

and return to you in the country, where from afar we can hear "the stir of the great Babel," where the trees renew their garments but do not change their style, where the rose is always a rose, and the stupendous difficulties of emerging a *princesse* from a last year's *polonoise* does not trouble the cool grace of the delicate lily, which envieth not the flaunting glory of the poppy.

ANNIE L. JACK.

"THE 90-CENT DOLLAR."

What has gone wrong with the 90-cent dollar of these "silver lunatics"?

The United States bonds are all legally payable in gold dollars or "90-cent" silver dollars. The "lunatics" will have wisdom enough left, surely, to redeem them with silver coin, the 90-cent dollar. But the bonds wont come down to the 90-cent level. There's the trouble. United States bonds are selling to-day, 4's at 101½, and so on up to 5-20's at 108. They are hale and hearty as ever, though said to be shorn of a tenth of their substance. They are not paying the slightest respect to the arguments and protestations of the eastern single standard men. They are not marshaling into order on the 90-cent line. It is rank financial heresy. The eastern editorial whip has been cracked over them in vain. Here are valuable bonds, a thousand millions worth and more, payable in "90-cent dollars," and yet single standard men, real gold men, none of your silver lunatics, are insane enough to buy them at 18 per cent. above the 90-cent line. Surely the bonds themselves are struck with the "silver craze," and stick fast by the double standard men. They seem to have become wholly suspicious of the men who discredit silver.

What has gone wrong with the silver bullion?

Far away, over the sea, it shows sympathy with the silver lunatics. It has such consideration for a lunatic majority in Congress as to have risen to 54½ pence per ounce—actually dared, in face of all the protestations of the single standard men, to step at once 3 to 4 per cent. over the 90-cent line. Ungenerous silver! One thinks you might have waited at any rate till some of the 90-centers were coined.

What has gone wrong with the single standard men themselves?

The New York *Times* of 8th March, an indefatigable single standard paper, reports that one of the brokers or dealers has had the temerity, even already, to deposit with the sub-treasurer at New York \$25,000 in gold, to be exchanged for silver dollars at par. Horror of horrors! Here is the unkindest cut of all. Are these acute money making men also getting struck with the silver craze? Have they no faith now in the 90-cent dollars? Here is one of them deliberately throwing away 10 cents on every dollar in 25 thousand—\$2,500 lost, irretrievably lost, on a single transaction by yielding to the silver craze. Make room, make room, enlarge your asylums. There will be more lunatics by and by. But has the *Times* no sense of shame left, to report such a transaction to the public?

What has gone wrong with the United States Mint?

The Mint report for last year has just been sent me. I find that for some years past the very Mint has become moonstruck. It also is a silver "pick-pocket," and has got the silver craze. It has actually been guilty of the enormous crime of purchasing silver bullion between January, 1875, and October, 1877, to the amount of 34 millions of dollars, for which it paid an average of only 54 pence sterling per ounce, and has coined that bullion into over 39½ millions of dollars. And the mint has not coined it into "90-cent dollars"—it has done far worse—it has coined it into debased, subsidiary, clipped silver pieces, and netted over 5½ millions by the transaction,—coined it into 84-cent dollars, and yet these utterly debased dollars somehow or other pass at par in the purchase of everything one wants to buy. And, most astonishing of all, this villainy of buying bullion in the cheapest market has not once been denounced by the eastern men. And the Director of the Mint has the temerity to write as follows in his report, addressed to no less a personage than Mr. Secretary Sherman: "In procuring this silver, the rule as to price has always been to purchase as much below the equivalent of the London rate as possible, and not above it if it could be avoided." There is a grim joke for the eastern men. Eye, Dr. Linderman. How dare you flood the country with 90-cent or 84-cent dollars, and brag at the same time about it?

What has gone wrong with United States "credit"?

Whatever sort of thing this is, the bottom was to fall out of it the moment the silver trumpet sounded the jubilee, and the bonds were to fall, and the laboring men were to perish, and commerce was to be stricken with paralysis, and warehouses were to be deserted, and the nation was to sink beneath the waves, and generally everything in creation to go to the dogs. But the trumpet has sounded, and the bonds have not gone by the run—they still hold water—indeed they are so oblivious to all the drumming they have received from the eastern press that if anything they incline to step forward in the ranks. Ungrateful credit!

What has gone wrong with the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury?

He has actually the hardihood, in issuing the new bonds and telling investors in what they will be paid, again to use that dangerous, double-meaning word "coin,"—not a word more—no explanation as to what he means by such a debatable term—simply lawful "coin." O wicked John Sherman! Well may a lean minority in Congress repeat a certain lawyer's complaint, "Master, thus saying, thou reproachest us also."

And what has gone wrong with the people?

They are investing dollars by the million, 100-cent dollars, in 4 per cent. "90-cent dollar bonds." One worthy banker is doing it for his clients at the rate of a million a day, and not a word of warning from him. Madness, utter madness.

In short, everything has gone wrong for the unhappy single standard men. The stars in their courses fight against them. The foundations of the world are out of course. Political Economy itself is turned topsy turvy. The wise men from the east, it is plain, have commenced to fall before silver, and had better, like Haman, cover their heads and hasten to their houses mourning.

