

THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN
PUBLISHED BY THE
Presbyterian Printing & Publishing Co., Ltd.
AT 5 JORDAN ST., TORONTO.

Terms, \$2.00 per annum in advance.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1.00 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

The Canada Presbyterian

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, MANAGER.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 16TH, 1893.

Where was the civic pride of the Queen city, when the Council agreed to allow the Street Railway Company to furnish funds to defray the expenses to be incurred by voting on the 26th inst.?

A man who had nothing to do last week but lie on the rocks and watch the Atlantic tide come in, or whose chief business consisted in paddling about on the Muskoka Lakes, didn't know how much he had to be thankful for.

The Interior seems to think that Macaulay's New Zealander has sailed, and that along with his long promised sketch he will make sketches of the members of the House of Commons, who have been turning the old Chamber into a ring. Possibly. We suggest that the artist continue his visit to Washington, for no doubt there will be scenes worthy of any pencil before the silver question is settled. Perhaps, he might be induced to go on to Chicago, and sketch that elder who defended his minister with his fists. That elder would be out of all sight the best man sketched.

The mayor of a northern town presided at a welcome meeting held in connection with the induction of a young minister, a few days ago. The programme was long, and there were many speakers. When any brother seemed to have a difficulty in getting done, his worship was observed to pencil a line or two on a small piece of paper, and politely pass it to him. Soon after the brother stopped. Nobody knows what was in those notes but the writer and the reader. His worship was asked next day, but refused to tell. It would be a great thing if all chairmen knew the secret.

Some of the Toronto journals quite frequently indulge in unmannerly sneers at small cities, at towns, and at rural municipalities. The members of the local legislature are sometimes alluded to as coming from the country, and, therefore, not entitled to much consideration. Can anybody tell us when any other Ontario municipality did anything half so contemptibly mean as to accept funds from a street railway company to defray the expense of submitting a by-law on an important question? If Hamilton had disgraced itself in that way, the end of it would scarcely ever be heard. Every citizen with a spark of civic pride should vote against the Sunday cars.

Four years ago, when Principal Caven took such a prominent part in the agitation against the Jesuit Estates Bill, his utterances were published in many journals, and great weight was attached to everything he said. The learned gentleman was frequently interviewed, and he could hardly say "Good day," to his neighbours, without some significance being attached to his friendly salute. We do not observe that all those who then paid so much attention to his utterances, are so anxious to follow him on the Sunday car question. The Principal is just as wise and patriotic now as he was four years ago. The Fourth Commandment is certainly as important as the preamble of the Jesuit Estates Bill. It must be remembered, however, that there was a fight with the Catholics on at that time, and a chance to make some political capital.

Legitimate help from any quarter is, no doubt, well earned by the friends of the Sabbath in Toronto, but, as Principal Caven says in his letter of Friday last, even some religious men oppose Sunday cars mainly on secular grounds. They rest the case largely, if not exclusively, on the temporal advantage of a quiet Sabbath. If this is done from a mere desire to bring out all the points, good and well, but when it is done in a manner which shows with painful clearness that the writer or speaker believes that temporal considerations are the only important ones, one may well ask, whither are we drifting. The fact that a considerable number of citizens are making a desperate effort to introduce the continental Sabbath, is serious enough, but not half so serious as the fact that even some friends of the Sabbath seem afraid or ashamed to defend the institution on religious grounds.

Dr. Stalker was asked the other day by an interviewer, if he thought ministers should take part in political discussions. His reply was as follows: "Well, my view is, that ministers in their place as citizens should take as active a part in politics as any other men. It should be no more a reason why a man should not take part in politics, that he is a minister, than that he is a tradesman. We are often told that we require to be more human, and to know the world better than we do; but how can this be if we are excluded from public life? It will generally be found that people who say that ministers ought not to take any part in politics, really mean that they should not take the side opposite to their own; but they have no fault to find with them when they happen to be on their own side. I do not, however, at all approve of introducing politics into the pulpit in such a way as to make people uncomfortable in church, whatever political party they may belong to, and I have never done so. Nor do I think that politics should be introduced into Church courts, except when it is very clear that they have a direct bearing on the interests of religion. But it is difficult to lay down any stringent rule on the matter." In this city of Toronto, some people are not quite as liberal as Dr. Stalker. They think a minister should not interfere even in matters of Sabbath observance, unless he happens to hold somewhat lax views on that most important question.

