



# THE UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED: FEBRUARY, APRIL, OCTOBER, DECEMBER

APRIL 1913

	Page
Militarism and Anti-Militarism—Maurice Hutton	179
The Referendum—O. D. Skelton	197
The Game of Politics—C. D. Allin	215
The Farm Labour Problem—Walter James Brown	232
A Breviary of the Fields—Maud Going	246
The Civil Service—C. A. Magrath	247
Desiderio Modus—Lionel Smith-Gordon	256
Feminism and Education—Ethel Colquhoun	258
Marriage Law in Canada—F. P. Walton	271
The Wing-Footed or Shining One—W. H. Blake	288
In an Old Vineyard—Robert Stanley Weir	299
The Intelligentsia and Revolution—James Mavor	300
In Memoriam—Blanche E. Holt Murison	313
The Settlement Spirit—Anne Higginson & Spicer	314
William Caxton, Simple Person—E. K. Broadus	320
Watts-Dunton—Robert Roberts	329
Meredith's Letters—J. S. McLennan	341
The Night Cometh—John McCrae	347
Unto the Church—Andrew Macphail	348

---

MORANG & CO. LIMITED  
TORONTO

THE UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE is issued in February, April, October, and December, by a committee for McGill University; University of Toronto; and Dalhousie College.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:—W. PETERSON, M.A., C.M.G., LL.D., Principal; F. P. WALTON, LL.D., Dean, Faculty of Law, McGill University; W. J. ALEXANDER, Ph.D., Professor of English; PELHAM EDGAR, Ph.D., Professor of English; J. MAVOR, Ph.D., Professor of Political Economy, University of Toronto; ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN, Ph.D., Professor of English, Dalhousie College, Halifax.

Editor: ANDREW MACPHAIL, 216 Peel Street, Montreal.

The purpose of the University Magazine is to express an educated opinion upon questions immediately concerning Canada; and to treat freely in a literary way all matters which have to do with politics, industry, philosophy, science, and art.

The Editorial management is gratuitous, and the proceeds of the publication are applied to the payment of contributors.

The subscription price is two dollars a year for four numbers, containing about 700 pages. Copies are on sale at book stores for fifty cents each. Subscriptions, advertisements, and enquiries of a business nature should be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. Morang and Company, Limited, Toronto.

## MILITARISM AND ANTI-MILITARISM

“WHAT has a teacher of Greek to do with National Defence, the Strathcona Trust, and universal military training, and what will this dreamer say?” That is the unspoken comment I catch with my mind’s ear, which is not so deaf as my ear physical. Well, but that is exactly why I am interested in this question, because I am a teacher of Greek.

We have all been surprised, I have been surprised, at the recent success of the Greek army. We can all remember the last war of the Greeks and Turks, and the ignominious collapse of the Greeks. It is also my business to remember historically the wars of the ancient Greeks no less, and with them, in spite of Marathon and Salamis, Thermopylæ and Plataea, a great deal of ignominious collapse; first before Macedon, which was scarcely Greek, and then before Rome which was wholly unlike Greece.

Two thousand years and more have passed since a state not unlike in many ways the Great Britain of to-day, full of commerce, science, and literature, of art, logic, and poetry, of theatres and even of athletes, went down in final and fatal ruin before an army of rude and simple soldiers, soldiers who were their inferiors in everything except in self-control, self-denial, and self-reliance, and in the knowledge of the use of arms. Athens fell before the common soldiers of Philip of Macedon, the Bismarck of ancient Greece; before the wood-rangers, lumbermen, and charcoal burners of Macedonia. Athens perished because she would not leave her theatres and her parliament; her statues and her statutes; her paintings and her plebiscites; her poets and her philosophers, to face the drudgery of military service. She would not fight her own battles. Thessalians and Arcadians, the adventurers of the plains and the adventurers of the mountains,

might do the fighting for her: she would have none of it. So, or somewhat so, have we seen battles won for Great Britain by the peasants of Ireland and highlanders from Scotland, though they at least, unlike Athens' mercenaries, belong to the same mother country with Englishmen. But is it fair to cast the brunt of the fighting for the Empire on their devoted heads? Are Irish peasants and Scotch highlanders to be the only men left in the Empire? The only citizens who retain the initial and elementary basis of all citizenship, the power and spirit of self-defence? Athens perished because she had forgotten what the old historian told her with covert archness and ironical reproach, that the first essentials of political education are to ride straight, to shoot straight, and to speak the truth. And these things seemed tedious to the brilliant Athenians. Better to run fast than to shoot straight, it is more spectacular; better to talk fast than to ride straight, it is more entertaining; better oratory, poetry, philosophy, and politics than speaking the truth. They are vastly more intellectual. Any fool can speak the truth but it takes a clever man to lie well.

