

Our Contributors.

CONCERNING LIBERTY OF SPEECH

BY KNOXIAN.

Some of the Toronto people have an idea that it would be a good thing to tell the orators who hold forth in the Queen's Park on Sabbath afternoons, that they should change their base of operations. Some other good people think that telling the orators to move on would be a dangerous interference with the right of free speech. If any given orator did not wind up and "move on" when requested to do so, gentle pressure by a policeman would, it is alleged, be an invasion of the orator's rights. Should the policeman use his baton as a motive power, that would, it is said, be a fracture of the fundamental rights of the citizen. One gentle, persuasive punch, from that baton, would violate the Magna Charta badly, and cause men to strike an attitude and ask, Do we live in Russia? and other awkward questions.

The *Globe*, always on the alert when the liberties of the subject are being discussed, comes out strongly in favour of the park orator. Perhaps the *Globe* thinks that it would be doubly wrong to make almost any kind of an orator break off within sight of George Brown's statue. George Brown was the most heroic defender of popular rights Canada ever saw, and that is just the reason why we think he would put a sudden stop to certain kinds of Sabbath oratory in the park, were he Mayor of Toronto. George Brown loved a quiet Sabbath, and would, no doubt, try to secure a quiet Sabbath for his fellow citizens, and when he tried to do anything, he generally did it.

The defence of the park orator proceeds on the assumption that the Salvationist, the infidel, the hobby-horse man, the crank, every kind of creature that wants to exhibit himself and his theories, have a monopoly of the rights of citizenship, and that quite respectable tax-payers have no rights that one is bound to respect, in the park on Sabbath. Now, surely the tax-paying citizen who takes out his wife and children for a quiet walk, has as much right to enjoy a quiet walk as the park orator has to make a noise. The quiet citizen does not disturb anybody; but we are told in effect that the park orator has a right to disturb *him* and his family. We don't believe the British Constitution, nor the Confederation Act, nor any other enactment, human or divine, confers any such right upon the park orator. The rights of the citizen who wants silence are just as sacred as the rights of the citizen who wants to force his noise upon the community.

"If you don't want to listen keep away." That is cool. Why not let the man who makes the noise keep away? Parks were never intended for the use of stump orators. Neither were street corners. And it is the coolest kind of insult to tell a citizen that if he does not wish to have his ears saluted by the unmelodious tones of every crank, he should *keep out of his own park*. Streets were made to walk and drive on, and even those highly favoured people—the Salvation Army—have no right to block up a sidewalk with their meetings, and compel the wives of taxpaying citizens to walk around in the mud.

But would the stopping of park oratory be an interference with freedom of speech? Most decidedly not. The most that the authorities would do would be to tell the orators to air their eloquence elsewhere. The policeman would say to the orator: "Mr. Demosthenes, this park was not purchased and beautified by the people for the purpose of holding public meetings in it on Sabbath. There are many public halls in the city in which you can hold forth at any length you please. An orator, with a fine, melodious voice like yours, should never speak in the open air. Go, please, to one of the many halls in our city, and exercise your freedom of speech to the utmost limit enjoyed by a British subject. There are many narrow-minded Sabbatarians passing through here to and from church and Sabbath school, and their Puritanical notions about the Sabbath lead them to dislike holding public meetings on Sabbath. There are also many common, illiterate citizens, walking about, who cannot appreciate your fine oratory. They have no taste for pure eloquence like yours, Mr. Demosthenes. Their education was neglected. Go then, please, to a public hall, and put the universe on a proper working basis."

Would Demosthenes go? Not likely. Two initial difficulties would stare him in the face. He would have to pay for the hall and nobody might go to hear him. So he uses the park because he can get it for nothing, and because he can force himself there on the attention of people, many of whom consider him a nuisance. The man was not asked to stop speaking. He was simply asked to speak in some other place. Where does the interference with freedom of speech come in? There is no such interference. At most, it is but a question of place. The essence of freedom of speech is not touched.

At the close of an anniversary service held two or three months ago, not fifty miles from Toronto, a crank, who was wandering about the neighbourhood, rose and insisted on addressing the congregation. Not wishing to have a painful "scene" in the church on Sabbath evening, the people allowed him to go on, much to the annoyance and disgust of everybody. His incoherent harrangue would probably not come within the law against disturbing public worship. He was merely exercising his freedom of speech. It may be urged that the congregation owned the church, and therefore had a right to stop him. The people of any town or city own their own park, and have an equal right to stop doubtful characters from holding public meetings in it on Sabbath.

