

carefully as any 'Gentiles' or 'white people,' and some are in principle opposed to polygamy or at least would prefer to see it dropped from the tenets of the Mormon Church. . . . There are cases of a second woman living in a house beside the legal wife, but such a woman, even though treated as a wife, rarely, if ever, bears a child in Canada."

Other gentlemen who had made charges—Presbyterians, Methodists, and Anglicans—were corresponded with, but, when pinned down, each showed a discreet, not to say elegant, reticence, on matters Mormon. They had "little specific information"; they found it "hard to state facts exactly," or "Mormon tactics are difficult to understand." In a word, these gentlemen would rather be safe than—shall we say, accurate? To sum up the whole matter, not one man made good his insinuations or charges, so it would seem that polygamous practice in Alberta is only so much smug talk, the uneasy dream of a few would-be Bumbles.

I repeat again, that anyone is at liberty to call upon the police to investigate the case of a man with plural wives, and until this is done we should keep "tongues off."

There was, however, one point upon which my correspondents came out flat-footed. They said the Government should not allow the Mormons to preach their "pagan Christianity" in Canada, nor allow them to leave Canada and preach it in other lands.

This matter of the freedom of opinion, and freedom of expressing it (so long as such opinion be not blasphemous or traitorous), is one that goes very far back and beyond either the Presbyterian or Mormon tenets, and we are greatly mistaken if, at this stage of civilization, the authorities at either Ottawa or Edmonton will undertake to say to the Mormons, or to any other law-abiding body, "Thou shalt not."

It has been urged that the success of the Mormon settlement is largely based upon its power to attract to the community men who are only imperfectly monogamous. "How else," asks the critic, "does this organization hold together? Is there any special benefit in being a Mormon? How do you account for their marked prosperity?"

Even the most dispassionate critic cannot but be interested in these questions.

I hold no brief for Mormonism and have a pronounced antipathy to the doctrine of polygamy, which doctrine I believe the Mormons have largely outgrown, even as the Presbyterians outgrew the doctrine of infant damnation, but these questions as to their communal growth seemed to me inevitable. It was only when I came close and studied the conditions at first hand—and with as open a mind as I could manage—that the reason of their prosperity became manifest. The secret of their growth is not in the attraction of a mere sensualist (who would be of little, if any, benefit, to any community), but, on the contrary, lies in their system of self-denial with its rule of tithing, this, and their putting into actual practice the Christian doctrine of the brotherhood of man—with them, the Mormon brother, in particular. Once a man joins the community every "saint" lends him a hand whenever needed. Yes! two hands. No man is allowed to fail because of illness, lack of work, or any other misfortune. Back of him, there is the clever experienced management of the elders to supply the money which any particular saint may lack, so that the saint gets on in spite of himself. They have a fraternal system which cuts out the objectionable features of socialism, such as the equalizing of profits, the nationalization of the land, and an equal minimum wage. In a word, these Mormon folk are like the Hyperboreans—the people who lived at the back of the north wind, where everyone is warm, happy, and comfortable. It is a condition settlers are not able to duplicate in any other part of Canada, or in any part of the world, except in Utah, where the same fraternal conditions prevail. I have not any recent statistics by me, but I find in the year 1878, there was not a saloon, a brewery, a gambling-house, a brothel, or a beggar, and as a consequence, not a lawyer, in thirteen of their counties. That the Alberta Mormons are equally law-abiding is evidenced by the fact that although they have been here thirteen years, not one member of their large community has been confined in our Provincial Penitentiary—a statement that cannot be made of any other religious body. This being the case, it is the commonest kind of sense that we present to them the tolerant spirit and the kindly, courteous manner that befits us as Canadian citizens and gentlefolk.

pose: some maliciously inclined persons may indeed hint that there is a trifle too much repose connected with the English mind, sometimes; but we banish this as a base suspicion. The Englishman, in short, likes not the "falsehood of extremes."

And now we come to the "last word" on Cricket vs. Baseball. It is a mistake, as has been said, to compare the two games, and say that cricket is the better game, and therefore Canadians *must* play cricket; or, on the other hand, to say that baseball is the better game, and therefore let Canadians play baseball and do not bother them. Things are only good, bad or indifferent as circumstances make them so. Cricket will never become in Canada a national game, or even a popular game, for the simple reason that it does not and never will appeal to the ideals and type of mind of the Canadian. This is not saying anything ungracious about the Canadian—far from it; but I have never seen a Canadian *really* enjoy a game of cricket and never expect to. On the other hand, baseball will never "cut any figure" in England for similar reasons: it offends an Englishman's sense of the fitness of things and shocks him. In fine, cricket is a good game, and so also is baseball—which is the better I do not know, and would not say if I did know; but both are eminently local, and cricket requires an Englishman to play it properly, just as surely as baseball requires an American or Canadian.

## A Defence of Tennis

IN a recent issue of the CANADIAN COURIER, says "Amateur," in a letter to this paper, Mr. J. P. Fitzgerald makes a defense of professional baseball which may or may not appeal to the average citizen. As a reader of the COURIER and a supporter of all good, clean, wholesome sport, I cannot let some of Mr. Fitzgerald's statements pass without a protest.

In defending professional baseball Mr. Fitzgerald makes the statement that, "amateurs are bought and sold." Such a statement does not strengthen the defense of professionalism nor is it a fair thing to say about our amateur sports. They may not attain perfection in every case, but they aim high and take a most vital part in the education of our children.

