

is everywhere—around us, beneath us; from the depths of yonder valleys, from the top of that mountain, history rises up and presents itself to our notice, exclaiming: Behold me!" . . . "History is everywhere around us. She rises as well from these ramparts, replete with daring deeds, as from those illustrious plains equally celebrated for feats of arms, and she again exclaims: Here I am!"

To the Christian traveller the River St. Charles, which flows to the north of the Citadel, will possess an interest, for on its banks Jacques Cartier first planted the Cross, and held his first conference with *Seigneur Donacoma*. I have not space to allude to the "memorials and the things of fame that do renown" the ancient city of "Stadacona," but I recommend every visitor curious in such matters to find out Mr. J. M. LeMoine, a very walking, and we may say talking, encyclopædia of things connected with "Quebec, past and present." It is presumed that tourists will take up their quarters at the St. Louis Hotel, whose proprietor, Willis Russell, is second to none on the continent of America as a liberal and genial host; near to the hotel are the rooms of the Historical Society of Quebec, of which Mr. J. M. LeMoine is the President, and I advise them before they start on their tour down the Lower St. Lawrence to get a copy of "The Chronicles of the St. Lawrence," if they want to know anything, beyond the monotonous, stereotyped information meted to them in the guide books, of the legends and history of the places which embrace both banks of the St. Lawrence (nearly 1,000 miles) between Quebec and Gaspé.

Thos. D. King.

P.S.—The best note-book relative to the ancient city of Stadacona is that edited by Mr. J. M. LeMoine, and published by F. X. Garant, Fabrique Street, near the Seminary.

THE RELIGION OF FREE TRADE.

It would be strange indeed were truth to triumph without opposition either in this or any other age. But the feeling which prompts "Argus" to unite "Scripture Teaching" with the "National Policy" shows at least a desire for truth pure from the source of *all* truth, which it is to be regretted is not more prevalent. To seek there and thence is to find, if only the will be pure, or willing to be purified in carrying out truth into life. For religion that is *not* life is not religion.

If freedom to think, to form opinion and to carry out the honest and benevolent conclusions arrived at into a life of godliness in trade, manufactures, law and politics, be *not* the boast of Protestantism all the world over, then, of course, Protestantism must have but poorly carried out her mission in just so far as she has failed to prompt Protestants to adopt mediæval restrictions on personal freedom to act and to trade.

The term "National Policy" is extremely objectionable, because in itself it means nothing distinctive—it expresses no idea. Under a constitution like that of our Dominion, where the nation is all too amply represented by seven Provincial Governments and a central eighth of extra magnitude, *any* policy adopted by the country is pretty certain to be *the* national policy for the time being. One can only, therefore, speak of the National Policy *as it is*—a protectionist policy. It may—and prophets assert it will—be a free trade policy within twelve months.

"Argus" evidently feels opposed to the phrase "the devil of selfishness." If love of self—self-love, selfishness—is not the root and origin of every crime in the calendar, as well as the primary cause of the transgression of every one of the ten commandments, then it is difficult to know who or what is the devil—that great opposing force to the two commandments of our Lord: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God (not self) with all thy heart, &c., and thy neighbour as thyself, and on these two commandments, our Lord says, "hang *all* the law and the prophets."

"Argus" seems to argue very much from the same standpoint as did the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher in his sermon recently preached in Montreal, viz., that by taking care of "No. 1" first, with a strong and ever deepening love, a man *really* loves his neighbour, because he thus keeps himself from being a burden on society, and by and bye gets to be able to *afford* to love others—a wife and children for example, and keep them too. But neither "Argus" nor the distinguished preacher explains at whose expense this is to be done, or how love of *others*, which is diametrically opposite to love of *self*, is to be evolved out of this preliminary self-love, which only enlarges and strengthens itself if wife and children are loved simply because they are a part of self. Viewed in this light the thing is certainly a puzzle to the subtlest mind if the aim held in view be love of the neighbour.