Let us rid our minds of cant, and interrogate some dispassionate critic about this thing called militarism. Nay, if we can find no one more dispassionate let us even be guilty of the portentous pedantry of invoking the witness of Plato and Aristotle. They were never victims of the craze of jingoism and "mafficking"; just a little were they victims of the opposite craze of peace at any price. They pointed out the inevitable downfall of merely military Sparta, but they attended no "peace conferences" in unmilitary Athens. They agreed, though one was a "Little Athens" man, and the other a member of no imperial city, to endorse within limits the soldier's training, as containing "many of the factors of virtue," especially those factors lacking in a commercial democracy; and they agreed that if they could found, or find, each of them a State after his own heart, it would neither be a camp like Sparta, nor a mob of talkers,

scribblers, poets, painters, and money-makers, like Athens. It would have the reserve, the brevity, the obedience, and the physique of Sparta, with a large measure of the intelligence, the science, and civilization of Athens. Yes, but they were only theorists. Then let us turn instead to the practical statesman; to the lost voice of free Athens, Demosthenes. Demosthenes cried himself hoarse over this question of military training and military service, and strove for twenty years in vain to arouse the people out of their amusements and their theatres, their athletics and their literature, to action; just hard, plain, common, military service, without which all the glory and the genius which was Athens, would pass away as a golden cloud at sunset and be no more seen. And even so it passed. It may seem a far cry from Demosthenes to Roosevelt, but their instinct is the same. "All the peace conferences among us" said the ex-President once, "will not prevent this country from fighting in certain contingencies, but they may prevent her winning." The peace-conference orators at Athens prevented Athens from winning.

The propositions which a Defence League puts before Canada amount to the following:

1. That historically in the past the nations which have despised and rejected military training, as tiresome and tedious for intellectual men, or unworthy of righteous and religious men, ancient Athens, modern China before the Japanese war, modern France before the Franco-German war, have suffered either fearfully or irremediably, irredeemably, from their lofty intellectualism or moral idealism; have lost their independence, or have lost enough to make them repent in sackcloth and ashes.

2. That as in the historic past, so to-day also the time is not ripe, human nature is not ripe, for rejecting military service and military training, for beating our swords into steel pens and our lances into railway-ties.

3. That such training, quite apart from its necessity in order to avert that which has happened in the past to

the nations rejecting it, is beneficial physically and morally, to the physique, and the health, and the morale of a people, especially of its boys and young men.

Now with regard to these three propositions, I have said enough of ancient Athens, more than enough. Modern democracies are suspicious of mouldy antiquity and musty classics. "Why, you manage a colliery accident, gentlemen, in these days," said an eminent classical scholar who was compelled to appeal from his classics to a great Lancashire democracy, "you manage a colliery accident nowadays, gentlemen, so as to cause more loss of life than at that old battle of Marathon."

1. But turn instead to modern France before 1870. The Liberal party then in France resisted and hampered the French emperor of those days, as their spiritual descendants, the modern French socialists, are hampering the present French Republic. "War is an anachronism," they cried; "war is out of date. Arbitration [which is no modern discovery, by the way, which is as old as ancient Greece], is to take its place; is taking its place." So they argued until the eve of war, until the brawling Paris mob drowned their voices by the cry, "à Berlin," and only after the collapse of Sedan did they repent; and in hot haste poor Gambetta spent his strength and energy in organizing "emergency" armies, which were too late, as "emergency" armies—or navies—are apt to be, especially if one waits till the "emergency" has arrived sufficiently near to suit the meaning which pacifist journalists find it convenient to attach to that interesting and cryptic word. Poor Gambetta spent his matchless energy in organizing "emergency" armies, and in trying to undo the mischief and the wounds which his previous pacifism had helped a weak and sick emperor to inflict on France.

Some societies of French elementary school teachers are again crying "peace" to-day. They have forced even the present Liberal French government to disband them. Similar societies cried "peace" then in the sixties, and the

Franco-German war disbanded them, but too late for France's chance of saving her provinces. There is a little book "Le Patriotisme" by Paul Pilant, which I picked up in Quebec, which is interesting and salutary reading for the pacifists.

The same is true of China, where the ruling classes, intellectual, learned, and—corrupt, sneered at soldiers, until China went down before the mushroom Empire of Japan; and to-day she is marching and drilling, and is not so scornful of soldiering, when her rights and her provinces are threatened.

2. The time has not yet come for us, or any people, to repeat the pacifism of the French Liberals in the sixties, or of the Chinese thirty years later. Need one labour this point? The present Liberal government of Great Britain is, like all British governments, absolutely pacific, absolutely unaggressive, wholly unmilitary, wholly opposed, like all British governments since Lord Palmerston's time, to those policies of adventure which loom large in the imagination of some pacifist journalists, and have very little existence in British policy, outside those vivid doctrinaire imaginations.

British foreign policy has no doubt been often foolish enough; has been made a catspaw by Prince Bismarck, for baulking Russia; has been cautious even to the point of breaking promises rather than risk adventures, as when Lord Palmerston, the most adventurous of all her statesmen, disappointed Denmark; or as when Mr. Gladstone after Majuba discovered it would be more discreet (more magnanimous he called it) to knuckle down to President Krüger; whence the great Boer war twenty years later. Britain's policy is not adventurous, and rarely has been for generations now. But the present pacific British government has yet considered it necessary to form friendships and ententes, to increase its navy and to reorganize its army, and in the summer of 1911 was even prepared, if necessary, to fight, and the result was, there was no war.

And the very powers which do not share in those alliances and those ententes, nevertheless have publicly declared that the formation of such friendships and ententes has consolidated the peace of Europe by creating a mass of power sufficient to counterbalance the great central European alliance. Nothing but such a balance has preserved European peace. What else is there equally sure to preserve it, until we are all a somewhat different sort of folk and a little nearer the millennium?

3. The training of boys and young men to be able to defend their country is not merely common sense and common necessity (as it is also, of course, the common law of Canada, that every Canadian can be called upon to defend the country), but it is in itself a safeguard against physical degeneracy and that physical decadence which industrialism continually brings in its train.

