

ly Hanoverian
" and Walpole.
e "professional
itics for what
even then char-
the days of the
rrible cornet of
said that the
have been guid-
l character, by
by that noblest
get him) the
of men, whom
iar glory of the
Duke of Devon-
eans a solitary,
rred to as clos-
Nothing of the
e feel assured,
s class, of men
lence: resolutely
nent to a sense
of their coun-
devoid of per-
f human action
English Parlia-
ost of them, it
ectly connected
has poured the
on the average
but isn't there
nowledged it may
after all have
en as the Eng-
Devonshire has
y, Palmerston,
thers whom we
splendid legacy
But there are
e, and so long
we have such
Curzon, Milner,
Grey, Messrs.
etc., etc., there
optimistic about

CANADA.

English immi-
en found guilty
Chief Justice of
the astounding
gh medical ex-
the immigrants
nerates." And
and deservedly
at is now being
vour of restrict-
igration. Why
nt of English
pe, the fact is
nced upon, and
the continent.
nationalities are
r Irish or Scot-
ned, but that is
hmen are made
he resources of
s this? Is there
his fair Canada
expression. It
s. But beyond
ewhat overbear-
of Englishmen,
n class, is there
and loudly ex-
s its climax in
ef Justice. Are
ng the past five
y the hundreds
ental and phy-
among us is a
eral well-being

of the community? Are sixty out of a hundred of these newcomers unfitted by their criminal propensities, their lack of physical stamina, and their defective mentality for Canadian citizenship? To us, whose experience of the country extends over considerably more than a quarter of a century, such a statement is a monstrous and outrageous libel upon a race, who while making due allowance for the work of other nationalities, has according to unimpeachable statistics, taken the leading part in the conquest of this great continent. Last year a number of very interesting articles appeared in Munsey's Magazine on the various nationalities in America, the Irish, the Scotch, the German, etc. In that devoted to the English in America the statement was made, that a careful analysis of the distinguished "foreigners" resident to-day in the United States establishes the fact that the largest percentage of any single nationality is composed of persons of English birth. Among the vast number of Englishmen, who during the past few years have taken up their residence in Canada, it cannot but happen that a certain percentage of them are what may be fairly called "degenerates or undesirables." How could it be otherwise, especially when one considers the fact that probably the majority of these immigrants were residents of large congested towns? But to us the wonder and marvel is that the number of such undesirables is so small. As diligent students of the daily press we cannot recall more than at most a dozen or fifteen cases of crime among English immigrants during the past five years. Call it twenty, and you have an average during this period of four per annum out of, say, 250,000 people, surely a marvellously low percentage. But these isolated cases have been trumpeted throughout the length and breadth of the land, and magnified (unconsciously) in the minds of the general public by continual reproduction, the misdeeds of Englishmen being apparently universally acceptable "copy" to the average Canadian journalist. If these statistics are questioned by our readers, let careful research be made in our criminal records for this period. We await the results of such an investigation with perfect composure. Regarding one particular class of Englishmen upon whose heads unbounded contempt has been poured, viz., the "gentleman's son," whose futile attempts at farming have almost become proverbial, there is this in common justice to be said. These young fellows, who come out here, generally with a few thousands of dollars in their pockets, and strongly imbued with the desire for an open air life have received a training which renders them especially "soft subjects" for the unscrupulous. They have been brought up in an atmosphere of truthfulness and honourable dealing, and among people whose word is as good as their bond. Naturally, therefore, the least suspicious of mortals, and regarding everyone else as honest and as truthful as themselves, they are easily taken in. Belonging to a class, who on principle seldom or ever bargain among themselves, they accept every man's word as a matter of course, and pay the price they are asked. Such young men consequently are "fair game" for a certain class of people, and are, no doubt, most unmercifully fooled and imposed upon in business transactions, owing to their guileless honesty. And then "adding insult to injury" the same individuals turn round and denounce their victims as "worthless and useless," and hold them up to contempt as "remittance men," etc., and so prejudice the whole community against a class of young men, who in other parts of the Empire have done, and are doing, magnificent work as officers in the Army and Navy, civil servants in India, administrators in Egypt, pioneers in South Africa, planters in the East and West Indies, and sheep farmers in our Australasian possessions. Where and what would the Empire to-day have been had it not been for the "younger son," for Clive, Hastings, Rhodes, Rajah Brooke, all Englishmen and members of this (in Canada) despised class of gentlemen's

CANADIAN CHURCHMAN.

sons. Why is it that this class, so brilliantly successful everywhere else, is unsuccessful in Canada? Is the fact, if it is a fact, more discreditable to themselves or to Canada? It is high time that this silly popular delusion, or obsession, regarding Englishmen received its quietus.

THE FALL OF MAN.

Being the second lecture of a three months' course teaching the Book of Genesis, in St. George's Parish Church, Montreal, by the Rev. Dr. Paterson Smyth.

Genesis III.

Last Sunday we learned the Creation Story as the old child-races of the world received it thousands of years ago. We saw what reason there was to believe that there was what in some rough-sense might be called a "Bible before the Bible,"—that the stories of the Creation, the Fall, the Flood, were great inspired legends of the child-races of the world ages before the present Book of Genesis, in which they stand. You remember the two chief lessons of the Creation Story for the old-world races.

(1) That it was GOD Who created the heavens and the earth—GOD, not some great crocodile or white bull which the Egyptians worshipped, or some crowd of warring lustful deities as the old Greeks and Chaldeans thought, but one God holy and righteous who created the heavens and the earth.

