

## The Presbyterian Review.

Issued EVERY THURSDAY, from the office of the Publishers, Rooms No. 20, 21, 23, 25 Aberdeen Block, South-East corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets, Toronto.

TERMS, \$1.50 per annum.

All communications for either Business or Editorial Departments should be addressed PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Drawer 2464, Toronto, Ont.

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, \$3.00. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None others than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

Toronto, Aug. 13, 1896.

### The Demand for Sunday Cars.

THE advocates for Sunday cars have shown their hand in Toronto. After impersonal preliminaries in the press they have ventured to the open and last week a deputation described as "influential" waited on his worship the mayor on behalf of their contention. Note those who were present. A Church of England clergyman heads the list. He is unknown to the general public, and as his address is given as Swansea, it may be that his "influence" will not count for much with the working men of Toronto. Then comes E. B. Osler, M.P., a most influential member of several corporations, such for instance, as the Toronto Ferry Co., who run boats on Sunday; the C.P.R. Co., who run trains on Sunday, the North West Land Co., investors in whose property, it is believed, have been for long in need of that Sabbath rest and consolation denied them by an unfeeling, unsympathetic world; W. R. Brock, wealthy merchant and corporation-monger, interested in electric motor power; Hugh Ryan, big contractor; E. C. Gurney a Methodist of influence in church circles. Flanked thus, by clerical and lay influence the huge capitalists might have considered their influence complete, but no. It would never do to appear as the friend of the working man for whose welfare they were mainly acting, without some representative of that much wronged class; so one is found, in the person of Robert Glockling, who, however, seems so ill at ease amid such glittering signs of wealth that he metaphorically speaking sidles up to Rev. Mr. Softley, and keeps the church between him, the poor down trodden labor man, and the gorgeous capitalists. After all the church may have its uses! It was not a very dignified position to assume. Seeing that the deputation was doing it all for the working man. Mr. Glockling should have been the leader. He is known to his worship, and he might have introduced his gentlemanly comrades and done the talking for them. It must have been quite a sacrifice of convenience and possibly of dignity to them to espouse the platform of the working-man, especially in a cause where the advantage is so obviously not theirs, and to have allowed them to introduce themselves and their business and to argue it on a hot summer, in the stuffy atmosphere of the old city hall, well—it showed that one working man at least can be very ungrateful, that's all. An explanation would be in order, as the representative of the working man does not usually lack in courtesy. As a rule he is polite and considerate, not given to swagger, high airs or gruff hauteur. Of course it is barely possible that Mr. Glockling did not represent organized labor, and yet, if not, why in such august company. An ordinary mortal, say an every day artisan does not often hob-nob with the elite of the financial world, bankers, brokers, capitalists, and clerks in orders with an imaginary Archbishopric at the end of their string! No, the chasm between capital and labor has

not been bridged thus far in the civilized countries of the world. So, an explanation is decidedly in order. Can it be possible that the great capitalists brought the labor man along with them without the authority of any representative organization of workingmen, for the purpose of making it appear that the workingmen were officially represented? Perish the thought! for "Brutus is an honorable man." The point is a moot one and it would be wearisome to pursue it further.

What did the deputation say? Much, verily, if assurance and arrogance be taken into account. According to one speaker, Mr. Bertram, a Unitarian, by the way, "the citizens were wondering why the question of Sunday cars had not been submitted to the people." Had he been asked for proof of this general statement he could have replied that "*Pro Bono Publico*," "*Vox Populi*," "Ratepayer," "Citizen" and "Old Subscriber" had made his demand for Sunday cars in the columns of two city papers. Mr. Bertram's best and freshest powers of oratory were expended in previous Sunday car agitations; he is no new recruit, his advocacy is an old, worn out tale and will not turn a vote. Mr. Brock, another speaker, must have been sadly out of his element, in doling out praise for public-spirited progressiveness to the Mayor whom he opposed on the hustings as an incapable, and narrow-minded economist. The burden of his cry, after the "taffy" was "blue laws" "the poorer classes," the spiritual influence which seemed to oppress "the people," and the "city's interests." Mr. Brock is an old-timer in the cause and brings no additional strength. Mr. Gurney's speech bristled with interest. He approached the subject with the authority of an expert, having "studied the working of Sunday cars in other cities," he could not have studied them in Toronto. "He had come to the conclusion that the Toronto Sabbath was no better than the Boston or the New York Sabbath." That is to say, he believes that orderly conduct, church-going and Sunday quiet, are no better things than Sunday theatres, horse races, games, matches, beer gardens, and pandemonium generally. Who will say that the Methodist umbrella is not an expansive one and generous withal! He proceeded "while he had the alternative presented to him of spending his summer on the ocean or at Muskoka, his employe had to choose only between the Gardens and Queen's Park, and it was not a fair mode of treatment." This fine sentiment, it is not surprising to learn, elicited applause, presumably from Messrs Brock, Bertram, Osler, H.P. Dwight, B.E. Walker, and Rev. H. Softley. It was so generous, as to be quite overpowering and doubtless it was unexpected too. It is to be hoped Mr. Gurney will apply the principle he here so touchingly gave expression to, in every way open to him for the benefit of the workmen of the city and that he will begin to exercise his talent in that direction at a certain well known factory on King Street West Toronto. Mr. Gurney is no new capture to the ranks of Sunday car men and his "influence" on the question is "nil." Mr. Walker was in at least one point Scriptural. He believes in the doctrine of self-denial, self-sacrifice even—strictly Biblical. This is the great truth of the Gospel indeed. Therefore, he had no doubt that "hundreds of people would be prepared to sink their individual wishes in deference to the opinion of those who favored the innovation." After this astounding rule of conduct and thought what may we not expect. Surely the accommodating Mr. Walker, banker and philosopher as he is, will be ready to sink his desire for Sunday cars when it shall be represented to him that a large number of people are opposed to them. 'Tis a poor instrument that cuts not both ways. We would recommend to Mr. Walker to obtain without delay a few convictions and a mind of his own.