

delay, proposed a junction in and his followers—either her, as the Whig statesman Hartington, however, deny any official union with it, assuring them that the aid support, which he believed effective if he occupied an office, he had permanently on with Mr. Gladstone. That he took no part in the "conference" intended to the Liberal ranks; and his leadership of an its own officers and its union with those whom he tested in arms seems to have by the sound common sense was remarkable, partly by a both natural and laudable, would almost involve the Whig party from English as influenced by this last from speeches which he me on the propriety of the had arrived. On more was careful to point out party had still a distinct political sphere: a reason that of either Liberals or action, he said, was to act the two forces of conservatism, and to break the force of which they were continuously more immediately practicing the coalition were Lord Stanley's when he de Robert Peel in 1835, and dent support instead. Lord had little doubt of being pusly with the Tory leadership about the rank, and it would be well to wait new each other better. It the experiment of acting any more binding connect between them. We cannot ations which resulted in the Liberal Unionists under Mr. e group of Liberals acting on, or the arrangements reed to act together as a ce with the Conservatives, I with them. Of this coming was the recognized relations with Mr. Chamberlains of the platform g the election of 1885 had between the Whig and the

the new government, from out serious friction beed the Conservative Unionists misunderstandings arose recession in the case of parcesion at by-elections. The act, introduced by the y, met with Lord Hartington, and he only regretted ple to extend it to Ireland. ington was personally conking incident of the parten the ministry was for a d Randolph Churchill's reanion offer on the part o which we have just repeated in 1887, but was or the same reason as be time, then, Lord Hartington first place in the state. The 892, returning only a remajority for Great Britain, e Rulers the mastery of the Gladstonians and the ether could only count on "Not enough," exclaimed "one was enough" became Home Rule was at once Gladstone, and, after hard ough the House of Com-

ger a Lord Hartington in ns. The Duke, his father, mith, who up to that date of Commons, died in the Balfour was recalled from acant place. Thus the secome Rule began under ditions from those which first. Mr. Balfour was a the Duke of Devonshire's e of Lords was especially ment. Being there, howo part in the opposition to , with which Sir W. Harlf on the landed interest mpt to "keep him down." ed to them in speeches deouse in terms of indigna-

Coalition Home Rule government its short-lived eminence, e meantime having withdeed by Lord Rosebery, ch affairs were not ripe in arranged in 1895. The became president of the of Hereford took the lborne was made his par. But the Duke of Devonr of keeping the two sec distinct from each other, eal organization. Their a the House of Commons

were. Conservatives 338, Liberal-Unionists 70, the Conservatives thus having a clear majority of the whole House. During the whole time that elapsed between the return of Lord Salisbury to power in 1895 and the outbreak of the South African war in 1899 the education question continued to be the uppermost subject of interest in political circles. The Duke of Devonshire from time to time made speeches on the subject, to which, in fact, his public appearances were almost entirely confined. In 1897 he took charge of two education bills in the House of Lords—the Voluntary Schools bill and the Elementary Education Act Amendment bill, sometimes called the Necessitous Board Schools bill—which both became law that session. Two years afterwards he initiated the reconstruction of the education department by carrying through the Board of Education bill. In 1898 he introduced the London University bill, for making it a teaching as well as an examining university. He spoke frequently on secondary education, but it was not till the absorbing interest of the South African war had subsided that it became possible for the government to carry the comprehensive scheme on which they had long meditated. Meantime, in 1899, he had been in charge of the London Government bill, a measure completely after his own heart, as he was strongly opposed to the "Progressive" policy of the London county council, which he considered Socialistic. There were several other subjects on which his voice was occasionally heard—on the question of Crete, on Fashoda, and on the Indian frontier, when he said it was impossible we could go back to the policy of Lord Lawrence.

