

# The Presbyterian Review.

Issued EVERY THURSDAY, from the office of the Publishers, Rooms No. 20, 21, 23, 25 Aberdeen Block, South-East corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets, Toronto.

TERMS, \$1.50 per annum.

All communications for either Business or Editorial Departments should be addressed PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Drawer 2464, Toronto, Ont.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 3 months, 15 cents per line per insertion; 3 months, \$1.00 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line; 1 year, \$3.00. No advertisement charged at less than five lines. None others than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

Toronto, Aug. 27, 1896.

## Sunday Cars.

Another stage has been reached in the Sunday street car agitation, Finding that the Aldermen did not keenly respond by holding a special meeting of the Council the pro-car men launched a petition signed by about 10,000 citizens at the Mayor's head last week. The deputation was again headed by Mr. Bertram, whose zeal is as truly remarkable as his parting threat to vote against the Mayor at the next election, unless that functionary proved docile, was in bad taste. Mayor Fleming has been accustomed to such threats and is not likely to be moved by them from the clear path of duty which is to guard the city's highest and best interests. That the Mayor can stand firm has been shown in the past, when he ignored the threats and persuasion of friends on the roadway question, and that he is not losing in grit was seen when he declined to be "drawn" by the alternate smiles and frowns of the deputation. Why all this hurry? Nothing will satisfy these agitators except lightning-speed haste. They say the vote must be taken in 1896 or lie over for three years longer. But we reply that more than one half of the year was allowed to pass away ere a formal demand was made for the Sunday car service. Was this lapse of time inadvertently allowed? By no means. It was by fell purpose. Not for the first time have these gentlemen seized upon the holiday season as the time for disturbing the community with their agitation, and the people are not so blinded as not to see through their shallow pretences.

The petitioners, we observe, did not bring with them the \$3,000 to \$4,000 which the vote will cost if taken before the municipal elections. That is a fact to be noted and it shows the soundness of Mr. Osler's position when he spoke before the Mayor recently. He stated frankly the whole thing was a question of making money and he was right. If the Street Railway were asked to pay the expenses of taking a vote in September or October, they would likely reply: "No; for that would eat up our profits from the Sunday service during the Fall, and therefore we would have no object in running our cars on Sunday." At all events, no money nor promise of it was forth coming, and we may conclude that it never will. Not only do the petitioners crave for the opportunity to make money out of the poor working men and their struggling families by tempting them to use cars on the Lord's Day, given to the poor and needy as a day of rest, but they have the brazen assurance to ask these working men to pay a portion of the money required to take the vote which they hope will allow them increased facilities for making money. Verily, to the greed of monopolists there is no limit.

The deputation made a sorry appearance at the city Hall. The leading speaker assumed the role of a bull-dozer. He pranced at the head of his myrmidons ready to brow-beat the chief magistrate, and he allowed ugly words to escape from his heart. He evidently felt the weakness of his

cause for there was no attempt at argument. "Behold the signatures! they are ten thousand strong!" And yet the Mayor did not tremble. Another of the speakers delighted in the fact that he and his family can afford to jaunt across the ocean and ride on street cars in Paris, France, of a Sunday. So he longs for the day when the Paris Sunday shall be introduced to poor Toronto. But the polish of Parisian manners did not cure him of an innate brutality worthy of the slave-drivers of the south, for his sentence on those who for conscience sake oppose Sunday cars is to line them up as a fatigue squad and march them around the Belt Line of cars on a hot August Sunday, presumably at the crack of the lash. Mr. Glockling took courage to explain that he represented himself only and appeared not even as a working man, but as a citizen. So the working-men were not represented this time. The device has evidently become too transparent to work. But a Mr. Jones expressed himself on their behalf: "so far as he could judge the only valid objection to Sunday cars among working men was their fear that the company could not be trusted and that the employees would have to work seven days a week or abandon their position." This is not the only valid objection nor the most important urged by working-men, but it is one founded on fact. The working man cannot eat his goose and have it; he cannot give up his Sabbath and enjoy rest from the worries of the world on the Lord's Day. Let him look to his interests.

## "Neodoxy."

This somewhat pedantic word is the latest addition to the theological vocabulary, and is gravely proposed by Dr. Parker, in a recent address at the Grindelwald Conference, to designate the prevailing attitude of England as regards theology. That attitude he avers is neither orthodoxy nor heterodoxy but a disposition to welcome novelties, to revel in inventiveness, to make progress without any idea of where it is going. He is probably not quite serious in suggesting that the coinage of this new term may prove to be his one permanent contribution to the theology of the century. But whether the term will stick or not it calls attention to a phase in contemporary thinking which is sufficiently important to merit notice. It is probably more characteristic of the churches in Britain than in America, but is by no means unknown on this side the Atlantic, and is quite as common among the laity as among the ministers.

In one respect this attitude is no fresh development in the world's history, for we learn on very good authority that nineteen centuries ago "the Athenians and strangers which were among them spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or to hear some new thing." But there has probably never been any time before in the Church's history when this attitude was so frankly confessed as it is now in many quarters. At the time of the Reformation the people were indeed eager to hear the new doctrine, but the argument which chiefly commended it then was not that it was new but that it was the old doctrine which had been forgotten or overlaid with novel superstitions. With some the argument takes that form still. The cry is: "Back to the Synoptic Gospels," "Back to Christ" or "Back to the Sermon on the Mount." Others more frankly proclaim a New Theology based upon the New Philosophy of Evolution. They have no interest in the old except as one of the stages in the development of the new.

Now within certain limits this attitude is to be commended. Every thinker is bound to be open-minded to the truth from whatever quarter it comes. No one, except the Pope, now claims infallibility and his claim is received among us with scant respect. No Protestant at any rate can afford to subscribe the Syllabus in its distinct refusal to modernize theology and bring it into vital relations with the