

## Our Contributors.

### THE PEOPLE YOU MEET ON A SUMMER TOUR.

BY KNOXIAN.

Thirty years ago an average Ontario man met few people except his neighbours. No doubt, most of the neighbours were excellent people, but their number was limited, and meeting them exclusively, had a tendency to make ideas a little narrow, and life a trifle monotonous. Few of us are so well informed that we can always say something bright and fresh to the man we meet every day. Not one in a thousand is so handsome that he or she can make a powerful impression each time he or she meets a daily visitor. We once heard a prominent divine try to account for the fact that so many handsome babies grew into plain-looking men and women, but after wrestling with the problem for a while, he gave it up. Even the brightest and best informed people generally make less impression on the neighbours they meet every day, than on comparative strangers. Probably the Duke of Wellington did not seem to be a great general to the man who blackened his boots. Very likely Gladstone's private secretary is not nearly so much impressed by the G. O. M. as many people are who never saw or heard the greatest man this century has produced. Constant contact with the same people makes us familiar with their good or bad points and, at the same time, has a tendency to make our ideas small, and our characters narrow. Hence it is a good thing, a very good thing, to travel a little, and, if your time and means are limited, do your little in places in which you will come in contact with the greatest variety of the Adam family.

Principal Grant should stop delivering that lecture of his on Imperial Federation, and prepare one on "The Railway as an Educator." The Principal knows a great deal about education, and he has travelled a great deal, and these are the prime qualifications for a man who would get up a good lecture on the locomotive viewed as a teacher. We venture to say that the Principal could prove to a demonstration, that the locomotive has done almost as much to educate mankind, as the university has done. The greasy-looking fellow who stands on the iron horse, does not look much like a college professor, but he has done his full share in educating the youth of the world. One of the ways, in fact the principal way, in which he does his educational work, is by carrying people to see other people. Seeing other people takes them out of a rut, enlarges the ideas they have, and gives them new ones, and powerfully impresses on their minds the fact that there really are a few people in the world besides themselves; that there are a few churches in the world besides the one they belong to, and a few places besides the town or concession in which they live. These are all useful lessons, and though somewhat primary, they are lessons that a good many people have never learned.

Railways began in Ontario about thirty years ago. If we rightly remember, the Northern, from Toronto to Barrie, was the first railway in Ontario, and was opened in 1851. The Lachine was running before that time, but, as it was only nine miles long, its force as an educator was not much felt. The Great Western was put through in 1853, the Grand Trunk soon afterwards, and then people began to travel. Now let no sharp statistical man turn up the figures, and say our dates are all wrong. These lines are being written in the office of a summer hotel in the northern part of Ontario, and we have no way of verifying the dates. Let them go. The point we want to make is that it is a good thing to see an interesting variety of people, and that the railway and steamboat have enabled us to see them.

Look around from the office in which we write. Out there on the verandah sit two judges of the High Court of Ontario. In their tourist clothes they look quite human. It is something to know that a judge is human. A good many people seem to think they are not. It is also something to know that there is a great deal in surroundings and professional costume. Would any rational man say, that either of these judges could administer justice as impressively sitting on that wooden chair, dressed in the plainest of tourist garb, as he could in Osgoode Hall arrayed in his official costume. The thing is absurd. The people who stand up for a decent degree of form in law courts, in church courts, in church services everywhere, are distinctly right.

Over there, in the centre of the office, stands a well-known Q. C., from one of our Ontario cities. He is a stalwart Presbyterian, and an equally stalwart supporter of the Mowat Government. He puts on no airs. He didn't write Q. C. or M. P. P. after his name on the hotel register. He didn't need to. Most of the people know who he is. Both of the judges held a friendly little chat with him on his arrival. It is a comfortable thing to be so big that you don't need to push yourself.