The Schism of 1903

In the year 1900 parliament was dissolved on September 25, and the polling began six days afterwards. The Unionist majority was 134. On March 29, 1901, the Duke of Devonshire gave notice that the Education bill would be introduced immediately after the Easter vacation. It was found, however, that it would be impossible to carry it through both Houses within the limit of an ordinary session, and the bill was withdrawn on the understanding that it should be brought in again immediately after the meeting of parliament in 1902. Lord Salisbury, who no longer combined the laborious duties of foreign secretary with those of prime minister, was now preparing to retire from political life altogether, and after 45 years of hard work and matchless services rendered to this country, he was certainly entitled to his repose. Mr. Balfour became prime minister, and the Duke of Devonshire leader of the House of Lords, a position for which his birth,

character, and the moderation of his opinions eminently qualified him. Mr. Balfour introduced the Education bill in the House of Commons, but such was the persistent obstruction which it encountered that it was found absolutely necessary to have recourse to an autumn session if the bill was not again to be withdrawn; and even so it was not read a third time in the House of Lords till the 12th of December. Here the Duke resisted the amendments proposed by leading churchmen to the Kenyon-Slaney clause, but, though his action in this respect was sharply criticised, nobody doubted that he had been guided by his own honest conviction.

The Duke's official life, however, was almost at its close. On May 15, 1903, Mr. Chamberlain enunciated his Tariff Reform policy. In the almost immediate split within the cabinet the Duke of Devonshire did not take part. Although it was known that his opinions were strongly in favor of maintaining the existing fiscal system, he was understood not to be opposed in principle to retaliation against hostile tariffs. Therefore he did not associate himself with the instantaneous protest of Mr. Ritchie and Lord George Hamilton, whose retirement was announced on the same day as Mr. Chamberlain's. Not until Mr. Balfour, in the autumn, marked his further progress towards the Birmingham policy, by his well known speech at Sheffield, did the Duke of Devonshire consider it necessary to part company with the bulk of the Unionist party.

Free Trade and Protection

"It was unnecessary, in my opinion" (wrote the Duke), "for the purpose of the statement to which I had assented, to assert that the controversy of 1846, which you describe as the great law suit between Free Trade and Protection, is of no interest whatever to us, except from a historical point of view. Nor can I think that it was necessary to assert that you desired to 'reverse the fiscal tradition, to alter fundamentally the fiscal tradition which has prevailed during the last two generations.' I had hoped to have found in your speech a definite statement of adherence to the principles of Free Trade as the ordinary basis of our fiscal and commercial system, and an equally definite repudiation of the principle of Protection in the interest of our national industries. But in their absence I cannot help thinking that such declarations as those which I have quoted cannot fail to have the effect of materially encouraging the advocates of direct Protection in the controversy which has been raised throughout the country, and of discouraging those who, like me—and I had hoped yourself—believe

that our present system of free imports, and especially of food imports, is, on the whole, the most advantageous to the country, although we do not contend that the principles on which it rests possess any such authority or sanctity as to forbid any departure from it—for sufficient reasons."

Mr. Balfour, in his reply, did not conceal the annoyance which he felt at the Duke's change of attitude.

"What and where is this discrepancy" (he asked) "which has forced you in so unexpected a fashion to revoke a considered policy? I do not believe it exists, and if any other man in the world but yourself had expended as much inquisitorial subtlety in detecting imaginary heresies, I should have surmised that he was more anxious to pick a quarrel than particular as to the sufficiency of its occasion. To you, fortunately, no such suspicion can attach."

Although personal relations between the two statesmen were not embittered, it was evident that further political co-operation had become impossible. Gradually the rift widened, and, step by step, the Duke, though never weakening on the question of Home Rule or the other leading articles in the Radical programme, drifted into a position of definite hostility towards the Unionist and Tariff Reform party. Eventually it became necessary to sever his connection with the Liberal Unionist organization of which he had been president.

The time has not yet come to judge the motives by which the late Duke was influenced, and the morrow of his death is certainly not the occasion which should be chosen by Conservatives and Unionists for passing an unfavorable verdict upon one incident in an upright and distinguished public life. But, amid all the various explanations given of the Duke's vacillating action, first in retaining and afterwards in resigning office, no one questioned his absolute good faith.

