

us to shift the argument to grounds which are, if we may say so without suspicion of punning, very uncertain. The question at issue is henceforth the vexed one of the meaning of certainty. Professor Huxley's position clearly is that certainty is given to us by the logical faculty and by that only. But it cannot have escaped his penetration that every deduction of the logical faculty is itself the product of at least two factors, each of which is given us by intuition, or if he would object to that word, by a natural process, and so incapable of logical demonstration. There must be first the fact or facts furnished by observation or experience. Professor Huxley is too keen a metaphysician not to perceive that the simplest fact given to us by any of our senses, *e.g.*, the sense of sight, is really the result of a process of inference, and that in every attempt to logically justify its certainty we are at once thrown back upon our innate or constitutional faith in the reliability of the physical and mental processes which make up the act of perception. Then, again, every logical inference from accepted data involves our intuitive faith in those convictions which are formulated as axioms, and the certainty of which cannot be justified by any logical process, though it is impossible to doubt it. Thus it appears that in resolving the whole controversy into one touching the nature of certainty, in other words, of knowledge, Professor Huxley is really transferring it to the battle ground of the old metaphysics, where the ghosts of the slain are perpetually reappearing in endless procession to renew the contest with their equally unsubstantial and indestructible antagonists.

THE spectacle of Mr. Gladstone followed by Mr. Parnell and the bulk of the Irish Nationalists, going into the lobby to vote with the Government, and against the leading Radicals, was an unwonted one in the British Commons. The question directly in issue so exclusively concerns the British people themselves that we may be excused from venturing an opinion upon its merits. In fact it is not very easy to say what were, in the last analysis, its exact merits. The point was not whether a sum of money should in this particular instance be voted from the public funds as a provision for one of the Queen's grandchildren, for if that proposal was not distinctly negatived it was at least significantly evaded in the shape in which the resolution was reported by the Committee and acted on by the House, that of an increase of the annual allowance to the Prince of Wales, the better to enable him to make provision for his own children. The terms of Mr. Morley's motion and speech would seem to have made the question one involving the general principle of the obligation of Parliament, that is of the people, to make provision for members of the Royal Family other than the children of the reigning Monarch, and such grandchildren as might be in the direct line of succession. But in regard to this there seems to have been scarcely a difference of opinion; or if there was the decision of Parliament was not directly challenged in regard to it. Perhaps we should be nearer the truth if we should say that the question voted upon was whether the Queen's promise that no further grants should be asked for the grandchildren of Royalty during the present reign should be accepted as sufficient for present purposes; or a distinct refusal by the House in advance to consider any such application should be recorded. The fact that, as Mr. Chamberlain pointed out, a general declaration against such future grants would be worthless, combined with the consideration that the passage of such a resolution, would have been an act of very scant courtesy to both the Queen and the Prince of Wales, would no doubt have sufficed to secure a large majority for the Government. But Mr. Gladstone evidently voted on what to all believers in hereditary monarchy will seem much higher and more loyal grounds, while there is every reason to believe that the bulk of the Parnellites who voted with him, did so as a personal compliment to him, not that they cared for Queen or Prince, or for the principle involved. Take it all in all the situation was a peculiar one, such as could not have been possible at any previous period in modern Parliamentary history.

IT is now morally certain that "Prof." Hogan, who ascended in Campbell's air-ship from Williamsburg two weeks since, met with a fatal disaster, and will not return to tell the tale of his aerial voyage. This result is to be deplored, not only for the sake of the fearless adventurer himself, but in the interests of the science of aeronautics, in which he was chosen to conduct a most important experiment. If the facts be as reported concerning the success which attended his voyage at the start and up to

the time of the accident, this experiment, notwithstanding its fatal issue, will stimulate rather than check the zeal of those who are trying to solve the problem of aerial navigation. It is said that after rising several hundred feet Hogan had no difficulty in lowering the ship to within one hundred feet of the ground. Everything seemed to be completely under his control, and he guided the ship in a northerly direction, turned it about and arrived at his starting point. Just at this moment, when success seemed already achieved, something went wrong with the machinery. The lower propeller of the ship, used in regulating the altitude, fell to the ground, the steering propeller became motionless, the ship shot up to a great height and drifted away. Nothing more is known, or is likely to be known. But so far as this attempt bears upon the solution of the problem of aerial navigation, it points in the direction of ultimate success rather than failure.

THE SUNDAY QUESTION.

THREE or four years ago, when the question of Sunday cars was agitated, we gave our opinion in favour of running a certain number, at certain times, on the Lord's Day. We pointed out at that time, that, in a great city like Toronto, it was very desirable, some might say even necessary, that the poorer classes who live in the very heart of the town should have the means of transport to the fresh air which is to be found in High Park and other similar resorts. It is a long way from Centre Street to the Humber, and the men, and women and children, who should accomplish a journey to and fro, would probably feel that the Day of Rest had been the hardest working day in the week.

We confess now, as we pointed out before, that this argument for the Sunday car seems to us a much stronger one than the plea on behalf of church-goers. There are now so many churches in Toronto of every colour and shade that a reasonable person can find no difficulty in attending one of his own communion without any grievous effort. If he is so hard to please that he must go miles before he can find a church to suit him, then let him pay for his pleasure without expecting much compassion from his neighbours. But the case of the poor man is quite different. He cannot get open spaces, and trees and grassy slopes at his own door, and he may fairly complain that he is refused access to them.

