

pal administration which brings disgrace upon the name of popular government the world over." The *Nation* goes on to show that this same lack of the "home side of patriotism," which Mr. Bryce defines as the willingness "to take trouble, personal and even tedious trouble, for the well-governing of every public community one belongs to, be it a township or parish, a ward or a city, or the nation as a whole," manifests itself in regard to State and national affairs, and permits their legislative bodies to sink into a condition which is a constant reflection upon the capacity of the people for self-government. The distinction which Mr. Bryce makes between the two kinds of patriotism is an instructive and valuable one, and there is reason to fear that the contrast drawn by the *Nation* between the eagerness of the American people to exhibit the one kind and their persistent neglect of the other, holds good, though we venture to hope in a smaller degree, of Canadians. We have little fear that Canadian patriotism, even in its embryo state, would fail to respond to any demand that might be made upon it at any time for resistance to foreign aggression, but we see much reason to fear that there is far too much lethargy of feeling with regard to the home side of patriotism, as manifested in a willingness to take trouble and make sacrifice, for the perfecting of internal administration and the development of that high type of personal and civic character without which no people can ever attain to the highest pitch of national development.

A good cause is sometimes weakened almost as much by the use of a bad argument in its support, as by a valid one in opposition to it. This thought must have been suggested to many in view of the grounds which have been taken by some of the opponents of Sunday cars in Toronto in the course of the current discussion. It is now settled that the question is to be decided by the ballot of those citizens who are entitled to the use of the franchise. The logical consequence would, therefore, seem to be that all arguments should be addressed to them. It is perfectly legitimate, we suppose that, in addition to other motives, they should be appealed to individually, on the ground of their religious convictions and obligations. To convince a citizen that the running and using of street cars on Sunday would be a violation, on the part of those doing the one or the other, of a divine command, and so of a supreme obligation, is no doubt to set before him the best of all reasons why he should vote against the proposal to establish a Sunday car service. But to go further, as some of the clerical disputants are doing, and maintain that the Fourth Commandment is of universal and perpetual obligation, that the thing in question would be a violation of that commandment, and that, therefore, the matter is one upon which the people have no right to pro-

nounce an opinion or to make a decision, goes far to reduce the whole Scriptural argument to an absurdity. If the citizens have not a right to decide whether the cars shall be run on Sunday, or even to decree that they shall not be so run, who has? The responsibility must be thrown back upon the City Council. This can only mean that the Council is to take the Bible for its supreme law book. This means, again, that they are to become its authoritative interpreters. Every question of civic legislation, or regulation, which, in their opinion, is covered by a Biblical precept, must be excepted from the list of those in regard to which they are to be guided by the wishes of their constituents, or to acknowledge their responsibility to those who appointed them. In other words, the city of Toronto is to be under theocratic rule, with the Aldermen as the flamens who are to consult the oracles and constitute themselves the authoritative exponents and enforcers of the Divine will. By parity of reasoning the same will be true of every other city, the Province, and the whole Dominion, the Local and General Governments or Parliaments taking the place of the City Councils as the arbitrary rulers of the theocracy. This would evidently be worse than the Quebec system, under which the priests, not the politicians, claim to be the ultimate authority in civil and political, as well as in religious matters. The impracticability, not to say absurdity, of such a view becomes the more apparent when we remember that neither the Aldermen nor even the clergymen themselves are agreed as to what is really the Scriptural teaching in the case. But, rejecting this high *a priori* mode of settling a vexed question, does it follow that no attention is to be paid to the teachings of the inspired volume in regard to such matters? By no means. No one who accepts the Scriptures as of divine origin can doubt that the prescriptions even of the ceremonial, and much more those of the moral law, must have been based upon profound physiological and psychological principles. The testimony of observation and history abundantly proves that the setting apart of one day in seven as a day of rest and religious worship is not only highly beneficial but positively essential to the physical, moral and spiritual well-being of any people. This demonstrably true principle being accepted, it follows that every innovation that infringes upon the quiet of the weekly rest day, and largely reduces the number of those who can enjoy it, is against the public weal, and so contrary to sound policy or to be justified only by necessity. This principle can, we believe, be shown to condemn a Sunday car service in the city of Toronto, and upon it the argument should be, in our opinion, made to turn.

Countless columns are being published touching the causes and the cure of the pre-

sent monetary stringency in the United States, but amidst them all one simple fact stands out so clear that even a child may read it. That is, that the immediate and efficient cause of the stringency is the fear that the people of the nation will not meet their obligations in gold but in a debased currency. Hence, what is needed in order to restore confidence and settle the national finances on a sound basis, is the certainty that every dollar in circulation in the United States, whether issued by the Government or by the banks, can at any moment be converted into a gold dollar, and that every obligation shall be unmistakably an obligation to pay in gold. To this obvious conclusion the minds of all disinterested thinkers in the Union seem to be rapidly verging. When it shall have been reached and the requisite action taken, commencing with the repeal of the Sherman Silver Act, the tension of the situation will no doubt be relaxed. As Senator Henderson said the other day in a published letter, the \$600,000,000 of gold which has disappeared is being hoarded abroad, "not to reappear until its holders have some guarantee that if loaned it will be returned in money equally good." It is noteworthy that even Senator Sherman himself accepts this view and approves of the proposed repeal of the Act which bears his name, but which was, as it is now made to appear, the outcome of a spirit of concession and compromise on his part, rather than of any mature conviction as to the wisdom of the measure. The Act has done its work of favoritism and nothing can now prevent the nation from suffering a very heavy loss as the result of the purchase by its treasury of an enormous quantity of silver at a much higher price than its real market value. The Republic is wealthy, and can endure the loss, and the conviction seems to be becoming general that the sooner it accepts the situation, puts the deficit on the proper side of its profit and loss account, and commences to do business on a gold basis the sooner will the present crisis be ended and the financial equilibrium restored.

But will the depreciation of silver, a practical result of the stopping of free coinage in India, the repeal of the Sherman Act in the United States, and similar movements, really remove the roots of the difficulty and settle the question of either national currency or international exchange? This would be too much to expect, so long as the gold, which will thus become the basis of finance in America, it has long been in England and elsewhere is variable in quantity and liable to fluctuation in value. There is evident truth in the contention of those who claim that gold has of late years appreciated in value, not merely in comparison with silver, but in its relation to other commodities in general.