To the last he never lost the regard and esteem of his countrymen. A heavy, silent man, not gifted with eloquence or remarkable for great intellectual attainments, he exercised wide influence in virtue of his high principles and transparent honesty of purpose. No one could say that the Duke ever sought personal advancement or the gratification of his own ambitions. Twice, if not three times, as we have seen, he might have been prime minister, and he stood aside, once for Mr. Gladstone and twice for Lord Salisbury, with complete abnegation of self, serving willingly under either chief. His was a character which the British people love and trust with implicit confidence.

Personal Details

The list of the late Duke's dignities is a

lengthy one. He was a Knight of the Garter, a Privy Councillor, Grand Cross of the Victorian Order, D.C.D. (Oxford, 1878), and Hon. LL.D. (Cambridge, 1862); Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, 1877 to 1890; Chancellor of Cambridge University, 1892; Chancellor of Victoria University, Manchester, 1907; Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the counties of Derby and Waterford; J. P. and D. L., Lancashire, etc. He owned about 186,000 acres. His chief residences, Devonshire House, Piccadilly, and Chatsworth, are famous for their pictures and art collections. Among the paintings at Chatsworth are works by Titian, Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, Raffaele, Albert-Dürer, Holbein, Rubens, Rembrandt, and Vandyck; while at Devonshire House are fine portraits by Tintoretto, Jordaens, Lely, Kneller, and Reynolds. The late Duke married, in 1892, Louise Frederica Augusta, widow of the seventh Duke of Manchester, and daughter of Count von Alten, a lady with tastes very similar to his own. There are no children of the marriage, and the late Duke is succeeded by his nephew, Mr. Victor Christian William Cavendish, son of the late Lord Edward Cavendish.

Association With the Turf

The Duke, it is generally known, had a long and noteworthy association with the turf as owner and member and steward of the Jockey Club. His deep interest in racing did much to uphold the character of the sport. It was not until 1870, as Marquess of Hartington, that he became identified with the turf as an owner of racehorses, and, though his successes did not include more than one classic event, he was from time to time credited with most of the big races and handicaps. His familiar colors, "all straw," were not registered until three years after his advent as an owner, prior to which time, when he raced as "Mr. J. C. Stuart," his colors were a brown jacket and orange cap. No victory was achieved for him during his first year, but in the succeeding one, Tabernacle, by Newminster—Mrs. Wood, won the Handicap Sweepstakes at the Newmarket Second October meeting, and subsequently took three races at Liverpool and one at Warwick. The Duke only made one serious attempt to capture the chief prize of the turf, namely, the Derby. This was in 1898, when it was thought he would realize the highest ambition of racing by winning over the famous Epsom Downs by the aid of Dieudonne, one of the best horses he ever owned. As a two year old the son of Amphion and Mon-Droit won the Imperial Produce Stakes at Kempton and the Middle Park Plate, but in the Derby he failed to stay home, and only finished fourth to his stable compan-

ion, the despised outsider, Jeddah, the property of Mr. J. W. Larnach.

In the early part of his turf career the Duke raced in partnership with Mr. Henry Chaplin, and, as a breeder, he was inclined to the blood of the latter's Derby winner, Hermit. Belpheobe, purchased as a yearling at his friend's sale for 650 guineas, gained for him his only classic victory, namely, the One Thousand Guineas. This was in 1877, when Belpheobe won by a neck, the race that year being more valuable than the Oaks, namely, £4,750 as against £4,150. Perhaps a more important success than this was the winning of the Eclipse Stakes six years ago by Cheers, who, after his racing career, was sold to go to Russia as a stallion.