This is a large question, leading straight back, where all large questions lead, to ancient Greek and to the ancient Greek philosophers. These musty pedants not merely insisted that the soldier's training is a large factor in virtue, but they dwelt upon the poor physique and the impaired health, the physical and moral decadence, of industrialism, and of the mechanic's life, unless it is safeguarded by other things. We thrust all this aside as ancient aristocracy; it was, in a sense: in the sense that these ancient philosophers wanted to see their countrymen at their best; wanted them to be *ἄριστοι*; and wanted their states to be controlled by men who were at their best; men with something of Spartan training, and Spartan simplicity, and Spartan hardihood. But this aristocracy of theirs has a simpler name; it was just the hard experience of life. Even the ancient Greek world had its industrialism; its industrial slavery, and its industrial "sweating"; its large bodies of men—sometimes citizens, sometimes slaves—not only cooped up in factories for manufacturing purposes, but sometimes condemned to labour in these factories in a round of very narrow and very mechanical drudgery, so that the workman ceased



to be an artist and spent his whole time in soul-destroying, body-crippling labour, upon one small part of one small product, on the sole of a sandal, I suppose, or the point of a reaping hook. And seeing all this, the ancient world deplored this loss of physique arising from industrialism, and recognized the better physique of the small military states of Sparta and Thebes.

In short the ancient Greek aristocratic prejudice, as we call it, against trade, like the aristocratic prejudices of Rome or Great Britain—conventional and unintelligent prejudice, as it often becomes on the lips of Roman or British snobbery—is not in itself, or in its origin either, conventional or unintelligent or snobbish. How could it be? It is simply the expression of life's hard experience and of two patent facts; one that commerce and industrialism often bear so hardly on men as to lower their physique and impair their vitality. And the other that a man who is catering to the public taste, and to the changing fashions of the hour, necessarily surrenders his own artistic taste and his own independence of action, if not of mind, to make what the public want, and not what his own artistic instinct may suggest. This latter objection to the business life may be, and often is, impracticable and over-strained; though every artist, every surgeon, and every scholar reëchoes it. But the other, the first objection, cannot be so easily tossed aside. It remains to-day a very serious evil, by no means confined to the ancient world, for still it manifests itself in the poor physique of the workers in modern industrial cities.

On the other hand, the modern illustrations of improved physique due to military training are not less manifest than in Sparta and Thebes. You can find them in Switzerland, in Sweden, perhaps most of all in Germany,—Germany, efficient all round, in commerce, in science, in intellect, even in literature still efficient, if not so predominant as once; and efficient also in military training, in physical exercise, and in physique. In Germany youth is trained to arms and to exercise; in England often without arms and some-

times without exercise; sometimes to watch exercise only, and to bet and "root" at football without playing even at football. Athletics have never taken, can never take, the place of soldiering. Greece produced athletes, and Rome soldiers, and no one doubts which were the better men in physique or morale. But athletes, at least, are better than the loafers and the "rooters" who scream around them and make of an honest game an occasion for more gambling, for mere gambling.

All travellers in Europe bear testimony to the improvement in physique and character where military training has been organized, even as all readers of the ancient gospels and epistles must have noticed that while the great apostle turns for his similes both to soldier and to athlete, it is to the soldier that he turns for his glowing metaphors, when his passion rises to the height of his high theme.

Now what is said on the other side? Two things I think. The pacifists denounce anything military as inhuman, unchristian, and already anachronistic; as feeding hatred and lust of bloodshed, as debasing and brutalizing and degrading.

A few biological pacifists, like President Jordan, seek to bolster up the weak spots in this indictment, and to clinch the argument by attributing European decadence and bad physique to the results of past wars. War has taken away all the best wheat, so to speak, from the European field. Only the poor wheat and the tares are left, to perpetuate themselves. War is responsible for the degenerate and rickety dwellers in the modern slum. "How that red rain has made the harvest *fail*,"—so runs the new Byron.

Let us look at the second proposition first. Biology is a fascinating science from which very large, very surprising inductions have been made; more large and entertaining than certain or scientific. Some people have based aristocratic politics upon biology. Professor Ridgeway, if I recollect, entertained a British association once with speculations of this kind. Other professors have based

democratic politics upon biology; and now Professor Jordan bases anti-militarism upon biology, and delivers this fruitful mother of yet another immature child.

Hardly had I written those words when, taking up *The Spectator* for November 30th, I found another reading of biology. General von Bernhardt declares "that war is biologically necessary in order that the survival of the fittest may be guaranteed." I do not guarantee the general's biology. I am sure that Professor Jordan repudiates it; but it comes from other professors of biology.

Meanwhile, if militarism is responsible for reduced physique, it is strange that human physique has improved since the Middle Ages, whose mediæval armour is now too small; it is stranger that women's physique has improved in our own day with exercise and athletics; and it is strangest that the falling off in physique should be most conspicuous in the least military of all countries, and the most industrial, Great Britain; and that the opposite phenomenon, improved physique, should be conspicuous in Germany which has had to fight so continually that it has become the most military of empires.

If there be any country where war should be responsible for the survival of the unfit it is France, with her history of the crushing revolutionary and Napoleonic wars; is it certain that even there there is a poor physique? I recollect that Mr. Rainsford, not a man of poor physique or a poor judge of physique, expressed in 1910 the opinion that no troops so impressed him with their physique, as the French he saw that year; with their physique, their energy, and marching power. Certainly declining birth rates, and the like, are features familiar to all countries, and no one would dream, I think, except in defence of a thesis, of ascribing them to the militarism of the past; their causes are so much more obviously economical and material. Ireland, and Scotland, and England are suffering. Emigration in the first two and industrialism in the third seem the more natural explanations.

