

manuscript theology he has had many dryas dust predecessors; the volume that he is most popularly known by, "La Vie de Jésus," is a text as old as Arianism itself; in this case Renan did not so much kill Faith, as he hypnotized belief with caresses, floral decorations and *berceuses*. Two singular facts: Renan ever appeared gay, or he conversed like a cheerful man; now his inner circle of friends are as rueful as was Don Quixote himself; rarely a quotation or an apothegm from the deceased's works is to be encountered in contemporary writings. Said Mlle. Demay, a café concert diva to M. Renan, who complimented her singing: "I have read your romance the 'Life of Jesus,' and your funny comedy the 'Abbess Jonane'; they are charming and I recommend them to all my friends." That's the popular verdict on Renan's *bagage littéraire*.

M. Renan had reached the psalmist's span of life, having been born in 1823, at Fréquier, in the ancient Province of Brittany. His father was captain of a coasting vessel and was "found drowned" on the sea shore. His mother was a Gascon peasant who infused the humorous and long-bow-drawing quality into Renan's character. The widow and her three orphans were reduced to misery, and the fishing village was poor. His sister Henriette, a very superior woman and who shaped her brother's life, was the schoolmistress of the village, and taught Ernest his alphabet and developed his precocious intellect. Removing to a neighbouring town—"a nest of priests"—Renan was selected to serve at mass, was taught Latin, and in time was admitted to St. Sulpice Seminary in Paris, to be ordained for the priesthood. Here he kicked, and on the advice of Bishop Dupanloup, then the rector, resigned his divinity studentship. He was again in misery; he knew Hebrew, obtained a few private pupils, became usher at an humble school, where he had for fellow-worker, M. Berthelot, the now famous chemist, his life chum, and his probable successor as director of the College of France. Aided by his sister, he studied Oriental languages, wrote for reviews, found official literary work, undertook a search expedition for the Government in the Holy Land, and, on his return, wrote "The Life of Jesus," which led to his dismissal as Hebrew, etc., Professor at the College of France. He supported himself by his writings and Biblical studies till the shipwreck of the Second Empire, when the present republic at once restored him and other liberal professors to their chairs. In due course the professors elected and re-elected him director of the College of France.

In person Renan was anything but handsome-looking; his gait was loutish and somniferous; two piercing Celtic eyes represented apparently all the animation of his mol-lusky body; he had large, flabby, hanging white cheeks, that imparted a benediction appearance to his features; indeed he recalled one of those "monks of Melrose, that made good kale on Friday when they fasted." He was a good listener; that is to say, he never interrupted the speaker, because his thoughts always were elsewhere, among the ideals; but he had the knack, the mechanical trick, of intuitively guessing when the speaker was drawing to a close, fixing his final phrase, and with a wag of his head repeated it, conveying thus to the visitor he agreed with all he uttered. It is a moot point: was Renan as gay, as happy, as he ever appeared to be in word and deed? Many say his light-heartedness was all assumed; that he never recovered from his fear at having left the priesthood; he dreaded the "clerical party" even on his death-bed, like Voltaire. "Victor Emmanuel and his family have a great fear of hell" was a common remark of Pius IX. Renan suffered great torture from the out-cry raised by Christianity against his "Life of Jesus"; when he visited his native village the peasantry avoided him on the highway as if a leper while they made the sign of the cross. Like Dante, mothers pointed him out to their children as a terror.

He was a martyr to gout, but never used unscriptural language to assuage its pangs. In 1878, when he was received at the Academy, I remember he hobbled to his seat on two sticks, and smiled like a stoic when his joints creaked. He was a long time ailing; his white face and lips indicated anemia and cardiac troubles; he was an habitué at the children's theatre in the Rue de Vivienne, and where chance often made me his neighbour, so I could study him; his friends said his slow circulation was due to deep thought, sedentary habits, and the effort he made to differ from nobody—to be all things to all men, de Goncourts excepted. His final crisis was swift and painless, what he wished, as he dreaded crumbling into physical demolition and servility. He wanted to leave the stage, ripe but not decayed. For a year he has been making his preparations for the grand "emigration," and set all his writings in order. He leaves his friends to defend his memory.

