

istry have plenty of time and abundance of opportunity to search deeply and examine closely the doctrines which they are expected to teach. If one man, after diligent inquiry, cannot conscientiously teach the peculiar doctrines of some particular denomination, he can very easily find another broad enough and liberal enough to receive with open arms men who hold the most inconsistent theories; but, if another man after such inquiry is prepared to accept and teach the doctrines demanded who can say that he is not candid? Professor Potter is right when he indignantly repudiates the charge of want of candour, and refers to the noble army of men who have been ready in all ages of the world to suffer the most cruel persecutions and even death itself rather than compromise the principles of their religion. At the present day the ranks of the ministry are full of men who have given up everything that the world regards as valuable in order to teach what they believe to be the mind and will of their Master. What better evidence can they give of their sincerity?

Further, Protestant ministers have not only been free inquirers themselves, but they have always encouraged their hearers to search the Scriptures. Not unfrequently we find them commending the Bereans as being more noble than the Thessalonians, because they received Word with all readiness of mind *and searched the Scriptures daily* to find out for themselves the truth of the things spoken.

It is true that when a man adopts theories at variance with the standards of the church to which he belongs, he is asked to resign the office of minister of that church. There is, however, no coercion here. The church does not force him to hold certain dogmas. It merely demands of him, so long as he wishes to bear

its name, a loyalty to its doctrines. Surely nothing can be more reasonable than this.

Speaking of the strong temptations to intellectual dishonesty in the clerical profession, President Eliot adds, with *Bystander's* approbation: "This turns away from the gate of the profession the choicest minds, whose place is ill-supplied by boys subsidized at school and college out of the funds of sectarian societies on condition that they shall enter the ministry."

In reply to this deliberate insult, we would respectfully refer *Bystander* and President Eliot to the class lists of our Provincial University, which may be taken as a fair standard, where they will find that divinity students have, to say the very least, held their own in the intellectual strife with the students of all other professions.

*Bystander's* utterances on the Sabbath Question are, on the whole, rather more reasonable; yet he allows himself to fall into the mistake, into which many good men have fallen, of regarding the Sabbath as belonging exclusively to the Mosaic ritual, and consequently terminating when that system came to an end. *Bystander* can thus find no scriptural warrant for its observance. He would not, however, abolish it; on the contrary he regards its continuance a matter of expediency and intimately connected with the welfare of man. With his utilitarian argument we are thoroughly in sympathy, but we would not stop there. We firmly maintain that the Sabbath did not belong exclusively to the Mosaic ceremony; that it had its origin long before the time of Moses, that it was instituted in Eden, and that there is evidence that it was observed during the long period between Adam and Moses. The circumstances under which it was instituted furnish very good evi-