

and root in religion. A false faith will produce a false form of life, in communities and individuals. Contracted views of religion will lead to bigotry, bigotry to intolerance, and intolerance is tyranny.

To burk discussion on religious subjects is worse than folly. Only Rome can consistently frown it down, for only Rome has claimed to have reached finality. Men seeking for religious rights have found their eyes opened to all other kinds of rights. Resistance to religious usurpation led men to withstand political oppression. Religious discussions have roused the minds of all classes to free and vigorous thought.

But there is no occasion for uncharitableness—there is no occasion for violence—occasion only, and great need, for the exercise of generosity. The orthodox man is sincere in his orthodoxy, the heterodox man in his heterodoxy—let each maintain his theories as best he can, nor count his opponent an enemy. All recognise the great obligation to be right and do right: starting from that they may travel by different lines and reach the same end. Each one thinks his path the better—the more wisely chosen—divinely marked out; let him. He finds confidence from his faith, and *may* be right—is not likely to be altogether wrong. But a religious paper must be also political—since the greater includes the lesser. Politics cannot be separated from religion; they are a part of it—must be inspired and guided by it. The religious man *must* be a politician; for he must seek to make good laws for himself and all others. If he can be content while bad and oppressive laws are in operation, then is his life a practical denial of his faith. The moment politics demand positive action, that moment religion has got to do with the matter. Picnic vulgarities and violent personal altercations may be little more than sins against culture; but political corruption is a sin against the highest and deepest interests of mankind. It is an evil thing and a calamity when politics are divorced from religion, and the making and administering of laws are left to self-seeking and unscrupulous men.

But to be political need not involve partizanship as a constant thing and a necessity. There are times when sides must be taken—for there are times when a well defined line must be drawn—but in party politics lurks a danger. Associate men together for a common cause, be it good or bad, and array against them a body resolutely pledged to an opposite interest, and a new passion, quite distinct from the original sentiment which brought them together—a fierce, fiery zeal, consisting chiefly of aversion to those who differ from them—is roused within them to fearful activity. Human nature seems incapable of a stronger and more unrelenting passion. It is hard for an individual, when contending alone for an interest or an opinion, to keep down his pride, his love of victory, and the angry uprising of his nature. But let him join a multitude in the same warfare, and, without great care and great self-control, he will receive into his single breast the vehemence and obstinacy of all; the triumphs of party will become immeasurably dearer to him than the principle which was the original ground of division; the conflict will become a struggle—not for principle, but for victory and power; that is the danger which besets all nations. But the people of Canada have more than ordinary need for care. All are for party, and few seem for the state. Men are ranging under the banner of the Conservative or the Liberal leaders; the fight is mostly for office; a few are looking for the national flag. This is no onslaught on parties, but a warning to men not to fall into the folly of seeing, hearing and judging by the senses and understanding of a party—not to surrender the natural rights of manhood to use and speak their own mind—not to wait for the rod of a leader, but to have a judgment and exercise it—not to be the tool of men who seek to secure a vote by an appeal to the passions; but to labour for a clear understanding of the subjects which agitate the community, and then act in the higher interests of all the people. Then some part of the great work of life will be done.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN SWEDEN.—The Copenhagen correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, writing on the 10th inst., says:—"An extraordinary religious movement is taking place in Sweden, where a petition, signed by nearly 25,000 persons, has been presented to the King, praying that 'the use of the Holy Communion may be free, like the use of God's Word,' or, in other words, that the celebration of the Communion may take place also out of the churches, and that the celebrants may be other than persons in holy orders. The Ecclesiastical Court at the Cathedral Chapter of Upsala, to whom the petition has been referred, has reported against such an innovation, which, in their opinion, would eventually destroy the Church.' The Government will probably refuse the prayer of the petitioners, and the consequence will be a serious split in the Swedish Church. It may, perhaps, not be generally known. English readers that until very lately there was no religious liberty in Sweden, Roman Catholics and Jews, for instance, being unable to exercise their religion publicly; the consequence being that even at present the total number of Jews in Sweden barely amounts to a thousand persons out of a population of nearly four million inhabitants, being, with the exception of Spain, the smallest proportion in Europe."

WHY THE MOABITE STONE WAS DESTROYED.—Mr. M. W. Shapira, writing in the *Athenaeum*, says:—"The Bedawins believe that the inscriptions are charms or directions for finding hidden treasure, and that to reveal where they are to be found should be punished by death for the following reason. They have a tradition that their ancestors were not satisfied with plenty of water and bread, but greedy for riches, and that God gave them for seven days a rain of gold, but no rain afterwards for many years. On their praying for rain, they were commanded to throw away the gold, which was hidden in certain places in the earth, and they vowed never to search for, or use charms to recover, it. Their punishment for breaking the vow was to be seven years of dearth. The Mesa stone they broke on account of this idea, and curiously enough, three years of suffering from drought followed; had it been removed whole, they believe that seven years of drought would have been their punishment. There was scarcely any rain round Diban this year, and they say it is because they allowed Dr. Almkvist to dig for treasure, though he dug at night, and only once by day in great danger of his life."