The arguments employed by the opponents of Sunday cars are of various kinds, some of a merely Judaic character, some vaguely biblical, but the greatest number frankly utilitarian. The only logical Sabbatarians are the Seventh Day Baptists, whose contention up to a certain point is perfectly sound. If the fourth commandment is literally binding upon Christians, then the day which we call Saturday should be kept as a day of rest. On Saturday no avoidable work should be done. The son and the daughter, the man-servant and the maid-servant, the cattle, the stranger within the gates, all these should rest and do no manner of work. The cooking of food, for example, on the Lord's Day is not necessary, and, on this theory, ought not to be done. Horses should certainly not be made to draw carriages; they should rest from their labours on this day, the commandment being precise.

Moreover, we must emphasize the keeping of the Saturday and not the Sunday. If the commandment is literally obligatory, then it requires rest on that day. There is not a grain of authority for the statement that Christ or the apostles changed the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first. The first day was kept in commemoration of the resurrection, without the slightest reference to the Sabbath. It was only by slow degrees that the Jewish Sabbath disappeared; and then the principle of resting on one day out of seven was recognized by the Christian Church, which gradually introduced regulations, differing in different places, in order to secure the observance of the Lord's Day. We do not propose to do more here than state the simple facts. Those who care to investigate the whole history of the subjects will find all that they need in Hesse's Bampton Lectures on the Sunday.

The ground, then, of Lord's Day observance is simply the ground of Christian expediency. There are persons to whom such a ground will seem altogether inadequate and unworthy. Expediency! they will say, this is something poor and mean and despicable. Let us move on the higher plane of principle.

Such people are a little trying, or even hopeless. They have a knack of converting their own private preferences into universal principles, and of opposing these preferences or prejudices to the well-considered conclusions of more

thoughtful men. It is of no use telling these people that three-fourths of the duties of human life are simply dictated by considerations of expediency; that even the deepest and most self-evident principles cannot be applied in practice without reference to utilitarian considerations; in short, that next to the plain dictates of conscience which say: Do this, and, Do not do that, there is nothing of higher obligation than the prescriptions of a reasonable Christian expediency.

The Sabbath was made for man; and so is the Lord's Day. Even if we were under the law, our Lord has taught us that its commands must be understood spiritually. It is lawful to draw an ox or an ass out of a pit on the Sabbath. It is "lawful to do well on the Sabbath day." Certainly then it is lawful for us who are not under the Law, but under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of love, to consider how we may so use the Day of Rest as to contribute to the highest good of the community.

After the Sabbatarian Argument, the value of which we have sufficiently discredited, the principal reason urged against the use of cars on Sunday is the fact that it imposes unnecessary and hurtful labour upon the drivers and conductors of the cars; and also upon the horses. With regard to the horses, the objection is utterly absurd. There can be no difficulty whatever in providing such an addition to the number of the horses as shall lay upon these animals no more burden than they already bear. May not the Car Company be trusted to see to this? Are they likely to be guilty of such inhumanity to their beasts of burden as will destroy or injure their own property? With regard to the men employed in the car service, there need be no greater difficulty. No man, we imagine, would be expected to work for seven days; and it would be quite easy to make such arrangements as would impose only two or three hours' labour on the men employed in the car service. The moment we come to work out the scheme, we find no real difficulty in any part of it. It becomes quite possible to accommodate the public without inflicting any injury or inconvenience upon the men employed in the car service.

But, it is said, this is letting in the thin end of the wedge. What is the meaning of such an objection? Does it mean that, because we are doing something which is lawful and right, we may be asked, by-and-by, to do something which is unlawful and wrong, and shall be unable to refuse it? If it does not mean this, we do not quite understand the meaning of the objection. But, surely, this is a very unworthy argument. It is to tell us that we are not governed by principle but by selfish considerations, that we shall yield to importunity that which we would not concede as the fulfilment of a duty. Such an argument is not complimentary to our strength of character, or to our public spirit.

If less than this is meant, then the thin end of the wedge is in already. We have our horses and our carriages in the streets already on the Lord's Day. Men and cattle do actually labour on the Day of Rest, that other men may drive to church on Sunday instead of walking. If this is wrong, then let it be stopped. If this is not wrong, then neither is the proposed running of cars on the Lord's Day wrong.

We have taken some pains to go into this subject, more than we may put on record our own deliberate judgment than with any great hope of convincing Sabbatarians of the absurdity of their position. We are not advocating Sunday labour. We are as anxious as any one can be that the greatest amount of rest may be secured to all persons on the Lord's Day. But we maintain that it is lawful to impose a certain amount of labour upon the minority for the benefit of the majority. Unless this principle is admitted, it is difficult to understand how good people can go to church on Sunday and make their clergy go through such an amount of labour on their account. As regards the Sunday car service, it is a little absurd to imagine that every other city of the same size in Europe and America is quite wrong and that we alone are right!

We are greatly afraid that the utterances of our Sabbatarians are proving a stumbling block to some who are not so well affected to Christianity as its adherents would desire. It is a bad thing to lay ourselves open to the charge of fanaticism; but it is even worse to be suspected of insincerity and inconsistency. One of the most flagrant instances of this—shall we say humbug?—is the tolerating of the hideous noises of the Salvation Army in our parks, and the prohibition of the playing of military bands. On what principle do we approve or condemn the use of music? Either on the ground of the actual emotions which it excites, or on account of the associations to which it gives rise. Tried by either principle, good music, whether secular or sacred, would be more edifying in every way than the howls of men like dancing dervishes aided by the noisy rumbling of a big drum.