

all the great and little scandals perpetrated by gentlemen who would like to be honest, if honesty paid better than anything else. Nor has it been given to many men, besides Mr. White, to have the opportunity of employing the intervals which necessarily occur in the duties of hard-worked editors in making stump orations many times in order to win the hardened hearts of electors who will not be won, charm the orator never so wisely. So that on every count, Mr. White should be able to find it in his heart and well-informed mind to extend a little tender patronage to those who have an honest desire to serve the best interests of Canada.

CHEAP LOYALTY.

But he who runs may read between the lines the real meaning of all this talk about loyalty and disloyalty. The *Globe* charges the Conservatives with disloyalty to England, and the *Mail* and *Gazette* fling it back and say: "You Liberals are the traitors." It is just and only a party move. An effort to promote free discussion is turned into an excuse for an exhibition of the most violent and bitter partizanship. The truth is, that the men who are now assuming to speak for loyalty are equally loyal. The partizan Liberals would vote for Independence to-morrow if they saw a certainty of getting back to power by it, and the partizan Conservatives would vote for the same if they needed it in order to keep office. The *Globe* bases every argument for the maintenance of British connection upon the assumption or proof that we are gainers by it. So do the *Mail* and the *Gazette*. They talk of the great and manifold advantages we derive from it, and that it would be suicidal to bring about a separation. That is a cheap kind of loyalty surely. If it can be proved—and I am far from saying it cannot—that Canada can do better for herself as a British colony than as an independent country, then let us by all means remain a British colony; but what on earth do we want with all this clatter and jangle about loyalty. Loyalty is generally understood to mean that a man or a people would be willing to sacrifice some personal or popular interests for the sake of fatherland. And one would like to hear something of that kind of sentiment expressed by our blatant loyalists. If they were to say: We could advance our own interests better by being an independent people, or by joining the United States—but will maintain our British connection, because we can be of service to Britain—there would be substantial reason for talk of "loyalty," but as it now stands there is not a sentiment of disinterestedness, or self-sacrifice for the sake of Britain, in any of the papers, and all the blarney about being loyal is most palpable nonsense.

NOT ALWAYS SO LOYAL.

When the National Policy was helping Mr. White into Parliament and others into power, the expression "Canada first" was common enough. We—that is, the great majority of the people of this Dominion—were ready and willing to consider Canadian commercial interests as of paramount importance. The *Globe* advocated Free Trade, not from considerations towards Great Britain, but because it seemed in the eyes of the *Globe* better for the traders and the people generally. But a still more notable instance was when the Governor-General referred the question of M. Letellier's dismissal to the Home authorities. The *Gazette* broke out in most bitter indignation against the Marquis of Lorne and threatened most dreadful consequences to Great Britain generally. And the *Gazette* was by no means the only paper that indulged in wild disloyal talk. It affected the whole party against which the movement was directed. Had it been the other party attacked—that is, had the Governor-General attempted to dismiss his Lieutenant at Quebec when the De Boucherville Cabinet was so summarily discharged from office—there is not the shadow of a reason for doubting that the Liberals, with the *Globe* at their head, would have acted the part circumstance forced upon the Conservatives. The truth is that this grandiose talk about loyalty indicates nothing but a shallow sentiment which is being used for party purposes.

What I earnestly hope and expect is that the Political Economy Society will be helped and not hindered by all the abuse heaped upon it. Poor Mr. Macmaster—although he had nothing whatever to do with the origination of the Society or with the organisation of it, but only attended by invitation, and only expressed his willingness to

become a member on condition that it be understood and agreed upon that no member shall be empowered or entitled to commit any other member to any sentiment or opinion—has been hunted and hounded by the papers—not excepting the *Gazette's* defence, which was of less real service than a direct attack would have been—as if in agreeing to free discussion he had committed some political crime. If this is to go on, able young men will hesitate about taking up politics, because able men cannot and will not put their manhood under a party. This abuse of the Political Economy Society indicates plainly enough that our political wire-pullers do not want free discussion of questions which affect the present and future life of the people. It is high time for us to move and carry a protest against this gagging business which has been so long practised.

PLAGIARISM.

Dr. Lorimer's plagiarism from Dr. Parker, and the very feeble excuse put forth, have called out a good deal of newspaper criticism on preaching and preachers generally, and the subject of conscious and unconscious plagiarism has been much debated. For myself, I believe that there is no such thing as unconscious plagiarism, and when Dr. Lorimer stated that his mind had become so saturated with Dr. Parker's ideas that he had reproduced them in Dr. Parker's own words, he simply made it evident that he did not understand the working of his own mind. Ideas may be taken from other men and used without any notion as to where they were got at first, but it can hardly be that one man will adopt another man's very words and phrases through a whole sermon without being aware of the fact. It is far more likely that Dr. Lorimer suffered from a lapse of memory than that he suffered from too good a memory. The chances are that he first wrote the sermon and preached it, knowing that it was Dr. Parker's, and copied verbatim. The MS. was laid aside with others. Removal from Boston to Chicago gave Dr. Lorimer a chance of preaching his old sermons over again. This one took its turn with the rest, and when the request was made that it be published, he had forgotten that it was borrowed bodily without leave of the author.

The papers say a great deal of this is done. A Montreal evening journal, noted for its reckless statements, says: "We have known published sermons repeated almost word for word by leading and able preachers in Montreal, of which no public notice has been taken, but which have not failed to shake the confidence of individuals in their before trusted teachers and weaken their faith in the truths of which they were the exponents." That is not true, of course; for public notice is taken of those things quickly enough. But it must be remembered that men who think in the same way often speak in the same way. The mind is master of the tongue, and likeness of thought must necessarily involve a close resemblance in style of speech. But when a sermon is found to correspond exactly with another sermon—not only as to ideas, but as to every phrase and word—it may be taken as a foregone conclusion that it is a copy and nothing else.

But the marvel is that not more of this is done by our clergymen. They are expected to deliver two original sermons every week—and must visit "the widows and the fatherless in their afflictions," and a good many others who have no afflictions of any sort, but a morbid desire to see the Pastor often; they have also to attend meetings and make speeches upon every conceivable and inconceivable subject—except those matters which pertain to the practicable life of the people; but if they are not fresh and full of thought on Sunday, the audience will say: "Oh, dear—what a stick our minister is!" He is a stick—a walking stick—a talking stick—a dry stick—a crutch for the limping layman to help him on his way to heaven. No class of men need more sympathy than preachers. They have to make bricks without a chance of gathering straw. No man can be equal to the task of preaching two good sermons every week, and the sooner church-going folk relax their rigid and tyrannous demand the better it will be for themselves and their ministers. A man must read, mark, learn, and digest, if he would speak with authority—but many a minister has to say as the Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Montreal did awhile ago: "Books! I have no time to read books."