



"EUGENICS AGAIN"

A CORRESPONDENT, Mr. Lewis F. Mills, of St. Stephen, N.B., writes me that he was "very much interested" in my remarks on "Eugenics" in this department. He is good enough to ask if I have written anything else on the subject; and, if so, when and where. And then he is—shall I say, "bad" enough?—to ask me, in case I have written nothing else on the theme, to give him the names and "works" of other writers who have dealt with this delicate subject along "similar lines." "Works" has a very impressive sound. It is much better than "books." I appreciate its use in this connection, even though it compels me to expose my bibliographical nakedness in the case and admit that I know of no "works" taking my view. So far as I am aware, my view is strictly original. I invented it. And I invented it for the *COURIER*.

AND, after several weeks, I still think that I was right. Nature is not only the Great Physician; but she is the great preventor of ill. Our best doctors now prescribe nature—study nature—obey nature—co-operate with nature. When you are ill, they simply remove whatever obstacles to nature which may have fallen athwart her course, out of the way; and then advise you to "let nature work her cure." Where nature is hard on the individual, is that she doesn't want to cure weaklings. She wants to kill them. She wrote her book, long before Barrie, on "Better Dead." Naturally, the weaklings rebel. They do not want to die for the benefit of the race. They have a selfish preference toward living. So they make a fight for it—and call in the doctors to help them. But the best the doctors can do for them is to artificially fortify the weak spot where nature is applying her punishment, and so bring them once more in line with nature's laws of health. And this is perfectly legitimate, so far as individuals go. The man-pack has made this gain over the wolf-pack—it cures its wounded instead of eating them. And, in the long run, it gains by it; for many of the wounded become again "first-class" fighting men.

BUT, while this is good business as applied to the already-born, it is criminally bad business when relied upon to cover up preventable weaknesses in the case of those yet to be born. For us to say—"We have skilled physicians and we have scientifically equipped hospitals and we have miraculous drugs; and so we will risk violating the laws of nature and the bringing into the world of foredoomed cripples," is as cruel and stupid an exhibition of wilful ignorance as could well be imagined. It is an abuse of medical skill. It bears no more relation to the healing of the sick than would the case of a builder, who should deliberately put faulty plumbing in his apartment-house because there are plumbers who can fix it, to the calling in of a plumber by an innocent tenant after the plumbing had broken. Thus my "invented" system of "Eugenics" is simply to make sure that nature has her way to begin with. Do not drive your "architect" off the building while you are putting it up, and then call him in frantically when the floors begin to sag. Let your "architect"—the matchless "architect" of nature—have his way from the first.

IT is very simple; and, if I do say it myself, it is very sensible. In this matter of the mating of the sexes, nature works by mysterious affinities and attractions which we do not even begin to understand. Any standard of attraction we try to set up will break down, I venture to say, in its attempted application to the young people of the first "city block" you know. You say, for example, that a pretty girl will attract in proportion to her prettiness; or that a strong young man will attract in proportion to his strength. And you go to a young people's party, and you find that, if there are a dozen young men there, there will be at least a half-dozen different opinions as to the "order of precedence" among the "pretty girls" present; and there is absolutely no guarantee that the athletic gradations of the young man will fix their order of popularity with the girls. Again, they say—

"health attracts." Sometimes; but many a man is drawn irresistibly to the pale and helpless "clinging vine"; and many a woman marries a feeble husband because he so needs her help. Write me down any fancied law of sex attraction, and I will produce to you about as many exceptions as examples.

NO; nature has not told us her secret. What it is that draws two people together, we cannot even guess. Under such circumstances, surely the proper method—admitting that the laws of nature ought to be followed—is to stand out of the way, and let nature take her course. Yet that is exactly what we prudent and wise people will not do. On this continent, we are very prone to think that we are much better in this respect than the class-bound and tradition-tied peoples of Europe. But I am not so sure. They are cruder about it over there—they keep their young people in a more dependent and docile state of mind, and then apply their iron rules and regulations quite frankly and even brutally. In some countries, they even deliberately pick out wives for their sons, and husbands for their daughters. We do nothing of that sort. But

we drill into the minds of our children all these formal maxims which govern the elders over there; and then let them—that is, our children—apply them for themselves. And the result is not so noticeably different. Our children are splendidly precocious and remarkably soon develop quite as much respect for "society" and "money" as their elders. In fact, it is not an uncommon experience on this continent to find the daughter of the house more in awe of social rank than either of her parents. The European prides himself on keeping "the mind of the young person" innocent of much knowledge; and then he looks after the marriage of this impressionable infant himself. The American prides himself of having children who are quite as knowing as their elders; and it is then the children who manage their own marriages and look after the social education of their parents.

