

adverb. We should therefore expect by analogy that a *prepositional phrase* performs the function of a preposition and apply the name to such phrases as *instead of*, *with regard to*, *with respect to*, *in the capacity of*, etc. But when we are told on page 177 that "the preposition and the word which it governs form together what is called a prepositional phrase," we feel the ground slipping from under our feet, for many adjectival and adverbial phrases are exactly of this form. Take for example the sentence, "He remained at his own house," what, we might ask, are we to call the phrase, "at his own house?" Is it a prepositional or an adverbial phrase; or shall we talk of adverbial-prepositional and adjectival-prepositional phrases? On page 178 the author himself speaks of a "prepositional adverb-phrase," where he means a preposition and its regimen used with the force and value of an adverb. What would Professor Whitney think of a geographer who should talk about a peninsular island, or of a geometer who should gravely discuss the properties of a circular parallelogram? If the nomenclature of mineralogy, or chemistry, or botany, were used in this loose way, what would become of these sciences? It cannot be doubted that the science of grammar has been retarded by the use of a shifting and inconsistent system of nomenclature; and it must be a matter of regret that such an able, clear, and precise writer, as Professor Whitney generally is, should have lent his high authority to a vicious use of technical terms, even in a single instance. This is, however, of minor consequence compared with a radical error in the method of development.

The chapter on *clauses* is well written, but it is sadly displaced from its logical position in a first book of English Grammar, for it is postponed to page 188, and appears as chapter xiv. It is, like every part of the book, admirably clear and concise. There is one statement, however, on page 199, that must prove rather confusing to a young student. He has read on page 195 the definition, "An adverb-phrase is one that performs the office of an adverb." This is brief, accurate, and clear-cut. But now he meets an account of "a substantive clause used adverbially with a preposition." This expression must surely be used in some "Pickwickian sense," if the previous definition is to be of any avail. It must strike the learner much the same as though he should find it reiterated in his chemistry that the atomic weight of oxygen is 16 under all known circumstances, and then shortly after read of an oxygen compound in which the atomic value of oxygen is the same as that of carbon, so that it is oxygen used carbonically.

There are spots on the sun; and apparent contradictions may easily be worked up from any book by violently tearing isolated statements from the context. The purpose here is quite different. Grammar has made only slow progress compared with other sciences much younger, and the lack of precision in the use of its technical terms has been one great hindrance. To exhibit the imperfections of the best book produced is one step towards the production of a still more perfect treatise, for free discussion and fearless criticism are the only reliable means of sifting out the truth in such cases. In the present instance there is the additional practical consideration that this work has been made the basis of our authorized textbooks for Public and High Schools, and therefore its method and procedure are all the more important to us personally.

C. C.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE GROWTH OF CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES
CONTRASTED.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—In your issue of the tenth of this month you do me the honour of referring to my letter, which appeared in your issue of the third, upon the comparative growth in population of the United States and of Canada. In defence of my position, namely, that Canada has grown more rapidly than have the United States, will you kindly allow me the privilege of a reply?

The following figures will, I think, be found to be correct: From 1776 to 1880 the United States increased in population 20 fold; Canada, 45 fold. From 1810 to 1880 the United States, 7 fold; Canada, 18 fold. From 1841 (the date of the union of the provinces) to 1880, the United States, 3 fold; Canada, 5 fold. From 1861 the United States 60 per cent.; Canada, 72 per cent.

It may be contended, of course, that this is not a fair method of comparison. But I contend that it is; and that "the percentage fallacy," as it has been termed, is the ordinary and the only true method of comparison. How, for example, is the growth of Toronto compared with that of American cities—cities many times as large—except upon the percentage principle? There are, undoubtedly, cases where the difference in conditions renders such a comparison impossible. For instance, a comparison could scarcely be made between the growth of London and that of a country hamlet, the former having a population 5,000 times as large as that of the latter. The difference in population between the United States and Canada is, to my mind, not so great as to render a comparison upon the basis of percentages unfair. If it be considered unfair, however, many other comparisons may be instituted. For example: a comparison between the New England States as a whole and the Maritime Provinces as a whole; between the Maritime Provinces individually and the adjoining States individually; between Quebec and the adjoining States; between Ontario and New York; between Ontario

and Ohio; between the United States as a whole during the time when their population was about the same as that of Canada at present, and Canada during the last few years; between the Canadian North-West and the American North-West.

