

THE WEEK.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19th, 1890.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies 10 Cents.

Eighth Year.
Vol. VIII., No. 3.

THE WEEK :

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00
Subscriptions payable in advance.
ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4.00 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period.
Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage prepaid, on terms following.—One year, 12s. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. Remittances by P. O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.
No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. O'LOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS -	PAGE
Social Questions Supreme.....	35
Relation of the Pulpit to Politics.....	35
Relation of the State to the Pulpit.....	35
The Election in Napierville.....	36
The Sudbury Nickel Treasure.....	36
Free Discussion Needed.....	36
Experiments in Sugar Beet.....	36
An Absurd Project.....	36
The Parnell Struggle.....	37
Senator Blair on Union.....	37
The Farmer in Politics.....	37
Is Civilization on the Decline?.....	37
CHRISTMAS	38
"CHRISTMAS NUMBERS".....	38
LONDON LETTER.....	39
ROUNDEAU.....	39
ON THE MARCH AT CHRISTMAS-TIDE IN INDIA.....	39
PROMINENT CANADIANS, XXXII. (Charles Mair).....	40
THE CHRISTMAS: A GHOST STORY.....	41
HOLLY LEAVES (POEM).....	42
THE FOOTBALL SEASON OF 1890.....	42
THE INDIAN MESSIAH.....	42
THE FUTURE OF CANADA.....	43
THE RAMBLE.....	43
THE LITTLE RED HOUSE (POEM).....	43
CORRESPONDENCE	
A Canadian National League.....	43
BABY'S QUESTION.....	44
NOTES ON GHOSTS.....	44
ART NOTES.....	45
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	45
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	48
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	48
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.....	48
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	50
CROSS.....	

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any other person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

"SOCIAL questions are supreme." So said a leading Non-Conformist preacher at the opening of one of the great May meetings of the churches in England a year and a-half ago, and his words gave the key-note to the discussions over which he presided. Those words were but the echo of the voice which has been going forth from some of the most influential pulpits of both the Established and the Non-Conformist churches in England for years past. The same note has, too, been taken up by a few leaders of Christian thought in the United States. All honour to the noble prelates and preachers who like Dr. Westcott, in England, and Bishop Huntington, in America, have neither failed to perceive nor shunned to declare "in the name of humanity" that "there are social sins and human equities which have a more urgent and imperative claim on the consideration of ecclesiastical councils and of weekly sermons, than any questions of discipline, ritual, hymnology or predestination." These men—and it is the wonder and reproach of modern Christianity that their number is so small—have done and are doing, we venture to say, more to bring the true Christian ethics from Heaven down to earth, and more to re-vindicate the claim of Christianity to the faith of the struggling and suffering millions, than all the profoundest theological disquisitions, and all the most eloquent eulogies of piety and virtue in the abstract, have effected in a century past, or can effect in a century to come. These men's eyes are opened to the actual state of society as it exists near the close of this vaunted century. These men, too, have not only the divine sympathy with suffering humanity which has nerved them to explore the depths of wretchedness in which hundreds of thousands of their brethren and sisters—for so their Bible calls them—are wearing out an existence which it seems almost a mockery to call life, but they have also the no less divine courage which emboldens them to search out and hold up to view, in the sunlight of the sermon on the Mount, the fruitful source and cause of all this misery. That cause they do not hesitate to describe in a word as human selfishness, selfishness rooted and

flourishing in the hearts of capitalists and employers of labour—the money-grabbers of every description who are one of the products of the age, and many of whom occupy the foremost seats in luxurious houses of worship. But these men go further and lay the axe, it may be hoped, at the root of the tree, by exposing the true character of that nineteenth century fetich, which was appropriately called by Rev. E. A. Oliver, in his striking sermon at St. Simon's Church, in this city, on Sunday last, "The Great God of Competition." After this allusion it is unnecessary to add that the preceding thoughts have been suggested by the reading of that sermon. We have often wondered that these great social questions, which are moving so deeply the minds and hearts of many of the foremost clergymen in England and of some in the United States, have attracted so little attention in Canada. The great billows of thought and feeling, which are overwhelming some of the noblest minds and hearts in the Mother Country, seem to become attenuated to the merest ripples before they reach our shores. It may be the fault of our own want of observation, but we do not remember to have before read or heard a sermon from a Toronto pulpit touching these intensely living questions in the manner and spirit in which they were dealt with by Mr. Oliver in the sermon which was noticed in most of the Monday morning papers. We congratulate the eloquent preacher on having called attention so pointedly to the great question, religious as well as social, of the day. We hope that he will continue the work so well begun and that many others will follow his example.

