

The Dominion Review.

VOL. I.

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

NO. 7.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE : ITS LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY, AND THERAPEUTICS.

BY W. F. MUNRO, TORONTO.

III. (*Conclusion*).

THE "God" of Christian Science is very like the god that Faust tried to palm off upon innocent Margaret. "Do you believe in God?" she asks. "Believe in him? Who dares say, I believe, or believe not, in him?"—

"The All-embracer, the All-sustainer!
Embraces and sustains he not
Thee, me, himself?
Rears not the heaven its arch above?
Doth not the firm-set earth beneath us lie?
And with the tender gaze of love
Climb not the everlasting stars on high?
Do I not gaze upon thee eye to eye?
And all the world of sight, and sense, and sound,
Bears it not in upon thy heart and brain,
And mystically weave around
Thy being influences that never wane?
Fill thy heart thence even unto overflowing.
Then call it whatsoe'er thou wilt,—
Bliss! Heart! Love! God!
Name for it I have none!
Feeling is all in all."

Margaret admits that this is all very beautiful, but adds: "Christian you are not, I see."

According to Goethe, it was the poet (maker) who first made gods for us—"brought them down to us, and raised us up to them;" but the poet afterwards learned to make them out of men's incoherent abstractions, giving thus to airy nothing a local habitation and a name, and the name invariably began with a capital. We do not revolt from this tendency to hypostatize adjectives and turn abstractions into entities when we meet with it in the *Iliad* or the *Faerie Queen*, but from its unnatural development in Christian Science we are apt to turn away in disgust. Its God is *Good*—not a good being in any conceivable sense; he is *Mind*—

not a mind; or he is Principle, Life, Truth, and Love—not an honest god at all; and yet such mere human concepts are, with insufferable cant, invoked as Our Heavenly Father, the Creator, the Infinite, the Good Shepherd, etc.

With some of the hymns ascribed to Mrs. Eddy and adopted into the liturgy of her divine science, orthodoxy is either propitiated or deceived:

“Shepherd, show me how to go
O'er the hill-side steep;
How to gather, how to sow,
How to feed thy sheep.
Lead thy lambkins to the fold,
Take them in thine arms,” etc., etc.

In another hymn there is this apostrophe to Spirit, which, according to the glossary in “Science and Health,” means “Divine substance, mind, principle, all that is good”:

“Sinner, it calls you, come to this fountain,
Cleanse the *foul senses* within;
'Tis the spirit that makes pure,
That exalts thee, and will cure
All thy sorrow and sickness and sin.”

The *foul senses within* are held to be on a par with matter and “mortal mind.” They are said to “defraud, lie and cheat.” They are “the only source of evil or error,” but “Christian Science shows them to be false, since matter has no sensation.”

Of those who have rashly invested three dollars in the “Precious Volume,” decoyed by its title and alleged wealth of editions, some may have been looking for real knowledge, others may have been in quest of health, while some may even have been allured by the hope of obtaining something new in Biblical interpretation, for a promise of all these—science, health, and a key to the Scriptures—has been artfully woven into the title of the book. How grossly deceived they must have been who expected to find any kind of knowledge or science in it; and as for health, or the means of preserving and restoring it, although promised as a reward for simply reading the book, the search must have turned out to be a fool's errand. Imagine, if possible, the mental condition of a professor of therapeutics capable of diagnosing a malady such as a boil in the following terms: “You say a boil is painful; but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests your belief in pain through inflammation and swelling, and you call this a boil.” The professor is quite as serious in proposing the following treatment for a boil: “Now, administer *mentally* to our patient a high attenuation of truth on this subject, and it will soon cure the boil” (“Science and Health,” p. 47). The curative agent here is some specific truth, not Truth with a capital T; but why it should be diluted is far from being clear. Take the case of palsy: “Palsy is a belief which

attacks n
portions
show mo
supreme,
various t
pain in t
body.”
ease, all t
unfortuna
him that
ease, then
God—the
ill.” Thi
that it wo
In adm
said to be
silently wi
at the bed
what she
you that s
how they s
the presen
thoughts o
as to what

“I said to
disease is a f
solute good.
at you, and I
yourself disea
fect, but it ha
Why, it was a
as sound as t
that beautifu
since man is t
diseased? Y
more divine t
have that pain
seemed to act

This is “
that they ca
nor time to
transferred
strong enou

“Seat yours
but your thoug

attacks mortals through fear and paralyzes the body, making certain portions of it motionless." The cure is as follows: "Destroy the fear; show mortal mind that muscles have no power to be lost, for mind is supreme, and you will cure the palsy." Again: "Fever is fears of various types; the quickened pulse, coated tongue, febrile heat, dry skin, pain in the head and limbs, are pictures depicted by mortal mind on the body." The cure in all cases is the same. In short, whatever the disease, all that is necessary to bring about a cure is to remove the patient's unfortunate misconception that he is ill, and this is done by convincing him that he is quite well. "Argue with the patient that he has no disease, then realize the presence of health. . . . Tell him he is a child of God—the highest expression of Good—and, therefore, that he cannot be ill." This is the truth (?), it seems, that has to be administered, a truth that it would be well to give—and take—in "high attenuations."

In administering this "truth" to a sick patient, the practitioner is said to be "realizing." He, or she—oftenest she—the "realizer," sits silently with her eyes shut for a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes at the bedside of her patient, and "realizes." If you ask her to make what she has been doing comprehensible to you, she will probably inform you that she has been giving her patient "mental treatment." This is how they speak of it to the profane; the shop phrase for it is, "realizing the presence of health." We are sometimes favored with the actual thoughts of a realizer. Here is what Miss Helen Wilmans has disclosed as to what constitutes a "mental treatment":

"I said to him (the patient) mentally: 'You have no disease; what you call your disease is a fixed mode of thought arising from the absence of positive belief in absolute good. Be stronger,' I said; 'you must believe in absolute good; I am looking at you, and I see you a beautiful, strong spirit, perfectly sound. What makes you think yourself diseased? You are not diseased; the shadow of a doubt is reflected on your feet, but it has no real existence. There, look down yourself and see that it is gone. Why, it was a mere negation, and the place where you located it now shows for itself as sound as the rest of your body. Don't you know that imperfection is impossible to that beautiful creature, your real self? Since there is no evil in all the universe, and since man is the highest expression of good amidst ubiquitous Good, how can you be diseased? You are not diseased. There is not an angel in all the spheres sounder or more divine than you.' Then I spoke out aloud: 'There, now,' I said, 'you won't have that pain again.' As I said it, there was a surge of conviction through me that seemed to act on the bloodvessels of my body, and made me tingle all over."

This is "giving it to him." It is claimed by the Christian Scientists that they can operate upon patients at a distance. "There is no space nor time to mind." "Remember that every thought you think will be transferred to the persons thought of, if you think long enough and strong enough." The rules for absent treatment are as follows:

"Seat yourself alone. Let the room be silent. Subjugate your senses to all else but your thought. Fix your thought upon the patient. Picture him in your mind. . .

He may be sympathetic ; that will help you greatly. He may be apathetic ; that is not so good, but better than the next. He may be antipathetic, hostile ; then say not a word, but silently *give it to him !*"

Mrs. Eddy relates the case of a cure she performed without having seen the patient, who wrote to her as follows :

" Please find enclosed a check for five hundred dollars in reward for your services that can never be repaid. The day you received my husband's letter I became conscious for the first time in forty-eight hours. My servant brought my wrapper, and I arose from my bed and sat up. . . . The enlargement of my left side is all gone, and the doctors pronounce me rid of heart disease. I had been afflicted with it from infancy. It became enlargement of the heart and dropsy of the chest. I was only waiting and almost logging to die, but you have healed me. How wonderful to think of it, when you and I have never seen each other."

Hamlet, chaffing the young sprigs of nobility that were sent for to the court to pluck out the heart of his mystery, says to them : " Denmark's a prison." They reply : " We think not so, my lord." " Why, then," says Hamlet, "'tis none to you, for there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." Mrs. Eddy has seized on this half-truth, " There is nothing either good or bad but thinking makes it so," and has made it one of the mottoes of her book, proving that the central idea of her system, stripped of all its cant and humbug, is the power of mind over certain physical states of the body, which was well known and recognized long before Mrs. Eddy made a superstition out of it.

" Science and Health " gives numerous instances of the power of mind ; and therein gives the whole case away. For example :

" A gentleman was made to believe that he occupied a bed where a cholera patient had died. Immediately the symptoms of the disease appeared in him, and he died. The fact was, that he had not caught the cholera by material contact, because no such patient had been in the bed."

The oft-quoted case is also given of the man who died under the belief that one of his veins had been opened. Another instance is related as follows :

" The author has attenuated common salt until there was not a saline property left ; with one drop of that attenuation in a goblet of water, and a teaspoonful of the water administered at intervals of three hours, she has cured a patient *sinking in the last stage of typhoid fever.*"

This prescription was evidently as free from salt as it could well have been made, but a grain or two of the condiment is essential to our acceptance of the story. The same must be said of the account she gives of a dropsical patient cured by bread-crumbs taken under the belief that they were *digitalis* or some other medicine. This is the account of the case given in " Science and Health," page 46 :

" A case of dropsy, given up by the faculty, fell into my hands. It was a terrible case. Tapping had been employed, and yet the patient *looked like a barrel* as she lay in bed. I prescribed the fourth attenuation of *Argentum nitricum*, with occasional

doses of a somewhat physican from their the medicated pellets said she w this, she in the third c this way, t employing

Accord with this " You hav thought a I am look not at all barrel to I that this to all who potency of very strik It is not th the ready from pois mankind h to be pois The conse opinions o sick chamb In the case surrounded and the in Science, ar Some Ch function of with the vic of unsuccess the nature e true, has e latitude of r hymn,

doses of a high attenuation of sulphur. She improved perceptibly. Believing then somewhat in the ordinary theories of medical practice, and learning that her former physician had prescribed these remedies, I began to fear an aggravation of symptoms from their prolonged use, and told the patient so; but she was unwilling to give up the medicine when she was recovering. It then occurred to me to give her unmedicated pellets, and watch the result. I did so, and she continued to gain. Finally, she said she would give up her medicine for one day, and risk the effects. After trying this, she informed me that she could get along two days without the globules; but on the third day she again suffered, and was relieved by taking them. She went on in this way, taking the unmedicated pellets, and receiving occasional visits from me, but employing no other means, *and was cured.*"

According to Christian Science, there was really nothing the matter with this poor woman. A "realizer" would say to her, as we have seen, "You have no disease, what you call your disease is a fixed mode of thought arising from the absence of positive belief in absolute good; I am looking at you and see you a beautiful strong spirit, perfectly sound, not at all like a barrel." But here is the difficulty—she looked like a barrel to Mrs. Eddy herself. Is this an evidence of the potency of mind that this woman's belief made her barrel-like, not only to herself, but to all who saw her? It is evident that Mrs. Eddy has ideas of the potency of mind that only a mind diseased could entertain. This is very strikingly manifested in what she says about death by poisoning. It is not the poison that kills, but the belief that it is deadly. To meet the ready objection that an unconscious infant or an idiot would die from poison, she advances the insane notion that "the vast majority of mankind believe the arsenic, the strychnine, or whatever the drug used, to be poisonous, for it has been set down as a poison by mortal mind. The consequence is, that the result is controlled by the majority of opinions outside, not by the infinitesimal minority of opinions in the sick chamber"—that is, of the patient who has taken poison inadvertently. In the case supposed which is too long to quote, the patient's bedside is surrounded by a few faithful ones who believe that poisons won't kill, and the insinuation is, that, if all the world were converted to Christian Science, arsenic and strychnine might be taken with impunity.

Some Christian Scientists have been known to designate that peculiar function of theirs called "realizing" by the name *silent prayer*, when, with the view of disarming or propitiating the nemesis of the law, a case of unsuccessful practice happened to get into the courts; but this is of the nature of an *equivocal*, that deserves to be exposed. Prayer, it is true, has even in the most orthodox acceptance of the term, a wide latitude of meaning. It may either be, as in Montgomery's well-known hymn,

"The soul's sincere desire,
Uttered or unexpressed,
The motion of a hidden fire
That slumbers in the breast."

Or it may be a plain objective request made to an objective Power believed to be able to grant it, as, "Give us this day our daily bread." But can there be anything like prayer addressed to an hypostatized adjective, or an abstract noun?