M. Renan was not rich. He did not make money by his books. Philosophers rarely do. Such harvests are reserved for Zolas. He had a good many official pickings that brought his income to nearly 50,000 frs. a year. He went through this with the abandon of a fine old "Irish" gentleman—remember he was a Celt—one of the olden time. He was married to the niece—not the daughter, as popularly believed—of the painter, Ary Scheffer, and leaves two children. The most extraordinary of hallucinations was Renan's belief that he was a politician. Dumas fils had a like nightmare. In 1869 Renan courted a constituency whose voters did not know "b from a bull's foot." He told them his idea of government—that, where the head

thinks and watches, while the nation neither thinks nor feels; that a nation was formed not by frontiers, language or glory, but by sorrows and suffering. Naturally those esthetics secured him the bottom of the polling for the four rival candidates. The winner was a radical who came out with a three acres and a cow programme. That defeat haunted Renan till his death.

Renan's happiest days were passed on his little estate near his birthplace. It was baptized by the "Celtic" name of Rosmaphamon, the hillock of Hamon's son. It was a wood of birch and fir trees overlooking the Bay of Biscay. The house was a plain whitewashed structure, with a tree-shaded terrace. Here he liked to receive his visitors. It was in Paris he composed his books, but it was at his villa he corrected and annotated his proofs. The latter the printers pronounced on the whole to be "clean." His first book was published when forty years of age. His rooms contained several religious pictures, but he took most pride in showing his album containing a collection of all the satires published and illustrated called forth by his "Life of Jesus." Never was Beelzebub and his toasting-fork so much called into artistic requisition.

The students have returned to their lyceums after the long vacation. Following the new regulations, the first two days are devoted to feasting and recreation which blunt nostalgia. Another amelioration: the average reduction in the hours of study is from two to three hours. The lads are all Socialists and subscribe to the "eight hour" movement.

Paris consumes 83,000 gallons of milk, more or less fresh from the cow, daily. Every inhabitant of France consumes annually one gallon of alcohol. If the total taxation of the country was levied per head in the form of a tax on each gallon of spirits France would have all the revenue she requires.

"The Finnigans" have arrived in Paris. They do not figure among the list of fashionables. They are an old pensioner and his wife, British subjects duly passported, who have walked on foot from Gibraltar to Paris. Since Wellington's march no such feat was performed. Lord Dufferin paid every attention to the poor globe trotters.

An old form of duelling worth revival: Rolet addressed 100 blows of a cane, by letter, to the poet Boileau, and the latter acknowledged their receipt.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. C. A. BOULTON ON FREE TRADE.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—I have read very carefully and with much interest the letter contributed to your last issue by Mr. C. A. Boulton on Free Trade and Mr. Lawder's Argument. Mr. Boulton's argument appears to be that protection, as now administered under the present tariff, is not based upon or adapted to promote the general interests of the country; but, on the contrary, has been framed in the interests of a class and for their exclusive benefit, and at the cost of great expense and injustice to the rest of the community. Mr. Boulton does not appear to believe that the policy of protection can be so amended as to prove as beneficial to Canada as would the policy of free trade with Great Britain, under which he thinks that even manufacturing would prosper better than under protection. His theory is thus stated: "Is not the value of the large market the world offers of greater value to the people of Canada as a whole than the home market, and have we not the self-reliance to feel that we can hold our own in our home market under a more enlightened policy?" Mr. Boulton uses the stock argument employed by Canadian free traders deduced from the results of the late census. He says: "If our census returns for 1891 show anything, they show clearly, after fourteen years' working under a protective policy, that protection protects capital only. It does not protect labour, or our population would be larger." "It does not diffuse wealth." The wealth that has been created during the last fourteen years has been chiefly derived from the importation of capital to build the C. P. R. and other works, etc.

Taking up Mr. Boulton's position based upon the results of the census and its failure to increase population or to diffuse wealth. When it is considered that the only increase in population in the older provinces has been in the cities and towns, whose progress during these fourteen years has arisen from the increase in the number and capacity of manufacturing establishments, and when the returns of our Government and other savings banks show that there has been a large and healthy increase in the deposits, and when it is considered that a very large proportion of the dwelling houses occupied by the artisans are owned by themselves, it does seem illogical to claim that the manufacturing industries of the country have not been increasing the population, and have not been protecting labour, or diffusing wealth and comfort. The question is, how much of this increase of population, wealth and labour is justly attributable to protection, or whether a greater increase would have been realized under a free-trade policy. A cognate question is, whether the success (let it be little or great) in manufacturing has been obtained at the expense of or through injustice to other industries, and, if so, whether the policy of protection cannot be so amended and administered as to remove all, or, at any rate, the greater part of the injustice complained of.