Were this merely a broad question, nothing would have

been said about it in this column. The people of Toronto can do as they please about Queen's Park. It is vastly more than a local question. There is a growing feeling in many places that almost any kind of a meeting may be held on Sabbath, and that no one has a right to protest. So long as it is a gathering addressed by somebody, it should be allowed. People who contend that the Lord's Day is a day for *rest and worship* are denounced as old fogies. Christian people who dare to say that secular, or semi-secular meetings should not be held on Sabbath, are met with the gibe—"If you don't like it you can keep away from it." The fact that the mere holding of the meeting may itself be a violation of the Sabbath is denied, or contemptuously ignored. Any attempt to stop such proceedings would be met with muttering about the Blue Laws of Connecticut, and platitudes about freedom of speech.

If one half the people who make speeches in this country would keep their mouths closed, and give more attention to the Fourth Commandment, Canada would be greatly benefited, and the millenium brought nearer. We need a well kept Sabbath much more than we need park or street oratory.

THE JESUITS.

BY REV. R. E. BURNS, D.D.

DOCTRINE OF DEVILS

"SIN, if the Church of Rome be not the Church of Christ, it is the masterpiece of the devil," was the statement of that crazy fanatic, Father Ignatius, in an interview he had with Dr. Cumming, of London. From the sketch we have given, imperfect though it be, you will be at no loss to discover which of these alternatives holds true with respect to the Order of Jesuits. Not bigoted Protestants, but rigid Romanists have claimed for it an infernal origin. "This doctrine of devils," this "device of the enemy of souls," are amongst the epithets heaped on it by the most extensive and enlightened of Popish universities. Denunciations of Jesuitism must not, therefore, be put down as ebullitions of malignant spleen on the part of hot-headed heretics.

Individuals and collective bodies within the pale of the Roman Catholic Church have been found honest enough to put it on the pillory and hold it up to withering execration.

By everyone deserving the name of Christian, the *Moral Law* is regarded as divine in its origin and permanent in its obligation. So elevated is the standard it lays down, so benevolent are the precepts it inculcates, that even infidels have been struck with admiration and involuntarily rendered it homage. To this celestial code, so lofty in its aim, so lovely in its spirit, so reasonable and beneficial in its provisions, Jesuitism stands diametrically opposed. It came, not to fulfil the law, but to destroy it. There is not one jot or tittle of that law to the root of which it does not lay the axe. It employs the pen-knife of Jehoiakim and the bed of Procrustes at pleasure. It mutilates the fair proportions of the law, shortening it or stretching it to suit its own convenience. We do not make this assertion rashly. It will be our endeavour (in the present section) to prove it.

LOVE TO GOD OF NO ACCOUNT.

1. Love to God lies at the very basis of the law. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul, with all thy strength, and with all thy mind." This is the model to which our obedience must be conformed, and the main motive which should prompt us to render it. Every genuine Christian has his heart bound by cords of love to the throne of Deity; pants after Him as the glittering goal of hopes and the only satisfying source of happiness. The Jesuits have discovered what they deem a more excellent way."

In their view, love to God forms a bondage, to which the Jews were subject in the days of old, and it was one great object of the advent of Christ to break this galling yoke, and bid the oppressed go free. This is the interpretation which Father Svimond gives to the passage. "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." "Yea [says he] we shall be free, as I hope, by his own testimony, even from that too strict obligation which some would lay upon us, of loving God."

If this release were not given, Father Faber shows that we who live under the present dispensation would fare as badly, nay, even worse, than those who lived under the previous. "If perfect contrition [says he] (by which is understood supreme love to God) were necessary in the sacrament, we Christians should be in a worse condition than the Jews were before Christ came into the world." De Brielle echoes the statement. "If the love [i.e., of God] were necessary, the way of salvation would be more difficult under the law of grace than under the law of nature or that of Moses."

Father Pinter thinks "it was reasonable that under the law of grace in the New Testament God should relieve us from that troublesome and arduous obligation which existed under the law of bondage; otherwise, indeed, Christians who are the children, would have no greater facility in gaining the good graces of the Father than the Jews, who were the slaves."

There are certain extreme cases and periodical seasons in which Jesuits affirm a certain infinitesimal degree of love to God should be entertained, but where these are or when these occur it is almost impossible to ascertain. Mendoza specifies once a year; Coninck, once in three or four years; Henriquez, once in five; Filiutius is doubtful as to the propriety of our loving God even once in five years. Some assign it to the period of baptism. Others confine it to certain festivals. Snarez and Vasquez agree that it is sufficient to love God when at the point of death.