It seems, however, that even this absurdity is possible among some of the schools of Christian Science. Here is part of a prayer addressed to the abstract noun Reality on behalf of a dyspeptic, taken verbatim from a textbook on mind-cure issued by the President of the "New York School of Primitive and Practical Christian Science," who states that *his* school will be free from "eccentricity, pretension, and fanaticism!"

"Holy Reality! we believe in thee, thou art everywhere present. We really believe it. Blessed reality! we do not pretend to believe, think we believe, believe that we believe; WE BELIEVE. Believing that thou art everywhere present, we believe that thou art in this patient's stomach, in every fibre, in every cell, in every atom, that thou art the sole only reality of that stomach. Heavenly, Holy Reality, we will try not to be such hypocrites and infidels as every day of our lives to affirm our faith in thee and then immediately begin to tell how sick we are, forgetting that thou art everywhere, and that thou art not sick, and therefore that nothing in this universe was ever sick, is now sick, or can be sick. . . . We know, father and mother of us all, that there is no such thing as a really diseased stomach, that the disease is the carnal mortal mind given over to the world, the flesh, and the devil. . . . Lord, help us to believe that all evil is utterly unreal; that it is silly to be sick, absurd to be ailing, wicked to be wailing, atheism to say 'I am sick.' Help us to stoutly affirm with our hand in your hand, with our eyes fixed on thee, that we have no dyspepsia, that we never had dyspepsia, that we will never have dyspepsia, that there is no such thing, that there never was any such thing, that there never will be any such thing. Amen."

It is very hard to believe that this is *unconscious* humbug. But even the Arch Quack of the 18th century is said to have been sincere to the extent of his ability. Carlyle was of opinion that there might be, at the bottom of all, a certain musk grain of real superstitious belief: "How wonderfully such a musk-grain of belief will flavor, and impregnate with seductive odor, a whole inward world of quackery, so that every fibre thereof shall smell musk, is well known." Perhaps the nearest counterpart to Christian Science that the world of humbug has furnished is the divine science of Egyptian Masonry, discovered and founded by Count Cagliostro:

"To prove that I have been chosen of God as an apostle to defend and propagate religion, I say that, as the Holy Church has instituted pastors to demonstrate in face of the world that she is the true Catholic faith, even so, having operated with approbation and by the counsel of pastors of the Holy Church, I am, as I said, fully justified in regard to my operations; and these pastors have assured me that my Egyptian Order was divine, and deserved to be formed into an order sanctioned by the Holy Father."

Carlyle's fine study of the "Quack of Quacks" will suggest other parallelisms.

We ha
interpret
herself to
is "Key
science co
nor pen c
tions, for
so-called,
of exeges
great an
competen
all he mu
both to t
the writin
American
Smith.
region of
all her lea
Christian
attainment

"My fath
out of schoo
site. At ten
with the We
favorite stud
Albert I was
After my dis
school books

From thi
exegesis of
the only Sc
the book of
John. We
unconnected
that book;
pretation—t
a neither m
in the passa
Mrs. Eddy,
versy. The
ancing of Je
a word to sa
day. The fo
Quoting the
"The Infnit

We have only now to consider Mrs. Eddy's claim to be an inspired interpreter of the inspired volume. The name given by the author herself to the last two chapters of her great work, "Science and Health," is "Key to the Scriptures": "No human pen or tongue taught me the science contained in this book, 'Science and Health,' and neither tongue nor pen can ever overthrow it." It is thus that she raises our expectations, for we take the science she here refers to as including the science, so-called, of Biblical interpretation, which in theology goes by the name of exegesis, or hermeneutics. The task of the exegete is a labor of great and complicated difficulty; that he must needs be a scholar, competently equipped for grammatical and philological inquiries, above all he must be familiar with the results of modern criticism as applied both to the Old and the New Testament; he must know something of the writings of the great critics — French, German, English and American, fifty names at least between Jean Astruc and Robertson Smith. Mrs. Eddy does not appear to have ever breathed in the region of the higher criticism, but even if she had, it appears that all her learning miraculously disappeared the moment she discovered Christian Science. This is how she modestly enough refers to her attainments:

"My father was taught that my brain was too large for my body, so kept me much out of school, but I gained book knowledge with far less labor than is usually requisite. At ten years of age I was as familiar with Lindley Murray's grammar as I was with the Westminster Catechism, and the latter I had to repeat every Sunday. My favorite studies were natural philosophy, logic, and moral science. To my brother Albert I was indebted for lessons in the ancient tongues — Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. After my discovery of Christian Science, most of the knowledge I had gleaned from school books vanished like a dream."

From this *naïve* confession, it may readily be inferred that Mrs. Eddy's exegesis of Scripture is not a very formidable affair. In the first place, the only Scriptures subjected to the "key" are the first four chapters of the book of Genesis and a few selected verses of the Revelation of St. John. We may be apt to think it strange that the exegesis of a few unconnected passages in an obscure book should be called the "key" to that book; but when we come to understand the real principle of interpretation—the trick, as it were—we are no longer amazed. The trick is neither more nor less than to destroy whatever meaning there may be in the passage by turning it into jargon. In her treatment of Genesis, Mrs. Eddy, as it may well be imagined, eschews all manner of controversy. There are no Pentateuchal difficulties in her way, no nice balancing of Jehovistic and Elohistie documents to undertake; she has not a word to say even on the burning question of the length of a creation day. The following may be taken as a fair specimen of the "key." Quoting the first verse of the Bible, she goes on to say:

"The Infinite hath no beginning. This word beginning is employed to signify the

first ; that is, the eternal verity and unity of God and man, including the universe. The creation principle, Life, Truth and Love, is God."

Quoting the next verse—"And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the deep," she applies the "key" thus :

"The divine principle and idea constitute spiritual harmony, heaven and eternity. In this universe of truth, matter is unknown. No supposition of error enters there. Christian Science—the word of God, saith to the darkness upon the face of error: God is all in all ; and light appears in proportion as this is understood."

The whole of the "key" to Genesis is of the same idiotic twaddle. The verses in Revelation selected for interpretation, whether consciously or unconsciously, refer for the most part to a *Woman* and a *Book*. What the Revelation of John reveals is still an open question. Its author, whether John the Apostle or John the Presbyter, meant something, no doubt, by the Beast and the False Prophet, the Woman Clothed with the Sun, and the visions of the Seals, the Trumpets, and the Vials. What all these meant is still under active discussion in the theological world, especially of Germany ; and it is felt by those who are qualified to judge that the investigations of scholars like Spitta, Erbes, and Schmidt may ultimately lead to an approximate solution of the difficulties surrounding this most obscure of all the sacred books, making it yield valuable information with regard to the development of thought and feeling in early Christian times. Poor Mrs. Eddy is not in this "running," to use a phrase of doubtful reputation. Perhaps the most contemptible thing in "Science and Health" is this "key" to the Revelation of St. John. After assuring us, as we have seen, that the Scriptures were incomplete "until *Our Heavenly Father* saw fit, through the 'key' to the Scriptures in 'Science and Health,' to unlock the mystery of godliness," we find that the main object of the "key" is to insinuate that she is the Apocalyptic Woman, and her "Precious Volume" the Apocalyptic Book. For example, beginning with the tenth chapter, she quotes the verses : "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven clothed with a cloud. . . . And he had in his hand a little book open," etc. The "key" to this passage begins thus : "Is this angel or message from God, Divine Science, that comes in a cloud?" No direct answer is given, but the soft impeachment remains, and the "key" proceeds with more courage to say :

"To mortals it is obscure, abstract and dark, but a bright promise crowns its brow. When understood, it is truth's prism and praise ; when you look it fairly in the face, you can heal by its means. This angel had in his hand a little book, open for all to read and understand. Did this book contain the revelation of Divine Science?"

Modesty once more forbids an answer in the affirmative, but further on all bashful reserve is thrown aside, and we read :

"Mortal, obey the heavenly evangel. Take up Divine Science. Read it from

beginning t
it heals you

She is m
Clothed
Orphic ja

" in the c
there is on
namely : " T
sun, and the

The "k

" Heaven
heavenly har
in the sun ;
down from h
sented the c
earth. . . .
lator comple
Motherhood

and so on
Mrs. Eddy
tached sent
books, and
" Science a
to speak of
the book.
system whi
pecuniary p

"When G
instructions in
for an impart
name \$300 as
from asking it
has since sho

And her l
physical Col
Some 4,000
the fees, the
We are told
of Christian
\$2.00 a year
it contains t
many of wh
the " pathol
issue of the

beginning to end. Study it, ponder it. It will be indeed sweet at its first taste, when it heals you, but murmur not over truth, if you find its digestion bitter."

She is much more guarded in insinuating her claim to be the Woman Clothed with the Sun, veiling her utterances in the darkest kind of Orphic jargon. We are told that—

"in the opening of the Sixth Seal, typical of the six thousand years since Adam, there is one distinctive feature which has special reference to the present age," namely: "There appeared a great wonder in heaven—a Woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars."

The "key" to this is that—

"Heaven represents harmony, and Divine Science interprets the principle of heavenly harmony. . . . Because of his more spiritual vision, St. John saw an angel in the sun; he saw the spiritual ideal as a woman clothed in light, a bride coming down from heaven wedded to the Lamb of Love. The Bride and the Lamb represented the correlation of divine principle and spiritual idea, bringing harmony to earth. . . . As Elias represents the fatherhood of God, through Jesus, so the Revelator completes this figure with woman, as the spiritual idea or type of God's Motherhood."

and so on beyond further endurance.

Mrs. Eddy deprecates "criticisms of her book that are based on detached sentences or clauses separated from the context;" but, in sibylline books, among which, in the sense of being oracular and fragmentary, "Science and Health" must undoubtedly rank, there is no context at all to speak of; detached sentences and clauses for the most part make up the book. The author has much more to fear from the criticism of a system which has turned an alleged divine revelation into a source of pecuniary profit. Mrs. Eddy informs us in her autobiography that,

"When God (the God of Christian Science) impelled me to set a price on my instructions in Christian Science mind reading, I could think of no financial equivalent for an impartation of a knowledge of that divine power which heals; but I was led to name \$300 as the price for each pupil in one course of lessons at my college. I shrank from asking it, but was finally led by a strange providence to accept this fee. God has since shown me, in multitudinous ways, the wisdom of this decision."

And her heirs will no doubt confirm it. The Massachusetts Metaphysical College was chartered in 1881, and closed abruptly in 1889. Some 4,000 students took the course, and if only half that number paid the fees, the value of Mrs. Eddy's "discovery" may be easily estimated. We are told that, "To meet the broader wants of humanity," the *Journal of Christian Science* was started in 1883; it is issued monthly, and costs \$2.00 a year, paid in advance. As the official organ of Christian Science, it contains the advertising cards of graduated students and their pupils, many of whom have set up schools or institutes of their own for teaching the "pathology of spiritual power," as some of them put it. In a recent issue of the *Journal* I counted some seven hundred cards; the fee for a

year's insertion, I have been told, is \$5.00, strictly payable in advance. Nearly all, if not all, the advertisers are agents for the sale of Mrs. Eddy's books.

There is this to be said, in conclusion, that the founder of a system who succeeds in making it a veritable gold mine for herself, as well as a means of livelihood for hundreds, perhaps thousands of others, must be allowed to have ability of some kind; but the verdict of all experience is that a religion can only be founded by a religious spirit who expects nothing from the world.

IF I SHOULD DIE TO-NIGHT.

BY WALT. A. RATCLIFFE, LISTOWEL.

IF, ere the morrow bright,
The Boatman from yon Shore of Shade
Should come and say, "Long time thou here hast stayed
Away with me to-night!"
And far beyond the sight
Of men should waft me out upon the sea,
Oh! say what would the written record be,
If I should die to-night?

No terror would affright,
No quailing at the billows' ceaseless boom,
No boding fear of boundless, rayless gloom
And chill and damp of night.
But when the last warm light
Of life, a burned-out candle's glow,
Shines o'er the fleeted years, what would it show,
If I should die to-night?

Pale, tearful Sorrow's blight,
As frost in June upon the tender flowers
Full oft descends to pierce these hearts of ours
And turn our day to night;
Then, when all's still and white,
From out his humble place will one draw near,
And say, I kissed away one bitter tear,
If I should die to-night?