SUNDAY IN GERMANY.

The writer of this paper, which we reprint from the Lutheran Observer, was a student at Leipzig, in Germany, and he gives an account of the manner in which Sunday is observed in that country, which we commend to the attention of our readers at the present crisis.

I was reared in my father's house to respect and observe the Lord's day every Sunday. I did not play on that day, I went to church and Sunday school, and in those, and perhaps a few other points, observed what wise men in these later days are wont to call with fine scorn, a "Puritanical Sunday."

When I grew a little older I did not break these restrictions, but I was wont once in a while to feel just a trifle rebellious against restrictions, the absolute wisdom of which I did not always see. I doubted sometimes whether we had not better ease up in our Sunday laws a little for the sake of the People (spelled with a big "P" in deference to a few demagogues who always spelled it that way in their speeches—before elections).

I was somewhat impressed with arguments which began with the premise that in Europe the people went about every Sunday and got themselves much innocent and rational amusement, and thereby were much profited. There was a lot of "fine lying" in some of those arguments, but I did not realize in those days to what a lofty pitch "lying as a fine art" had been carried. I said in my haste, all men are truth-tellers, and it must surely be good that in Europe the people have

Sunday as a day of rest and recreation. I was on the verge of being converted to the views of "liberal" men on that point.

But, alas for my growing liberality! I went to Europe. I went to Germany to study in a German university and to try a European Sunday. I was not a tourist; I was a resident. I do not mean that tourists are not good people, but simply that they do not get to know the country through which they pass. Tourists are generally "passing." Hence it is that when they come home to us again their information is not always reliable. A man must reside in a place in order to know it.

It is the tourist, for example, who comes back from Europe and reports that he never saw one single drunken man on his whole trip. Residents in any European cities never say that. The tourist's happy remark is taken up by people who are searching for that sort of evidence. His testimony is published all over America, and people believe after awhile, that in Europe men never get drunk, and that therefore the drinking of light wine and beer is not dangerous. I was a resident. I saw the European Sunday as it really is. I was in Leipzig. The very first Sunday of mine in the historic old city was interesting.

I saw people going away to picnic in the country, and I said in my heart, this is good. They went away in big wagons, with banners and flags and music. Everything in Germany is done to music—happy land! Then I beheld and lo! all the tram lines are running extra cars; and all the railroads had extra carriages for the throngs; and all the boats on the little river were let to pleasure seekers; and all the restaurants and cafes and beer gardens had extra waiters; and all the bands of music which had not gone out with the people on picnics were playing in said beer gardens. Then I began to remind myself of the arguments which I had heard in America.

These arguments admitted with much show of fairness that many men had to work on Sunday, but that they got a day off somewhere else in the week. But I was skeptical now, and began to ask questions of people who knew how much time they got off from labour. I asked a conductor on a tram car how many days he worked in a week, and his answer was "seven."

I asked a waiter in a restaurant how often he got a day off, and he smiled proudly as he said, "I never get a day off. I haven't missed a single day for seven years." "Do you always work on Sundays?" "Oh, yes, I must!" I thought that he soon ought to have a Sabbatical year. But he was still at it in the same restaurant three years later. I was growing more skeptical about the value of this sort of Sunday. But I patiently continued my search for facts. I always got a letter or two from America every Sunday. I said nothing, but simply watched the face and form of the old postman who handed it in at my door. Day after day, week after week, month after month, it was always the same man. He did not seem to get one day in seven for rest.

