

affairs. A certain section of the community object to have men of honour and religious character in the City Council. Such men as these they spurn as "Holy Willies."

Is it not time for those who regard the public good to bestir themselves? When language as is here referred to is found in the mouths of aldermen and business men the case requires serious thought.

On what grounds are ministers to be debarred, in this free country, from expressing an opinion, and offering counsel on a question relating to Sabbath observance, or on any question in which they may feel disposed to take an interest. Surely a man does not divest himself of his citizenship when he enters the ministry. If the Church, with the ministers at her head, did not defend the sanctity of the Sabbath, would she not be most inexcusably derelict? Surely the ministers cannot be accused of being tyrannical for doing that which did they not perform they would be clearly remiss in their duty. There is no such a thing as tyranny in the Protestant church of to-day, as between pastor and people. The people, not the pastor, govern, and all are free within the compass of their voluntary agreements. But the people would not hold the ministers free from blame, if they failed to fight for truth and righteousness in public as well as in personal life.

The cry of "priest" is raised to prejudice the minds of people who are, as a rule, guiltless of church-going and whose conception of ministerial duties and responsibilities is altogether wrong. The ministers will not be frustrated by these misrepresentations. Their duty is to strengthen and encourage their people by precept and example, and to acquit themselves fully to their consciences. So far they have rendered admirable service which the community as a whole fully appreciates.

But what about our Christian citizens? Are they to be dubbed "Holy Willies" because they would see the principles they profess carried out in daily practice? A change must certainly have come over the sentiment of Toronto, if men are to be avoided, and driven to private life, because they profess to be Christians. That is practically what the "Holy Willie" taunt means. The objectors do not want men whose religious views lead them to oppose Sunday cars, to become aldermen. There should be no religious test applied to candidates for civic honours; but, most assuredly, a man's moral and Christian character ought to be taken into account when citizens exercise the municipal franchise. The position calls for men above reproach, for men of integrity and undisputed probity, as well as for men of business ability. Are not such men to be found within the folds of the Church? If they are to be ostracised because of their religion, it is well the fact should be known and understood. We are apt to make light of such cries, but those who study the course of things at the seat of our city rule see the object to be gained by the absence of sternly true men. There is need for action, not only to defeat the Sabbath car by-law, but also the wider schemes of base men who drag their office in the dust and disgrace the name of aldermen; and this latter can only be done in January, when every voter ought to ponder well over the events which are taking place now.

The City Council having refused to postpone the vote, it will likely be taken on August the 26th. If the by-law is to be defeated it will be by a supreme effort and much self-sacrifice on the part of many of the people. But it is worth making the struggle, and the sacrifice ought to be cheerfully offered. A sweeping victory will mean a quiet Sabbath devoted as now to the sacred duties of public wor-

ship; a defeat by however small a majority will mean the deprivation of Sabbath privileges from thousands of people, and the introduction in Toronto of a most potent agent for the ultimate secularization of the Sabbath day.

*Sabbath at the World's Fair.* By the sweeping majority of fifty-four to six the National Commission condemned the opening on the Sabbath Day of the World's Fair, in the following terms: Resolved, by the World's Columbian Commission, that the rulings now being enforced by the World's Columbian Exposition for the purpose of opening the gates of the Exposition on Sunday has not been approved by this Commission and is in violation of the rule jointly adopted and promulgated by said Exposition and said Commission, and is being enforced without the assent or authority of the World's Columbian Commission.

*A Word of Explanation.* In the last issue of our contemporary, the Canada Presbyterian, there appeared an extract from one of the Toronto papers which in some respects is misleading, and might be misconstrued by persons unacquainted with the establishment and maintenance of a journal such as THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. In the first place, THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW was one branch of the business concern known as the Presbyterian News Co. (L<sup>td</sup>), the other branch being an extensive book-room. The amount of loss, as mentioned in the article referred to, was that lost by the Company upon its entire business, and not upon THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW alone, which was responsible for considerably less than one half the amount mentioned, an amount not greater than what might reasonably be expected in the establishment of a journal of the influence and wide circulation of THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW. Again, referring to the retirement of the late editor, Mr George H. Robinson, an injustice is done. As before stated in the columns of this journal, it was a purely voluntary act on his part to have retired. Mr. Robinson had the option of continuing in the editor's chair, but he considered the change of ownership an appropriate time for retiring from a post, the duties of which he discharged with incessant diligence for eight years without a week's rest. We make this explanation purely for the benefit of our friends and subscribers, who, perhaps, may have read the extract which was quoted as above mentioned.

*Discussion of Public Matters.* In the Sunday street-car agitation, there is abundant evidence that our methods of discussing public questions are not always fair and straightforward. Unfair and *ex parte* representations must in the end injure the cause in whose interest they are advanced. Specimens of extravagance in statement may be found among those who seek to preserve the quiet rest of the Lord's Day, but worse than extravagance has been resorted to by certain advocates of Sunday cars. Many of their arguments are shallow — too shallow to deceive the intelligent workmen of Toronto, still they are arguments, and ought to be weighed carefully and candidly. But the appeals to prejudice, the defaming of character, the aspersions cast on such men as Principal Caven, Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, Mr. W. H. Howland, and others — these are not arguments, they are the weapons in the hands of unscrupulous men in favour of a losing cause. Such methods of warfare are grossly unfair, and ought to be frowned on by all honest men. Let us hope soon to be able to see eye to eye on great moral questions. In the meantime let us give to others the credit of their convictions and be fair and just in our treatment of them.