

in his assertions that "The fourth commandment was intended only for a single nation is clear from the fact that it takes no notice of difference of meridian, which makes it impossible to keep the very same day in more than one part of the earth. The Mosaic law altogether is evidently the law of a particular country, of a particular race, of a particular stage in the religious education of mankind. When we are asked what becomes of the rest of the Decalogue if one commandment is no longer to be literally observed, the answer is that for the Christians the ten commandments have been superseded by the two, and that if the ten are still in force, it is by virtue not of their Mosaic promulgation, but of their intrinsic conformity to the Divine will. As the dedication of a reasonable portion of time to our spiritual needs and our bodily refreshment, which is its essence, is necessary, the fourth commandment is an universal and indefeasible obligation," we may view his statements from another standpoint and our conclusions he cannot escape. He wishes to deal with the question by "Christian wisdom," but he immediately cites the beer gardens of Chicago asserting that these are not English but German, evidently intending to show that the English are superior in "Christian wisdom" to the Germans. If he were asked what evidence he had for this he would doubtless say "read history." So pronounced a Protestant as the professor will not deny that the Bible has had an incalculable influence in moulding the British character. True, he is a pronounced Englishman, who places strong reliance on English history. Yet he seeks to set aside that which has given strength and nobility to the English people, and has produced the most interesting and striking passages in their history. He would set aside the Mosaic law as "the law of a particular country." If this was the case why did not the English cast out the Bible altogether and stick to the religion of the Druids as it was "evidently the law of their particular country." Moreover, why does not the professor call out for the abolition in this country of everything that savors of some other "particular country" and demand that we have the worship of the sun and the Indian war dance? These were the customs of our "particular country." Let the professor act on his own logic; close his library, shut up the fountains of his knowledge, and erase from his mind all the teachings and influences of the past, save those that came from Indian legends and lore. Let him ponder over the bloody massacres of one Indian race by another. Let these be the sources of his intellectual development and the fountain from which to draw "Christian wisdom," and let him on no consideration allow the Mosaic law to influence him, for if he does he may find himself in a "different meridian." This may seem to be trifling with the learned and esteemed professor, but in reality we do not trifle to such an extent with his lame, lop-sided statements as does he with a grave subject that should receive the best, unbiassed thought of a well-balanced mind. The professor is not a good special-pleader, and his remarks on "Christian wisdom," "particular country" and "difference of meridian" are so totally unworthy of his grasp of principles and knowledge of historical facts and inferences, that he reduces himself to the plane of ridicule and should be treated so.

Why should there be a compromise? Christian people are demanding that there be no Sunday cars. They stand for a principle, and upon that principle they will win. It will be a desecration of the Sabbath to run cars. Why then should they agree to compromise? This would simply be measuring wickedness and countenancing a system bad in

principle, at variance with "Christian wisdom" and against the direct teachings of the Old and New Testaments, and of human experience.

Let there be no compromise and now since the advocates of Sunday cars have seen the weakness of their demands none need fear the result of the issue.

College Committee Uniformity in Theological Education Proposed.

forms the subject of a timely and interesting article in the Record for August, which ought to be carefully thought over by the Church. The position taken is, that while diversity to a desirable degree will be afforded by the individuality of the professors, there ought to be a uniform course and teaching in all the colleges in connection with the Presbyterian Church. This can be brought about, it is affirmed, by the agency of a College Committee to direct theological education, as is the case in the Free Church of Scotland. The writer sums up with the following propositions. —(1.) The Assembly should have one standard of education which it assigns for all students of our Church, one basis of licensure; one final examination to be conducted by a board of examiners not exclusively professorial. (2.) When reports are presented to Assembly they should come from this representative committee. At present the interest in the report of each institution is largely absorbed by its alumni or foster parents, whereas the colleges and professors belong to the Presbyterian Church and not to individuals or sections. (3.) We need more intercollegiate sympathy and co-operation. Common studies and a common aim would secure this in some measure.

Ritualism and Disestablishment The Presbyterian (London, Eng.) has submitted to a number of prominent clergy men and laymen for their opinion, the proposition that the Church of England should be disestablished because of the ritualistic practices which are becoming prevalent within her fold. The answers make good reading. As was to be expected opinions differ, but a refreshing unanimity is brought out against the tendency to ritualism. It may seem singular that a remedy should be sought for in disestablishment for a practice in the Church, the legality of which may well be questioned. But even should its legality be upheld, as the Lincoln judgment might lead us to suppose, there can be no guarantee that ritualism would not prevail, even to a greater degree than now, in a Free Episcopal Church. Indeed, it is a matter of fact that the Episcopal Church of Scotland, without the prestige or security of endowments or state connection is more ritualistic and "Higher" than is the Church of England. The strongest reason for thus bringing ritualism and disestablishment together is that the latter would free the nation from the responsibility of maintaining a church whose permitted practice leads to Romanism, a system repugnant to the vast majority of the people. A great deal could be said for this argument, but nothing with so much force as could be said for the proposition that disestablishment should be treated on its own merits, and not as a remedy for an incident of church service. The letters indicate a moving of opinion for disestablishment in the English Presbyterian Church, which may assume formidable shape should common cause be made with the numerous and by no means to be despised non-conformist bodies. The Church of England is strongly entrenched, but it would be vain to deny that many of her more thoughtful sons see rocks ahead in the levelling up or down forces which are powerfully making their way in British life at the present day.