The wide world seeketh light.
The oase, the false, the many long have curst

Dr. JOHN
States," sa
"It is part
is a worthy st
'hoodlers' do
them is wide
The char
The general
the local go
always on
this reason
half the spe
e would h

And wanton hid, tho' faint their souls athirst,
 The well-springs from their sight ;
 But would one pause to write
 That ever I hoar Age or ruddy Youth
 Did point to fountains of Eternal Truth,
 If I should die to-night ?

Now reigns the tyrant Might,
 And crushes low the weak, for he is strong ;
 With each succeeding sun red-handed Wrong
 Doth triumph over Right.
 But from the hate and spite,
 Would one faint voice in falt'ring accents speak
 And say, I once was strength unto the weak,
 If I should die to-night ?

Time doth each deed requite,
 For Sorrow's crown of thorns is vain Regret,
 That we may wear, each thorn with tear-drops wet,
 As day gives place to night.
 I would that naught but light
 Of Love, of Truth, of Good may round me shine,
 No wasted hour reproach this heart of mine,
 If I should die to-night.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

BY B. F. UNDERWOOD, CHICAGO.

Dr. JOHN FISKE, in his work on "Civil Government in the United States," says :

"It is partly because too many of our citizens fail to realize that local government is a worthy study that we find it making so much trouble for us ; the 'bummers' and 'hoodlers' do not find the subject beneath their notice ; the Master who inspires them is wide awake and - for a creature that divides the hoof—extremely intelligent."

The character of an aggregate depends upon the character of its units. The general government must depend very largely upon the efficiency of the local governments. For this reason it was that Jefferson insisted always on the importance of a thorough study of the township. For this reason Dr. Fiske, in the work referred to above, devotes about one-half the space to the government of the town, the county and the city. He would have that taught which is near and simple, before attempting

to make the student understand the more remote and complex. To study, as he points out, grand generalizations about government before attending to such of its features as come most directly before us, is to run the risk of achieving a result like that attained by the New Hampshire school boy who had studied geology in a text-book, but was not aware that he had ever set eyes upon an igneous rock. And yet there is a popular text-book which says that "to learn the duties of town, city and county officers has nothing whatever to do with the grand and noble subject of civil government," and that "to attempt class drill on petty town and county offices would be simply a burlesque of the whole subject."

A writer who takes such a view of government fails to see the relation of the parts to the whole, and does not recognize the true historical development of government. The township, the unit of local government, and the county existed before there were cities, and townships, counties and cities before there was properly speaking a State. English shires coalesced into small States, and these States, by uniting, formed the English nation. Local government was first a necessity in this country, and then came general government, the colonial government being the first in order. Dr. Fiske's method of studying government is the only method consistent with the facts of social evolution.

There is nothing more needed to-day than popular interest in local government. The city governments in this country are far from what they should be and can be made. The chief American cities are now ruled by organizations and conspiracies of plunderers, gangs of marauders on the tax-payers. Gamblers and rum-sellers are among the most active officials and political workers, and there is a general conviction among the people that official dishonesty is the rule rather than the exception. Whenever an attempt is made to suppress gambling and other evils, in the perpetuation of which unscrupulous men are interested, what should be the strong arm of the law is paralyzed, and it is the boast of thieves and thugs that they are "in" with this or that man whom the party dares not offend.

The substantial citizens are too busy with their own affairs to unite and vigorously apply the remedy to this most scandalous state of things. Can the tax-payers justly exempt themselves from censure for the results of their neglect to fulfil their duties as citizens? What is needed is a revival of interest in local governments, taking them out of the hands of unworthy men, and making them as high in character as the Boston town meetings were in the days of Sam Adams. The self-respecting and self-supporting class of people should unite, break up the old combinations that now control city politics, and select men of known character, and those capable of managing municipal affairs.



As all t
commu
depend
persons
Effectiv
the deg
commun
as a tra
fail, eith
illustrat
on the i
increase
we trade
own cou
countrie
check in
depends.
Many
plication
that this
guarante
communi
througho
machiner
The tend
of cultura
which is
Protect
modities
full benefi
of protect
average r
by an inc
This eff
returns of
Cobden tre
rapid than
the abroga
fective dut
Experien
population

A PLEA FOR A REVENUE TARIFF.

BY H. WASHINGTON, OTTAWA.

As all trade arises from the constant necessity each individual in the community feels himself under, to provide food for himself and those dependent on him, and as on the average it takes more food for two persons than one, increase of trade must depend on increase of population. Effective demand for other things must at all times be in proportion to the degree of certainty with which the food supply is assured to the community. The partial cessation of effective demand, or what is known as a trade depression, that always occurs in our own country when crops fail, either in our own country or in those countries with which we trade, illustrates the truth of this. Now, as increase of population depends on the increase of the food supply, which in its turn depends on the increase of the area of cultivation in our own country and those countries we trade with, any law that discourages the pursuit of agriculture in our own country or prevents our people trading with the farmers of other countries must narrow the source of the food supply and consequently check increase of population on which increase of trade necessarily depends.

Many assume that increase of trade arises principally from the multiplication of man's wants under modern conditions. It is self-evident that this multiplication of wants arises from the increased assurance, guaranteed by modern conditions, of a plentiful supply of food to each community, owing to the vast extension of the area of cultivation throughout the world, combined with the introduction of labor-saving machinery, improvements in navigation, transport and communication. The tendency of all such improvement and the extension of the area of cultivation is to reduce the cost of commodities to the consumer, which is but another name for the whole community.

Protection, in so far as it protects, tends to increase the cost of commodities, thus in a measure depriving the community protected of the full benefits of modern improvements. Hence we find that the introduction of protection in any country is always followed by a falling off in the average rate of increase of population, and the abrogation of protection by an increase in such average.

This effect of protection on population is illustrated by the census returns of France. The rate of increase for the first five years under the Cobden treaty, a comparatively free trade measure, was 300 per cent. more rapid than for the previous ten years, or for the first nine years after the abrogation of the Cobden treaty and the re-imposition of high protective duties.

Experience teaches that protection in Canada had a similar effect on population. From 1871 to 1881, under a revenue tariff, we increased

our population 18 per cent., healthily distributed between the urban and rural class.

Between 1881 and 1891, under Protection, our increase was less than 12 per cent., said increase being entirely amongst the urban class. The number of our farmers from ocean to ocean decreased 9000 during this period.

A similar uneven distribution of population followed the introduction of protection in the United States and Victoria, Australia. It is a fact worth noting in this connection that the serious trade depressions that have marked the history of commerce since 1869 were first developed in these countries.

Why an abnormal increase in the urban class of the community results under Protection in a depression of trade becomes apparent when we consider the known effect of a failure of crops. It is self-evident that whether crops fail or those dependent on the crops increase at a greater ratio than the crops, the same results must ensue.

No hurt can possibly come to the community from an abnormal increase in the area of cultivation, for inasmuch as all industries have their basis in agriculture, the greater the proportionate number of farmers, the greater must be the prosperity of those who are not farmers.

It will be seen from the foregoing that Protection gives an impetus to the increase of the urban class, whilst it narrows their market at home by discouraging the pursuit of agriculture. This necessarily clogs the source of the food supply, which manifests itself in a shrinkage in the rate of increase of population. Now, as an increase of trade necessarily depends on increase of population, the aggregate of trade must suffer in sympathy with the shrinkage in the rate of increase of population, although it is always possible to show that some lines of trade and manufacture did increase in consequence of the introduction of protective tariffs. Protection has a similar narrowing effect on our foreign trade, as will be seen from the following facts and deductions therefrom. The farmer, in order to utilize his surplus products, is forced to exchange them for things he does not or cannot produce. All nations are in the same position in regard to their surplus for export. That is to say, they are forced to exchange it for something they cannot or do not produce in their own country as cheaply as in the country where the exchange takes place.

Protection is an effort to prevent the people protected purchasing the surplus stocks of other nations, or as the Protectionist puts it, it prevents the people being flooded by the cheap goods of other nations. It is funny to consider, in this connection, that those great benefactors of the human race, the inventors and engineers, have devoted their lives to enable us to get these cheap goods, and western governments have made the people spend thousands of millions of public money in international bridges and railways with the same object in view. The Chinese are more consistent Protectionists, for they won't build the bridges and railways. This well

nigh ur
from ea
the ha
preven
nations
people
to purc

Many
of their
cheaply
to sell
price pr
price pa
tion, an
quantity
product
ports.
effort of
apparen
would pr
fed good
paupers
total we
increas
decrease
During t
times, an
silver coi
began th
coin and
the world

Though
trated in
well as in

It will
impetus t
at home l
foreign m
foreign fa
possible u
individual
with food,
will cause
The fac
to utilize i
exchange

nigh universal effort of the nations to prevent their people buying direct from each other, is fast driving the international trade of the world into the hands of the people of Great Britain, where no effort is made to prevent her people taking advantage of the sales the people of other nations are forced to make. The keen competition thus forced on the people of protected countries by their rulers, enables the people of England to purchase the surplus stocks of these nations very cheaply.

Many governments tax their own subjects heavily in order to pay some of their people large bonuses to enable them to sell their surplus products cheaply in the English market. This forced competition among the nations to sell their surplus products in the British market accounts for the low price prevailing the world over for the raw products of the land. The price paid for export will always govern the price paid for home consumption, and that price will be fixed in the country importing the largest quantity, which at present is Great Britain. The bulk of the raw products of the land exported by all countries is now forced into her ports. The wonderful benefits to the people of Great Britain of this effort of Protectionist countries to flood her with cheap goods is very apparent. Since she opened her ports to the world, or, as the Protectionist would put it, since she allowed herself to be flooded by the cheap bonused goods of the pauper labor of the world, she has reduced her own total wealth four times, the bulk of her international trade ten times, increased her affluent class eight times faster than population, and decreased her criminal class from 1 in 700 to 1 in 2,400 of population. During this period the world's debt to Great Britain multiplied nineteen times, and at present amounts to a greater sum than all the gold and silver coin and bullion at present out of the ground. When this flooding began the world's debt to Great Britain amounted to one-tenth of the coin and bullion in gold and silver in circulation and in stock throughout the world.

Though wealth is increasing in protected countries, it is being concentrated in the hands of the few, and poverty and crime are increasing as well as indebtedness to England.

It will be seen from the foregoing that Protection not only gives an impetus to the increase of the urban class, while it narrows their market at home by discouraging the pursuit of agriculture, but it also narrows the foreign market by discouraging the interchange of commodities with foreign farmers, making progress slow and painful. That progress is possible under such a system is owing to the unceasing efforts of the individuals of the community to provide themselves and their families with food, clothes and shelter. Experience teaches us that such efforts will cause wealth to increase, even amid war and pestilence.

The fact that all nations have a surplus which, if they wish profitably to utilize it, they must sell outside their borders, and that all trade is an exchange of one commodity for another, illustrates the absurdity of ne-

gotiating reciprocity treaties. It is self-evident that the country which places no obstacle in the way of her people taking full advantage of the sales of surplus products the people of other countries must necessarily offer, gets reciprocity with the rest of the world. This result is obtained in spite of any effort on the part of other nations to prevent their people reaping an advantage from the import into their own country of goods they were compelled to take in exchange for the goods they exported.

Just in proportion, therefore, as we eliminate the protective element from our tariff will we enjoy reciprocity of trade with the world, placing ourselves in a position to share the benefits that the mistakes of the McKinleys of the various countries are forcing on Great Britain. In a word, every move we make towards a revenue tariff would permit our farmers to obtain a more equitable exchange for their surplus products, and capital would flow to the land. It would enable the urban class to get access to the foreign farmer in spite of hostile tariffs, thus widening our market at home and abroad, giving assurance and steadiness to our food supply. Increase of population would follow as a natural sequence, causing in its turn an expansion of trade. It should never be forgotten that the number of those members of the community who at any time will be able to support themselves in comfort, not being farmers, will always be limited by the number of farmers at home and abroad that they can obtain access to for trading purposes. Free trade gives the people of Great Britain access to the farmers of all countries; hence she is able to support a larger proportionate urban population in a greater degree of comfort than any other country in the world.

As the cause of trade, pointed out in the opening sentence, is the same in all countries, a similar policy would necessarily give any country a similar advantage, but no country in the world is so favorably situated as Canada for unprecedented expansion of population and trade, owing to our wonderful domain of fertile land and resources of forest and minerals, which will be developed in proportion to the extension of agriculture in our own country and in those countries we can obtain access to for trading purposes; and the presence of seventy millions of (economically speaking) badly governed people on our southern borders, had we the courage to follow the example of Great Britain, New South Wales, the Straits Settlements, and Japan in our trade policy, and open our ports to the world,—which, after all, would only be doing to others as we would have others do to us,—would give us a tremendous advantage in inaugurating such a policy. Experience abundantly proves that the countries taking the initiative in this regard are the greatest gainers in all that makes a people great.