As for the first objection: that war is so inherently brutal, anachronistic, and unchristian, I will take the liberty to observe that it is more conspicuous as an objection to war on the part of the early Christian church, than on the part of the Apostles themselves, and more conspicuous as a proposition of the Quakers than of any normal human nature, Anglo-Saxon or other; least of all, of any broad humanity or Christianity, muscular or just simply masculine. I have also observed with some surprise that the same radical pacifists who denounce all war and all militarism, and proclaim war on war, are accustomed in the same breath to demand that Great Britain exert her power to protect weak races, and struggling nationalities, and oppressed peoples against their oppressors, and against tyrannical governments. Yet the only hold Great Britain has on such oppressions and such governments is her power forcibly to interfere with them through her ships or army.

If she can help to-day the struggling league of the Balkans it is only because that struggling league is not a Quaker league, but has been willing and able to put armies into the field, and armies that can fight; and because Great Britain herself can, if necessary, use similar force, naval and military, in their behalf. Furthermore, I note that the United States themselves, the home of Mr. Ginn, and President Jordan, and some of the chief pacifists of this continent, are not inclined to diminish their own army and navy, but to increase them.

But most of all, these humanitarian and pacifist movements are somewhat suspect in the eyes of thoughtful men and statesmen, because the real force, the motive power behind them, is not pure humanitarianism, Quakerism, and idealism; these every man can respect and recognize with sympathy, even if the pacifists overshoot their mark, and seem to be provoking greater dangers than the dangers they seek to remove. The real force behind this pacifist movement, especially in France, where all movements begin and all ideas have their origin, is a very different force,

far removed from disinterested humanitarianism and Christian idealism; it is class-consciousness or class feeling, which is the strongest force making against military training and the profession of the soldier.

The ultra-socialists of France, the most logical and practical of anti-militarists, are against war and the continuance of war, because they seek to replace nationalism, the principle of race, the competition of races, by a crusade against inequality, a crusade against class distinctions everywhere; they seek to replace war in the old sense, what I shall venture to call war, natural and national, world-wide and world-old, by the new civil war, *la guerre sociale*; by the destruction of the old national and individualistic bases of life, with its nations, its classes in each nation, its individuals in each class, in favour of the new doctrine of universal levelling down, and universal equality; by the abolition of competition, national or individual, in favour of the extreme form of egalitarian socialism.

Competition involves individualism and nationalism, and rests on individualism and on individual or national inequalities, and on the survival of the fittest. The ultra-socialist denounces both forms of individualism, and would make of society a vast, homogeneous dead level.

A man may well pause and doubt before such dreams. It is true that they have the charm of all revolutionary dreams: in this world of chance and change "where this and that way swings the flux of mortal things, tho' moving inly to some far-off goal," in this mixed world which seems to all of us at times to have been designed by intelligence and then forgotten, a wise man will hesitate to pronounce anything impossible merely because it is novel; but he will ask for evidence that the novel idea is something more than novel; for evidence even that it is something more than noble and generous on the lips of many among its advocates; he will ask for evidence that it is broadly, and for all men, generous and just. What if it turn out that this assault on war, and nationalism, and nature's inequalities, is not

merely an assault on war, and nationalism, and inequality, but is also, in the last resort, an assault on the ultimate things, on the ultimate distinctions of better and worse, of energy and indolence, of capacity and incapacity, of efficiency and inefficiency, of right and wrong? If so, this crusade will, after all, be impracticable, but that will not be its weakest spot. It will not even be generous or just; equality must rest on justice for its justification, not justice on equality.

It is not generous even, except when echoed, as often echoed by generous idealists, who have much to lose and are willing to lose it; it is not generous when it becomes but the echo of that envy and jealousy which ran so high in the great French Revolution, which made up so much of the passion of that Revolution, which produced all its excesses, and has left France even to-day a country divided against itself and distracted beyond other countries; with class-consciousness, and class-bitterness, and class-hatred at their maximum; with envy and jealousy, the meanest of human motives, still masquerading under the fair name of democracy. Neither is it just if it really conflict with the ultimate distinctions of right and wrong.

If a nation can secure, as in new countries, as in this happy country has been in some considerable measure secured, equality of opportunity, proportional equality, an equal chance for all to measure up to that stature and that rank and place to which their natural gifts entitle them; if a nation can secure that aristocracy of nature which is not incompatible with broad or democratic human instincts, which is rather the expression of the most permanent because most wholesome form of democracy, is not such an equality of opportunity, such a proportionate and relative equality, more generous and more just than the abstract mathematical equality which is demanded by the envious and the jealous, by the mean man whenever he is also by nature inferior, and by the inferior man when he is also naturally mean?