Hear men talk about the seducer. They tell you how he creeps, how his eye glares, how he sweetens his words, how he throws one web after another into the snare that he is weaving, and how at last he seizes and destroys his victims, having found before him a garden of Eden, and leaving behind a desolate wilderness. Everybody is ready to damn him. No words of condemnation are so masterful that men will not apply them to this kind of destroying the household. But there sits in the household one who never eats too much, who never drinks too much, and who never steals, but whose mouth is an open crater and whose words are lava; and the children cannot live there happily, the servants cannot live there happily, nobody can live there happily; and they are in a constant tumult from week to week and from month to month; and at last some combustion quarrel breaks out and the household is destroyed. Thus one man's ugliness may work destruction in a household as much as another man's salacious appetites. I do not say that the two things are to be compared in all respects; I do not say that they are exactly equal in their disastrous results; but I say that, so far as the destruction of a household is concerned, it can be accomplished by a person whose temper is violent, whose exactions are intolerable, whose lips are blistered with fiery words as a forge is with sparks, as well as by a person who enters it and destroys it in seductive ways.—*Beecher.*

A CANADIAN NATIONAL POLICY.

The use of the terms "Free Trade" and "Protection" has done much to confuse the question which above and before all others is important, in its present and future influence upon the prosperity of this country. Absolute Free Trade, that is the unrestricted admission of all goods without the payment of dues of any description to the Government, or in other words, the abolition of Custom Houses, except, perhaps, for purposes of statistical information, exists nowhere in the world, and is especially impossible in Canada. Our revenue must always be derived, as to the larger part of it at any rate, from duties of customs. So Protection, in the sense of absolute prohibition, which our free trade friends tell us is the logical conclusion of the argument in favour of the system which goes by that name, is equally impossible. Our tariff in Canada, under any possible system, must be to a large extent a revenue tariff. The necessities of the Government, the obligations which have been incurred for public works, and the further obligations which the necessities of the future, in relation particularly to the development of the resources of our great north-west territories—upon which our prosperity so largely depends, make that a self-evident proposition, and one which, we fancy, all parties will be prepared to accept.

Recent discussions, however, have tended to define, with tolerable clearness, the line which divides the parties who are known conventionally as free traders and protectionists. The former, as represented by the governing party in Canada to-day, hold the view that the only consideration of importance in the framing of a tariff, is the question of revenue. The Government require so much money, and the one thought, in providing for that requirement, is, how can duties be so adjusted as to yield the amount with the greatest certainty? To consider for a moment the wants of special industries, and to apportion the duties in such a way as afford them encouragement and support, is, according to them, to act contrary to all sound economic principles. Governments have nothing to do with building up commerce or manufactures. That is a result depending upon the individual energy and enterprise of merchants and manufacturers themselves. The Finance Minister, when in one of his budget speeches he declared that governments had no more to do with the prosperity or depression of trade and commerce than the fly on the wheel had to do with its revolution, stated this view very clearly. In fact so strongly is it held by the leading men belonging to the free trade school of thought, that they have almost come to regard manufacturers as in some sort enemies to the country. Mr. Cartwright's defence of his refusal to consider the demands of the manufacturers, that he was unwilling to build up great interests in the country, which would have an almost controlling lobby influence upon Parliament and the Government; and his subsequent defence based upon the evils resulting from the concentration of population in cities and towns, are sufficient proof that with him—and we cite him as the leading representative of his school—it is not only not the duty of the Government of the country to encourage the establishment of a manufacturing industry among the people, but that if they did so they would be doing an injury to the people.

On the other hand, the Protectionists, who in the party divisions in Parliament and the country, are represented by the Opposition, hold the opposite view. They take the ground that no community can be prosperous in which diversity of employment for the people does not exist. Recognizing the great importance of the agricultural interests, they hold that however prosperous in itself, alone it can never build up a strong and healthy nation; that its own prosperity is impossible, unless there are centres of population which become the local consumers for the products, especially for the perishable products, of the farm; and that, situated as we are in Canada, prosperous centres of population, large cities and towns, are impossible unless manufacturing industry is flourishing. And starting with these premises, they hold it to be the duty of the Government so to adjust the fiscal policy of the country, as to afford encouragement to its trade and industries. Thus, leaving aside all questions of detail as to the manner in which a protective policy should be framed, the two parties stand upon directly opposite and easily definable grounds. The one recognising on the part of the Government no duty to consider, in framing the tariff, the interests either of the commerce or industries of the country, their only thought being directed to the one question of revenue; while the other hold that the first consideration in the imposition of duties should be the effect which they will have in building up the industries and fostering the commerce of the country, and that it is incumbent to so apportion them that these results may be secured, as far as is consistent with the revenue requirements of the country.

Which of these two opposite opinions best meets the wants of a young country like the Dominion of Canada? We are fortunate in the discussion of this question, in having the experience of our neighbours in the United States. They have adopted the policy of protection, and with all the imperfections of their system, arising out of the circumstances under which the tariff was originally adopted and has been from time to time changed, they have prospered wonderfully under it. It is true that they, like all the rest of the world, have suffered during the last few years from commercial depression. But to charge the depression as in any way due to the system of protection, would involve curious consequences for free traders, who would be compelled to account for the depression in Great Britain as well. In spite of this depression, in spite of the over-production which has in some branches of business caused embarrassment and failure, what has been the general result? We take a free trade authority from which to answer this question. The *London Telegraph* had an article recently, in which, admitting that England stood alone among the nations of the world in its practical advocacy of free trade principles, and still uttering words of encouragement for the future of the industries of the mother-country, it was compelled to make some striking confessions. After stating that there is "a lessened foreign demand for our (England's) staple manufactures," and that England has "reached the anomalous position of being 'from foreigners exactly twice as much' as she sells them, the *Telegraph* makes the following remarkable statements:

"American calicoes are reported to meet with increasing success. The saws and cutlery of Philadelphia and Pittsburg are some manufactures produced in Sheffield. The machine-made water-suppliants the solid horlogie workmanship of Coventry. Leather