But I was not convinced yet. I went to the German church occasionally, the established church, the strongest church, and looked over the congregation carefully and narrowly. Then I always said: "Where are the men?" And I remembered the men were working in the restaurants and beer gardens and theatres and railroads. Those things gave me a pause. But I looked closer and saw a contrast—a great contrast. I went every Sunday afternoon to the union English-American church. It was thronged with men as well as with women.

In the songs of praise to God, the deep, mellow bass came full and strong amid the light and airy soprano. This presents a great contrast to the German Church. Why is it? The answer was no far to seek. Those who crowded the Anglo-American church came from lands where Sunday was kept and work largely a stranger. They had always had a day of rest; they were accustomed to it; they went to church naturally. I

A European Sunday does bring rest to some people, but it makes work for thousands. And its undoubted tendency is to ward more and more work, and less and less rest.

Those weeks and months of residence as a student in Leipzig stole away from me all my rebellion against Sunday. I came home with a greater love and respect for the Lord's day of rest. I felt like giving every man a full day of rest—except preachers!

**PRINCIPAL MACVICAR AND
PROF. SCRIMGER ON THE
RELEVANCY OF THE
LIBEL.**

At a meeting of the Presbytery of Montreal, held to consider the relevancy of the libel in the case of Prof. Campbell, the Rev. Dr. MacVicar and Prof. Scrimger both made speeches of more than usual importance. We regret that their lengthy thing, which, in the circumstances was unavoidable, makes it impossible for us to publish them in full for the information of all our readers. All we can do is to give in as brief compass as possible, the points of chief importance dwelt upon in the addresses, which upon their face bear marks of having been prepared with great care and with a deep sense of their responsibility to the Church and to the truth of God. The addresses were substantially one, but that of Dr. MacVicar is the more lengthy and most minute in detail.

In beginning, he points out that the question then before the Presbytery really was, "Do the statements of Prof. Campbell's Kingston lecture, warrant the libel framed against him, or can they be construed in harmony with the Word of God and the Standards of the Church?" Is the lecture a manifest departure from the doctrines which he voluntarily and solemnly promised to teach and defend at the time of his ordination to the ministry, and more recently when inducted into the chair which he occupies in the Presbyterian College, Montreal.

Before setting forth in detail his answer to these questions which involve the relevancy of the libel, the Professor states first that, "he is in favour of a legitimate and properly-regulated freedom, and the employment of the best scholarship in the treatment of Biblical subjects." This, he shows, is fully provided for by the polity and practice of the Presbyterian Church. In this both professors are at one. Again, what all Christian scholars agree to, is granted—"that certain important functions belong to Biblical criticism, both higher and lower. Appreciation is expressed of the labours of Christian scholars in this regard. It is also stated in the next place, what the most cursory study of the Bible makes clear, that there has been progress, gradual development in the delivery of revelation, culminating in the appearance, in the fulness of time, of Jesus Christ. But while the views of the Father taught by Jesus Christ, are to be emphasized, they do not contravene the teaching of the older Scriptures; the elementary and introductory are as true and essential as what is final and complete." No one would have found fault with Professor Campbell in going thus far. Nay, further, it might be safely admitted, "that many of the Jewish people who were the public custodians of the oracles of God erred exceedingly, they often held wrong views and were guilty of wrong conduct; but we may condemn the unholy conduct of those to whom the word of the Lord was sent without doing dishonour to the word itself." "Even inspired men, when not being used as the special organs of the Holy Spirit in receiving, delivering, and recording revelations, were capable of error." Of this, the Apostle Peter is a notable instance. This also might be safely allowed. But Prof. Campbell's lecture fairly interpreted, "goes far beyond all this, and teaches in a startling and indefensible sense, the errancy of the sacred writers while speaking by the Holy Spirit, and at the same time sets forth views of God's character, government and