But history will have something to say of the battle recently fought and of the victory so nobly won. In face of the facts just stated, there is one thing it

is certain will never be chronicled—that nine-tenths, aye nineteen-twentieths of the people of the United States were "lunatics" in the winter of 1877-78, and that wisdom died with a few men who did their best to destroy the peoples' money, to break a nation's plighted faith, and who, with an arrogance only less contemptible than the ignorance which inspired it, consigned to Bedlam all who opposed their wild and dangerous schemes.

And the Pulpit. What will history, pale with astonishment, record of the pulpit? That in face of a conspiracy to destroy the means of payment of forty millions of people, it remained silent as the grave. Not one note of warning, not one voice lifted in the peoples' defence! An entire nation imperilled, its liberties in danger, controversy raging around, commerce pleading from its ashes and industry from its ruins, but no sound seeming to strike upon the dull cold ear. And this from men claiming descent from the Puritan fathers! The opportunity came, it lingered, it passed away never to return. Well may serious and thoughtful men lay such things to heart.

WM. BROWN.

A PEER ON RELIGIOUS DEMOCRACY.

2 SERGEANTS INN,

Temple E. C. London, Jan. 29, 1878.

SIR,—Ere this reaches you some of your readers especially the Presbyterians, will have been charmed with the article on which it is a comment; but there are one or two topics contained in it which I think open to criticism, either on this side of the Atlantic or the other.

The point of the Duke of Argyll's argument in His Grace's article on "Disestablishment," in the last number of *The Contemporary*, lies in the claim put forward that the Church of Scotland, as a spiritual institution and as a democratic religious organization, is more truly what it professes to be than the Church of England. While the first is in a sense self-governing, the latter is wholly dependent upon the Imperial Legislature. The essay is lucid, logical and scholarly and, though within the realm of polemics, is permeated by the singular breadth and liberality which should and does characterize the author of "The Reign of Law": but the Duke has taken up a position which he would scarcely we think like to follow to an ultimate and logical sequence; for, in that case, while his argument might score something—not much—for the Scottish Establishment it would be fatal to that of England and Wales; an uncertain sound, if indeed the *Daily Review* and *Scotsman* be guides, for Presbyterian State Churchism; but a blast distinct enough against English or any other form of Erastianism.

The noble author's treatise may be divided into two parts. The first is an historical sketch of "Patronage": the other an analysis of the Westminster Confession.

The substance of the moral pointed by the retrospect of patronage in Scotland may be tersely stated in the three propositions that in the Scottish Reform Church, patronage is alien to its constitution; its restoration by Queen Anne, a Jacobite reactionary policy, was hostile to the Revolution settlement; and that the form in which it survived after 1843, that of Lord Aberdeen's Act, was unworkable. The theory briefly stated is this—and herein is its significance in your *Canadian Civil Alliance* point of view: that the Scottish Church Establishment is wholly, solely and essentially a democratic institution; while, on the other hand, the only qualities which prevent the English Establishment from being a literal hierarchy, a veritable government by priests, a sacerdotalism unalloyed, are the supremacy of the Crown and the Lay ownership of Advowsons.

In as far as the plea put forward for the kirk is correct it is well; for if any institution on earth should rest on a democratic basis it certainly is that of a spiritual fraternity; and while in this one particular something commendable is advanced for the Scottish system, a substantial indictment is at the same time preferred against any institution, which is under the control and patronage of a government or an order and not of the people at large. He joins Bishops Temple and Fraser in abhorrence of "the coarse and literal sense in which appointments to the pastoral office are considered and dealt with as 'property'—the sale of benefices, and the sale of them too often under circumstances which separate the transaction from simony by nothing but the shadow of a shade—these are not," he says, "circumstances which can be contemplated with any satisfaction." And yet this is the one lay element which saves the Church of England, in conjunction with the royal supremacy, from utter sacerdotalism! Surely His Grace looks afield and in predicating that disestablishment will, ere long, be as much an "open question" with the Tories as it is with the Liberals now, demonstrates clearly enough that the question of establishments cannot be determined by any abstract principle, and evidently regards with complacency the downfall of the English establishment. He, an aristocrat, sees salvation in democracy for the Church north of the Tweed.

Lord Hartington gave the party a surprise at Edinburgh, but there is something as hopeful, as surprising in a peer nigh to the throne discerning a panacea for spiritual diversity in an inherent democratic quality.

Unfortunately, however, this democratic quality has been advanced to a bold but dangerous extremity in the Highlands lately: and some are doubtful whether the Calvinists dubbed Free Churchmen in the extreme north are not Ultramontanes as well as Jansenists. They may repudiate the designation; but their pretensions savour of the principle. These claim not only the supremacy of the Church in things spiritual, but, as the *Times* says, also claim to define what is spiritual. Thus the Church could widen the bounds of its jurisdiction at will; and practically it would be not only independent of the State, but above the State. They require the pay and honour of the State, for the contention of these Highlanders is merely transfer, and then to set the nation at defiance. Cardinal Manning may well claim the Highlanders for *confreres*!

The repeal of the Act of Queen Anne it is stated threw the Church back on its ancient foundations, a sweep of operation on the relations between Church and State which has as yet been imperfectly understood. The author claims that on these foundations may be raised an edifice admitting of the widest diversity of opinion; though, he says, in another place, even the ethics of Christianity would not survive a defined theology. The Westminster Confession, he quotes, bears the marks of conflict,