LET US as
assistance
the maint
itself. T
have been
word mea
standing o
to the "K
and the n
their fund
which alon
trow not.
idea that I
It is irratic
to propoun
follies. M
almighty po
to the settl
succession o
and wisdom
"God is lov
The histo
very existen
powers perm
were not so
There are te
must be.
It is easy
conditions h
progress, and
But the limit
veil it has b
electricity as
We have disc
which knows
sage—it is al

RELIGION VERSUS SCIENCE.

BY THE EDITOR OF THE "MAIL AND EMPIRE."

LET us ask, first of all, what is religion? Herein etymology will render us no assistance, for the word, as such, originally referred only to human devices for the maintenance of what we understand by the word religion, not to the thing itself. The purest-hearted layman existing in mediaeval times might properly have been described as "not religious," and so, for instance, Chaucer uses the word meaning "not affiliated to any religious order." Perhaps a definite understanding of the term may be arrived at if it be conceded that religion is equivalent to the "Knowledge of God." This at least has been the aim of every system, and the message of every supposed revelation. Our own Scriptures have, as their fundamental object, the revealing of the nature of God, on which, and on which alone, our worship must needs be based. Can science help us here? We throw not. If we believe in God at all, can we doubt that God is almighty? The idea that He is not so is the end of all faith and the beginning of superstition. It is irrational and worse, and probably no enlightened human being would dare to propound it in set terms, mother though it has been of many of our irreligious follies. Must He not also be all-wise? It is self-evident that he must be so, for almighty power wielded in ignorance or incompetency, would have no resemblance to the settled order we observe, and could only maintain itself by an endless succession of miracles. Finally, is not God as perfect in benevolence as in power and wisdom? Is it not clear, to state the matter in the simplest terms, that "God is love?"

The history of the world, whether revealed by geology or recorded by man, the very existence and supremacy of the human race, and the fact that our intellectual powers permit of such a thing as science, conclusively prove it. Indeed, if it were not so we should be only losing our time in the discussion of religion. There are few who believe there is no God: If there be a God at all, such He must be.

It is easy to see what has prompted the speculations so rife in our time. The conditions have been favorable to their growth. Science has made great progress, and men have begun to talk as though there were no limit to its progress. But the limitations of science are exceedingly real. Where she has removed a veil it has been only to show more impenetrable darkness beyond. We use electricity as our everyday servant. Has science told us what electricity is? We have discovered that life in its beginnings takes form in one simple protoplasm which knows no distinction, whether the result be microbe or elephant, ape or sage—it is alike for all. But the discovery has not advanced us one jot towards

the knowledge of what life is, or how it comes, or how it is turned into channels so extravagantly divergent. The darkness has but deepened by our knowledge. The grass can perpetuate its species and so can we, and the one knows as much of the mystery involved in the fact as the other. What precedes life and follows death, what binds together things so incongruous as spirit and flesh—the nature of the connection and how it is dissolved—what do we, here on this 12th October, 1895, know of these things?

Science does not deal with God at all, but with God's works. Science is as easily pursued in a non-religious as in a religious spirit. Its greatest names are distributed in either class. The domain of science is the positively known and proved. The essentials of religion are such as by their nature are at present incapable of positive proof. *They are matters of feeling, not of knowing.* Our convictions thereupon may be immovable, but they have never arisen from demonstration—and it is scarcely conceivable that they ever will. Suffice it to say that science has at present been the reverse of helpful in this respect, and that those scientists who have surmised, for it is nothing more, an evolution of morality have notoriously left God and religion out of the account. There is not the smallest possibility that people will ever be made religious by a process of pure reasoning; and nobody would believe in the religion thus engendered. Our religion must no doubt be guided by reason in its conduct, but its true power and only life arise from the feelings—not from the intellect; from the heart—not from the brain. Let who will make fun of these homely unscientific terms. Some of the most truly religious men and women have had but little brain. Power and consideration, rank, luxury, and ease—these must be denied to most—in their nature they cannot be common. *If it be so with religion, if that require a cultivated intellect, it is the worst news the world has had to hear.* Science has added nothing to simple faith. The truly religious are akin to the truly religious of centuries ago. We want no scientific religion.*

To fulfil the duties which Nature and humanity impose, there exists an indispensable obligation for mental exertion—an obligation which decides us to shun indolence, to despise culpable indulgences; and that necessarily induces us to support all kinds of hardship, and even to endure suffering, for the sake of what is just and true; hence result honor, friendship, and confidence, which are preferable to all the pleasures and the luxuries of sensual life.—*Plato.*

GREAT men are the fire-pillars in this dark pilgrimage of mankind; they stand as heavenly signs, everlasting witnesses of what has been, prophetic tokens of what may still be,—the revealed, embodied possibilities of human nature.—*Carlyle.*

* Reprinted from the Toronto MAIL.

TRUE RELIGION MUST BE SCIENTIFIC.

BY J. SPENCER ELLIS.

THERE have been many definitions of "religion;" but, certainly, if it be conceded that "religion is equivalent to knowledge of God," then the *Mail* editor's conclusion—that religion is antagonistic to science,—must be conceded also, unless "God" be defined in a way that would not be acceptable to orthodox authorities. But it is clear that a "definite understanding" could not be arrived at without some explanations which would be fatal to the pretensions of all supernatural religions, for we constantly hear such phrases as "natural religion," "true religion," "rational religion," and so on; and it is certain that the persons who use these terms understand by them something very different from theological, or ceremonial, or dogmatic religion. All such religions depend essentially upon some sort of revelation or knowledge of a God or of a supreme Being or Power ruling the universe. Indeed, and the editor says, "this has been the aim of every system and the message of every supposed revelation;" and the question for us is, Is there, or can there be, anything to which we may properly apply the term "religion" apart from this "knowledge of God?"

We are introduced to four words which should have a clear definition if this discussion is to be of any avail—Religion, Science, Knowledge, and God.

Of the first, the editor gives us a definition, and his conclusion from it; but the question is, can we have any real religion which is not scientific—scientific, that is, as far as the knowledge of its professors will allow it to be so—anything, in short, which is not mere emotionalism? I take it that every religion depends upon the knowledge of its professors, and that for them it may be fairly called scientific. It is the result of their world-view, their philosophy, and represents their scientific attainments.

The editor does not give us a definition of science to match that of religion, but justly enough says that "science has made great progress," and that "the domain of science is the positively known and proved." Now, the definition of science implied in these phrases shows it to be practically synonymous with the third term, knowledge. And here I wish to point out that, if the ordinary meanings of these words be correct, the editor's dictum—that "we want no scientific religion"—is stultifying and cannot stand. On every hand, indeed, in increasing volume is heard the cry—"We want a religion founded on science, not on mere belief and superstition."

"The essentials of religion," says the editor, "are such as by their very nature are at present incapable of proof. They are matters of *feeling, not of knowing.*" Let us go back to the beginning of the article, where the editor says, "Religion

is equivalent to the *knowledge* of God!" If we can agree upon a definition of knowledge, the editor will perhaps agree that there need be no more discussion. What is knowledge? Science, as he tells us, is real knowledge—knowledge that can be proved. He devotes some passages to the consideration of the limitations of science, but it is not at all necessary to follow him in this; for if it be true, as he says, that where science "has removed a veil, it has only been to show more impenetrable darkness beyond," it is abundantly clear that the field of science is co-extensive with the knowableness of things, and that what she has not illumined is really unknown. Science, indeed, comprises all knowledge and methods of obtaining knowledge; and if there be any real knowledge of God, such knowledge must necessarily be scientific knowledge.

It is undoubtedly true that large numbers of persons have had experiences which they very devoutly designate as real, blessed, sanctifying knowledge of God, and so on; and, accepting once more the editor's definition—that "God is love"—I see no reason to doubt them. The wonderful organization we know as a human being presents many problems, in the investigation of which science is as yet only taking the first weak steps. But to classify such feelings and entirely subjective experiences as "knowledge" is simply misusing words. If "God is love," or some such phrase, be accepted as sufficiently elucidative, well and good; but if God be an entity, a Being, a living person with a mind, capable of doing things in our universe, then we are justified in demanding, not only some better definition of him, but also some substantial evidence of the reality of the supposed "knowledge" of him.

But I very seriously object to this description of God as "love." Just look at what has occurred in this world even during the last year, and then ask if the almighty ruler of such a world can by any stretch of imagination be called a god of love? Think of the millions who have gone to unpitied graves by famine, pestilence, sword, earthquake, and the thousand and one accidents that terminate in a more or less violent fashion the miserable lives of unhappy mankind, and then ask, Where shall we find the love of this almighty Being? As Tennyson says—

"Were there a God, as you say,

His love would have power over hell till it utterly vanished away . . .

But the God of Love and of Hell together they cannot be thought."

Read "evii" for "hell," and the conclusion must be the same.

I most emphatically protest against the editor's apotheosis of ignorance. It may be true, as he says, that "some of the most truly religious men and women have had but little brain!" We have, indeed, been told that Christianity was intended for babes and sucklings, and to confound the learned and wise. But I think it utterly false to say that "science has at present been the reverse of helpful;" nor can I believe that, if true religion "require a cultivated intellect,

it is the v
a total mi
learn to d
good? V
How, ther

I do no
cepting "I
task before
morality.

that the ob
question is

wicked ma
fulcrum tha

the differen
scientific e

Ethics teach
knowledge

enforce wha
of some sup

Now, I st
knowledge.

given circum
knowledge:

moral or rel
or through c

than a slave.
do the right,

only be mora
said to be me

editor says, t
out, let us as

church? Th
taught by tho

eries. And,
Protestant Re

men led the v
An intelligent

inquiry, abneg
conscience.

It is childis
out of hand, a

is the worst news the world has had to hear." Such ideas are founded upon a total misapprehension of the whole problem. How can one "cease to do evil, learn to do well," unless he has knowledge to point out what is evil and what good? Will each ignoramus instinctively find out what is right without learning? How, then, can teaching in Sunday-school and church be justified?

I do not by any means wish to ignore the difficulties of this question. Accepting "religion" as synonymous with "morality," there is still an immense task before us to make the mass of men amenable to the dictates of a high morality. Whatever may be the ultimate object of human life, it will be admitted that the object of religion, as commonly understood, is to make men better. The question is, what is to be our *point d'appui*? On what ground shall we urge the wicked man to flee from the wickedness he finds so pleasant? What is to be the fulcrum that will enable us to elevate the moral tone of the masses? Radically, the difference between dogmatic religion,—based on "knowledge of God,"—and scientific ethics,—based on knowledge of man and his surroundings,—is this: Ethics teaches men their duty to themselves and to their fellows, based upon knowledge of their constitution and relations; whereas religion endeavors to enforce what it teaches in the same direction by the supposed promises or threats of some superior—some almighty Being.

Now, I submit that correct conduct depends essentially upon intelligence and knowledge. The corner-stone of morality is justice. To be able to judge of given circumstances and to choose the right course, involves the necessity of knowledge and reason. A person who acts in what may be termed a correct moral or religious way merely from habits acquired through inherited capacities or through compliance with the will-power of those in authority, is little better than a slave. To know the right from the wrong, and to consciously choose to do the right, is of the very essence of true morality. An ignorant person can only be moral in the sense that ants and bees, beavers and monkeys, may be said to be moral when they do what conduces to their common good. As the editor says, this may possibly be the lot of the masses under a scientific religion; but, let us ask, what different condition obtains among the followers of the church? The masses are simply the innocent believers of what they have been taught by those who are supposed to have to some extent penetrated the mysteries. And, perhaps, this must to some extent ever be so. Where would the Protestant Reformation have been had not a few enlightened and determined men led the way? Would the ignorant masses themselves have brought it about? An ignorant man who simply believes what religion he has been taught without inquiry, abnegates his rights of manhood, and installs the priest as keeper of his conscience.

