

COMMENTING, a few weeks since, on the valuable paper read by Mr. W. H. Merritt, F.G.S., before the Geological and Mining Section of the Canadian Institute of this city, we demurred to his conclusion that the Dominion should adopt a tariff sufficiently high to ensure the smelting of our own iron and steel, on two grounds, which we may, to save space, designate as the geographical difficulty and the want of a sufficient market. Our able contemporary, the *Canadian Manufacturer*, undertakes to meet and remove these difficulties. The first named was in effect, that the geographical configuration of our country, and the vast distances by which its Provinces are separated, would be serious obstacles in the way of utilizing the home market to the extent required. This difficulty the *Manufacturer* claims to have disposed of by pointing out that the several localities in the Dominion in which facilities for manufacturing pig iron exist are respectively nearer certain sections of the Canadian market than the nearest localities in which the manufacture is carried on in the United States. In reply, it might be sufficient to ask: "Why, then, should a higher protective tariff be needed?" A little reflection will show that the facts adduced do not dispose of the difficulty. That difficulty arises from the economic law that production on a large scale, and consequently for a large market, is an essential condition of success in iron manufacture. The whole tenor of the *Manufacturer's* article suggests this fact, and goes to show the impossibility of producing such an article on a small scale and for a limited market at a price that will make competition with those manufacturing on a large scale for a large market possible. Hence the necessity for the high tariff and the exorbitant price. Otherwise, we repeat, why should more protection be needed by those who already have the advantage in every other respect? The *Manufacturer's* article throughout loses sight of a most important condition of the whole question, by arguing from the effect of a certain policy in a country which is a world in itself in population, and in variety of resources, to the assumed effect of the same policy in a country with a sparse and scattered population, and greatly inferior in wealth. This is, in fact, the fallacy which underlies and invalidates very much of the reasoning of the ultra protectionist press. One portion of the *Manufacturer's* argument is so curious that we must give its own words. After quoting statistics to show the rapid increase of the consumption of iron in the United States, under protection, seemingly forgetting, by the way, that the Republic has made some progress both in population and in wealth during the last thirty years, it adds:—

THE WEEK seems to forget the fact that the prosperity of a country may be gauged and measured by the consumption of iron by the people. Measuring by this standard, Canada is not as prosperous as the United States. Under high duties in the United States the production of iron has increased to a point where that country stands ahead of even Great Britain; while the per capita consumption there, as compared with that of Canada, is one hundred and thirty-four times as much. In other words, under a low tariff in Canada, the Canadian farmer consumes only one pound of iron to one hundred and thirty-four pounds consumed by the American farmer under a high tariff.

This is, be it observed, in answer to our objection that so high a tariff as that indicated would increase the cost of iron to consumers to an unbearable extent. The argument in reply must mean, apparently, that the way to increase the consumption of an article is to increase its cost, and that we have only to raise the price high enough to make the per capita consumption of iron in Canada equal with that in the United States; in other words, to increase it one hundred and thirty-four times! Comment is surely needless. Great are the logical powers of statistics.

EVERY true Canadian will be glad to know that the American Executive has lost no time in fixing a date for the informal conference which was so unexpectedly postponed the other day. It is now pretty evident that the sudden change of purpose at Washington involved no intentional discourtesy to the Canadian delegates. That being clear, it is not our business to enquire too closely whether that change was the result of any playing at cross-purposes between the President of the United States and his able Secretary of State. That is a matter of purely national concern, though we are, of course, deeply interested in the related question, whether and to what extent the President's intervention was the outcome of hostility to reciprocity with Canada in any shape. For reliable information on that point we shall probably have to await the developments of the Conference in October. While

the delay is to be regretted by Canadians for many reasons, and particularly because of the somewhat unsettled state of the public mind which may be superinduced during the intervening period, it will not be without some compensating advantages. The lapse of time will, it may be hoped, bring about a state of international feeling more favourable to dispassionate and friendly discussion, for it is undeniable that in the heat of our election contest many things were said on public platforms and in the press by those who felt constrained to denounce the reciprocity policy of the Opposition as disloyal, which were calculated to foster irritation on both sides of the line. A calmer view of the situation, coupled with the salutary influence of friendly negotiations in prospect, will, it may be hoped, result in a state of opinion and feeling more conducive to successful results. Though we are not, we confess, hopeful that the Washington Administration will accept any proposals looking to reciprocity that the Ottawa Administration is likely to make, we deem it, nevertheless, matter for congratulation that the conference is to take place. It is highly desirable that the people of Canada should know just how far their neighbours are prepared to go in the direction of reciprocity, and on what terms it can be obtained. With that knowledge we shall be in a position to count the cost, choose our future course advisedly, and adhere to it with firmness of purpose. Meanwhile it may not be amiss to remember that however we may be disposed to deprecate the ultra protectionism of our neighbours, they have just the same right which England or any other nation has to adopt the policy which they deem most in the interests of their own nation. The epithets "selfish," "unfriendly," "hostile," etc., which we so often hear applied to that policy, are justifiable only on the supposition that in framing it the statesmen of the United States have been actuated by the design of doing injury to Canada and not simply by that of benefiting their own people. Few will seriously maintain such an opinion. Our neighbour's trade policy may be a very narrow and purblind one, and we believe it is, but we see no reason to suppose that they are one whit more selfish in adopting it, than England in following her free-trade system or Canada in adopting her protective tariff. It is greatly to be deplored, no doubt, that nations have not learned to apply the golden rule in their relations to other nations, but for that we shall have to wait, we fear, till the millenium. We refer to this fact, because it seems to us that a frank recognition of it will do more than almost anything else to promote a state of feeling favourable to successful reciprocity negotiations. The spirit in which the United States press either deprecates or repudiates the idea that the Canadian delegates were treated with any lack of courtesy at Washington is reassuring. Nor should it ever be forgotten that, whatever may be the future of Canada, whether her people eventually choose Independence, or Imperial Federation, or some other course, Providence has irrevocably fixed her in the closest proximity to the United States, and made it in the highest degree desirable that genuine good feeling should be perpetually maintained between the two peoples.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