Could all of the new manufacturing industries and the

numerous extensions of old ones have been undertaken under a policy of free trade, or, failing these, would an equal number and value of other industries have been established? Admitted that in so far as natural resources, raw material, a vigorous, industrious and intelligent population and fair amount of idle capital are concerned, Canada is richly endowed; there has been, and, in connection with new industries, there always will be, that lack of skill, experience and well-established business relations which are essential to success. Until these requisite conditions are attained, new establishments cannot hope to succeed in open competition with those which have acquired them. If they are to surmount the embarrassments and errors consequent upon inexperience, they must, for the first few years, be relieved from unequal competition with those which have already overcome these primary difficulties. Is it the duty of the State to assist them in getting fairly on their legs, by means of bonus or protective duties? If so, to what extent? The business answer to these questions is, certainly, but only to the extent to which public interest is likely to be benefited by the additional value imparted to the products and labour of the country employed in the manufacture of the proposed article. Mr. Boulton's objections to the National Policy, or system of protection, as now administered in Canada, are unanswerable. There is a large proportion of the manufacturing industries which have been so long established, and have so many advantages in the shape of raw material, moderate prices for labour, coal, etc., that they require now nothing more in the way of protection than such reasonably low rate of duty as will protect them against sacrifice imports from overcrowded markets. There are other industries employed in the manufacture of articles, three-fourths or more of the value of which consists of the raw material imported, but the protection now granted is upon the whole value of the finished article. Among many of such articles may be named refined sugar, binding twine, many articles of cotton or silk, drugs, etc. To illustrate this point, take the two articles of refined sugar and steel rails, and assume that it would be to the general interest of the country that, in order to have refined sugar and steel rails manufactured in the country, the consumers would be willing to pay one-third more for the home-made articles than for imported. All the wages, Canadian coal and other material expended in refining 100 pounds sugar cannot possibly exceed sixty or, at the very outside, seventy-five cents. This is the only part of the value of refined sugar in which Canadians are interested, or from which they can derive any benefit. Following out the line of argument suggested, the protection granted to refiners of sugar should be twenty and twenty-five cents per 100 pounds, and if Canadian refiners cannot carry on their works under this protection, it would be better for the country that this branch of manufacturing should be abandoned. Under the present tariff, refiners have a protection of eighty cents per 100 pounds, which enables them to extort from the consumer a much larger profit than their service entitles them to receive. In the case of steel rails, of the value of about \$30 per ton, every cent of which, if produced in Canada, would be expended on Canadian material or wages, this article is admitted free of duty, and the value of the imports in 1890-91 was about \$3,000,000. The general consumers of iron and steel are subjected to heavy duties; big railway corporations are exempt. This is not protection, it is favouritism. Free traders are constantly asserting that Canada does not furnish a large enough market for manufactures. In steel rails there is an annual demand for about \$3,000,000 worth. This manufacture would employ a small army of at least 6,000 people in all branches and their dependents, a number sufficient to populate a considerable city. A true national policy would foster this enterprise. Place an import duty of \$5 per ton on foreign rails, and grant a bonus of like amount on every ton of steel rails laid on railways in Canada, either for construction or renewals, and fix this legislation for the number of years required for stability, and there will soon be steel-rail establishments erected either by the great trunk railways or by others. As with steel rails, so with numerous other articles, there is an ample field for their manufacture, if the proper guarantee of reasonable continuance of the protective policy were granted to capital and enterprise. If the objectionable features of the tariff were removed, and the whole structure of duties erected on the principle of a given percentage of protection in proportion to the native material and labour employed, capital and enterprise would have some intelligible ground to work upon, instead of the preferences and favouritism of the Government in power.

Mr. Boulton condemns the whole policy of protection, because of its alleged injustice to all of the community except the beneficiaries of the protective system. He says that the census shows that the average wages of the manufacturing class, men, women and children, is \$272 per annum, and that the protective policy mulcts them of \$50 of this amount. Assume rather that the average income of an artisan family is \$500. Unless beer, spirits or tobacco are largely used, really very little of his expenditure is increased by the customs duties. I have for nearly fifty years been dealing with farmers and artisans, and am quite familiar with the description and value of their general expenditure. Take rent and taxes, tea, coffee, household furniture, sugar, provisions of all kinds, vegetables, fruit, etc., all the clothing except a very few importeur articles, and it will be found that very few families purchase over \$50 of imported goods, the duty upon which