

The Canada Presbyterian

Published every Wednesday by

The Presbyterian Printing & Publishing Co.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Manager.

5 Jordan St., - - - Toronto, Ont.

Terms: Two Dollars Per Annum, Payable in Advance.

REMITTANCES should be made direct to us by Postoffice, or Express Money Order, or in a Registered letter. If none of these precautions be observed, the money is at the risk of the sender. Local Cheques should not be sent unless at par in Toronto. Write names very plainly. Give the Postoffice address with every order.

RECEIPTS. We do not send receipts for subscriptions unless the request is accompanied with stamp. The change of date on your label will indicate within two weeks that the remittance was received.

CHANGES OF ADDRESS. When a change of address is ordered, both the new and the old address must be given, and notice sent one week before the change is desired.

ORDERS TO DISCONTINUE should always be sent direct to us by letter or postal card. Do not return a paper with something written on the margin. To do so is contrary to law, and unintelligible to the publishers. Accompany the order with payment of arrearages.

ADVERTISING RATES. Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None other than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

Communications should be addressed

The Presbyterian Printing & Publishing Co.,
5 JORDAN STREET, TORONTO.

TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19th, 1896.

IT is often said: "What is in a name?" But really there is often a great deal in a name. The removal of the Theological College of the English Presbyterian Church from London to Cambridge brought up the question of a name for it. Among those proposed were: "St. Columbas," "St. Paul's," "Knox College," and "Westminster." Nearly an hour was spent in discussing this subject by the committee to which the matter was referred. "Westminster" at last carried by a clear majority over all other names proposed, and so the college will be called. We think this was a wise decision, and the name Westminster is decidedly happy, suitable and suggestive.

THE *Manitoba College Journal*, just to hand, speaks warmly of the session of 1896. "The lectures," it says, "are so good that not nearly all the benefit can be derived from them in the few months of cram now, but they will be fruitful for many days." It would not do to have all our theological sessions in the summer, but by *Manitoba College* having its in this season, and by the quality of the service, which, through the wise forethought of the Principal and Faculty it is able to command, the work which this college does for its students is not one whit behind that of the very best of our theological colleges, and perhaps, in their stimulating effect upon the minds of the students, they are superior to most.

THE *United Presbyterian Magazine*, the organ of the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland, passed last month into new editorial hands. Under Professor Calderwood's able management the *Magazine* rose into new denominational importance, and to him Dr. Corbett proved a worthy successor. He lately resigned, and the Rev. Professor Orr, D.D., has been installed in the editorial chair. With his ability and the influence and assistance he is easily able to command, not to speak of an enlarged committee of management and other propitious conditions, the *Magazine*, already able and influential, will not only not fail in any respect, but, it may be fully expected, will enter upon a new career of ever-increasing prosperity and usefulness. This is, at least, our earnest wish and hope for it.

THE question of denominational religious teaching in the common schools has lately been up in South Australia. A correspondent of the *Religious Intelligencer* from the Antipodes says that "The Anglican and Roman Catholic churches failing to capture the schools or to get a majority in either House, persuaded the House of Assembly to order a referendum at the ensuing election. The result has been a rude awakening for them. The assertion had been loudly and persistently made that the parents desired the State teaching of

religion in the schools. The parents have now given their answer in a striking defeat of the sectarian party. In justice to the Anglican laity it must be said that very many refused to vote at the bidding of the priests, and so break up our excellent school system."

THE July-August *Manitoba College Journal* speaks in the warmest terms of the services rendered by Professor Beattie during the summer session now in progress. Referring to the able men from both sides of the Atlantic, whose services the College has enjoyed in the past, it says, "but none has helped us more in the class-room and out of it than Dr. Beattie." It is wholly unnecessary to speak of Dr. Beattie's ability as a scholar and teacher. The journal refers to his services in another aspect by no means unimportant. It says:

"As a fellow-resident we have found Dr. Beattie very genial, coming to our table, joining with us in an occasional 11 p.m. repast in one of the student's rooms, conversing with us in the halls and worshipping with us at our college altar. It does students a world of good to have such a man among them for a few months and we hail with delight the prospect of having Dr. Beattie with us again next session."

UNDER the Act of 1894, the vote could have been taken on the Sunday street car question at any time since the 1st January, 1896, and one would have supposed that if there had been an earnest desire on the part of the people as a whole for the establishment of a Sunday car service such would have been manifested in no unmistakable way long before this present month. If it is true, as alleged, that an enormous majority of thronging thousands have been itching with a mighty and overwhelming desire to declare their manhood and their emancipation from the thralldom of the fanatical few and mark their ballots for Sunday cars, why this reticence from January to July? Why did not the agitation start last fall and why did it not culminate in an overwhelming expression of public opinion last January in favor of the innovation? If, in fact, it be true that the "people" want it, we know not why—we make a distinct pause for a reply. And now in the heat of the summer we are expected to prepare for the contest and the Mayor is asked to summon a special meeting of the Council and everybody is expected to drop in a hurry their present business and occupation and suit themselves just to the requirements of those who want Sunday cars, and who moreover have been defeated twice already on that very issue. Is there anything else the people of Toronto can do for these gentlemen? Is it necessary in order to attain success that this issue must be forced upon the city with such a head-long rapidity of movement, with such Napoleonic celerity? We humbly suggest that much remains yet to be done to convince the people of Toronto that they must reverse their former vote, and that they will not be driven in this hasty way to come to any deliberative and valuable conclusion on such an important matter, the Car Company and the Ferry Company to the contrary notwithstanding.

