

seen from the following extracts from official Reports of the Indian Council of the Indian Territory for 1874 and 1875. Keokuk, Chief of the Soas and Foxes, says:—"If a man or a crowd of men came to a tribe of Indians, and seriously injured them, as it is now, the injured tribe could get no redress." In support of which assertion we have a statement of the Friend's Review that "no law exists under our (U.S.) Government for the punishment of any crime of an Indian agent over Indians." For while a negro freedman is a citizen, the red man, unless he abjures his nationality, is regarded as a foreigner, *but without the rights accorded to unnaturalized aliens in American courts.* However, to go on with the Reports of the Council. An aged, grey haired Comanche Chief thus expresses himself:—"Many years ago we lived in Texas, where the Government opened farms and supplied us with cattle and all other domestic animals, which prospered and made us happy for a while, but the citizens of that country soon said 'the Comanches are bad' and arose and drove us from these homes, destroying all we had. Brothers, I'm very glad to see you doing so well, but my heart feels bad when I look back and think what I might have been, had not Texas treated me and my people so bad."

And Buffalo Good, of the Wacos, says:—"It is many years ago since the Wacos commenced to live like the white man, in Texas, and I've often thought had they not been disturbed by the whites, they at this time would have been equal in civilization to any tribe, perhaps, in the Council. But we were driven away from our homes there, into Kansas; and when we had made another commencement, we were again driven away. So that, even now, though we are doing comparatively well, our hearts are not strong, for we are by *no means certain that we will not be driven to some other place.* \* \* \* We have not now any guarantee that we will be allowed to remain long at our present location, and this accounts for our tardiness. The Wacos' history shows that when the white man thinks the Indian is in his way, he has but to rise in his might and drive him, for there is no law to which the Indian can appeal for protection."

In contrast to this picture we may, with some pardonable pride, place the following sketch of the principles of our own Indian policy, again quoting from Principal Grant in "Ocean to Ocean":—

"What is the secret of our wonderful success in dealing with the Indian? It can be told in very few words. We acknowledge their right and title to the land, and a treaty once made with them, we keep it. Lord Dufferin has pointed out what is involved in our acknowledgment that the original title to the land exists in the Indian tribes and communities! Before we touch an acre, we make a treaty with the chiefs representing the bands we are dealing with, and having agreed upon and paid the stipulated price, we enter into possession, but not until then do we consider that we are entitled to deal with an acre! It is well that this should be clearly understood, because the Indians themselves have no manner of doubt on the subject. At the North-West Angle, chief after chief said to the Governor: 'This is what we think, that the Great Spirit has planted us on this ground where we are, as you were where you came from. We think that where we are is our property.' Being well assured that the land is theirs, they demand compensation for it as a right. And who will question their right?" "Something more than making a treaty is needed. It must be kept to the letter, and in the spirit. I am not aware that the Indians ever broke a treaty that was fairly and solemnly made. They believe in the sanctity of an oath, and to a Christian nation, a treaty made with true believers, heretics or pagans, with those old lords and sons of the soil would be worse than to break one with a nation able to resent a breach of faith."

Let us be thankful for the fair record which, in this respect, we inherit, and let us see to it that we do not sully it by either doing or permitting injustice to a people occupying so peculiar a relation towards us, looking forward to the consummation to be desired, when the Indians shall be simply our fellow-subjects, standing upon precisely the same basis of civil rights which we claim as our own.

FIDELIS.

### THE STANDARD OF VALUE!

Our attention has been drawn to a couple of letters which lately appeared in the columns of the SPECTATOR, over the signature of Wm. Brown, discussing the merits of the United States silver bill. They are evidently from the pen of a gentleman indulging in the grossest delusions in money matters. The writer goes into ecstasies over that measure as a great triumph of legislation, and by his language, he appears to favor its introduction to Canada. In view of the wide-spread commercial ruin he asks "how is that money over nearly all the world has doubled its purchasing power; and that real estate and every product of labor have lost one half of theirs. How is it that tens of thousands are pining away simply for want of work? Is there not something in this wild and insane determination, to destroy silver, constituting fully one half of the precious metals in the world? He calls upon us Canadians beware! It is indeed a money question that should be probed to the bottom."

To us Mr. Brown's fears and surmises are very gratuitous. It should not require very much probing to ascertain that neither the general, nor our own commercial difficulties have any relation whatever to the discarding of silver, as a standard of value.