The Stewards Cup fell to the Duke three times, with Monaco in 1876 and twice with Marvel, in 1900 and 1902. He also secured a triple success in the Wokingham Stakes—an other sprint race—at Ascot with Corunna, Oatlands, and Minstrel. Other big handicap triumphs included the Liverpool Cup, Manchester November Handicap, and the Ascot Coronation Stakes by Belpheobe—the last mentioned race also being won a few years ago by Commune—and the Lewes Handicap three years in succession by Rylstone, who was an own sister to Moorhen, famous as the dam of the celebrated sires Gallinule and Pioneer. Mention should also be made of Chaplet, who won several races at Ascot and Newmarket and at the stud produced Morion, the winner of the Royal Hunt Cup, and Winkfield, who was sold to go to Ireland, and there became the sire of Winkfield's Pride and several other fine animals. At comparatively recent dates the Duke achieved considerable success with horses trained by S. Darling, at Beckhampton. They included Burgundy, who carried off the Queen's Prize at Kempton, and Acclaim, who last season won the Column Produce Stakes, the Newmarket Stakes, and the Triennial on the concluding afternoon of the Ascot meeting. Earlier that afternoon Fugleman had won another nice race. Unfortunately, the Duke at the time was lying ill at home, having returned from Ascot the previous day.

With respect to the Duke's trainers, the brothers Bloss for some time had charge of his horses at Newmarket, but later Richard Marsh took them over. Subsequently they were transferred to the care of W. Goodwin at Newmarket, and afterwards to the most part to Darling. It is interesting to recall that after the death of the late Queen the horses owned by the King ran in the Duke's name, and colors, Lauzun winning the St. James's Palace Stakes at Ascot during this time.

Shipping Rings—The System is an Old One

THE Glasgow Herald of March 25 has the following report of the previous day's proceedings before the Royal Commission on Shipping Rings:

Col. J. Smith Park, M.V.O., of the Allan line, gave evidence. He said he was a ship owner, and had been connected with the Allan line for thirty-six and a half years, for over thirty of which period he had been freight manager. For the last fifteen years he had also been managing owner of the Park Steamship company, which owns tramp steamers. He gave evidence at the request of the commission as a representative of the Canadian North Atlantic Westbound Freight Conference, which comprised all the Canadian lines of steamers—Allan line, Canadian Pacific Railway, Dominion line, Donaldson line, Manchester liners, and Thompson line—all of which lines had a deferred system of rebate. He would also speak in regard to the deferred rebate system of the Allen line and Furness lines in the Newfoundland trade, and as to the deferred rebate system in the River Plate trade in connection with the Allan line, although as they were doubtless aware, a witness had, after all, been arranged to appear on behalf of the River Plate Conference. The system of deferred rebates was started in 1877 by the Allan line in connection with the Calcutta trade of the City line, for which they acted as agents. It was not, however, until 1886 that they adopted the deferred rebate system in their own Canadian trade, confining it at first to the direct St. Lawrence season. He might explain, however, that he had before him one of their Glasgow freight circulars, dated so far back as 1862, in which one rate of freight was given to those who contracted for twelve months to send all their goods by the Allan line, and another and higher rate of those who did not so contract, and in 1875 they had been securing the support of shippers by returning half the prime on freight. He had also before him a list of rates, dated 1863, by which all the then Atlantic lines of steamers agreed to abide; there was a general conference of these lines, which lasted till about 1880. The deferred rebates in the Canadian trade differed at the various ports. Liverpool, Manchester, and Bristol lines acted together, and always had six months' rebates in hand. The Glasgow lines acted by themselves, and returned the rebates at the end of each year ending in October, when they held nothing in hand. The Newcastle line did the same, while the London lines kept about three to four months in hand. It might be of interest to trace the evolution of the deferred rebate system in their Glasgow-Canadian trade in his experience. When he first had to do with this trade his firm despatched a large fleet of fine sail-