To illustrate my meaning. From 1795 (the earliest available date) to 1880 (the date of the last American census) Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and, New Brunswick increased in combined population about 18 fold; the New England States about 4 fold. From 1820 the former 5, the latter 2½ fold. From 1840 the former about 103 per cent.; the latter 79 per cent. From 1860 the former 31 per cent.; the latter 27 per cent. From 1870 the respective growths were about the same, with possibly a fraction in favour of the Maritime Provinces. From 1880 to the present the difference is, I believe, largely in favour of Canada.

Again, to make a really fair comparison, that is, between the Maritime Provinces individually and the adjoining States individually, and to go back no further than 1840. From 1840 to 1860 New Brunswick increased 58 per cent., Maine, 25 per cent.; from 1860 to 1870, New Brunswick increased 14 per cent., Maine decreased; from 1870 to 1880 New Brunswick increased 12 per cent., Maine 3 per cent. From 1871 to 1881 Prince Edward Island increased almost 16 per cent., and Nova Scotia 13 per cent.; while from 1870 to 1880 Maine increased 3 per cent., New Hampshire 4 per cent., and Vermont ½ of 1 per cent.

Again, the increase in the Province of Quebec during the last fifty years has been 2.65 fold, and of New York, 2.65 fold; of Quebec from 1871 to 1881, 14 per cent., and of New York from 1870 to 1880, 15 per cent. So that even with New York, Quebec makes a very good showing. It is needless to say she far outstrips the adjoining New England States. From 1841 to 1861 Quebec increased 73 per cent., and from 1871 to 1884 14 per cent.; while, as before stated, from 1840 to 1860, Maine increased 25 per cent.; and from 1870 to 1880 Maine increased 3 per cent., New Hampshire 4 per cent., and Vermont ½ of 2 per cent.

Again, during the 50 years from 1831 to 1881 Ontario increased 9.14 fold; New York from 1830 to 1880, 2.65 fold. From 1861 to 1871, Ontario increased 16 per cent.; New York, from 1860 to 1870, 12 per cent. From 1871 to 1881, Ontario, 19 per cent.; New York, from 1870 to 1880, 16 per cent.

Again, during the 50 years from 1831 to 1881 Ontario increased 9.14 fold; Ohio, from 1830 to 1880, 3.40 fold. From 1862 to 1871, Ontario increased 16 per cent.; from 1860 to 1870, Ohio, 14 per cent. From 1870 to 1880, Ohio increased 19 per cent.; Ontario, from 1871 to 1881, 18 per cent. Since 1881 Ontario has without doubt outstripped Ohio in the rate of growth.

Again, from 1871 to 1881 Manitoba increased 247 per cent.; from 1870 to 1880, Minnesota 78 per cent. If the whole Canadian North-West be compared with the whole American North-west, a similar result will, I feel confident, be shown.

Again, from 1780 to 1800 the United States as a whole increased 72 per cent. From 1861 to 1881, Canada, with a population about the same as that of the United States in the period just mentioned, increased by the same percentage 72. Since 1881 Canada's growth has been more rapid.

"But," you say, "the United States, which had in 1860 a population, all told, of about 35,000,000, has now a population of from 55,000,000 to 60,000,000, an increase of at least 20,000,000 in 30 years. Canada, which has now a total population of less than 5,000,000, has probably added a little more than a million to its population within the same period."

As a matter of fact, Canada has added to its population during this time, not 1,000,000, but 2,500,000. But apart from this, is there anything remarkable in the fact that the 35,000,000 should, in 30 years, have grown by 20,000,000? Not at all, as far as I can see: the natural increase alone would almost have accomplished this result. Of course there has been a vast immigration into the United States, and there has been undoubtedly an emigration—or as it has been called—an exodus from Canada.

Upon this question of emigration from Canada, and of immigration to Canada and the States, I would, however, say:—

(1) Canada gets her proportion of European emigration, that is, she gets at least one-tenth of the number of emigrants who go to the United States, and until the free-grant lands of the States are all taken up we can hardly expect more. For the great force which draws emigrants towards any particular country, other things being equal, is the presence in that country of relatives and friends. Why do so many Germans go to the United States? Chiefly, in fact, almost solely, because there are already in the States 6,000,000 Germans.