Near by stands an American gentleman, who arrived last evening from Missouri. He is a fine-looking man, and may be a member of Congress, or a millionaire, or a general, or anything high up the ladder, so far as his appearance goes. He does not seem quite at home, and may leave before his vacation is over. Perhaps there is not tone enough around to suit his taste. Most of the guests are here for rest, and they don't get up or keep up any excitement.

We might, if space permitted, sketch a score of different people in this office, and all people one is the better for seeing. But what is one hotel compared with all the hotels or tourist routes in Canada. Going down the St. Lawrence one meets groups of people from all parts of the United States, on every boat, and they are instructive people to meet. In Muskoka, you may meet at any moment, any kind of a man, from any part of the world. All the way from Winnipeg to the coast, you meet tourists from the old country. The surest place in Canada to see a live Lord or Duke, is on the Rocky Mountains. Anywhere on the coast, you can see all the Chinese and Japanese you want to study.

Yes, it is a good thing to see various specimens of the human family, and those of us who have no time or money for much travel, ought to be thankful that there is one month in the year when we can see a good many specimens of humanity at a small cost. Many of us suffer from narrowness, smallness of mental build, and one cure for that awful malady is to see many people different from ourselves.

### ST. GEORGE OR ST. PETER FOR ENGLAND.

BY REV. GEO. SEXTON, LL.D.

It would be difficult to imagine anything to exceed the impudence of the scene which recently took place in England, in making Peter the patron saint of that country. Not that intelligent Christian people care a row of pins for the patronage of so-called saints, and one, therefore, is much the same as another, for any good that can come of their protection. But the Pope of Rome and his vassals seem to imagine that not only is England theirs to do as they please with, but that the inhabitants of heaven are subject to their control, and can be commanded to look after the wellbeing of any particular land, whether they will or no. On July 3rd last, Cardinal Vaughan, the successor to Dr. Manning, in the Oratory at Brompton, and by request of the Pope, went through the farce of dedicating England to St. Peter, in the

place of St. George, the hitherto patron saint of the country. A solemn religious service was held on the occasion, and a great spectacular display provided of so imposing a character that a picture of it has been given in one of the London illustrated papers. A prayer was drawn up for the occasion and actually printed beforehand—a prayer offered, however, not to God, but to the Apostle Peter. The Cardinal, placing himself in an attitude of devotion, said "Humbly kneeling before thee, we offer to thee this country in which we live." When a man offers to give away that which does not belong to him, the act is usually described by a very strong term. Only in this case no great harm can be done, for the transfer cannot be made. Surely no one—not even the most ignorant papist—can believe that England, in any sense of the word, belongs to Dr. Vaughan or to his master at Rome. This matter is also a little mixed, for in the Pope's letter to Cardinal Vaughan, he speaks of England as "Our Lady's Dowry." It would seem, therefore, that Peter is not after all to have exclusive possession of the country, but must share his newly acquired territory with the Virgin Mary. But what a farce the whole thing is, and it would be intensely amusing, but for the sad reflection that multitudes of people seriously regard it as an important religious ceremony.

It must be confessed that we know very little indeed of St. George, as to who he was, when he lived, or what he did to entitle him to occupy the exalted position to which he was elevated so long ago, and which he has held unchallenged till the present year. The accounts given of him by historians are very conflicting. According to some he was a heretic, and by no means saintly in character whilst on earth; and we know that Rome has canonized some queer people in its time, indeed, it is doing that same still. Others think he was well worthy of the position to which he was raised. And there are yet others—and these by no means unlearned—who relegate his saintship to the region of mythology, and maintain that he never had an actual flesh and blood existence. Protestants anyhow, care nothing for him. He may be in heaven, or—well the reverse. He certainly has no place on the earth today, and unless Mr. Stead, or some kindred genius can command his assistance, he is not likely to interfere either for good or evil with matters in England or anywhere else on earth. But for a good many centuries St. George and England have become so intimately associated that there is not much chance now of displacing this so-called saint for another, even though that other be known to have been an Apostle of Christ.