Again, Mr. Fitzgerald makes the perfectly reasonable claim that clean, open professionalism is decent, but then asks his readers if as much can be said for a great part of the species of amateurism that stalks through the land. He goes on to say that, "You can't find a tennis meet at which stars are not imported to add interest. Are they real amateurs?"

Anyone who knows tennis and tennis players knows also that no player enters a tournament with any other reason than an ambition to reach the top, to improve his game by meeting strong players, or simply for his love of the sport. I have attended many such tournaments and never did I hear of the importation of a star. The open events are for all-comers, and a Montreal player may enter an event of this kind in a Toronto tournament if he thinks enough of the game to make the trip and pay all his own expenses.

In criticizing Mr. Ernest Paterson's views on baseball, Mr. Fitzgerald comes to the conclusion that Mr. Paterson can't be very well acquainted with baseball conditions, and then shows his own ignorance regarding amateur sports by making a statement about tennis so absolutely wide of the mark.

Well, every man to his own tastes. Mr. Fitzgerald's is professional baseball, and when his favourite sport is attacked he will put up a better defense if he will stick to baseball, which is evidently his forte.

## Canada's Superiority

CANADA recently received a great compliment from Governor Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey, prospective Democratic candidate for the presidency. He was speaking at Hackensack on the relation of legislation to business, and said:

"The present contrast between Canada and the United States is this, that in the United States business is feverish and fretful and distrusted; in Canada it is absolutely buoyant with confidence and with hope. Canada is just about a generation ahead of us in the regulation of corporate business, in her banking system and in her currency system. She has got through all the deep waters we are in now, or rather she was never in them; she never let herself get in them. While we have been going on helplessly from one financial crisis to another, Canada has not had any financial crisis. Canada, if we must admit the truth, feels her economic superiority to the United States because she did some time ago, as a matter of course, the things now called radical in the United States, and which are making business men uneasy."

# BASEBALL vs. CRICKET

## A College Student's Plea for Both

IN articles on baseball recently published in the CANADIAN COURIER comparisons were made between that game and cricket. Opinions differ concerning which one is better for Canada. The college student's views on the matter are well presented—in *St. Andrew's College Review*, Toronto, by George M. Vogt, a student at that college recently and now an under-graduate at Harvard.

Cricket vs. baseball is an exceedingly live question in Canada to-day, says Mr. Vogt, and its liveliness is increased when it is discussed in connection with such schools as St. Andrew's. For these schools labour under the disadvantage of desiring to be English, when, as a matter of fact, they are Canadian. They do not realize, in short, that "God fulfils himself in many ways, lest one good custom should corrupt the world." They have tried to solve the question by considering it from a purely aesthetic point of view—that is, which is the better game?—and not from the more practical point of view—that is, which game is the better adapted to the ideals and genius of the people?

The whole discussion, then, resolves itself into a question, not so much as to which is the better game, but which is better suited to the Canadian, that is, a modified American type of mind. It will not be necessary to define, in detail, the differences between the Canadian and the English type of mind; suffice it to say, that the Canadian is eminently democratic, whereas the Englishman is as eminently monarchical and tending to conservatism. With these two points established—if indeed they may be considered so—who cannot see them reflected in the two games? Cricket is a little monarchy in itself; the batter is king, and all the rest his faithful ministers and minions. It is a limited monarchy indeed, for the batter must have his wits about him; but it is nevertheless a monarchy. It is a personified history of England—if we may imagine such a thing: changes are brought about gradually in the true spirit of Tennyson; one is never, or very seldom, startled into a frenzy of excitement; one may go away to dinner and return to find the king still on his throne, discharging his royal duties with benignity and grace; everything is done with due ceremony, and nobody ever seems to forget himself so far as to evince any absorbing interest in the game. Such

is cricket; as English as Mr. Pickwick or Trafalgar Square.

It may be said that cricket is unsurpassed from an esthetical point of view: nothing, surely, can be more pleasing to the senses than the white ducks set off by the background of green grass; the orderly way in which everything is done; the graceful actions of the bowler and the still more graceful bearing of the batter; the arrangement of the different players—how their positions seem to dove-tail into one another. In short, the general aspect of the game, when viewed from a distance, is indeed a work of art; but, alas, for this very reason, perhaps, and for others, it does not appeal to the Canadian youth.

Looking at baseball in the same impartial (?) light, we observe a little republic; everybody is in action at least. Everyone has, in due order, a regularly recurring chance to whack the ball; for no matter how skilled the batter may be he cannot remain "in" forever. The batter is, for the time being, president indeed, but there is no man on the diamond who is not of the most vital importance; everything is on edge; the spectators are breathless; the players are strung to the highest tension; the ball travels with lightning speed, and the player doesn't often reach "home." In short, baseball is liberal and democratic: everyone is given a fair chance to show exactly what he is capable of.

The one thing, among others, that may be urged against baseball is its weakness from the esthetical point of view; the burning sand of the diamond; the pop-corn and peanut atmosphere; the grey or yellow or Lord knows what colour of the suits of the players; the unsightly caps; the truly man-eating aspect of the catcher, and the fierce antics of the pitcher; the very fact, in short, that the game is always in motion makes it impossible to secure that delightful scene picture which is so satisfying in a game of cricket. But this aspect of cricket, which so endears it, and rightly, to the Englishman's heart, is wholly lost on that excellent animal, the Canadian youth.

And so, we come back to the beginning—what is the Canadian type of mind as compared with the English? The Canadian mind inclines to action, while the English inclines to action balanced by re-