THE boys who make the cable despatches say that they have started a "school of love" in Germany. I don't know what they teach at it; but it need not be quite a joke. No particular school is needed, of course. But what is needed is that we should enter into one vast conspiracy to impress upon the mind of youth that "love" is the only thing to be considered in choosing a mate for life; and that those who talk of "money" and "position" and "prospects" at such times, are not only blasphemers against the sacred Religion of Love, but are colossal and conspicuous fools into the bargain.

THE MONOCLE MAN.

Local vs. National Parsimony

Truro, May 12th, 1913.

Editor, *CANADIAN COURIER*:

The Monocle Man, in his interesting causerie of May 10th, puts it down to municipal and local parsimony that in matters of education and of highway improvement of the Provinces of Canada are so backward.

Such an explanation, while doubtless sufficient to account for a good many isolated cases of educational stagnation and of bad roads, is untenable as accounting for what may be called a general failure in the maintenance of these greatest two public services, viz., education and transportation. Is it not a truer explanation to say that we have failed in these two great duties mainly because we have been taught to consider education and the highways not as national but merely as provincial or parochial concerns?

The Monocle Man believes it would be better for us if these services were administered by the Federal Government and maintained by indirect taxation, as in France. It is quite within the power of our Federal authorities to deal with both education and the highways by subsidizing provincial effort, just as the Federal Government of the United States has subsidized by enormous sums of money and by enormous grants of public land the educational efforts of not only the newly organized states of the union, but also the older eastern states through whose effort and sacrifice the West was opened up and developed. Canada, whose taxation for Federal purposes has grown so huge as to amount to little short of a scandal, has, so far, appropriated none of her revenue to either schools or roads.

Our Federal taxation now amounts to over \$19 per head, as contrasted with \$18 in Great Britain, \$17 1-2 in France, \$19 in Argentina, \$19 in New Zealand, \$17 1-4 in Australia, \$7 1-4 in the United States. And, notwithstanding that none of these latter countries have

a national tax-rate as high as Canada's yet they all provide handsomely for education, for roads, and for other services which we in Canada have been taught to regard as merely provincial or local concerns.

Thus, out of the national revenues of Great Britain some ninety-two million dollars, or over two dollars per head of the population, is appropriated to public education, and over six millions to roads.

In France, the national treasury annually contributes over sixty-four million dollars to education. In Argentina, which has almost the same population as Canada, public education is assisted from the Federal treasury to the amount of over ten million dollars per year. (And this, forsooth, in a Latin country!)

New Zealand, with a population of one million, votes to education the sum of nearly five million dollars, which is more than half as great as Ontario's aggregate outlay, provincial and sectional, on her educational system.

The United States, notwithstanding her comparatively slender Federal revenues, continues to subsidize state effort in education in a way that should make Canadians ashamed of their Ottawa rulers.

In Australia, while the central government of the Commonwealth does not directly assist education, it renders possible a most generous provision for this as for every other provincial service by returning to the treasuries of the several states a sum equal to over six dollars per head of their population.

Money has become rather too plentiful at Ottawa. Men of "big business," and parliamentary magnates assure the ill-informed public that there is scarcely any limit to our power to pay. And yet, they have all around them the spectacle of the worst roads in the world and probably the poorest rural schools.

DAVID SOLOAN.

MONTREAL BASEBALL TEAM, 1913



Standing, Left to Right: Mike Murphy (Catcher), Ray Demmitt (Outfielder), "Del." Mason (Pitcher), Bill Cunningham (Second Baseman), Tom Madden (Catcher), Joe Yeager (Third Baseman and Captain), Wm. Allen (Outfielder), Art. Griggs (First Baseman), Howard McGraner (Pitcher). Kneeling: Jimmy Esmond (Infielder), Eddie Lennox (Infielder), Frank Gilhooley (Outfielder), Benny Purtell (Shortstop), Eddie Burns (Catcher), Billie Burke (Pitcher), Al. Mattern (Pitcher), and Frank Smith (Pitcher).