It is childish in the extreme for the editor of the *Mail* to settle the matter out of hand, as he does when he says, "There is not the smallest possibility that

people will ever be made religious by a process of pure reasoning ; and nobody would believe in the religion thus engendered." He appears to forget the fact that the most elaborate system of Christian dogmatism, Roman Catholicism, has been erected by pure reasoning, applied though it may have been to false and unprovable doctrines ; and that that religion is believed by the largest section of the Christian world. In the main, too, its dogmas are those of his own church ; and if he will consult the members of the congregation to whom he next preaches and prays, I think he will find that each one will tell him that he accepts his creed because he believes it to be true. In other words, he uses his powers of ratiocination as far as they have been cultivated, and if another cult is presented to him which appears to him to be more reasonable—that is, truer or more scientific—he accepts it. Unless this were so, there would be very few converts ; for experience has shown that converts made by the means suggested by the *Mail* editor—that is, through the heart, not the head : by feelings and emotions, not by reason—are very unstable, and in most cases relapse.

Science makes progress possible, because it increases our resources and our command over natural powers. It shows us how to preserve healthy bodies and sound minds ; it is teaching men their duty to themselves and to society ; it is teaching men humanity in the treatment of disease, of crime, of insanity. It is lengthening the days of man on the earth, and will surely, if slowly, make those days happier ; but, just as the stream cannot rise above its source, so the standard of morality, in spite of a few teachers and exemplars of the noblest mold, will depend upon the culture of the masses.

One thing is clear. The world has never wanted for religions with supernatural pretensions ; but, in spite of all these faiths, little real progress was made until these latter days, when science has begun to place human life and conduct on principles which can be understood and applied. Science to-day is guiding the world, and any religion that is irreconcilable with it is inevitably doomed.

I maintain, what I think every sane man must admit, that true science—real, provable knowledge—must necessarily form the foundation for any true and permanently useful system of human conduct, be it termed religion or morality ; that any system founded upon subjective experiences, sentiments, or emotions, must submit to the same tests to which every proposition—scientific or otherwise—must be subjected before it can be accepted as either valid or useful. To postulate the opposition of science and religion is simply to affirm that what has been called religion lies outside the bounds of provable knowledge, that it is founded upon false and untenable bases, and that it must ultimately collapse, to make way for a more substantial structure.



THAT man
will ventu
admit. I
very far fr
gressive d
of time wi
obstacle to
subject of
to train up
to gain kn
practical k
use and co
on such sa
That wo
concerned
realize. T
about its hu
ally, protec
pishments
which now a
fetching," in
chase, the q
men and wo
other ; deve
and thus the
mutual help
recognizes t
marriage sh
beings who,
are in perfe
begins in th
the finest qu
To enable
each other w
thought mus
operation in
can meet on

THE MATRIMONIAL OUTLOOK.

BY LAURA E. CAMERON.

THAT marriage is an unqualified success very few, even of the happiest people, will venture to assert; that it is an utter failure, the majority are not prepared to admit. It must be owned, however, that sex relations at the present time are very far from satisfactory to most of us; and it is scarcely likely in these progressive days that this state of affairs will be allowed to continue for any length of time without some attempt being made to remedy the existing evils. A great obstacle to much improvement in this direction is the extreme reticence on the subject of so many really earnest and conscientious people. It is not indelicate to train up daughters to catch eligible husbands, or to leave young ignorant sons to gain knowledge and experience in stables and gutters. But give them a sound practical knowledge of their own physiology? Advise with them as to the proper use and control, and wise direction of natural functions? Talk to young people on *such subjects!* Shocking! Most improper!

That women constitute half the human race, and therefore should be equally concerned and engaged in all human interests, neither men nor women fully realize. The fair sex, for the most part, has not so far concerned itself much about its human rights; it is more than anything else a *sex* entitled to the chivalry, protection and support of the human beings for whom it dabbles in accomplishments and bedecks itself in an infinite variety of modes, in admiration of which nowadays one not infrequently hears from fair ones the words "perfectly fetching," in tones of rapture! Thus equipped the fair sex proceeds to the chase, the quarry being the home-providing creatures misnamed husbands. Thus men and women live divided and totally dissimilar lives, each preying on the other; developing widely different and opposing aims, modes of life and thought; and thus they prepare for the union which is to make them "one flesh," "for the mutual help, society, and comfort the one ought to have of the other." Neither recognizes that nature designed them to help and complement each other; that marriage should be the truest and noblest form of friendship, the union of two beings who, perhaps opposite in temperament and kinds of mental capacity, yet are in perfect sympathy with each other's aims and aspirations; whose love begins in the head and goes down to the heart," and each of whom brings out the finest qualities of the other.

To enable us to marry rationally a considerable change of sentiment toward each other will have to come about in both sexes; their modes of life and thought must be brought more into line, and a free and unrestricted friendly cooperation in all departments of life established between them. Not till they can meet on higher grounds than those of pleasure and profit will true comradeship

ship be possible between men and women. It may well be asked if platonic friendships are possible to this generation. Perhaps not to those whose conception of chivalry is to make *some* women the objects of all sorts of politenesses and mannerisms from men, and to have them protected by them from the wiles of other men, while the chivalrous protectors hunt other more defenceless women to ruin. Not to men who are not ashamed to boast to each other of certain disgraceful "experiences"; nor to women who have no more refinement and delicacy in them than to prate about their "conquests." But surely the vainest and silliest persons are not quite incapable of learning better than this; meanwhile, what all parents can do for the wiser marrying of the rising generation is to teach, or have both sons and daughters taught, physiology, and the wise direction of natural instincts, remembering that more wrong-doing, disease, and suffering have resulted, and still result, from ignorance and so-called innocence than could ever come of knowledge of these subjects; and to promote unity of aims and mutual respect and confidence between young people of the two sexes.

We hear a great deal of nonsense about wives being the chattels of their husbands - and this was so in the past to some extent; but the marriage laws of to-day cannot be said to favor husbands more than wives, and where a wife is now a chattel, it is because of her own incapacity to be anything else, and is not the fault of the present laws. The wording of the marriage ceremony is certainly degrading to women, and out of date, and this is their real grievance; but if they will open their eyes to the extent to which the clergy are dependent on the female portion of the community for support, they will see that they have only to unite, demand, and insist upon having an alteration to get it. The age of an enlightened, dignified womanhood has dawned; and the number of earnest men who realize that a manly man is infinitely purer and nobler than a fine animal is increasing every year. We have, therefore, some reason to hope that a time of free, unrestricted co-operation in social, domestic, and political matters between the sexes is neither impossible nor very far distant, and that it may result in a community of rightly mated people living rational, healthy lives.*

BY EDWARD CAREY.

THE demand for what can be raised should keep pace with the supply, or, as the acute French put it more simply and completely, with the offer. This may seem a crude, even rude, law to cite as underlying the marriage customs of the Republic, and closely and directly affecting the happiness of millions of women and men and their offspring. But such a law there is, and, on the whole, I am enough of an optimist to believe that it works steadily for the bettering of the condition of the race. Whatever else marriage may or ought to be, and however the fact may be concealed or modified by associations—religious, social, literary,

—there
country,
or of I
point ou
law that
wheat.

To be
women b
duced co
a slight b
liable to
unto the
marriage
only way
marriage
happened.

[There are
afford mo
consists in
has been
important,
shops, at t
and typew
occupation
men only 2
total as aga
more wom
whole field

The char
sumably a
population
of the fema
course, muc
as to the ne
effect is up
or associated
opinion and
much more
becoming cl
livelihood w

* Reprinted

—there can be no doubt that it is, for a very large part of the women of the country, a means of livelihood. I do not assert or deny that it is a law of nature, or of human society, or of Providence; I simply cite the fact, and venture to point out some of its results, and the bearing on them of the simple economic law that governs the disposition of marriageable women as it does of Minnesota wheat.

To begin with, in all thickly-populated and settled communities the number of women born tends slightly to exceed the number of men. Here, then, is produced continuously and without chance for evasion or hope of any facile change, a slight but appreciable surplus of women. This discrepancy, slight in itself, is liable to be increased in the ratio that men may be unwilling or unable to take unto themselves wives; and thus the intensity of the desire, the need even, of marriage among women, other things being equal, tends to become greater. The only way in which it can be reduced, is by reducing the necessity to women of marriage as a means of securing a living. This, I think, is precisely what has happened, and in increasing ratio within the last half or even quarter of a century. [There are] two modes in which the situation is changed. The old employment affords more and more satisfactory chances of livelihood. The second mode consists in the rapid development of entirely new employments. This change has been more recent, more rapid, and extensive than the other. The most important, so far as numbers are concerned, is in the employment of women in shops, at the sales counters, or as cashiers or bookkeepers, and as stenographers and typewriters in general business and the professions. Taking all the gainful occupations, although the ratio of increase for women is 47.88 per cent., and for men only 27.64 per cent., yet the women are in 1890 but 17 per cent. of the total as against 15 per cent. in 1880. It is a fair conclusion that while many more women earned their own living in 1890 than in 1880, they had over the whole field to a very slight extent only displaced the men.

The change in the proportion of women who now earn an income, and presumably a living, is the important point. About one in three of the total population are engaged in "gainful occupation," and only one in about twenty of the female population. The proportion to females of marriageable age is, of course, much larger, and it is this percentage that produces the effect I have noted as to the necessity of marriage to women as a means of support. What the effect is upon society, I do not now propose to discuss, nor the subordinate or associated questions as to which there is much room for honest difference of opinion and endless discussion. The facts—and they would undoubtedly be much more striking were they brought down five years later,—show that it is becoming clearly easier for the average woman in the United States to earn her livelihood without marriage—if she so choose.†

† Reprinted from PUBLIC OPINION, New York (condensed from Westminster Review and † Forum).

THE SILVER QUESTION.

BY EDWARD MEEK, TORONTO.

HAS gold risen in price or has everything else fallen in value? This is the important question which is now being discussed before the electors of the United States. We are so accustomed to the use of money as a measure of value and as a medium of exchange, that we forget that it is liable to fluctuate in price, the same as all other commodities. A greater demand for any commodity increases its value, and the scarcity of a thing which is in demand produces the same result. Conversely, the increase in the supply of an article, or a decrease in the demand for it, decreases its value or price. These are general principles,—they enunciate what are now self-evident truths. The general demonetization of silver in 1873, both in Europe and America, made gold the principal metallic money, hence the demand for gold increased and its price began to go up. To the majority of people it did not seem that gold was rising in price, but that everything else was becoming cheaper. However, it is immaterial which way it is put, the fact remains that gold has been rising, or everything else has been falling in value ever since the use of silver was relegated to its present position as a subsidiary coinage. If left to itself, unaffected by legislation, gold would rise and fall in value like other commodities according to the general law of supply and demand; but legislation may affect the price of an article, and the evidence seems overwhelming, that it has affected the price of gold. To illustrate: If a law could be passed and enforced forbidding the use of beef as food, not only would cattle decrease in value, but other animals used as food, would immediately begin to increase in value. If a law could be passed and enforced forbidding the use of any timber except pine in the manufacture of furniture, pine would rise in price with a bound, and those who could control the supply would make it rise still higher.

The demonetization of silver made it more easy to obtain the control of the money of the world. It became possible for the few who had the bulk of the gold to demand a higher price for it, and thus to give it a fictitious value. Perhaps no person can positively prove that the financiers of the world had to do with the demonetization of silver, but it is almost certain that the billions of interest-bearing bonds,—state, municipal, and corporation,—then outstanding, payable in twenty, thirty, or forty years, have been nearly doubled in value, and that this increase in value has been largely due to the demonetization of silver. The gold in which these bonds were all made payable will now purchase nearly twice as much of everything (including silver) as it would twenty years ago. It is said that prices have declined, and we all know that the price of land, of farm produce, of all kinds of manufactured articles, of everything, in fact, has fallen

nearly o
way of
it might
in gold;
which fo
about 32
ago—the
true nam

Admit
ties, that
legislation
probable
has been
When a fi
able in go
bonds sho
valuable w
loaned
denounced
they are c
with 50 ce
in fact, the
have to pa
price of th
and right fo
moral or v
asked, how
age law hav
ment of all
one ounce
of a free sil
the payment
and to that
other words
been used fo
same purpos
reasonable,
two medium
between the
value and m
now an abso

nearly one-half, and in some cases more than one-half. But is not this another way of saying that gold has appreciated? If only a few things had fallen in price, it might be contended that the depreciation of those articles did not mean a rise in gold; but, considering that the fall in prices is almost universal; that silver, which for four centuries ranged between 13 and 18 to 1, has fallen since 1873 to about 32 to 1—in other words, to about one-half the value it had twenty years ago—the phenomenon cannot be called a fall in prices; it must be called by its true name—that is, a rise in the price of gold.