The ultra-socialists who preach *la guerre sociale* denounce war because they have no sympathy with nationalism and

patriotism, with love of country and countrymen. Patriotism is to them a luxury of the well to do, a fraud, an imposition on the poor; "their country forsooth," they say, *leur patrie*, "what is it but the place where the poor starve, the scene of their sorrow and their suffering? Just let them take the chance of war to rise against their masters and establish the reign of equality, and let the soldier shoot his officer and fraternize with the mob." Monsieur Gustave Hervé has built a reputation as the French school-master who believes most confidently in this new crusade; but it is not altogether a new crusade, and Monsieur Hervé is not its first crusader; it is interesting to find in the notes attached by Andrew Lang to his edition of Scott's "Antiquary," a note describing how in 1805, when a French invasion of Great Britain was expected, a worthy tailor recommended the poor in Scotland to lie low and hold off; but some of the poor thought otherwise, and the old mendicant, Edie Ochiltree, is represented by Sir Walter as belonging to this misguided class. "I would not have thought, Edie," says the Antiquary "that you had so much to fight for." "Me no muckle to fight for, sir?" answered the beggar. "Is na there the country to fight for, and the burn sides that I gang daundering beside, and the hearths of the gude wives that gie me my bit bread, and the bits of weans that come toddling to play with me when I come about a landward town? Deil," he continued grasping his pike staff with great emphasis, "an I had as gude pith as I has gude will and a gude cause, I should gie some of them a day's kemping." It is probable that the novelist is nearer the truth—truth of fact and truth of ideal—than Monsieur Hervé, when in the "Antiquary" he suggests that the virtue of a generous patriotism is not a luxury or a monopoly of wealth.

In short, I think one may say of this modern pacifism what Aristotle said of Plato's soaring and "high falutin'" communism: "Whatever is practicable in it," said Aristotle, "is Spartan, and whatever is not Spartan is impracticable." So I think I hear Aristotle's ghost to-day remonstrating

soberly with the pacifists, "all that is noblest and most generous in your ideals is impracticable still; all that is most practicable is neither generous nor noble."

Universal peace, benevolence, and love, are noble and generous ideals, and so far ahead of human nature as still to lie in the millennium; on the other hand, the replacing of war and nationalism by class consciousness, and class war, and *la guerre sociale*, may be practicable, but it is neither generous nor noble. It offers nothing better, but something that is worse, than the old system of nationalism and individualism, even with all its faults, crudities, and cruelties. What is there in natural, national, normal war worse than this civil war, this *guerre sociale*? What is there so bad? There is war and war. National war, like everything else in this age, takes, and will ever take more and more, the spirit of the age, the Christianity of the age, the humanity of the age. The wars of our people in ever increasing degree are becoming more humane, more restrained, more Christian. Even fifty, even seventy-five years ago in India, we astonished the people there; we provoked their doubts and their smiles by the absurd humanity and mercy of the British arms. Why pardon enemies, they asked? Why deal gently with offenders? Why win victories and then jeopardize the fruits of victory? Is not war killing? Why kill only in battle? and after battle, spare, and so produce more war? Why not kill after battle even more than in battle? It is much easier and much safer, and it stamps out opposition more effectually.

So the native officer of the Indian army, so Sita Ram, whose moving autobiography has come down to us, was asking almost a hundred years ago. And he came not unnaturally to the mixed conclusion that the British were brave but stupid; that they fought for the pleasure of fighting, and not to kill and afterwards tyrannize in peace.

Let us suppose they did; let us leave it there, dismissing all ideas of generosity, of mercy, of justice. Even so our soldiers emerge from the test as no worse than brave and



straight fighting men, somewhat on a par with brave and straight athletes who play for play's sake, and not to win at all costs, and not for the gate money; who just play up and play the game. And so the game of war goes on, becoming ever more restrained and straighter and fairer; a realization of the ancient and not dishonourable ambitions, to shoot straight, to ride straight, and to speak the truth.

The soldier in this age, with us, and not with us only but even in the Balkans, is the child of his age; what else could he be? He cannot escape its humanity and its humanitarianism. Nay, he is, more than any one else, directly affected by this humanitarianism, because it is aimed at him, preached at him, has him for its object, and his reform and improvement for its passion and its goal.

I sometimes wish that the pacifist journalists who write so much against war and militarism would turn some of their sermons against other forms of war, more modern, not more wholesome and much nearer home. Why should anti-militarism or humanity be merely a civilian passion against soldiers? Is there no other and nearer warfare to preach against than war?—some other warfare which touches all the rest of us more closely; the war of politics for example, waged with all the cunning and insincerity of that crafty animal, the politician; the war of capital and labour, for example, waged with hard hearts or bombs; or even this rising war of men and women, which is capable of becoming the worst and most dangerous of all forms of war. Why not spend a little of the spirit of Christianity on these things? That spirit has already of necessity caught our armies, who are generous enough and humane enough, for all their readiness to shed blood—or to lose it. We may be sure it will do its benign work with them, for they are decent, honest, pleasant souls to start with, and have no personal quarrel with the enemy; whom they are feeding just now in the Balkans during the armistice.

But, after all, all this is largely beside the mark. It is not to provoke war, it is not even because the military

life is, in the ancient phrase, a large factor in virtue, or, in more modern phrase, has been largely redeemed and humanized, and is day by day becoming ever more humane, and profits more than other professions, because it is the profession specially aimed at, by the humaner spirit of the age, that defence leagues are wise and justifiable. It is to prevent war that such a league is useful. War is averted when the pacific powers, which are Great Britain, France, and the United States, the great democracies, are able to counterbalance the more military powers; war is not averted by giving those powers a free rein; war is not averted by anything else in the present stage of the world so surely as by that counterbalance.

And besides, after all, were arbitration ten times more strongly supported than it is, it will not always meet the mark and secure justice. Arbitration is essentially prejudiced in favour of the *status quo* and the nations who have established themselves. It is essentially lukewarm and indifferent to the coming nations, to the peoples whose appeal is to the future rather than the past. Arbitration has all the weakness of ultra-conservatism.