The starting point of such an argument is false. The fruit must be false sentiment and evil life. And it is. It is the root of all evils and miseries from which we suffer. Our Lord taught us very plainly "Love of the neighbour," and labour and life for others' good—taught that we should let the reward for honest, kindly labour spring spontaneously from a sense of the benefit conferred; and, if it did not come, learn to do without. This seems a harsh law, perhaps, but it is really but a part of "that yoke which is easy, and that

burden which is light." Unselfish love and service *does* bring forth kindness and help from others to a degree which none knows who has not, more or less, laid down self and tried the experiment. It was not ever so, but since our God Himself assumed the human nature and restored the avenues of entrance to our being, so that His Love and Wisdom can once more find expanse, this has been, and is an actual fact of life. More than that, it is actually the law of trade of all enlightened nations to-day. Nations now who claim any advancement of view have given up as unwise the effort to conquer and compel, by force of arms, other nations to buy their commodities. They have seen that the only road to genuine trade or exchange is to make their goods so good, so useful, so beneficial, or attractive, that the service they can render a neighbouring nation will, by freedom of desire or will, tend to an exchange advantageous to both parties. This is the basis of all really productive modern trade—a trade which is the natural outcome of freedom on both sides—a trade which is based on *uses*. Trade based on compulsion is as dangerous and as fleeting as obedience based on compulsion where the will to be free produces endless revolutions. Freedom and voluntary conjunction with God from love towards Him whose very Being is Love, is the source of all true religion. Freedom and voluntary conjunction with each other from love of usefulness each to each is the source of all genuine trade of man with man and nation with nation. Therefore, Free Trade is on the natural plane exactly what religion is on the spiritual plane. And just in so far as spirit is the cause of matter—not matter of spirit—so religion, pure religion and undefiled, is the cause of that purity of motive and act in trade which leads inevitably to freedom, and consideration for others. A nation that has lost this desire for freedom so to trade, has lost it because it has lost the knowledge of God.

Let "Argus" ask himself if these are, or are not, the principles which our Lord—his Lord and mine—distinctly taught. If either of us is inclined to doubt it, an attentive perusal of the "Sermon on the Mount" will prove it.

St. Paul, Christian, noble man as he was, is only a follower of his Lord and Master, as "Argus" and others are, or may be to-day, and is *not* the authority we must seek for that highest form of wisdom which is the Being of God. Yet, St. Paul saw clearly on this point. In his tent-making, he "worked with his hands the thing which was *good*," that its goodness or usefulness might make him "chargeable to no man." "Argus" puts a good many words into St. Paul's mouth, which may or may not be correct. Into that question it is needless to enter, for we have no record that he used them.

The most daring flight which "Argus" takes is his parallel of Joseph as "Finance Minister" of Egypt with, say, the inventor of the "National Policy." Of course he sticks to the letter of Scripture, and does not venture out of his depth into the spiritual meaning which underlies it. Still, if he did venture wisely, there would be no need for his apology: "Let it not be said that this reference to events recorded in the Book of Genesis is out of place in our present disputes"; for *all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for correction, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness of life.

But on the ground of the letter of the narrative only, how would "Argus" like it if our Finance Minister took him at his word and copied the "Finance Minister of Egypt"? Foreseeing a certain dearth of lumber, for instance, in the near future, he might absolutely prohibit, by fire, imprisonment, or even the death penalty (as was the manner of Eastern potentates), all exportation of timber, lest we should as a nation run short of supplies. He might apply the principle equally to grain, for there might come a bad harvest or two; and any manufactures we do indulge in might as well be prohibited from export also, that there might be abundance and cheapness within our borders. This would only be carrying out boldly and completely the principle of protection to ourselves, which is at present our National Policy. To do this would be equivalent to repudiation of our national and personal debts; but what are honesty and good faith compared to the literal following of the literal example of so great a Patriarch as Joseph? It is right—is it?—to tithe mint and annise and cummin, and to leave the weightier matters of the law (the spirit of it) undone, in spite of our Lord's verdict: "These ought ye to have done, and not have left the other undone."

"Argus" will excuse our treating his theory thus by the *reductio ad absurdum* method, for our aim and his is truth. And just by this appears the difference. Protection carried out to its legitimate and logical conclusion puts an end to all trade, while freedom of trade, like personal freedom, is capable of unlimited extension, one step in advance leading the sojourner to another, till the whole world is explored and set working in harmonious order. None are injured. All are benefitted. Industry may have to seek new directions, but is never crushed or destroyed. Newer and vaster fields are opened in place of those on which labour is found to have been wasted. A man who desires to labour profitably to others, regardless of self, will never lack opportunity.

It is, in short, *impossible* to show that the theory of Free Trade is absurd, and it is equally impossible to show that it is hurtful to any nation that practises it. None has yet carried it out in its fulness, but Canada may if she will, and gladden many a heart.

Eusebius.