THE so-called "Minister's Movement" for the deliverance of the city of New York from Tammany rule, which unfortunately for the city ended in defeat at the recent elections, has given rise to an interesting discussion with regard to the proper relation of the clergy to politics. The question evidently has two aspects quite distinct from each other. It may be looked at from the view point of the churches, or from that of the citizens. Touching the former the policy of the clergy in most parts of Canada is pretty clearly marked out by the law of expediency, and can scarcely be considered on its merits, the fact being that in most congregations both political parties are usually so well represented that any attempt of the clergyman to bring pulpit or vestry influence to bear in favour of either candidate would inevitably lead either to the dismissal of the pastor or to the disruption of the church. This fact would make it eminently unwise, if not utterly impracticable—to say nothing of its consistency or otherwise with the spiritual functions of the churches and the great ends for which they avowedly exist—for the Canadian clergy to attempt to exert any influence in their professional capacity on the side of either party or candidate. But we may venture to doubt whether either the politically mixed character of its adherents, or the spiritual motives and aims of the church itself, should prevent the occupant of the pulpit from bringing all the combined influence of his office and his personal character and eloquence to bear for the moral education of his hearers in regard to their duties and responsibilities in political as well as in business and social life. Is there not reason to fear that this duty of the pastoral office is in too many cases neglected or shunned? It can hardly be denied that the political morality of a considerable proportion of Canadian electors, including, there is reason to fear, many habitual church-goers, and even active church members, is at a deplorably low ebb. How else is it possible to interpret the facts that are constantly being brought to light in our election courts, facts which should bring the blush of shame and the flush of indignation to the cheek of every honest Canadian? It is, unhappily, not necessary to go back more than a very few days or weeks in our political history in Ontario for illustrations of our meaning. It can hardly be doubted, we think, that this unblushing buying and selling of votes is in very many cases due more to the lack of moral education than to utter unscrupulousness. Somehow or other, many a man, who would be tolerably upright in regard to ordinary business transactions, seems to see no moral wrong in selling, or bribing another to sell his political birthright, his national manhood, for filthy lucre. Could such a state of things exist if the pulpits of the

various churches rang as they should with denunciation of such acts of baseness and corruption, by whomsoever done or winked at? Is there not reason to believe that if the great principles of New Testament morals—the highest code of morals the world has ever known—were persistently and fearlessly brought home to the consciences of those who sit in the pews from Sunday to Sunday, and from week to week, the occupation of the briber would soon become politically unprofitable? Surely the churches, with their pulpits, Sunday schools, and other machinery for doing religious work, should regard it as a part of their duty to teach their adherents that genuine Christianity, whatever else it may mean, means honest and conscientious citizenship.

CLEARLY it is one thing to conclude that the clergy, as such, neither can nor should take part directly in party political contests, unless compelled by the highest moral considerations; but is quite another thing to maintain that the State, as such, has any right to deny to the clergy the utmost freedom of action in the matter. It may be very wrong politically for the State to forbid what it may be equally wrong religiously for the clergy to do. In Canada the principles of absolute religious liberty and equality are happily pretty well understood, and in most respects pretty firmly established. With the exception of one particular Church, the Roman Catholic, we do not suppose that any Canadian Parliament or Legislature would think of interfering with the freedom of the clergy, even were they, or any number of them, to use their pulpits for the advocacy of partisan politics of the most pronounced stripe. An unenviable notoriety has recently been gained by a Nova Scotian Bishop, through the publication of a letter written by him to influence the judgments of his parishioners at the last general election, which letter, it is thought, saved the present able Minister of Justice from defeat. But it will be found on examination that the main inducements held out by the letter in question are precisely of the same kind as those often used by other canvassers, and even by Ministers of the Crown themselves. It is simply an appeal to the avaricious instincts and impulses of his parishioners. No thoughtful person can have much doubt as to the moral quality of such appeals and their pernicious effects in lowering the general standard of political morality. But a clergyman loses none of his rights of citizenship on entering his profession, and it would be absurdly unjust to forbid a priest or prelate to do what any other citizen may do with impunity. The only question that can be soberly argued touching the right of the clergy to the utmost freedom in the use of their professional influence is that which concerns the practice of that spiritual intimidation which ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church alone can use, because they alone are believed to have power to follow their parishioners with their influence beyond the bourne, and to determine, in some measure, their happiness in the future state. This spiritual intimidation is, as is well-known, regarded as a species of undue influence, and as such forbidden by our laws. An able correspondent of THE WEEK has criticized this particular characteristic of our election laws with much force and acumen, but we doubt if he will be able to convince the people of Canada that the free use of this mighty weapon for influencing weak and superstitious electors can be permitted without serious danger to Canadian interests. The question is really *sui generis* and can hardly be discussed on general principles, and there is undoubtedly a good deal to be said on both sides. But should a priest make use of the same spiritual terrors to deprive a superstitious parishioner of his property, few would hesitate to declare that the law should step in for the protection of the defrauded. Why should society be readier to protect a man's personal property than his political liberties?

THE return of Mr. Paradis, the Government Candidate in Napierville, adds another to the series of Government victories in bye-elections during the present Parliament. Napierville was regarded as one of the strongholds of the Opposition in the Province of Quebec. What is the cause of this unexpected change in its political sentiments? A satisfactory answer to the question is not easy to find.