It would be interesting to inquire whether these two saints were consulted about this new arrangement, or whether it was made without their consent. If the latter, are they likely to acquiesce in it without protest? The Pope seems to think that not only is he the supreme director of all affairs on the earth, but that to him belongs the power to allot to the saints in heaven their respective duties. Surely the force of superstition can no further go. For it must be borne in mind that this is not a mere nominal matter, like the naming of a child, or applying a classical term to a city, in the way we speak of Edinburgh as the Modern Athens. It is a real belief that the deceased saint does look after the wellbeing of the country thus allotted to him, and that the land, which shall become his especial care, is decided by a poor, weak, sinful man. It is true that in the prayer offered, Peter is politely asked to take this duty upon himself, but no room is left for refusal. It is taken for granted that he will, or that he must, comply with the request. And then it does not appear that the other saint, who has reigned so long, was so much as even asked to abdicate. He was deposed, nolens volens, almost without any notice. And this arrogant and almost blasphemous presumption passes among

us under the sacred name of religion, and the hierarchy that teaches it calls itself the one true Church of Christ. O tempora! O mores! Should not a fact of this character open the eyes of all intelligent men to the monstrous character of the whole system of popery?

Besides, did not this same Church originally appoint St. George to the position which he has heretofore held, and did it not do that by virtue of its infallible authority? How, then, can an infallible decree be set aside or superseded? Or, perhaps, the motto, *semper eadem*, does not apply to the disposition of the functions of the saints in heaven. Has St. George in some way offended the Pope? Perhaps he has been lax in his duties in not restoring the papacy in England. But if so will St. Peter do any better? He is supposed to have especial charge of the Pope himself and his affairs. And yet he first allowed the Papal States to be taken from the Church, and then let the King of Italy seize the city of Rome itself, leaving Signor Pecci only the Vatican in which to play his puerile antics.

The Pope and all his vassals may be quite certain that no priestly jugglery will ever again be able to bind the fetters of popery upon the people of England. They are familiar with its history in the past, awake to its machinations in the present, and determined upon its destruction in the future.

### MORE LIGHT WANTED

BY A LAYMAN.

In last week's Presbyterian I notice a communication from "Presbyter," respecting the Confession of Faith and Inspiration. As the writer promises to continue the subject at a future time, I would like him to explain more fully and clearly what he considers the proper course to take in explaining the Scriptures. No doubt "Presbyter" has studied the subject thoroughly in one of our theological colleges, and is able to explain the difficulties which sometimes trouble the members of the Church who, like myself, have not had the privilege of studying systematic theology in a college. Now it is admitted by all that there are in the Bible some things hard to be understood, and that it is necessary sometimes to reconcile apparent contradictions. We all agree that the Bible is inspired and that it is the only Rule of Faith. But when we come to explain some passages in the Old Testament, to the children in Sabbath school, we have to give a reason for not taking them literally. For instance, when we are reading the Mosiac account of the Creation, I have told my class that the six days do not mean days of 24 hours, but long periods of time extending over thousands of years, as shown by the testimony of the rocks. So, also, in the passages which say that God tempted men, we have told them that God does not tempt men to commit sin, but permits the devil to do so. Now, when we make these explanations we have no intention to deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, but rather to maintain their claims to our confidence. Of course some explanation must be given, where there are apparent contradictions, otherwise, there is a danger of scepticism. I have taken the view that the sacred writings of the Old Testament were adapted to the time, state and capacity of the people; that the Jews, after escaping from years of slavery, were not very far advanced in civilization and scientific attainments, and therefore it was necessary to adapt the sacred writings to the state of knowledge in which the people were. Consequently, we have the statement that the heavens and earth were created in six days, instead of lengthy periods: for the Scriptures were not given for the purpose of teaching science, but to make people "wise unto salvation." So also, in speaking of the sun standing still: of course they did not then know that the earth is a sphere and revolves on its axis. Even in later times, when the Copernican system was propounded, we find great opposition offered to it by the clergy; for they could quote Scripture to