

opinion which she so expresses in regard to friendship appears too exclusive and unqualified, but she is certainly not far from the truth, in so far as she uses the term to denote the breathings and actings of love on the part of one toward another in the matrimonial relationship. Friend is a word insignificant of the connection—to have one soul, one fate with her; to participate her happiness, to share her griefs, to be that single being to whom, the next to the Divinity, she pours out the feelings of her heart, to whom she speaks the gentlest of her wishes, to whom she sighs the most delicate of her fears; to grant those wishes, to soothe those fears, to have such a woman (like one's guardian angel without his superiority), to whom we may unbosom our own, the creation of pleasures is little; this is a creation of soul to enjoy them!

### THE WORKINGMAN'S HOME.

NO. X.—THE SABBATH.—Continued.

We sometimes see the poor man whose income is small, but whose great desire is to bring up his family in church-going habits, appearing with them regularly in the house of God, all clothed in decent attire, and we have wondered how the small weekly income, coupled with the strictest economy, could accomplish such a task; while another family, with the same or a much larger weekly receipt, having no regard for the Sabbath, may be seen on that day scattered along the thoroughfares, or lounging at street-corners, dressed in their working clothes. These are facts patent to the most common observation, and evidently show that God's blessing and God's curse are awful realities, and that the one is too little coveted and the other too little feared. Assuredly he is no friend of the workingman who would seek to deprive him of the benefits derivable from the Sabbath, or attempt to lower in his estimation its moral obligations; although there are in our day men with pretended principles of the broadest philanthropy who seek to pervert its character by converting it into a day of worldly pleasure and enjoyment. "The hard-working man," say they, "requires relaxation and amusement; pent up in the crowded and smoky city or unhealthy workshop, he requires on this day to breathe the pure air of heaven; therefore let railway trains run and steamboats ply let museums, picture galleries, theatres and other public institutions be thrown open—that opportunity may be afforded him to recruit his physical strength and feast his intellect." They forget, or seem to forget, that man has a spiritual as well as an intellectual nature; and that God's command, given forth amid the thunders of Sinai, is: "Remember the Sabbath Day, to keep it holy." It is a fearful, awful thing to rob God, or to encourage and teach others to do so. But the ultimate result would be to rob man also; for let the Sabbath cease to be regarded as a divine institution and where is your guarantee for a Sabbath at all? Greedy, grasping avarice might then demand incessant toil, and the Sabbath would no longer be the poor man's day. Then, for the love which we bear to our religion, to our country, and to our homes, let us sacredly safeguard the blessings and privileges of the weekly Sabbath.

### NO. XI.—FAMILY TRIALS.

There is no flock, however watched and tended,  
But one dead lamb is there;  
There is no fireside, howsoever defended,  
But has one vacant chair.

—Longfellow.

While much of the misery and suffering that exists in families may be traced to causes which attach the blame to the sufferers themselves, there are other cases where no such secondary causes exist, and where the affliction is traceable directly to the hand of God. It is well to expect trials, that, being forewarned, we may also in some measure be forearmed. And yet how often are these overlooked by the young and inexperienced in entering on the married state! The young couple in the rosebud of health, and buoyed up by hopeful prospects of perfect felicity and bliss, soon begin to discover that life is not a mere romance, a sentimental dream, but a stern reality, a perpetual hard fight. It is well not only to expect trials, but to meet them in a right spirit. We must endeavour to ascertain their causes; and if they are traceable to ourselves, to our ignorance, to improvidence, to intemperance in any of its forms, or to any other sin, let the cause be removed, and the

effect will cease. There is many a suffering family, martyrs in their own estimation, conscious that there is something radically wrong, who blame their neighbours, their masters, their legislators, their landlords and even their God; and yet who are all the while their own self-tormentors, and even in some instances their own self-murderers. There are others who, it may be, are earnestly seeking to know the path of duty and desirous to walk therein, on whom God, in His providence, sees meet to lay His afflicting hand. They cannot comprehend His mysterious dealings with them; but, believing that "God is His own interpreter," they can trust and also in some measure with meekness and patience submit.

A WORKINGMAN.

### THE RETORT COURTEOUS.

MR. EDITOR,—I am sorry to ask you to print in your paper the enclosed letter, which I lately addressed to the editor of the *Presbyterian Review*, and which has been refused insertion. The excuse given for not doing me this simple piece of justice is in the following terms:

We have received another communication from Rev. W. Inglis, regarding his connection with the *Globe* newspaper, much in the same strain as that of his previous letter, but we do not deem it necessary to trouble our readers with it at present. We would have been pleased had our correspondent stated that he is not the author of the discreditable attacks on his brethren of the Toronto Presbytery, Rev. Messrs. McLeod, Macdonnell and Milligan, which have lately appeared in that paper; but he has not done so or signified even the mildest disapproval of its indecent treatment of them. We have no desire to pry into the *personnel* of the *Globe* staff, and had not our correspondent challenged enquiry and volunteered so much, we should not have felt prompted to ask this question.

