

This is his strong characteristic, and it accounts in a large measure for his failure to follow a leader. He cannot subordinate his own opinions to those of another, and is restless in the ranks. As he has said on more occasions than one, he "could be no man's man," and even when assisting Sir John Macdonald to carry the N. P. at the time of the overthrow of the Mackenzie administration he invariably referred to himself as "an ally, not a follower." Time and again he has sacrificed his political opportunities at the shrine of his mental independence. His instincts and tendencies are Liberal, and once he maps out his course on a public question he allows no consideration of popularity or unpopularity to have the slightest effect on his advocacy of it. Although Mr. Macdougall has been a hard hitter in his time, one incident will illustrate his regard for the personal feelings of his opponents. When he returned from the North-West, after his ill-starred efforts to acquire possession of the country, and smarting under the injustice to which he had been subjected by the Government he was serving, it was expected on all hands that he would make a stinging attack on Howe, who had charge of the department under whose authority Mr. Macdougall was acting. Howe was in his place looking anxious, perturbed, and in poor health. Mr. Macdougall, seeing the weak condition of Mr. Howe, refrained from criticizing his action in leaving him to his fate, spoke of his failing health, referred to the great services he had rendered to the country, and said, "I forbear to subject him to criticism, and will leave to history my own justification." A few moments afterwards Mr. Macdougall was asked to go out into the corridor to meet Howe and shake hands with him. "I believe," said Mr. Howe, gratefully, "that we can write the best pamphlets, and make the best speeches of any two men in Parliament, why should we not be friends?" And friends they continued till death took Howe.

Mr. Macdougall's proper place is in the legislative halls of his country. Party lines are so strictly drawn that our public men have little chance to make headway unless they are willing to be branded with the trade-mark of one or other of the political parties. But as an exponent of independent views, as a representative of that large and growing class in the community which looks with favour on the untrammelled expression of opinion by keen thinkers and vigorous debaters, Mr. Macdougall would be of invaluable service to the country as a whole. His knowledge of constitutional law, his fine intellectual powers, his quick grasp of the salient points of a case, his marked ability both as a writer and a speaker, added to all of which is a striking presence, would ensure his taking a commanding position in any deliberative assembly in which constitutional government prevails. When the great majority of the present race of politicians were trundling their hoops and flying their kites Mr. Macdougall was making history.

ALEX. F. PIRIE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—In your issue of the 31st ult. there is an article by "Saville" entitled "Imperial Federation" which contains some assertions upon which I would ask you to allow me to make a few comments. There are several remarks contained in the article which I should like to dilate upon; but this would be encroaching too much on your space, hence I will confine myself to two assertions which "Saville" makes, and endeavour to show wherein he errs.

These are as follows: "No politician known to fame—great landholder, or Tory dyed-in-the-wool—would propose to levy preferential duties for the benefit of the Colonies. Yet such preference is universally alleged by its advocates to be a condition precedent to Imperial Federation!"

I will speak of the latter assertion first, and deny that "such preference is universally alleged by its advocates to be a condition precedent to Imperial Federation." The League has no trade policy whatsoever, and deems it inadvisable to lay one down. The advocates think that the ends they have in view can be accomplished without such a policy. What we aim at is an organized defence of our Empire, a united voice in foreign affairs, and that the great self-governing colonies should be elevated to their proper positions as integral parts of the Empire, and should thus attain their majority of perfect development. We say that these objects can and will be obtained without it being a condition precedent that England should levy preferential duties for our benefit. There are among our members men of all shades of belief—Free-Traders and Protectionists of all degrees—and there are also many firm believers in Imperial Reciprocity; but the League has not as yet seen fit to formulate a trade policy from any one of these.

In the assertion that "no politician known to fame—great landholder or Tory dyed-in-the-wool would propose to levy preferential duties in favour of the Colonies," "Saville" errs again. He under-estimates the strength of the movement now making itself felt in England, in favour of fiscal reform, and he is evidently ignorant of the fact that a Commercial Federation of the Empire is the policy of a large number of these fiscal reformers. The outcry against the one-sided Free Trade policy which now obtains in England daily increases in strength, and we find Associations and Leagues for the preservation of agriculture and other industries springing up in various parts of the country, and co-operating with such bodies as the National Fair-Trade League and the British Union of Manchester, in advocating the imposition of import duties upon foreign products. And when these matters are discussed the Colonies are not forgotten! The British Union of Manchester has for its mottoes "Colonial Federation" and "Re-adjustment of Taxation." Its President is the Duke of Manchester, whose wide knowledge of Colonial affairs is well known, and