Admitting the fact, then, that gold rises and falls in value like other commodities, that its value may be depreciated or appreciated by legislation, and also that legislation can be manipulated by those who have control of money, it seems probable that the rise in value of gold and the fall in price of other commodities has been brought about by those who have controlled the gold of the world. When a firm of bankers or money-lenders purchases \$1,000,000 of bonds payable in gold at the end of thirty years, it is only natural that the holders of those bonds should endeavor so to manage the gold market that the gold will be more valuable when the bonds become payable than it was when the money was loaned. The morality of the Free Silver movement has been discussed and is denounced. The promoters of the remonetization of silver are called repudiators, they are charged with being dishonest,—with endeavouring to pay their debts with 50 cent dollars; but looking at the whole question broadly, it is only fair, in fact, the law of self-protection and self preservation requires, that those who have to pay should endeavor to depreciate the value, in other words, to lower the price of the thing which they have to pay, to redeem their bonds. If it is moral and right for the creditor class to appreciate the value of gold, it cannot be immoral or wrong for the debtor class to depreciate its value. The question is asked, how can this be done? What effect will the passage of a free silver coinage law have? and what will be the effect of making silver a legal tender in payment of all commodities at the ratio of 16 ounces of silver as the equivalent of one ounce of gold? It may be answered that it is very probable that the passage of a free silver coinage and remonetization law, making silver a legal tender, for the payment of commodities, will, by bringing silver into greater use as money and to that extent displacing gold, operate to depreciate the value of gold, or in other words, to raise the price of everything else. Where one metal only has been used for a particular purpose, and another metal is brought into use for the same purpose, the price of the former will necessarily be decreased. It seems reasonable, therefore, that it would be better to have two metallic currencies,—two mediums of exchange,—a double standard of value, even if the parity of value between the two metals cannot be kept at 16 to 1, than that the standard of value and medium of exchange should be limited to one metal. As money is now an absolute necessity in the conduct of the business affairs of the world,

governments should do all in their power to prevent its being controlled by a few, who can raise its value and thereby depress the value of other things at pleasure to suit their own selfish ends. The material interests of the great mass of mankind should be protected, so far as this can be legally accomplished, from the grasping instincts of the moneyed few. The greed for wealth blights patriotism and destroys nations. Witness the remnants of those old races and nations who go prowling about the world living and fattening on the refuse of the younger races. A nation which has begun to worship wealth rather than honor, merit and genius, is cultivating the seeds of its own destruction. Who have made nations great? Not their Rothschilds and Vanderbilts, but their statesmen, their poets, their inventors, their philosophers, their scientists and their soldiers. The inventions of Stephenson, Thompson, and Edison; the writings of Shakespeare, Macaulay, Mill, and Spencer; the discoveries of Newton, Darwin, and Huxley, and the inventions, writings and discoveries of many others, are what has produced our modern civilization. Wealth does not need so much protection from the State, it can protect itself. It is merit, genius, and patriotism which should be nurtured, encouraged, and guarded.

Of course, the above is only one phase of the argument on this question, but I think it must be conceded that, in so far as the advocates of silver aim at reducing the price of gold and increasing the price of everything else, no one can justly condemn them. But will the adoption of the double metallic standard of silver and gold, fixing the ratio between the two metals at 16 to 1, accomplish the desired object? The gold advocates contend that it will not; that the market value of 16 ounces of silver is only equivalent to about half-an-ounce of gold, that the real ratio between the two metals is nearly 32 to 1, and that the contents of a silver dollar of 412.8 grains is only worth about 51 cents in gold. They say the legalization of a ratio of 16 to 1 would have the effect of driving the gold currency out of the country, and of substituting a silver currency in its place. They admit, however, that the remonetization of silver would have some effect upon the ratio of values, that silver would rise to some extent, and that gold would correspondingly depreciate. But I think they prove that the ratio of 16 to 1 could not possibly be produced or maintained, and consequently that the over-valued metal—that is, silver—would drive the gold currency out of the country, according to Gresham's law. I would observe, however, in passing, that the words used to express this law, "bad money always drives out good," do not correctly express it. It is better stated by saying, "over-valued money drives out undervalued." The law is simple enough. To illustrate: If a man owns a horse which he values at a price higher than others think it worth, he can't sell it, and must therefore keep it. So, if the United States should fix the value of silver higher than its market value in other countries, not only would its own silver remain in the country, but the silver from other countries would flow there

—that is
and the
not be
them to
placed o
the ratio
There w
main an
currency
to contro
currency
a silver c
that the c
a silver c
of comm
modern t
and silver
required f
now by sh
use of dr
anteed by
pass at its
rency now
silver is or
bills, or dr
Another
They prop
gold and si
weight fixe
—that all s
every bill o
They say th
beyond the
standards o
value, and
any coin or
universal co
the same st
ideal coinag
look forward
adoption of
national cou
or retarded
years.

—that is, the silver would go where the highest price could be obtained for it, and the gold likewise. Even if the ratio of 15 to 1 could be attained, it could not be maintained. A thousand things affect the prices of metals and cause them to fluctuate. Therefore, a double metallic standard (both metals being placed on an equality so far as the law can make them equal), at any ratio, or at the ratio of their market values at any given time, could not be maintained. There would be continual fluctuation, and the over-valued currency would remain and the under-valued currency would leave the country. The history of currency has so well established these facts, that it would be idle now to attempt to controvert them. England has a double standard, and acquired her gold currency by over-valuing gold, just as France, with her double standard, acquired a silver currency by over-valuing silver. But the silver advocates say, admitting that the effect will be to drive gold out of the United States and to replace it by a silver currency, what matters it? A silver currency will answer all the purposes of commerce as well as a gold currency. The principal object of a currency in modern times is, not as a medium of exchange, but to fix a standard of value, and silver will answer this purpose as well as gold. The metals are no longer required for exchanges as formerly. The business of the world is not carried on now by shipments of coin. The whole volume of business can be done by the use of drafts, notes, or promises to pay, based on a silver currency and guaranteed by the Government. Therefore, let silver be the standard, and let gold pass at its commercial value. They point to the fact that the only metallic currency now in practical use is silver, that few payments are made in gold, and that silver is only used for change, all other payments being in national notes, bank bills, or drafts.

Another class of Bimetallists advocate the demonetization of both metals. They propose that governments should establish mints for the free coinage of gold and silver. That the pieces so coined should be stamped of a fineness and weight fixed by a law, but, that the law should not make anything a legal tender, —that all should be left free to contract for payment in either currency, and that every bill or note issued should state on its face in which currency it is redeemable. They say there is no absolute unchangeable standard of values, and that it is beyond the power of governments or legislatures to fix such a standard. Positive standards of weights and measures can be fixed, but everything fluctuates in value, and therefore governments should not attempt to fix values or to make any coin or currency a legal tender in payment of debts. They also advocate a universal coinage for all civilized countries. The coins minted in each to be of the same standard fineness, weight, and designs as in the others. This is the ideal coinage to which the "scientific Bimetallists," and believers in progress, look forward. But though this may not be so difficult of attainment as the adoption of a universal language, nor even as the establishment of an international court of arbitration would be, yet its consummation may be prevented or retarded by the same causes, and its accomplishment may yet be delayed many years.

THE STAGE AND ORCHESTRA.

THE COMING SEASON.

By the time this magazine is in the hands of the public at least two of the theatres in Toronto will have opened for the season—the Grand and the Toronto Opera houses. The Toronto was announced to open on the 10th of August, but at the last moment the arrangement fell through, as Manager Small was unable to procure any attraction to put in his house at that date. It may not be generally understood that in Canada we are entirely dependent for all our theatrical attractions on the United States, excepting of course the great London companies when on tour, and only some of those consider it worth their while to include the Dominion. Thus all the organizations "going out on the road" are arranged for about July at New York, and the route mapped out and the dates fixed for every city each company will play in up to the end of the season. The only hitch that can occur in this arrangement is when a company falls by the way from financial distress, and much of this has unfortunately occurred in the course of the last couple of seasons. This year, largely on account of the political situation and the Presidential election across the line many companies do not start until October; another reason for this delay is the extremely poor business done in the principal cities of the States by the different companies; some few had fair business, but with the majority it was a difficult matter to simply pay their way, in fact managers were fortunate who closed the season with their salary list paid up. The number of theatrical companies leaving New York of late years has ranged from five hundred to seven hundred, occasionally a little more; I understand that the number made up at present is barely three hundred. Managers had such a hard time last season and the season before that they are nervous about starting. The year of the Presidential election is always a bad "show" time in the United States; politics, caucuses, conventions and processions occupy the attention of the people; to this we must add unprecedentedly bad business in all lines of trade throughout the entire United States, a general dearth of employment, and shortness of money. In circumstances like these the theatres are naturally the first to suffer; therefore it is not surprising that theatrical agents are shy of organizing and that the date for starting out has been put off about a couple of months. The Grand Opera House opened on Aug. 31 with "The Old Homestead"—a piece familiar enough to most of us, but likely to take with the strangers and especially the country people whom we hope to see in the city during the Exhibition weeks. The Toronto Opera House opened on the same date with "A Happy Little Home"; and one week later the Princess theatre starts the season with Hanlon's "Superba," also a good holiday piece. The Toronto Opera House has—so far as the booking is complete—an unusually good list of superior attractions; the bookings for the Grand are presumably not completed, or if completed they have not, for some reason, been given to the press yet. We shall have, as far as I can gather, a run of very good attractions at our theatres this season, and it is to be hoped they will receive ample and encouraging patronage.

Among the minor places of amusement the Yonge Street Musee will be opened by the original proprietor, Mr. Robinson, who is renovating the place, and promises to provide the best class of shows possible at the price. The Auditorium

has als
the 31
gramm
of the
Such
forecas
see all
ment w
credit o
Since
has con
Barrett,
Wilson,
Slavey,
There i
be heard
expects
brighter
and the

In Ne
up; alre
A few th
theatres
is a prob

Miss M
an actress
various co
having o
among th
this succe
During h
Dreams,
the Haym
'Dearest

Mr. Gra
and will la
operas, am
Opera Ho
world. M
German op
he says,
our manag
Symphony
repeat her

has also been leased for a term of years, is being reconstructed, and will open on the 31st of August, with two performances every day—at least such is the programme at present. Prices are to range from 10c. to 25c., the attractions to be of the melodramatic and variety order.

Such is the position of theatrical matters in Toronto to-day. To attempt a forecast of the probabilities of the season would be futile; but I at least hope to see all the houses able to keep open, and receive the patronage and encouragement which enterprise merits, and that we owe to ourselves for the profit and the credit of the city to bestow.

Since writing the above a partial list of attractions at the Grand Opera House has come to hand; it includes E. S. Willard, John Hare, Beerbohm Tree, Wilson Barrett, Lilian Russell, in her new opera, "The American Beauty;" Francis Wilson, the operas "Wizard of the Nile" and "Brian Boru," "The Lady Slavey," "In Gay New York," "Cherry Pickles," and "Salvini the Younger." There is a probability that Anna Held, the beautiful *chanteuse* from Paris, may be heard here. So far this is not a formidable showing, but Manager Sheppard expects to add some specially attractive "bills." The Grand presents a much brighter appearance after the "cleaning up" process it has just gone through, and the new chairs especially will be appreciated by the patrons of the house.

PROFESSIONAL NOTES AND GOSSIP.

In New York the roof gardens, after a season of much prosperity, are closing up; already it is often too cold of an evening for those which are much exposed. A few theatres have started, and a few weeks from now we shall see most of the theatres in New York opened, though how long some of them will continue open is a problem the turmoil of the Presidential election may do much to solve.

Miss Mabel Beardsley, the sister of Aubrey Beardsley, who has recently become an actress, is thus described by *The Sketch*: "As a child she used to recite at various concerts and 'at homes.' Later on she became a High School teacher, having obtained first-class honors in the Higher Cambridge Locals, and was among the first five of those who intended to take up teaching. On account of this success she was offered a scholarship at Newnham College by Miss Gladstone. During her brief theatrical career she has played Mrs. Wanklyn in 'John-a-Dreams,' Lady Basilidon in 'An Ideal Husband,' and has been understudying at the Haymarket and Criterion. She made her debut in London as Edith in 'Dearest Mamma' with great success at a matinee not long ago."