Arbitration may come in time, it certainly has not come yet. Is not that obvious when the very protagonist of arbitration, President Taft himself, after going further towards arbitration in theory than any one, at the very first sight of a dispute, and of a dispute with a most friendly nation, allied in blood and language and political system, a dispute involving no question of national honour whatever, only dollars and cents, at once hedges, and draws back, and is not even prepared after all, it seems, to promise arbitration even there.

There in a nutshell is the weakness of arbitration. It cannot stand the first spicy breeze from the unpacific Pacific coast; it cannot stand the first zephyr from California; it rocks and bows at the first breath that blows cold upon it; at the mildest little breath, at a petty quarrel about harbour dues, this great structure of lofty sentiment

and pacifism or idealism begins to roll and reel in the very home and on the very lips of its strongest champion. What wise man will build confidently for the immediate future of mankind on such foundations of shifting sand? What wise man will dismiss precautions and eschew military training for boys and young men, with no one better than that half-hearted pacifist at Washington to encourage him?

Further, military training for boys and young men is designed to avoid continental conscription; to avoid the life in barracks, during some of the most precious years of manhood, for mature men; is designed to avert war, not by ignoring the boys' interest in war, the boys' instinct for the pomp and circumstance of war, but by turning to sober, national purposes that interest and that instinct. These things may produce war when war has never been known, after years of piping peace; not so easily when the fear of war is before a nation, and the knowledge of war has not been forgotten, and aptitude for war has not been lost.

So far as I am aware the wars of recent times have come from commerce or have come from ambitious statesmen and falsified telegrams in a sensational press, or from brawling city mobs, and yellow journalists, not from trained soldiers, not from sober men trained to know something of war's demands and of its uncertainties. The soldiers could never have made the Franco-German war without the politicians, and the city mob, and the city press.

Military training is designed, finally, to promote a sound physique and a better general health (such as is seen in Switzerland, in Germany, in Scandinavia), in those places where industrialism and commercial conditions are threatening general health and are impairing national physique. You cannot eradicate the military spirit of the schoolboy; you can by military discipline regulate and chasten it and turn him from a hooligan into a self-contained, restrained and self-respecting person, of active habits, of punctuality, of obedience, of silence, of all those virtues in which democracy and unrestrained liberty are weakest, and in which, therefore, the present age is specially deficient.

For military training is the training compensatory of the foibles and the weaknesses of our age and our political system; antithetic to the virtues of our age, and therefore for us antiseptic: antiseptic against the excesses of our own systems and our own shibboleths. In an age and a country wholly divorced from militarism, military virtues can do no harm but only good; in an age of education and free thought we want as an offset to their abuses habit and fixed thought; as an offset to democracy and liberty, we can put up with something of the spirit of obedience and something of the spirit of service, qualities which belong to the ages of authority, but which, if they have any home left to them in the world to-day, find it in the military life and type. We want these qualities even more against ourselves than against any possible external foe. If there turn out to be no external foe, all the better. We have got the qualities for our own souls' good, without all the miseries, great and small, of war. Each of these reasons is sufficient in itself to justify the military training of the young. Their cumulative effect is all the greater and is writ large in history, both negatively and positively; indirectly in the nations that have gone down to ruin, with all their genius, just for want of military training and military spirit; directly in the nations that have recovered their self-respect and their place in the sun, like Prussia, once so little now so great, just because they showed that spirit and had the patience to practise that wholesome discipline.

MAURICE HUTTON

## THE REFERENDUM

A UNIONIST member of the British parliament declares that, in the last general election, one of his constituents laboured under the impression that the Veto, of which Mr. Asquith talked so freely, was a vegetable. He does not say to which kingdom this promising citizen assigned the Referendum, of which Mr. Balfour talked so freely. Ten years ago the Initiative and Referendum were outlandish words which conveyed to the mass of the English-speaking world little more meaning than did the Veto to Mr. F. E. Smith's supporter. To-day, so rapid is the political pace of the twentieth century, nearly every section of that English-speaking world is experimenting, or discussing the advisability of experimenting, with these latest constitutional devices. In the United States the initiative and referendum are firmly entrenched in the constitutions of many states, and are likely soon to be adopted by many more. Within the British Empire we find the same tendency, though in less advanced form. In Natal two years ago the question of entering the South African Confederation was left to a referendum of the electors. In Australia the electorate will vote at the time of the general election in April, 1913, upon important referenda, in the form of amendments to the Federal constitution, empowering the Federal government to declare any industry a monopoly and take it over, to grant wider powers of arbitration in labour disputes to Commonwealth tribunals, and to instal the New Protection, which endeavours to combine protection for the manufacturer, high wages for the working man, and low prices for the consumer. In Great Britain the referendum was advocated a short time ago by Mr. Balfour as a means of settling the Tariff Reform question, and by Lord Lansdowne as a means of ending deadlock between Lords and Commons.

In Canada we have had frequent demands for the adoption of the referendum, or rather a plebiscite, on specific issues such as reciprocity, or the naval proposals, while its adoption as an integral and normal feature of the Constitution is strongly urged in the prairie provinces. Saskatchewan has attained this last session the distinction of being the first section of the British Empire to place upon the statute book a measure providing for the adoption of both the initiative and the referendum, conditional upon this measure itself being endorsed by the electorate. The government of Alberta is bringing down a similar bill. The opposition in Manitoba are committed to the same policy. The referendum has ceased to be an academic phrase or a hobby of a small circle of enthusiasts.