Gold and silver have been acknowledged measures of value, from the earliest times, and both usage and law have made them equivalent at a certain ratio, some nations using silver, others gold. But if Great Britain chooses the gold standard, it does not follow that her industry is deprived of the benefit that silver may afford as a standard to other countries. The fact of silver being used elsewhere, as is largely done by European nations, as well as in the distant East, sets free the *more gold for the countries that prefer that standard.* There is only a certain quantity of these metals in the world, and the steady rates of 15½ to 1 of gold proves they are as actively at work as ever they were. Not even American legislation can increase the quantity of silver, but simply distribute it, and we are only turning Mr. Brown's argument against himself in quoting "The announcement of the passage of the bill caused silver and gold in London to advance towards each other from 15.98 to 1 to the old and normal standard of

15½ to 1." That is, *the gold was cheapened by the enlarged market afforded to silver by the Americans,* who in that act saddled themselves with a tax which is appropriated by the gold standard communities. But supposing both the metals used in this country as standards of value, how could we get either of them without paying for it. We now have to purchase whatever is wanted of gold to keep our bank circulation redeemable, by our industry, and when the balance of trade is unfavourable we have to resort to the exportation of mortgages. It is necessary to have *one* standard of value, but immaterial which, but to be ambitious of two or more standards as our American friends seem to be, is on a par with envying them their gold room, a ring, created by the greenback standard. Standard of value is a "legislating on prices," and the less of that handy work the better. Legislating on prices, or in favour of the debtor, is only another name for cheating the creditor. Depend upon it if you make wrong financial laws the nations you deal with will benefit by your errors. We fail to perceive the good of manufacturing a "people's money" as Mr. Brown chooses to name it, that costs more *labour* to purchase the coin than it did the silver. The measure, however, has some claim to patriotism, as one class within the country will pocket the profits, and they are holders of mining stocks. The vice of all legislation in favour of the debtor class is that it sacrifices industry to financial rings. Since the greenback issue, that country has become notorious for swindles. The more standards of value, the more dubious the terms of contracts are likely to be made; and full play is afforded to that "dangerous and double-meaning word *coin.*" For our part, we prefer one standard of value; a uniform standard of weights and measures, as well as a universal language.

Sound financial laws should firstly respect the wishes of the creditor; secondly the wishes of the debtor; and if that order be scrupulously observed, the visits of commercial crises would be few and far between, because it would throw more security into commercial transactions.

In this respect the Canadian banking law is sadly deficient. I have in my pocket a ten dollar bank note which the law obliges me, the creditor, to accept without security; only think!

The crying evil these days is not the lack of a silver standard, but the plentiful lack of security. All countries are afflicted by the dead weight of carrying a large amount of fixed and useless capital; resulting from the action of partial and expedient legislation; and the study now is to make said capital available by an intelligent application of the principles of banking. Will Mr. Brown do his readers the favour of showing how this country might be aided in that direction by the adoption of the defunct "German Silver Bill"? Unfortunately, what Mr. Brown admires most in his favourite measure is of the least advantage to the general good—for instance, the appreciation of the 90-cent dollar to that of 100 cents! He also discourses very learnedly of the average labour values of gold and silver. "It is the labour ratio of centuries, and will in all likelihood be the labour ratio for centuries to come." In our humble opinion the labour ratio is one thing, and the legal or nominal value quite another, and no writer has ever yet defined or explained the connection of the two; and in fact the game is not worth the powder.

Sensible business men know very well that neither gold nor silver are worth anything like their accepted values; but that does not unfit them for being "standards of value." The practical point in establishing a standard of value is to ascertain what the creditor prefers the debt payable in. He chooses that which he can sell most readily, and that suits all parties.

We have explained our views at some length in these columns on "Business," "Banking," "Balance of Trade," "Commercial Depression," &c., the perusal of which letters, we flatter ourselves, will aid one in arriving at the true state of the country in its present embarrassed condition. If our principles are not unassailable, we should be pleased to be corrected. The principles of money and commerce, as Mr. Brown suggests, are by no means too generally understood. The Americans, we admit, are in many respects "a great and generous people," and occupying a country of unrivalled natural resources; but it appears to us that their commercial legislation does much towards sacrificing these natural advantages. At the present time, perhaps no country exhibits more evidences of poverty amongst its active population. In management we have certainly little presented to us as worthy of imitation.

ALPHA.

### MYSTERY PLAYS.

The vast proportions of the theatres of ancient Ephesus, Athens, Corinth, Syracuse and Rome are evidence of the prominence of the Drama as a means for the entertainment and instruction of the people of those cities. Several were capable of accommodating an audience of 20,000 to 30,000. It is evident that the human voice could not reach the limits of these vast structures, hence the entertainment consisted of *tableaux vivants* and a species of pantomime. In modern times Jenny Lind has been heard by 6,000, and Sankey's voice in sacred melodies was heard distinctly, in every part of Agricultural Hall in London, by an audience of 18,000; but in these instances the buildings were covered and constructed with every regard to the acoustic properties. In the ancient theatres there was seldom a covering. The materials for the tragedies and dramatic tableaux were derived from mythology. It was the eye and the imagination which were addressed rather than the intellect. There must have been some strong attraction to bring together so large audiences as filled, at every performance, these vast amphitheatres. The lessons inculcated were generally good,—virtue was commended and vice denounced. Many were impure, and pandered to the sensual passions of the people. The early Christians denounced these plays, derived from heathen mythology, but after the third century, when Christianity had in a measure gained its freedom, began religious plays, in which were enacted the mysteries of the Passion. In time, the ceremonies of the church, on festivals and other occasions, in their imposing grandeur of altar decoration and display of rich costumes of the celebrants, appear addressed to the eye. Gradually the passion for religious plays extended from east to west, and Germany for a time was the home of scenic representation of religious subjects. These were performed in convents, monasteries, and in buildings erected for the purpose in open fields and