ing ships each season, which along with those of other owners, competed strongly with their own steamers. As the latter grew in size it became an object to educate shippers into sending more largely and regularly by steamers, as well as exclusively by their line, and they accordingly offered special terms to those who sent all by their ships and steamers, and still better terms to those who sent everything by their steamers. Sailing ship competition gradually ceased, but in 1876 they began to be troubled with occasional steamers being placed on the berth, which offered very low rates to attract the better paying class of traffic. They had to meet these competitive rates to a certain extent as occasion arose, but their shippers said to them in effect—"We are satisfied with your service and rates, but we are always afraid of getting into trouble with our consignees for not availing ourselves of these outside boats, which our competitors may do. Can you not meet this in some way that will justify our refusing to support the opposition?" At first they did this by special contract rates covering more or less extended periods, but this had its disadvantages, and in 1887, a year after Liverpool, they introduced the system of allowing a deferred rebate of prime to exclusive supporters of the Conference lines, and this system had continued ever since, irrespective of whether they had been working with their competitors on the basis of agreed rates of freight or not. At first they only allowed half the prime on a number of articles, but at the request of shippers they arranged to allow the full prime on all. The system had worked most satisfactorily, and they had had no complaints, while he thought their shippers would regard as insulting the suggestion that they would be deterred by the loss of their rebates from ceasing to give the Conference their exclusive support if for any reason they deemed it desirable not to do so.

Colonel Smith Park said their experience in the Newfoundland trade had been very instructive. This trade was originally in a very special degree a seasonal one, served by small sailing ships, going out in the spring and fall. In 1872 they contracted with the Newfoundland government to run a mail service, despatching a steamer from Liverpool to St. John, Nfld., once a fortnight from the middle of April to the end of December, and a monthly service January to March via Halifax, in addition to which they despatched a special steamer from Glasgow in August. They found, however, that while importers were very glad to avail themselves of their steamers during the dull season, many could only be induced by very cut rates during the spring and fall, when large shipments were going forward and outside tonnage could be induced to go on the berth; this was, indeed, necessary to enable those who loyally supported them to

compete with the larger shippers who were able to charter special boats. In 1877 they gave special allowances in the way of return primages, etc., to those who supported them exclusively, and in 1882 they issued a circular in the following terms to shippers and importers:

"The purpose of the owners under this agreement is to grant a uniform freight rate all the year round, whether by the direct boats from Liverpool and Glasgow or the indirect route over Halifax. The advantage of this to the trade will be that they will secure a moderate rate of freight, and a rate that will not vary, so that shippers need not consider the question of freight in deciding the special period of shipment, and they will, so far as freight is concerned, have no occasion to crowd all their goods into special vessels or confine their shipments to fixed months or periods. In ordering goods also they will know exactly the freight to be charged. To the owners of the steamers it will tend to spread the goods over more vessels, give them in the aggregate larger quantities to carry, and so enable them to charge, as they purpose doing, somewhat less rates than they could otherwise afford to do."

This had a very good effect, and many contracted with them, and shipments began to be spread more regularly over the season. A fairly regular steamer opposition, however, sprang up, and they again had experience of cutting of rates which made the trade unsatisfactory to everyone. In 1898, in meeting this opposition, they commenced making contracts on the basis of those importers who gave them all their traffic, getting 20 per cent. return; those who gave 75 per cent., 15 per cent., and those who gave 50 per cent., getting 12 1-2 per cent. The opposition found that to retain support they had to make similar concessions, and as the cutting of rates had made the trade unprofitable to both, in 1900 they combined to offer a deferred rebate of 20 per cent. to those who arranged dates, etc., so as to not to conflict, and so gave a better service to the trade, and this latest arrangement had proved to be far the most satisfactory to the trade.