Mr. Grau writes that the New York opera season will begin on November 16, and will last the usual thirteen weeks. There will be new scenery for the new operas, among these "Hero and Leander" being a possibility. The Metropolitan Opera House is already equipped with the best stock scenery of any house in the world. Mr. Grau says there will be this year no subscription performances of German opera. "It is possible that we may produce 'Lohengrin' in French," he says. "None of the artists we have engaged will appear anywhere but under our management, except Mme. Melba. She will sing in three of the Boston Symphony concerts at Washington, Baltimore and Philadelphia, but she will not repeat her concert tour of last year."

Mr Grau has taken over the management of Covent Garden, London, so that between London and New York he is likely to be well occupied. He is an Austrian by birth, but an American by adoption and long residence. He is broadly built, of the middle height, and his dark hair, moustache, and beard give him a distinctly foreign appearance. He speaks English perfectly, with a quick, sharp incisiveness that shows the man of action, as does his manner generally.

Not content with having Lilian Russell make her first appearance on horseback, the authors of "An American Beauty" now announce that she will bestride an elephant. One of the scenes of the opera will show a circus carnival and necessitates Miss Russell making an entry on the back of one of the circus animals, and it has been decided to use an elephant for the purpose.

T. Henry French, the manager of the American Theatre, returned from Europe on the *Lucania*. He has engaged August Van Biene, known in England as "the actor-musician," for an American tour, to begin at the American Theatre on Nov. 9 or 16. He has had a good deal of success in England. He has a play called "The Broken Melody," in which he acts the leading part and plays the 'cello. The company engaged to support him includes John Carter, Arthur Leigh, Edouard Jose, a pianist, and Miss Frances Brooke. Mr. French bought the American rights of "The Gay Parisienne," which is now running at the Duke of York's Theatre in London. Miss Margaret Mather will be under Mr. French's management for the coming season.

Marie Lloyd, the English serio-comic, has published a "Blue-book." It contains a partial history of her life and a number of anecdotes and stories. Of course, her parents opposed her going on the stage. (Was there ever an actress who did not meet with this opposition?) However, when they saw, according to her, "that they could not kick their objections as high as she could kick her legs," they capitulated. Miss Lloyd naively refers to her increase of salary. She began at thirty shillings and has run the figures up to £100 per week.

Sardou is now sixty-four years old, wrinkled, and half bald, but in his elastic step and brilliant eye as youthful as a boy. He is said to have earned a million dollars from his plays.

The welcome which has been extended to the revival of "Thoroughbred" at the Garrick Theatre, New York, was unexpected, and some of the cool nights lately brought in audiences that filled the house. The new song, "Keep the Baby Warm, Mother," by George Grossmith, proves vastly amusing.

To appreciate thoroughly what it means to play to an empty house, one must travel to Brooklyn and attend a Wednesday matinee, says a writer in the *New York Sun*. At a recent performance of "John-a-Dreams," a school-girl sat in an orchestra chair and there was a young man in the front row of the balcony. The scene is the deck of a yacht, and as Henry Miller emerged from the cabin and gazed into the empty gulf before him, he spoke his first line, "The sea is purple; have you too noticed it?" An instant later a voice came from the balcony: "Well, I don't know about the lady downstairs, but I can see it all right."

WILFRID WISGAST.

THE Jap
determina
sort of "C
Christiani
or even M

The Ch
tions are e
nationalist
Oriental cl
acknowled
proposals a
remark, we
published i
whereby th
the Japane
Articles ha
be a compl
by their co
Isles. Fu
standards, a
the facts o
doctrinal co
should be th
surrounding
obvious me
Though a
missionaries
and action o
that they are
of the churc
enrolled as a
from which v
Christian a g
at Nara last y
of common b
a country like
It is conten
of church gov
founded, acco
by divine righ
Head. This,
pastors: of cert
still be suppo

CURRENT OPINIONS.

HOW JAPAN IS BEING "CHRISTIANIZED."

THE *Japan Weekly Mail* makes the following remarks upon the evident determination of the "converted" Japanese to decide for themselves as to what sort of "Christianity" it shall be that they will accept. It seems likely that the Christianity developed in Japan will be about as much like orthodox Anglicanism or even Methodism, as is Secularism or Agnosticism :

The Christian press furnishes abundant proof that churches of all denominations are engaged in a struggle, in one form or other, with the current of Japanese nationalism and self-assertion. The principal that it is not necessary that an Oriental church should be an exact imitation of its western models is generally acknowledged, and numerous concessions are constantly made in response to proposals advanced by native churches. As an illustration of the truth of this remark, we may quote a few lines from Bishop Bickersteth's pastoral letter, published in May last. Referring to the recent decision of a synod of bishops, whereby the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England were excluded from the Japanese prayer book, Bishop Bickersteth says : " Now the Thirty-nine Articles have no ecumenical authority They are not, and do not profess to be, a complete statement of Christian doctrine, and were certainly never intended by their compilers to be imposed as a standard of orthodoxy outside the British Isles. Further, speaking generally, the imposition of elaborate doctrinal standards, as distinguished from the brief devotional enumeration in a creed of the facts of belief, is an evidence of weakness." The Bishop adds, " The doctrinal confession of an Eastern church, if its formulation be deemed requisite, should be the work of Oriental theologians, be racy of the soil, spring out of a surrounding of Eastern circumstances, and carry to those who study it the obvious meaning of its own allusions and references."

Though all this, and a great deal more, is admitted by the majority of foreign missionaries, there is a general feeling that the demands for freedom of thought and action constantly made by Japanese churches are fraught with danger, in that they are apt to be extended so as to include liberty to decide on the doctrines of the church which it is necessary for a Japanese to accept in order to be enrolled as a member. " I deeply regret," says Bishop Bickersteth, in the charge from which we have quoted, " that it does not seem to me possible to accept as Christian a great deal that goes by that name in Japan. The manifesto put forth at Nara last year, at a very large meeting, as expressing apparently the maximum of common belief of those who attended, is lamentable evidence of the results in a country like Japan of what is called ' liberal ' or undenominational Christianity."

It is contended in some quarters that congregationalism is a dangerous form of church government as regards Japan. The great principle on which it is founded, according to Henry M. Dexter, is that every Congregational church is, by divine right, independent of all control from without, except that of Christ its Head. This, say some writers, accounts for the fact that it is possible for the pastors of certain *Kumi-ai* churches to become Unitarian or even agnostic and still be supported by their congregations, no other church having the right to

interfere. But there is evidence that signs of impatience of foreign control are one of the characteristics of modern Christian literature, and that the next ten years may witness some rather astonishing developments, from a foreign point of view. The general tone of numbers of Japanese articles on Christian doctrine and practice is decidedly anti-conservative and anti-dogmatic and the tendency of the age is to question the authority on which the time-honored doctrines of the Christian church rest.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN'S NOMINATION SPEECH.

Mr. Bryan is beaten. This prediction may be as well recorded now as at some later day. The candidate himself furnishes the complete assurance of its fulfillment. He has come to the first great test of the campaign and he has wretchedly failed to meet it. Every paragraph in his dull speech was a nail in his political coffin. It is right and fit that the candidate of repudiation should have achieved in New York the flattest fizzle ever made by a candidate for the Presidency.—*New York Times*.

The verdict among the friends and foes of the candidate alike was that the whole demonstration fell far short of the success that had been expected. The document fully confirms the opinion that he is utterly unfit to be trusted with the high office to which he aspires.—*New York Sun*.

It is a very foolish mistake in the McKinley newspapers to ridicule or attempt to belittle Mr. Bryan's speech of acceptance. It was a very able speech, logical in its arrangement, admirable in spirit, and strongly reasoned, clearly and cleverly expressed. We do not think there is another free-silver advocate in the country who could write so able or so effective a plea for his cause as was that of Mr. Bryan.—*New York World*.

The speech delivered last night was, in truth, one of the most effective and well considered that could have been devised. It exhibited the speaker in the form that is most likely to gain for him the favor of his countrymen. He furnished the enemy with no ammunition.—*Brooklyn Citizen*.

It was the speech of a statesman. His argument was sober, sincere, and intelligent. He dodged no material point urged by his adversaries. He met every contention fairly and squarely. His reasoning was lucid and straightforward. He blunted the point of every dart launched by the enemy.—*Elmira (N. Y.) Gazette and Free Press*.

It was a plain, forcible, statesmanlike appeal to the business men of the commercial metropolis of the nation.—*Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle*.

It is now pretty certain that Bryan and Sewall will carry New York State. It would be delightful to hear some of the critics of Mr. Bryan's great speech attempt to reply to it. It is the speech of a patriot and a statesman.—*Birmingham (Ala.) State Herald*.

The demonstration was a grand one, which well displayed the personal popularity of Mr. Bryan, and it proved further that, however the moneyed classes of New York may stand, Mr. Bryan has the people, the wage-earners behind him.—*New Orleans (La.) Times-Democrat*.

The Boy Orator's plea for free-coinage is nothing better than a farrago of speculation and assertion.—*Cincinnati (O.) Times-Star*.

The Que

THE QU

was certa

oped tha

few word

troubleso

be satisf

and, judg

be every

every true

or the an

but the ra

serve to sh

tically, of

(General) c

politics, an

agreed upo

being adm

Such a con

opinion; h

Public sch

liberty," so

will be the

may be left

out of his h

The Sunday

If we ma

question in

conclusion s

The tone is

by endeavor

company for

not likely to

sand signatu

the Mayor, p

vote. The s

is a good ind

he belongs a

FROM OUR OWN OBSERVATORY.

The Queen's Speech and the Manitoba School Question.

THE Queen's Speech at the opening of the Dominion Parliament, on Aug. 19, was certainly as short as could have been expected, but, though no one anticipated that the Manitoba school dispute would have been so soon settled, if the few words devoted to it have any substantial justification, they imply that the troublesome business has been successfully dealt with, and in a way which will be satisfactory to all but the extremists. If this should turn out to be the case, and, judging from the speeches of the principals on both sides, there seems to be every reason to credit it, the new Ministers will have earned the thanks of every true Canadian. The terms agreed upon are not fully worked out in detail, or the announcement made in the speech should have been in the past tense; but the ravings of papers which are but the mouthpieces of the hierarchy only serve to show that the interests of liberty and progress are in safe hands. Practically, of course, the announcement of the Ministers (through the Governor-General) can only mean that the matter is removed from the arena of Dominion politics, and must be finally settled by the Manitoba Legislature on the terms agreed upon. These terms will doubtless admit of some "religious" teaching being administered to the helpless victims in the schools in Catholic districts. Such a concession could hardly be avoided in the present condition of public opinion; but undoubtedly anything like Separate schools or priestly control of Public schools will be avoided. Still, as "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," so, when the matter comes up for discussion in the Manitoba House, it will be the duty of every Liberal to scrutinize the proposals, that no loophole may be left through which the priest may again clutch the prey so happily taken out of his hands.

The Sunday Car Question in Toronto.

If we may judge of the probable result of the next vote on the Sunday car question in Toronto from the tone assumed by the leaders of the "Antis," the conclusion seems clear that the vote will be in favor of the running of the cars. The tone is mainly apologetic, mingled with an effort to complicate the question by endeavoring to squeeze an extra financial consideration out of the street car company for the bartered privilege of "breaking the Sawbath." Such tactics are not likely to deceive the voters, however; and the fact that nearly eleven thousand signatures (10,960) were obtained in a couple of days to the requisition to the Mayor, proves that the liberals are well organized and will poll a very large vote. The somewhat hesitating policy of Mayor Fleming was conspicuous, and is a good index to the increasing scepticism of the "religious" element to which he belongs as to their ability longer to control the consciences of the people.

The Horrors to which Sunday Cars lead.

Notwithstanding the fact that a more liberal and more humanizing day of rest is called for by a majority of our citizens, with a very clear notion that this will give them better means of enjoying life and of becoming better men and women, there are, of course, plenty of men in the church who still continue to threaten us with the terrors which will surely follow the infraction of their Sabbatarian laws. A good sample of this was given by Dr. Hershey, of Boston, who has lately been exchanging pulpits for a few Sundays with the preacher of Cook's Church, Toronto. Among his utterances was this passage :

If two hundred cars were placed on the streets next Sunday, two weeks thereafter five hundred would be required for the excursions to Long Branch, High Park and other places of resort, and when the winter shuts off these excursions then people will demand somewhere to go, and there will be an open theatre on Sunday, and in two years Toronto would have Sunday saloons. In five years they would have a Sabbath to match Boston, with the number of people in the Police Court on Monday in ratio of proportion to those in the churches on Sunday.