(2) It is only within the last seven years that Canada has had good prairie land to offer to immigrants. Before that time no one ever thought of going to the North-West. It is only within the last two years that we have heard of the Mackenzie Basin as a valuable heritage. It is only within the last year that we, in Ontario, have discovered that the "desolate wastes," these "geographical barriers" whereof we have heard so much, which form the northern parts of our Province, possess, in soil and climate, everything requisite for the support of a large population. When you say, then, that our climate and resources are not inferior to those of the States—the correctness of which statement I by no means acknowledge, for I do not believe that Canada can ever support a population at all as large

as that capable of being supported by the United States—you should, I think, add, "as has been discovered within very recent years."

(3) "The climate of Canada, however beautiful, will always act as a deterrent to immigration. Colonists from Europe, especially from the southern parts, will always prefer, other things being equal, to make their home in a country where the thermometer does not fall to 30 or 40 degrees below zero."

(4) I believe the "exodus" from Canada to the States has been greatly exaggerated. By American statistics there were, in 1880, living in the States, 710,575 Canadians. We sometimes see the statement that there are one million French-Canadians alone in the Republic.

(5) Populous countries and wealthy cities always have a strong, attractive force. Why do so many persons go to Toronto and Montreal? What attracts Scotchmen to England, and the Swiss to France?

(6) The great reason why so many young men, not of the former class, have left Canada for the States is found in this fact, a fact which is very often ignored, namely, the training here is, in general, far better than it is there. Does the doctor or lawyer who has just finished his Canadian course go to the States because he will there have less competition? Not at all; he will have more. He goes because he thinks that, by reason of his better training and the reputation which Canadians have in the States for steadiness and honesty, he will be preferred to Americans. Why does the young man who is about to enter upon a profession take his course in the States and not in Canada? Because he knows that he can "get through" there far more easily than here. The same thing holds true with many other classes, mechanics among the number. I have not heard, however, that the suggestion has ever been made to lower our standard in order to stop this exodus.

(7) Canada, unfortunately, has always suffered from the presence of men who have persistently attacked and decried her. Some of these persons have been native Canadians; others, discontented critics from the Old country. These gentlemen have told us that no railway could ever be built across the Dominion; that, if built, parts of it would never be used, and that the cultivation of an oriental trade *via* Canada was an absurdity; that summer frosts would kill the crops in the North-West; that Canada is nothing more than a collection of rods joined together at the ends; and that her ultimate destiny is absorption into the American Republic. Language of this kind would never be allowed in the States; and these gentlemen are "wise in their generation" in choosing for their home a land where they can indulge their cynicism without personal inconvenience.

Is it a marvel, I would ask in conclusion, that with all these adverse circumstances, Canada has not gained on the United States more rapidly than she has?

Peterborough, May 20th, 1889.

J. H. LONG.

MRS. CURZON'S "LAURA SECORD."

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—I quite regretted in reading the friendly phrases on Mrs. Curzon's volume, "Laura Secord and Other Poems," last week, that there should seem any reason to consider that book differently than as a literary work on its simple merits as such. May I not wedge in a word of appreciation of a sound and true book when the public seem to bite so readily at ones whose chief merit is the enterprise connected with their advertising and sale? I will do no more than call attention to a few passages, on this principle, that the proper way with almost any book is to let it speak for itself:

ON QUEENSTON HEIGHTS.

I stood on Queenston Heights;
And as I gazed from tomb to cenotaph,
From cenotaph to tomb, adown and up,
My heart grew full, much moved with many thoughts.
At length I cried:
"O robed with honour and with glory crowned,
Tell me again the story of yon pile."
And straight the ancient shuddering cedars wept,
The solemn junipers inhaled their pale,
The moaning wind crept through the trembling oaks,
And, shrieking, fled. Strange clamour filled the air;
The steepy hill shook with the rush of arms;
Around me rolled the tide of sudden war.

This is the beginning of a fine poem on one of our greatest national glories—the battle where Brock fell victorious. I do not see why such poetry cannot stand upon its own merits. Mrs. Curzon is the Loyalist Poetess. The whole book is full of lofty Loyalist sentiment, and its notes are both very interesting and valuable. Some weak poems there are towards the end, but how does this—which again is on the Loyalists—go?

O ye who with your blood and sweat
Watered the furrows of this land,
See where upon a nation's brow
In honour's front, ye proudly stand!
Who for her pride abased your own,
And gladly on her altar laid
All bounty of the older world,
All memories that your glory made.
And to her service bowed your strength,
Took labour for your shield and crest;
See where upon a nation's brow
Her diadem, ye proudly rest!

In the drama of "Laura Secord" too, the passage:

"Already hath this war
Shown many a young and delicate woman
A very hero for her hero's sake;
Nay, more, for others. She, our neighbour there,