IT is difficult for those whose memory cannot go back for more than half a century to understand the feelings awakened by the great religious movement which had its origin, its actors, and its whole motive power within the great University of Oxford. The passionate devotion, the bitter hatred, the startled wonder with which it was contemplated from the one side or the other—these have long passed away, and have been replaced by criticism, by gratitude or repugnance, by approval or disapproval, more or less qualified.

There are few, indeed, of any communion, or of any school of religious thought, who will deny that the Church of Christ owes much to the movement which began in Oxford in 1833, not merely Roman Catholics who are thought to have profited by the remarkable revival of forgotten tenets, not merely Ritualists who declare that they are the true heirs of the movement, or the more sedate Anglicans who reproduce much of its spirit—not merely these, but all thoughtful students of historical religion of all parties will confess that there is not a department of Christian life, in the individual or in the community, which has not been affected by this movement. The slightest reference to the state of theological studies, to the types of ecclesiastical architecture, to the development of the ritual, the worship of all communions, will satisfy them that, here at east, apart altogether from any changes which may have

taken place in religious opinions, the influences of this movement have been extensive, profound, and mainly beneficial.

These reflections, although they reach far beyond the limits of the book in question, have been immediately suggested by the perusal of a very fascinating volume from the pen of the late Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. R. W. Church.* It is not the first time that an attempt has been made, by those who were actors or spectators, to tell us of the doings of the splendid group of men, who, with Newman at their head, sought almost to revolutionize the theological mind and perhaps the religious life of the Church of England, more especially in regard to the doctrine of the ministry and the sacraments. The classical work on the subject must always be Newman's own *Apologia*, or Defence of his own sincerity and consistency in passing from the Church of England to the papal communion. No one knew the inner history of the movement as Newman did. He projected the Tracts, he wrote the first numbers of them and contributed many more than any other writer.

But although Newman was the head and perhaps the heart of the movement, he never professed to be its beginner. That honour he assigns unhesitatingly to the Poet of the "Christian Year." It was John Keble's sermon before the University on the subject of "National Apostasy" that struck the first note. It was Hurrell Froude who carried the torch into the Oxford Common Room. Even when Newman was the principal intellectual influence in the movement, Dr. Pusey by reason of his learning, his piety, his high social position, and his standing in the University, did perhaps more than anyone to gain attention to the movement and to diffuse its influence.

We have not yet had the history given from Pusey's side. The late Canon Liddon, we are told, left ready for publication a considerable portion of the life of his master, and when that history sees the light we shall doubtless know all that can be told from that point of view. But Mr. (afterwards Sir) William Palmer, who participated in the movement, although by no means with complete sympathy, has left us a Narrative of Events which must always be serviceable; and Mr. T. Mozley, in his Reminiscences, has put on record many facts connected with the great men of the movement which should not be forgotten. No one who reads books such as those to which we have referred, we say not with sympathy, but with mere fairness, can fail to be impressed with the learning and scholarship, the high and fine character, the brilliant abilities of the leaders in the movement—Keble, Hurrell Froude, Newman, Charles Marriott, Pusey, Isaac Williams and others.

We do not know that Dean Church's posthumous work will add very much to the knowledge of persons already well read in the history of the movement; but even these will find some new facts, and they will receive help to the understanding of the facts in the clear, calm, vivid, cultivated style of the writer. It is a natural and inevitable drawback to the study of the volume that it suggests comparison with the *Apologia*; and Church is the first to disavow any competition of this kind. Newman's style was his own and it was supreme. Besides, Church was a disciple, not a leader, a younger contemporary. But for this very reason he can, perhaps, better interpret the general tendencies of the movement than one who is put on his defence for having first promoted it and then deserted his colleagues. The object of Church is, in his own words, "to preserve a contemporary memorial of what seems to me to have been a true and noble effort which passed before my eyes, a short scene of religious earnestness and aspiration, with all that was in it of self-devotion, affectionateness, and high and refined and varied character, displayed under circumstances which are scarcely intelligible to men of the present time" on account of the immense changes in religious thought partly resulting from this very movement.

The early Tractarians professed from the beginning that they were not innovators, but were only restoring the doctrines of their own Church which had been for a season forgotten, and they declared that all the principles for which they contended were to be found in the writings of the Caroline divines. As far as the earlier Tracts are concerned, this contention may be maintained. The eighteenth century had lost both the religious and the ecclesiastical sense. The Evangelical movement revised the one, the Tractarian the other; and both were greeted with surprise and opposition, and almost in equal degrees.

* "The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years—1833-1845." By R. W. Church, D.C.L. Price 12s. 6d. London: Macmillan. 1891.