Now, leaving aside the question as to whether Toronto is any better than the city of Boston, which Dr. Hershey very unpatriotically paints in such dismal colors, and which we very emphatically answer in the negative, what is the conclusion we must come to, admitting that his prophecies will be verified? It is, that, with free opportunities, the instincts of the people inevitably lead them in a direction contrary to the teachings of the preachers. We believe he is right. But see the inconsistency. Dr. Hershey and most other preachers tell us that the greatest proof of the existence of God is to be found in the fact that all men have an instinctive idea of worshipping God, implanted in them, of course, by the deity himself. If we follow the leadings of our instincts in one direction, why not in another? The answer is very clear. The one idea tells in favor of the church, the other against it. And that is about all. The preachers are but men; the church is but a corporation headed by the preachers, and, like other corporations, has financial and personal interests which must ever be paramount, with, we are afraid, a very small soul for any affairs but its own.

Tyranny of Protestantism.

It is a remarkable thing that Protestant ministers should be able to exercise such an overwhelming influence over the masses in this matter. We doubt if the Roman Catholic clergy of Quebec would attempt to ride rough-shod over the people's natural rights in this fashion. Supposing all the terrible things Mr. Hershey predicted should happen, what right have he and his crew to step in and say that the people shall be prevented from exercising the instincts God has implanted in them? He thinks, of course, these are not good things, but who has constituted him, and such as him, the keepers of the people's conscience? The fact is, it is the ignorance of the masses which alone enables these men to

surro
ill
God
D
was
" "
of th
to-da
York
of h
educ
of G
statu
It
of all
Hers
The s
nearly
them
and w
the co
course
who c
tating
cities
God o
told th
sugges
ture, w
of suc
that fil
Railwa
The
the da

Pa
1890...
1891...
1892...
1893...
1894...
1895...
1894...

surround themselves with a halo of assumed sanctity and authority which would ill befit much better and more learned men.

God in History.

Dr. Hershey was not content with prophesying. He told the audience what was the one lesson of history :

"The city that sets aside God would go to destruction. All the great civilizations of the ancient East have fallen because they broke the laws of God. No city of to-day, whether it be this beautiful city on the lake or 'my' Boston or New York or any other city in the world, no matter what the wealth and refinement of her people, the industry and prosperity within her walls, the extent of her educational, charitable or benevolent institutions, could safely set aside the law of God. When one of these cities for one generation persistently breaks the statutes of God that city is doomed."

It is very strange those who listened to this folly did not laugh outright. First of all, let us apply it to the cities and civilizations we are acquainted with. Dr. Hershey says Boston has set God aside and is a terrible example to Toronto. The same has been said of Chicago, New York, Montreal, London, Paris, and nearly every large city in the civilized world. But what do these cities say for themselves? They all, without exception, say they are growing better, healthier and wealthier, Dr. Hershey's own city claiming to be the Hub of the Universe, the centre of light and culture. But our prophet turns historian, and here, of course, he has a "cinch." There are the buried cities to prove his words, and who can deny that they were destroyed for "setting God aside?" We may hesitatingly suggest that Thebes, and Troy, and Pompeii, and the numerous other cities that have disappeared in past ages, never heard of "God," that is, of the God of the Jews and Christians, Jehovah or Christ; but perhaps we shall be told that their ignorance was no excuse, as runs the legal maxim; and when we suggest that they worshipped the best gods they could get hold of or manufacture, we suppose we shall be told they ought to have known better. The follies of such men as Mr. Hershey, however, seem the natural food of the intellects that fill the orthodox churches.

Railway Passenger Risk in the United States and Great Britain.

The *Railway Gazette*, of New York, gives some statistics referring to the dangers of railway travelling, which show these results :

		UNITED STATES.									
		KILLED.				INJURED.					
	Passengers.	Employees.	Others.	Total.	Passengers.	Employees.	Others.	Total.	Train Miles Millions.	KILLED per Mill'n Tr. Miles.	
1890....	172	569	65	806	1,224	1,519	69	2,812	793.9	1.015	
1891....	177	550	63	790	1,183	1,447	55	2,685	831.2	0.950	
1892....	116	490	66	672	1,128	1,205	74	2,407	864.9	0.777	
1893....	178	424	89	691	1,240	1,243	101	2,584	889.4	0.777	
1894....	58	280	104	442	410	845	88	1,343	828.4	0.540	
1895....	38	302	75	415	701	739	95	1,535			
GREAT BRITAIN.											
1894....	16	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,600.0	0.001	



BOOK NOTICES.

THE ARENA FOR SEPTEMBER.

The *Arena* for September has several articles by prominent politicians discussing the free silver question. Among these, one is a reprint of an article contributed to the magazine in February, 1895, which clearly shows his ability and the fact that he is by no means a sudden convert. We extract the following editorial remarks accompanying a very fine portrait of Mr. Bryan :

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, A TRIBUNE OF THE PEOPLE.

William J. Bryan represents the statesmanship of age and the vigour of youth. His career has been marked by ability, candor, consistency, and fidelity to the cause of justice and the interests of the wealth-creators of the nation.

He is no "mortgaged candidate"; the stench of syndicates, trusts, and rings has never tainted the atmosphere which surrounds him. He has never been afraid to speak, nor sought to deceive voters by the well-known trick of the mere politician who, when confronted by a vital question, replies, "I have nothing to say." He has never been a wabblor; on the contrary, he has ably, forcibly, and logically discussed the burning issues of the hour in Congress, through magazines, in the press, and on the platform; and more than this, he has always placed himself on the side of the people against plutocracy.

Physically, mentally, and morally he is a splendid type of man. He has an old head on young shoulders, but it is the head of a free, honest, candid statesman instead of an intriguing demagogue. He has the statesmanship, courage, and conscience of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln. He is the tribune of the people.

He has behind him a magnificent congressional record. He preferred to be defeated for the United States Senate rather than betray the cause of the people to plutocracy.

He is, in the truest sense, a manly man, and those who know him best describe his home life as being characterized by that beautiful simplicity, genuine affection, and sturdy morality which must underly enduring civilization.

Among the other important articles is a synopsis of a remarkable statistical report relating to taxation in Illinois, issued by the Illinois Bureau of Labor Statistics, which shows the outrageous under-valuation of the property of some wealthy Chicagoans; I. N. Taylor discusses the question, "Is a Universal Religion possible?" from an orthodox standpoint; C. H. Chapman, "The Right of Woman to the Ballot;" and Paul Paquin, M.D., V.M., "Inherited Wretchedness; Should Consumptives Marry?" The whole of the articles are on interesting subjects. (Boston, 25c; \$3 per ann.)

We have received two small pamphlets, "Mimetic Diseases," by M. Woods, M.D., and "Hydrophobia as a Simulated Disease," which can be obtained by addressing the American Vivisection Soc., 118 South 17th Street, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.

" Say,
hands of
An' butte
take my

The wa
The ex
might be

" It's b
meal sen
French
with the p

" I sho
" Woul
the farm
I'm goin'
two, an' g
it. Old I

When S
" There is
a perfect i
fect woma
somewhat
have hear

GRAVE AND GAY.

ODDITIES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

We'll begin with box, and the plural is boxes,
But the plural of ox should be oxen, not oxes.
The one fowl is a goose, but two are called geese,
Yet the plural of moose should never be meese.
You may find a lone mouse, or a whole nest of mice,
But the plural of house is houses, not hicc.
If the plural of man is always called men,
Why shouldn't the plural of pan be called pen?
The cow in the plural may be cows or kine,
But a bow if repeated is never called bine,
And the plural of vow is vows, never vine.
If I speak of a foot, and you show me your feet,
And I give you a boot, would a pair be called beet?
If one is a tooth, and a whole set are teeth,
Why shouldn't the plural of booth be called beeth?
If the singular's this and the plural is these,
Should the plural of kiss ever be nick-named keese?
Then one would be that, and three would be those,
Yet hat in the plural would never be hose,
And the plural of cat is cats, not cose.
We speak of a brother and also of brethren,
But though we say mother, we never say methren,
Then the masculine pronouns are he, his, and him,
But imagine the feminine she, shis and shim.
So the English, I think, you all will agree,
Is the greatest language you ever did see.

—Commonwealth.

ONE DAY OF FREEDOM.

"Say," said the man with the correct clothes and the bowed back and horny hands of a farmer, to the restaurant waiter, "have you got pig jowl and greens here? An' buttermilk? An' corn bread? An' kin I shovel the truck in with a knife and take my coat off?"

The waiter said he could be accommodated in all particulars.

The ex-farmer removed his coat and sat down opposite a man who looked as if he might be willing to listen, and explained:

"It's bin two year now sence we struck gas on the farm, an' I ain't had a square meal sence. Bin fillin' up on Charley horse rusies, sooflay de allakazam, an' all them French dishes. That's what comes o' marryin' a woman who b'lieves in keepin' up with the percession when you got the price, as she says."

"I should think you'd have kicked long ago," said the listener.

"Would, but, you see, about three year ago I was so deep in debt that I had to put the farm in her name. I sneaked away to-night an' left her at one of them fine hotels. I'm goin' to have anorgie of old-fashioned vittels, sasprilly pop, an' mebbe a beer or two, an' go back an' tell her what I've did, an' ef she wants to git a divorce she kin git it. Old Eli will hev hed his day of freedom for a few glorious hours, anyway!"

When Sam Jones was holding his meetings in Dallas, on one occasion, he said: "There is no such thing as a perfect man. Anybody present who has ever known a perfect man, stand up." Nobody stood up. "Those who have ever known a perfect woman stand up." "Did you know an absolutely perfect woman?" asked Sam, somewhat amazed. "I didn't know her personally," replied the little woman, "but I have heard a great deal of her. She was my husband's first wife."

THE TOUCHHOLE LEFT.

"Here," said an old gentleman to his young friend, "is a family relic of which I am proud, and the sight of which should inspire in your heart feelings of the loftiest patriotism. It is a musket, borne by my father in the Revolutionary war, and before its deadly aim many a redcoat bit the dust in that struggle for liberty."

The young man handled the venerable relic tenderly and reverently, but he ventured at last to ask:

"But where is the bayonet?"

"Oh!" said the old man, "one of the boys was poking in a hollow tree for a coon, and broke it, and the pieces are lost."

"Where is the ramrod?"

"Why, that was splintered so badly that I had a new one made of iron at the blacksmith shop, but young Will used that to mend the bear-trap."

"These marks on the stock look quite fresh."

"So? Oh, yes! Jim broke the old stock last year cracking hickory nuts, and I had a new one made."

"The barrel seems well preserved."

"Well, the old barrel busted last hog-killing time, so I've got a new one."

"I was not aware," said the young man in a thoughtful mood, "that they used percussion locks in the Revolutionary war."

"I think that's so," hesitatingly replied the old gentleman, "but I believe the touchhole is left."

HE LEFT THE BOOK.

He entered the street car with a parcel in his hand, and as he sat down he placed the parcel at his back.

"Book?" queried the man at his left.

"Yes."

"Taking it home to read this evening?"

"Yes."

"I see. Had to go half a mile out of your way to buy it?"

"About half a mile."

"Just so. Dollar and a half book, I presume?"

"That's exactly the cost."

"Think I've read it?"

"Can't say, but it's only out to-day."

"Then I haven't read it. Thank you for taking this car."

The man with the book looked at the other in a queer way for half a minute, and then said:—

"Do you want to see the book?"

"Oh, no. I'll take it home with me, you see."

"But I can't loan it to you."

"No need to. You'll leave it on the car."

"Oh, I see. Well, I shan't leave it." He reached for the book, and laid it on his knees, but after riding three blocks he slid it down alongside his leg. After two blocks more he worked it behind him again, and became interested in the young woman opposite. The encouragement he received was slight, but it was enough to keep his thoughts busy, and the first thing he knew he was carried a block past his corner. He suddenly started up and skipped out, and as he went the man who had been talking with him reached back for the book and chuckled.

"Told him he'd leave it behind and I'd take it home."

But the book wasn't there. The woman beside him had already gobbled it, and as it rested on her lap she stared straight out of the opposite window, and never moved a muscle when he growled out, "That's a — of a game."

Banks are more dangerous to the liberties of people than standing armies.—Jefferson.