among its most prominent officers are to be found such names as the Marquis of Exeter, Viscount Torrington, Lord Napier of Magdala, Lord Penzance and Lord Stanley of Alderley, and some thirty M.P.'s, embracing such names as Captain Colomb, Mr. Haveley Hill, Q.C., Mr. Howard Vincent, C.B., Colonel Hughes Hallett, and Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, besides such prominent Colonists as Sir Wm. FitzHerbert of New Zealand, the Hon. J. H. Hoffmeyer of Cape Colony, and Sir Leonard Tilley, Mr. G. R. R. Cockburn, M.P., Mr. Dalton McCarthy, M.P., and Mr. A. McNeill, M.P., of Canada. The object of this great Union is: "Such a Commercial Federation of the Mother Country with her Colonies and Dependencies, on the basis of preferential duties; as may secure the nearest approach to Free Trade within the Empire that may be found to be compatible with the exigencies of the respective independent Governments constituting the Federation."

This movement for a reversal of the present suicidal trade policy of England, misnamed Free Trade, is growing daily in strength; and I believe that the time is not far off when the Colonies will be admitted to the more intimate fiscal relations which should exist between them and the Mother Country. The logical consequence of the policy of 1846 has been, in the past, the neglect of England's then infant, but growing and robust Colonies. If during the last forty years she had extended to her Colonies the vast mass of her food custom, instead of frittering it away upon alien nationalities, who have refused and still refuse her the exchange trade, which was the only justification for a Free Import Policy, what man can estimate what the difference would have been to both the Colonies and the Mother Country?

I believe and hope that England will in time see her mistake and rectify it; but I do not look upon this as a necessary condition precedent to Imperial Federation. I am a humble member of the League, and also an Associate of the British Union, but I do not feel that the accomplishment of the objects of either one is an essential preliminary to the accomplishment of the objects of the other. That they would greatly assist one another none can deny.

Yours, etc.,

CUBO SED CURO.

Toronto, June 18, 1888.

THE ANCIENT MARINER.

IN a recent number of THE WEEK there was a paper by Louisa Murray on Coleridge, from which I quote the following passage:—"But incomparably Coleridge's greatest work is the *Ancient Mariner*. The simplicity of its ballad form and its weird supernaturalism hide its spiritual meaning from many who delightedly yield themselves to its witching spell, and think it the most wonderful fairy-tale that ever was written. To Coleridge it was something far more than a fairy-tale. . . . In the *Ancient Mariner* we have a symbol of man's soul, alienated from God, and leading a blind and selfish existence, destitute of sympathy and love." The idea embodied in this passage, that of an allegorical meaning, in the *Ancient Mariner*, I wish to combat.

Let us briefly review the causes that led to Coleridge's writing the *Ancient Mariner*. He and his friend, Wordsworth, had planned a series of Lyrical Ballads of two distinct types. One type was to deal with the commonplaces of life; the other was to have a supernatural element. The latter sort Coleridge was to write.

The *Ancient Mariner* was Coleridge's first attempt. He tells us that the plot was suggested by a friend's dream. We know, too, that Wordsworth wrote a few of the lines, and proposed the killing of the Albatross as the necessary crime, he having lately read about this bird in a book of travels. This much Coleridge owes to others; all else—the vivid word-pictures, the weird imaginings, the melody unsurpassed—are his, and his only. As Wordsworth says:—"Much the greatest part of the story was Mr. Coleridge's invention." Thus did the poem originate.

Now in all this what hint do we find of a hidden meaning? Of one thing we may be sure,—if Coleridge began the poem without intending to introduce a moral, he ended it in the same mind. His declared intention at starting was to write a poem containing a supernatural element, but with sufficient human interest to counterbalance, and throw a glamour of reality over that element. Now this "human interest" is the ground-work of all attempted allegories. Coleridge gives one explanation of it, the moralists another; which should one accept?

Again, the human interest was introduced "to procure poetic faith." Now in an allegory one is expected to not only disbelieve in the incidents related, but to view them as the shadow of reality behind; which veiled reality is the writer's thought. Naturally this thought would be sustained even at the expense of the shadow. In this connection let me quote Macaulay: "We do not believe that any man, whatever might be his genius, and whatever his good luck, could long continue a figurative history without falling into many inconsistencies." But in the *Ancient Mariner* is no inconsistency, only a sustained, fully-developed story. No unbroken undercurrent of thought can be found. Then may we not reasonably infer that there is no hidden thought?

One point more. Any story that deals, though ever so slightly, with our humanity may be used "to point a moral." But no one dreams that all such morals are intentional. When an author plainly states the end he wishes to attain, and the means he intends taking to secure that end, it is fair to conclude that he uses the means in the manner indicated, and in no other. And now let me conclude with the hope that some people will, in consequence of this paper, enjoy their jam without dread of its containing any powder; will read this "most wonderful fairy-tale," nor fear to find a moral at the end.

M. MIDDLETON.