The Initiative and the Referendum, it may be useful to recall, are two distinct forms of direct legislation. The referendum is a people's veto-power. Under the compulsory referendum all laws except urgency measures, or all laws of certain specified classes, must be submitted to popular vote before going into force. Under the optional referendum, the form usually advocated on this continent, all but urgency laws must be so submitted, if demanded by a petition of a definite proportion of the voters, usually five to ten per cent. In view of the doubts prevalent at Ottawa as to the definition of "emergency," it may be noted that in the States "urgency" measures are those which at least two-thirds of the members of the legislature on individual roll-call so affirm. The initiative is a spur rather than a bridle. It empowers a stated proportion of the electorate, usually eight per cent, to demand the enactment of any measure which the legislature has declined to discuss or to pass; the full text of the proposed law may be embodied in the petition, and voted on directly, or the legislature may be required to accept the measure or submit it with an alternative proposal to the people or, as in the recent Wisconsin provision, bills introduced into the legislature by any member, and rejected, may on petition go before

the people. Usually a majority of the votes cast upon the measure submitted is sufficient for ratification, but in some cases half the highest vote cast in the contemporary state election is required. In the Saskatchewan Act, it may be added, the proportion of electors necessary to set the referendum in motion is put at five per cent. of the vote polled at the preceding general election, and for the initiative eight per cent; financial measures are excluded from its scope and the consent of thirty per cent. of the total number of electors in the province is required for the adoption of the measure itself—the latter provisions being denounced by the leaders of the movement as a delusion and a snare, making its adoption almost impossible and its operation narrowly limited.

The line of historical progress is frequently a spiral. Direct legislation is no new-fangled device. At the dawn of democracy it is the obvious and almost universal method of regulating the affairs of small and primitive communities. In the market place of Athens or of Rome, in Swiss *Landesgemeinde*, or Saxon folk-moot, or New England town-meeting, the people have gathered to give their yea, or nay, direct on the measures proposed for their governing. As the city or tribe gave way to the nation-state, and the number and complexity of legislative problems grew, the impossibility of assembling all the citizens in a central place made government by representatives the only alternative to despotism. To-day the railroad, and the telegraph, and the newspaper have shrunk the earth's circumference to one tenth its former size, and made it conceivable that a nation covering half a continent should discuss, and by the ballot should decide, questions of state directly and definitively as of old.

The special circumstances which have led to the extensive development of the referendum in Switzerland and the United States may be briefly stated. In Switzerland alone of the European states north of the Alps, no king arose to break down feudal and local jealousies, and weld the

nation into centralized unity. The separate cantons were too small to feel the need of a representative system; the diet of the loose federation of cantons had no final power, but was merely a congress of ambassadors from the various cantons, commissioned *ad audiendum et referendum*. When, in the nineteenth century, representative institutions were established, long tradition, local jealousy, initial difficulties in the working of the representative system, and some instances of corrupt or class legislation, led to the revival of the referendum all along the line. To-day in the separate cantons, omitting the four which retain the still more pure democracy of government without representative institutions at all, the referendum is obligatory in all for changes in the constitution, obligatory in half for other measures, and optional in all the rest but Fribourg; in the Confederation it is obligatory in constitutional cases and optional on other questions. The initiative, though of more recent development, has almost as wide acceptance.

In the United States the referendum is native in origin, though its recent extension has been much influenced by Swiss example. It has two roots. The first is the century long practice of submitting the constitutions, or amendments of the constitutions, of the various states to popular vote. The second is the gradual transformation of the constitutions, in consequence of the popular distrust of the state legislatures and the desire to leave them as little scope as possible, from fundamental provisions for distribution of power among the various agencies of government into collections of ordinary statutes. Various state constitutions prohibit lotteries and the contracting of convict labour, state the maximum rate of interest, fix the salaries of school superintendents at \$2,000, grant public employees an eight-hour day, impose two-cent a mile fare upon the railroads, put the minimum age of attendance of children at public schools at five years, or levy a definite tax upon sleeping-car companies. From such detailed legislation to the formal adoption of the referendum the step was short. Already



the referendum, and in most cases the initiative, have been established in Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Ohio, Maine, and, in restricted form, Massachusetts and Michigan, and will shortly be voted upon in other states.

The main arguments in support of the statutory referendum may be reduced to three. It is held to be necessary because the legislature is corrupt and inefficient. Or it is held necessary because the legislators, even though individually honest and fairly efficient, are prevented by party, or factional, or class bias from really representing the people's will, the more so because under our party system it is impossible to disentangle issues and obtain an undisputed pronouncement on each from the nation. And, finally, in more positive fashion, direct legislation is held to be desirable for its own sake, because of the educative effect upon the mass of the people.

It is in the United States that the first argument is insisted on. There is no question that in the majority of the states representative government is in bad repute. Carleton's verse will be remembered:

He writes from out in Denver, and the story's mighty short,  
I just can't tell his mother, it'll crush her poor ol' heart,  
An' so I reckon, parson, you might break the news to her,—  
Bill's in the legislatur', but he doesn't say what fur.

It is urged by the advocates of the referendum that with few exceptions the state legislators are third-rate men, tools of state or city boss, or, where passably honest, incapable and untrained. It is claimed that the laws passed are incredibly numerous and incredibly crude, badly drafted, ill-digested, jammed through without a tithe of the necessary discussion and consideration, reaching the climax of freakishness in state laws prohibiting flirtations with railroad employees, compelling a druggist who offers patent medicine for sale to give with the bottle an affidavit that he has tried

it, prohibiting the printing of hotel menus in any other language than English, or compelling hotelkeepers to provide bed-clothes nine feet long. And it is especially urged that legislation is corrupt, that everywhere the lobby is a third house, that it is a rare bill affecting financial interests which does not have its joker, that many legislators vary their activities as henchmen of the great corporations only by blackmailing them by strike bills; that, in short, representative government means representation of "the interests."

