; George E. Ross, Charlottetown.

Rev. James Cumberland, Stells, Ont., dissented because faith had not been kept with the people.

Rev. Dr. Sedgewick also gave reasons for his dissent, but they were not handed in.

The appointment of Rev. J. A. MacFarlane, M.A., to be Synodical Superintendent of Home Missions in the widely extended field within the bounds of the Province of Quebec, at a salary of \$2,000 a year, was well received by the General Assembly, as was indicated by remarks of members.

Among others Rev. W. J. Dey, Simcoe, Ont., in supporting the motion said: "The province of Quebec is the only one now without a superintendent. Mr. MacFarlane is a man of vision and enthusiasm. When I heard him in Hamilton I thought he had caught the spirit of 'Robertson the Great.' The Synod of Montreal and Ottawa ought to get a 'stirring up'." (Applause).

Another advance in the evolution of Home Mission work was in granting to the synods practical autonomy in the business within their bounds. Dr. D. D. McLeod, Barrie, said—"This will be one of the best things we can possibly do. It will kindle more interest." Dr. G. Bryce, Winnipeg, said—"I heartily support this. It will give a uniform system to the whole Church."

PRINCIPAL PATRICK'S "CASE."

BY REV. A. B. DOBSON.

The statement that "the United Church will possess greater facilities for evangelizing the country", and that our present divisions are a serious hindrance, is the only really important thing which Principal Patrick has written in support of his case. And certainly this is a serious statement and deserves the most earnest and thorough consideration. If it be true, if the Church be not doing the very thing which she was called into existence to do, if on the contrary, she be actually to any extent a hindrance to that work, most certainly she is no longer worthy of the allegiance of good men, and should be either revolutionized or abolished. Principal Patrick does not hesitate to declare that the Church, whatever her other virtues, is guilty of this shameful wrong. He does not even blush in saying so. He lays the blame on "overlapping" and "waste". When he gives correct and definite answers to the two questions asked in my last letter the value of his statement can be easily determined, and not till then.

If, as Dr. Patrick states, there are too many ministers and churches in the older parts of the country, if they are in each other's way, and if two or three men are now doing the work which one man can do just as well or better, won't he please tell us where they are, and of how many places this is really true? We don't want his suppositions. If it be generally true that the Kingdom of God in this land is so suffering, why is it that our "leaders" are sending more men into these very same overworked and "overlapped" places? They are sending Evangelists to arouse the indifferent, a task which seems to be too great for our present "overlapping" staff of workers. They are sending boys "teams" (?) to teach other boys to study for the ministry. They send us Sunday School Secretaries to teach us how to manage Sunday Schools. They send us collecting agents to teach us to be liberal, especially to the colleges. We have all kinds of additional workers sent to us. Is it not a pity that these unfortunate and overlapped places should be further overlapped and that these extra workers are not sent out to the needy places of the North and West, with a view to "evangelizing the country?"

Usually when more work is to be done the working forces are increased not diminished. But Principal Patrick tells us that by diminishing our religious forces, which are now, it seems, too weak for their task, we shall get more and better work done. He tells us that if we close up a half, or two-thirds of our churches, in the older districts, if we lessen to that extent our intensive working power here, and if we also lessen, proportionately, the incentives to work in older Canada, we shall more speedily evangelize newer Canada. This is so contrary to all analogy that some of us may be pardoned if we frankly, but most humbly, tell our "leaders" that we don't believe a word of it. This is the crucial point in the controversy. It is an amazing thing that Principal Patrick, in making a "case for Church Union", laid such little stress upon it; and especially that he had no verified information to give on the matter. In the absence of such information the matter is one of mere opinion, or of observation, and Dr. Patrick has no special qualification to express better opinions on it than other men until he investigates and ascertains the facts. Until he does so the statement is not intelligent and some of us will continue to deny it.

If Dr. Patrick be so anxious for the welfare of the Church in Canada that this alleged "overlapping" pains him he will at once collect the facts, and then prove to us that this proposed Union is the best way of dealing with it. The "ipse dixit" style of his letters in the "Presbyterian" will not pass for argument, especially in such a case as this.

Fordwich, June 24, 1910.