The question is simply and definitely whether or not, as was charged by a letter in the *Review* and practically endorsed, editorially, both in previous and subsequent issues, every writer in "a party paper makes his bread and butter by lying." That is the one issue raised and that ought to be definitely and distinctly settled, either one way or the other. If such be the fact, then, as you put it, I ought certainly to be deposed from the ministry, and expelled from the membership of the Presbyterian Church. If such is not the fact, then I leave your readers to say how the correspondent and editors of the *Review* ought to be characterized. Your obedient servant,

WM. INGLIS.

### TO THE EDITOR OF THE PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

SIR,—I am much obliged by your insertion of my letter of the 27th ult. Allow me, however, to draw your attention to one or two misstatements (I will not say misrepresentation, for that would imply an imputation of motives which I willingly leave to religious journalists) in your editorial note.

1. I did not say that anything in your columns was written with direct reference to myself. Your own statements, and those of your correspondent, were of the most general and the most sweeping character, comprehending every editor of every "party" paper, otherwise they had no point or relevancy. I merely said, in reply, that I was, and had been, such an editor, and consequently that I must be one of the sinners condemned. If not, then others of the same fraternity, for aught your correspondent knew to the contrary, might be equally guiltless; and then both his statements on the subject and yours were mere railing, unsupported assertions, and not sober, reliable declarations of fact. If, on the contrary, I was included, then proof, I said, was needed if calumny were not to be confessed.

I do not know that either you or your correspondent could definitely say who wrote any article whatever that ever appeared in the "party press." But if all such writers are said to "make their bread and butter by lying," of course I must be included, and I merely gave data, by means of which it would not be difficult to detect and expose my falsehoods.

2. I did not say that I had written "almost all the political articles in the *Globe*." Very far from it. Had I done so, that would at any rate have been one falsehood, of which I stood convicted.

By no possible process, however, either of interpretation or of inference, could such a meaning be put upon my language.

3. I had not the slightest idea that your correspondent, "Riverside," ever heard of my existence or occupation. His having so heard, or the reverse, had nothing to do with the question at issue. It is more

than likely that he does not know the names of two persons in the whole Dominion who, to a certainty, write for the "party press." But he says he knows they are all liars, and of the meanest kind—"liars for bread."

Indeed, I should not have known that even you had ever heard of my existence, had it not been that you have once and again, and very pressing, asked me to contribute to the *Presbyterian Review*, and, allow me to add, that I duly appreciated the honour, and felt almost oppressed by the apparently very undeserved compliment.

Let me assure you, that though I am only a very humble, and of course, quite unknown member of the editorial staff of a "lying party paper," my reputation for veracity and honour is as dear to me as that of more important personages may be to them; and what I say for myself I can confidently add, for all the other members of that same staff.

When you or your correspondents give even one instance of deliberate falsification of the record on the part of the *Globe*, with any thing approaching to proof, rest assured your statements will be met. Mere vague unsupported assertion, however (and that is all I have yet seen, either in your editorial columns or in the letters of your correspondents), must go for what it is worth, and must be treated, after challenge to the proof has been unanswered, with the silent contempt which it deserves. I am your obedient servant,

WILLIAM INGLIS.

St. October, 1886.

### CHURCH UNION.

MR. EDITOR,—In THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN of the 13th inst., there is a letter signed "W. S.," dated from Aylwin, Quebec, on the subject of "Church Union," which, I think, should not be allowed to pass without comment. The recent advance made by the Church of England toward the other Protestant Churches of the Dominion, with a view to union, is treated by "W. S.," in a manner in which few, I trust, are prepared to concur. He alleges that "no Church is doing more to promote division," and yet none "louder in its cry for union than the Church of England." In support of an accusation so serious, he cites the sending of a minister of that Church to labour at Maniwaki, Quebec, which field, he says, had been previously taken possession of by the Presbyterian Church, and contained only two families of the Church of England.

Now, supposing the facts to be as stated by "W. S.," is the whole Church of England, in Canada, to be held responsible for what has been done at Maniwaki? Has the Presbyterian Church never done anything similar? Is the preferring of such accusations likely to promote brotherly love, or to diminish "the evils of division" which "W. S.," says are nowhere so apparent as in the Province of Quebec? Would our meeting in the spirit of his letter, the present advance by the Church of England help to make matters better at Maniwaki, or anywhere else?

Again, he alleges that union means that all the other Churches should conform to the Church of England. What grounds has "W. S." for assuming that the Church of England will yield nothing for the sake of union? The advance which she has made implies her readiness to confer in good faith, and in an earnest Christian spirit, with the other Churches, on the question of union; and that advance should be met in a courteous and appreciative spirit, and I am confident it will be, so far as the Presbyterian Church is concerned. Yours, etc.,

W. F. McMULLEN.

Woodstock, October 15, 1886.

THE latest phase in the Russo-Bulgarian difficulty seems to be that immediate submission of the Bulgars to the wishes of the Czar being out of the question, other efforts by intrigue have been incessantly kept up by General Kaulbars. He is said to have visited in succession the chief garrison towns in Bulgaria, endeavouring to secure the military to work for his master and betray their nation. Now it is asserted that Russia and Turkey have come to an understanding, and that between the two poor Bulgaria may be crushed as in a vice. Even this menace has not taken the spirit out of Bulgarian independence. Turkey is told that encroachments from the shores of the Bosphorus will be as intolerable as those from St. Petersburg.