Father Svimond, a high authority, after enumerating in his "Defence of Virtue" the opinions of a variety of doctors as to when God should be loved, winds up with a very broad insinuation that at no time is it really necessary.

Such being the sentiments in vogue amongst the Jesuits respecting this cardinal principle, it cannot be expected that when we come into details—when we advance to a consideration of that section of the decalogue which it specially embraces—we should find them more scrupulous or sound. If God be not loved, as a matter of course, His person will not be regarded, nor His name honoured, nor His day kept.

Compare the four Commandments which are engraven on the first Table of the Law with the recognized exponents of Jesuitism. You will find every one of them systematically contravened. In the first two God is held forth as the sole and supreme object of adoration, while everything wearing the semblance of idolatry is pointedly denounced.

Jesuits join in with ordinary Roman Catholics in bowing to images and praying to saints, and whatever hair-splitting distinctions may be drawn by cunning casuists as to kinds of worship, there can be no question that even in its least exceptionable form, it is at utter variance with the mind of Him who hath said, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." In nothing is this idolatry of the Jesuits more observable than in the adoration paid to the cross and to the Virgin. Here, again, there is no difference betwixt them and Romanists in general. They adore not the Crucified One, but the piece of wood to which they falsely assert He was bound. This sacred relic is exhibited in Rome every Good Friday, and not the illiterate and obscure, but her highest dignitaries unite in bowing prostrate before it.

GOVERNMENT CHAPLAINS.

MR. EDITOR, The notice in your issue of March 20, anent appointment of the Rev. A. T. Love to the chaplaincy of the Marine Hospital, Quebec, and the extensive correspondence between the English Church bishop, his archdeacon and Hon. C. H. Tupper, raises a very important question demanding consideration by the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches of the Dominion. Is there any imaginable reason why Episcopalians should be allowed to claim all such appointments as a matter of right? They do so, however, and we sit quietly by until a state of matters is established which the Irish Presbyterians find to be intolerable and grossly unjust, and which they are now fighting against. And it is a state of affairs now almost impossible to remedy, simply because of their own neglect. There is no state Church in Canada, and the government should not be allowed to act as if there were. When a Presbyterian was appointed some years ago to a chaplaincy in one of our penitentiaries a performance similar to the one referred to took place. Bishops, archdeacons and curates bothered and badgered the government to upset the appointment, and their annoyance and indignation that a *dissenter* could by any possibility receive such an appointment was something wonderful! Their opposition was a very silly proceeding but they had to toe the mark. A deliverance by the Assembly on the whole subject would not be amiss.

March, 20, 1889.

EQUALITY

A CORRECTION.

MR. EDITOR, -Permit me to correct a wrong impression which I fear I may have inadvertently given in an article on "The First Anti-Poverty Society" by saying that Henry George "is not an orthodox believer." I did not intend to make such an unqualified statement. What I should have said was, that Mr. George might not be an orthodox believer according to Presbyterian standards; i.e., that his religious views might not square with the Westminster Confession, and he might not be allowed to communicate in a certain western congregation. But besides being in a true sense a Christian worker, he is, I understand, an active member of the Episcopal Church, at whose Conferences he has occasionally been asked to read papers. I take the earliest opportunity of retrieving an unintentional injustice.

FIDELIS.

OLD ST. ANDREWS, FIFE.

I am glad to know that it is becoming fashionable for well-to-do Americans and Canadians to take a week on the Atlantic and spend their holidays in old historic St. Andrews. I could fancy no more delicious earthly place of rest for the weary than in this sea-washed, venerable old town, with its wide still streets, its skeleton ruins and ancient gateways. It is a city of the past; originally of the Celts, who, flourishing in the ninth century, were superseded by Anglican Monks from Northumberland, these giving to the Monastery they then founded the name of their patron, Saint Andrew. A city of intense historic interest, being one of the great arenas where truth and freedom wrestled with and overthrew a powerful ecclesiastical tyranny, bearing yet on its grim front the marks of the shock of battle.

From the early days of old, St. Andrew's University has been famous the world over. It is the oldest in Scotland, being founded in 1411. It has 100,000 printed volumes, besides 160 manuscripts, and its museum is a treasure house of antiquities and natural curiosities. In these, its corridors, with all the buoyancy of youth, have walked the feet of men whose after tread shook the world they lived in. St. Salvador's College, and St. Leonard