IT seems that, according to the advocates of Sunday cars, the American travelling public have stated their desire to be accommodated on the Lord's Day by a five cent ride through the City of Toronto, and that we are therefore to reverse our long-time practice, violate our consciences, break down our quiet and restful Sabbath that is the admiration of the world, and set our street car system in operation, and all this for what? To meet the alleged wishes of a few Pullman car passengers from Boston, New York or Chicago. Of all the reasons we have ever heard for a street car Sunday this possesses the undoubted merits of the sublimest impudence and the most arctic coolness—and anything cool is good in a hot summer. Verily it out-Herod's Herod; flagellates the record and eclipses all that has ever yet been attempted in prose or rhyme. Well, let us hasten and give those travellers the street cars on Sabbath, for of course they bring so much wealth into our city and we prosper or fail just as they say we must. What then? Will they not want for precisely similar reasons the Sunday newspaper? and why not give them, too, the Sunday saloons? And why not be astute and prudent in order to make a Sabbath sojourn here pleasant for them and throw in the Sabbath base ball?

and then weld it all into one consistent and harmonious whole by a Sunday theatre with the skirt dancer, etc. Just let us ask the Saturday night Wagner car arrivals from the neighboring republic what kind of Sabbath they would like and let us poor Toronto people serve it up to them in genuine "New York style" (as they say in the restaurants), and beseech them to kindly accept it as the best we can do for them at present and that we hope to do better for them in the future. They will then mayhap stay over in our city from Saturday night to the Monday morning and spend some silver dollars at the best hotels, and thus our city will prosper hugely and we will all be so happy and so friendly, and all ablaze with the glow of international courtesy. But really such reasons are too loathsome and contemptible for further contemplation and we must from considerations of self-respect stop.

ON THE OTHER HAND.

THERE is a very important proviso to be made in connection with the question of "equal rights," which we could not consider even in a sentence or two at the end of a previous article, and yet which must never be lost sight of. We refer to that which is only the other side of all we then said, but which many seem to regard as if it were altogether different. We protested, and we think with reason, against the idea of any one suffering the smallest civil or social disability on account of his religion. We must equally protest against any one receiving from the State any, even the smallest, favor for the same reason. Under a somewhat different form these propositions are simply identical. And yet every day they are treated as if they had little or nothing in common. To ostracise Wilfrid Laurier because he is a Roman Catholic, to prevent him on that account from ever reaching the position he now occupies, is of course very, very wrong. But what about trying to make him or some one else the foremost man in Canada for the same reason? Is it any more becoming? Any more honest? Any more commendable? Not one whit. And yet how many are speaking, and feeling, and voting as if it were. They would not like to do any one wrong. They have an infinite horror, so they say, of anything like persecution. But oh, they do like to do a co-religionist a favor without allowing the thought of any other kind of fitness to intrude. And so in practice all over this fair land this pleasant kind of quasi-benevolent persecution is not only found to exist, but is praised and defended as if it were the embodiment of Christ's own law, the express result of Christ's own love. What men do as private individuals in this respect, it may be, can't be helped, however fairly it may be all the same condemned. If a man, as a private individual, chooses to employ only the incompetent, because they are of his religion, that is his concern. His conduct may perhaps be excused, if not defended, on the old plea of doing as he likes with his own, yet even then persecution and boycott are of the very essence of his proceeding. But when common funds are to be administered and the work of the community is to be done, then any consideration of the religion of those to be employed, apart from their general fitness, is a crime against man and a dishonor done to God. And yet we repeat, every day this very evident principle of ordinary honesty and practical wisdom is being systematically set at naught. How many officials in the Dominion, Provincial, and Municipal services are to-day where they are for no better reason than the colour of their faith, too often for some other more indefensible reason? "None," does some one say? "Not many?" Oh come, now, such denials are too ridiculous. The knowing ones would find a difficulty in meeting them with a serious face. Why, what means the cry about the composition of Cabinets to be heard at present—to be heard, in this country at any rate—almost always when such articles are being manufactured? Does it not all spring from the very negation of what Wilfrid Laurier has made his corner-stone? Has he not said "I shall not speak or act on the plane of Catholicism or of Protestantism, but on the eternal principles of truth and righteousness, and even-handed justice," and yet even before he has gathered his colleagues around him, the cry arises "in divers tones": "This is not right and that is not fair from a religious point of view." One says, "Too much Protestantism." Another as vehemently protests