(2) That Man was the crown and blossom of this creation, greater than the mighty mammoth or the huge mountain, or even the glorious sun in the heavens, because of all creation He alone was akin to God, able to feel with God, able to be in sympathy with God about right and wrong. Man was akin to God, with God's nature in him. He thus stands apart from all the rest of creation, "God breathed into his nostrils, . . . living soul."

I.

We have a difficult subject before us to-day which needs careful handling. We are studying the infancy of humanity these earliest members of our race as they came fresh from the hand of God. Never mind the question of evolution just now. Keep the problem as simple as possible.

First comes an important question concerning the Fall. What was the condition of these first members of our race? It seems to have been one of perfect innocence, the innocence of infancy—good dispositions, good desires, no knowledge of evil, no temptation to it. It was a sweet, peaceful, happy state, the state of a child who has never heard of wrong.

But we must not exaggerate the value of this. We should be much mistaken if we thought that primeval man was a God-like being because he was made in "God's image after His likeness." If he were he could not have fallen. The meaning is plain enough. God had just made the brute creatures who were not "in His image." Now comes a great step upward, a being with personality, consciousness, freedom of will, conscience, moral responsibility, a being also of purity and innocence, a being unto whom, whatever it may mean, "God breathed the breath of life and man became a living soul." And thus man was like his Maker, in His image, after His likeness.

I think that is all that the Bible means. You will make the story of the Fall much harder to understand if you exaggerate the condition of primeval man. For there is a common notion that the first of our race were a sort of lofty, divine, celestial, glorified beings, somewhat like angels from which lofty state it is thought man fell. Keep strictly to the Bible and you will perhaps be surprised to learn that it says nothing of the kind. Primeval man is described in Scripture much in the same way as science describes him as a helpless, naked, undeveloped being, living on the fruits of the earth—with no clothes and no shelter, and so little God-like that he collapses at the first temptation of the devil.

His greatness lay in the glorious destiny that God had set before him. Imperfect as he was, he was the climax of God's creation, the lord of God's world, differing from all the rest of the creatures in his spiritual kinship with God.

His condition then I repeat was one of innocence, the innocence of infancy. Good dispositions, good desires, no knowledge of evil, no temptation to it. It was a sweet peaceful innocent state, the state of a child who has never heard of wrong.

II.

That is the first stage in the life of humanity. Now what is the next stage?

Is not innocence and freedom from sin enough? What more could God want in His creature?

What more could God want, do you ask! What more than a baby soul! No character in it! Should you be content with that stage of spiritual growth for your child? That he should remain in his present stage of baby innocence with no character really formed in him? If so you must have a very poor ambition for your child.

Now give the closest attention to what I am about to say. "Innocence is not by any means the highest stage of goodness. Innocence is only a baby stage. Righteousness is the higher stage. And God will not be content without Righteousness, which means innocence maintained in the face of temptation. **Innocence is not Righteousness.** Innocence belongs to the untutored child who has never known evil. Righteousness belongs to the developed saint who knows evil and has been tempted by evil, but by the grace of God has conquered at the last."

God desired righteousness for His creatures. God desired character just as you do for your innocent undeveloped baby. But for this there must first come to them the "knowledge of good and evil,"—the knowledge of it even as God knows it. For God surely knows evil; as a something hateful and revolting; as a thing outside of Him altogether. And man must also know it thus, else he can never make a deliberate choice of good; never rise into the glory of moral manhood. Unless one knows both good and evil, and deliberately chooses the good, it is clear that there can be no real character.

Make no mistake here. Men sometimes say, "a man must know life," "must sow his wild oats," etc., which means that he must know evil by partaking of it. God forbid! "Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." For all growth of character it is necessary to have to keep choosing between good and evil, and, therefore, to know evil; but the evil must be known as God knows it—as a thing external and to be detested.

It is most important to keep in mind this distinction between Innocence and Righteousness. Earnest, godly people often talk sentimentally about the innocence of childhood; of their regret for it, as compared with their present state of temptation and struggle. We find the sentiment frequent in poetry. You remember Hood:—

"I remember, I remember
The fir-trees dark and high,
I used to think their slender tops
Were close against the sky.
It was a childish ignorance,
But now 'tis little joy
To know I'm farther off from heaven
Than when I was a boy."

Perhaps he was, but perhaps he was not. At any rate, character can only be formed by means of temptation. That is God's will for man, and there is no use in trying to avoid it. You know how a mother would like to keep her boy always in her sight, that no evil should ever be seen or heard by him. She is afraid of school life; afraid of business life. She wants to keep her darling in the innocent stage always. It is very pathetic; but she must learn that her child, too, must come to the knowledge of good and evil, though she will pray that he may come to it by conquering the wrong. He must know good and evil. He must choose. This is God's will. All she can do is to spend her soul in prayer and effort that her boy may be nobly trained against the days of temptation.

III.

Now come to our story. Adam and Eve are before us in the lovely world that God has made for them. They have got a fair and beautiful start in life, more so than any of us who are already tainted. They have good dispositions, good desires, no knowledge of evil, or temptation to it. They are like happy children in the presence of the great Father. But their testing-time must come. God is too desirous of good for them to spare them that. And so immediately following the story of their creation come the story of their testing, and, alas! their fall. Look at the picture in the old child-story, Adam and Eve are in a beautiful garden. In the midst of it is a tree with a mystical name—the Tree of Life, and, more prominent still, for the purpose of the story, another mystical tree—the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, (very curious names if real literal trees were meant); and lurking near this tree a serpent which speaks to them words of temptation to sin and doubt about God. Nobody can read that story without feeling that there is something meant more than the mere literal story. The talking serpent and the trees with their mystical names suggest at once that, though it is a narration of facts of vital importance to each of us, yet that these facts are presented to us under an