In the River Plate trade, witness continued, the deferred system of rebates was introduced and made applicable to the British lines in conference in January, 1895, and was extended in 1897 to embrace the principal continental lines to the River Plate, thereby securing uniformity in British and Continental rates of freight. In his experience, conference and systems of deferred rebates to exclusive supporters were not objected to by shippers save those who hoped that in the absence thereof they would be able to get better terms than their neighbors, and while, like all human institutions, they were open to abuse, after reading all the evidence given to this com-

mission that had been published, he considered no case has been made out to justify in any way an interference in the freedom of contract between shipowners and their clients any more than between land traders and their customers, some of such traders having far more stringent arrangements with their clients than that of any shipping company that he knew of. The conference system not only tended largely to the assimilation of British and Constitutional rates, but shippers generally were far more concerned to secure the equality and stability of rates than cheap freights. All conferences he had been connected with gave the most careful consideration to shippers' representations when competition pressed on them, it being obviously to the interest of shipowners to do all they reasonably could to encourage the largest possible amount of oversea traffic.

In answer to the chairman, who put a series of questions on the deferred rebate system, Colonel Smith Park said that if there was room for an opposition line of steamers in a trade where this system had been in operation and merchants were so dissatisfied that they would be prepared to give adequate support to a new line, there would be always found a shipowner to provide that line.

The Chairman—"You say if there is any general dissatisfaction there would, in your opinion, be no difficulty in procuring outside steamers to carry goods for dissatisfied merchants?"

Yes, if the merchants are prepared to support them. Merchants have a great weakness for supporting an opposition at first, but they are very speedy in falling off when it has been started.

Under this system of deferred rebates, if there is an opposition, and you have outside steamers offering to carry goods at lower rates of freight, what is the position of merchants who are bound by this system to deferred rates? Would you lower your freights?

It depends entirely on the circumstances. We do not profess, supposing a casual boat went alongside a berth and offered to take lower rates, that we would reduce our rates. The thing depends upon the nature and the extent of the opposition. If shippers supported such opposition they would forfeit the advantage of the special discount offered by the shipowner.

A system of rebates in your opinion makes freight more steady?

Yes. Of course the volume of traffic which steamers secure is important. In the mail service, they had been in the position that they had to send a steamer once a fortnight whether they had a full loading or whether the vessel went empty. Obviously, the amount of tonnage they had to send was constant. It was of the greatest importance that they

should get the largest volume of traffic to carry.

The Chairman—"Before raising your rates of freight do you consult the merchants?"

No. There was no meeting between the shipowners and the merchants at which rates of freight were considered and discussed.

The system of rebates gives you a certain hold over the merchants. I want to put this to you—the system of deferred rebates is intended to a certain extent to give you a monopoly of the trade?

I do not see where the monopoly comes in. Is not the very object of this system to induce the shippers not to ship goods by outside steamers?

I think so. I think you have used exactly the appropriate word, "induce." It is simply a special discount we give in exchange for value received. It is open to shippers to accept or reject it. We have had in our experience every form of making arrangements with shippers to try and attract exclusive support, which is so necessary to the conduct of a regular line, and one of the systems we used to have was that we made contracts for a year ahead at fixed rates. Many times merchants considered it a serious disadvantage that they had to commit themselves ahead, and when opposition came on they could not take advantage of it. This system of rebates meets them exactly. If when the time comes when opposition is put on they are exactly in the position that they may consider whether they take advantage of that opposition or not, subject simply to the loss of the rebate.

The merchants being tied to the system of rebates, do you think it is right you should be able to raise the rates of freight without consulting them?

Perfectly fair.

The Chairman—"You have made your position very clearly, and I have put those questions to you to elicit your opinions."

Lord Inverclyde—"Complaints are made by traders that your rates in certain instances are higher than the New York rates. Does the question of insurance specially affect your trade?"

Most seriously. Our insurance is not only very much higher than the New York, but there are other circumstances. The Montreal trade was a seasonal trade. The New York trade was a special trade in view of the enormous number of passengers carried. The tonnage in that trade was enormously in excess of what would be necessary for cargo purposes only.

How do you view the suggestion that in the event of the trader and shipowner not seeing eye to eye as to rates the matter should be settled by some form of arbitration?

The suggestion would be ludicrous. We could never agree to it for one moment. We are sellers of an article as well as anybody else.