Allowing for partizan exaggeration and lack of perspective, there is only too much truth in the indictment. Yet a correct analysis of the sources of these evils seems to show that the referendum would, in the long run, do little to remedy them. One universal reason for the failure of so many state governments has been apathy of the citizens, the indifference of an individualistic people, intensely on the make, with a half continent to exploit, confident that the glorious constitution of the fathers could run itself, that democracy was automatic, and so assured of the boundless riches of the country as to be careless of waste or graft. Now a new day is dawning: the need of national economy is being pressed home to a people whose last West is gone, and whose resources are squandered or mortgaged to monopolies. Civic interest is everywhere reviving. With an alert citizenry, it is as possible to elect better representatives as to pass better laws by referendum vote; with the citizens still apathetic it is futile to hope that voters who do not care about men will worry about measures.

A further reason for the inefficiency of state government is the inadequacy of the political machinery. The cardinal principle of good government, as we understand it in Canada or in the United Kingdom, the concentration of power and responsibility, is flagrantly disregarded. Instead, diffusion and confusion reign. The executive and the legislature are entirely distinct and independent. The governor has no official connexion with either house. The men who are to administer the laws have usually nothing

to do with framing them. All bills in American legislatures are private members' bills; from 1000 to 4000 are introduced in state legislatures every session. There is none of the preliminary sifting by the cabinet with which we are familiar, keeping the number of measures proposed within reasonable limits, and thus making fairly adequate discussion possible; there is little of the responsibility which here is concentrated on the party and the minister identified with the measure, and gaining or losing prestige according as it proves a success or a failure. Nor is this all. The legislature is itself divided into two houses, the upper as well as the lower elected, not, as in the Dominion and in the two of our nine provinces where blind tradition keeps a second chamber in existence, appointive; consequently assertion and deadlock are much more frequent. Still further, the executive is divided and cut up almost into political hash by the custom of electing practically all state officials directly, and putting each on his own little pedestal of independence. The state offices filled by election include, in different states, those of governor, lieutenant-governor, secretary of state, treasurer, attorney-general, state printer, state engineer, commissioner of labour, superintendent of instruction, state university trustees, auditor, insurance commissioners, railroad commissioners, game commissioners, sheriffs, state senators, assembly-men, judges of the court of appeals, supreme court judges, surrogates, and state veterinarian. Nor is this all. Besides voting for several of the above state officials, an elector in Chicago, for example, must on the same ballot, vote for county officials, treasurer, clerk, clerk of the probate court, clerk of the criminal court, clerk of the circuit court, county superintendent of schools, judge of the county court, judge of the probate court, members of the board of assessors, members of the board of review, ten county commissioners, trustees of the sanitary district, judges of the municipal court, and so on through the list. In the state of Oregon there are forty-seven separate and independent state boards and commissions. Nor is the wearied voter's task ended

here. If he does his duty, as the preachers of good government urge him, and endeavours to take his share in the control of the party through the primary or caucus, he must vote, to take the New York city list, for every one of the following party officials, from one to four times in a four year cycle: (1) members of the city committee, (2) members of the county committee, (3) members of the assembly district committee, (4) delegates to aldermanic district convention, (5) delegates to a municipal court district convention, (6) delegates to a borough convention, (7) delegates to a city convention (8) delegates to a county convention. (9) delegates to a judicial district convention, (10) delegates to an assembly district convention, (11) delegates to a senatorial district convention, (12) delegates to a congressional district convention. Or, if the direct primary has taken the place of the convention system, the hapless citizen's fate is little bettered, as he is compelled to choose the party candidate for each and all of the state and county and city offices mentioned. The number of elective officials, it may be mentioned, is much greater as a rule in the sections of the United States which have adopted the referendum than in the northern and eastern states.

This system of extreme separation and division of power appears to the outsider indefensible. The chances it offers for deadlock and evasion of responsibility are precisely what the corrupt interests are seeking; the scattering of power lessens the attractiveness of a political career for the able and honest man. Especially indefensible is the system of direct election of the hosts of state and county and city officials. It is monumentally absurd to imagine that the average voter can intelligently and independently fulfil the task that is thrust upon him in the name of democracy. R. S. Childs reports the following results of a canvass of voters in the most independent assembly district in Brooklyn, immediately after a recent election: Do you know the name of the New State Treasurer, just elected? No, 87 per cent. Do you know the name of the present treasurer?

No, 75 per cent. Do you know the name of the assemblyman from this district? No, 70 per cent. Do you know the name of the defeated candidate for the assembly? No, 80 per cent. Do you know the name of the surrogate of this county? No, 65 per cent. Do you know the name of your alderman? No, 85 per cent. No amateur citizen can cope with this burden; the professional expert must be called in, slates must be elaborately framed, the party circle must be devised to ease the voter's task, and boss rule—with occasional breaks of rule by reform committees equally professional but not so permanent in organization—becomes inevitable and therefore excusable.

From the diagnosis the remedy would seem clear—concentration. Abolish one house of the legislature, give the governor the right to initiate and defend legislation, make him the only elective executive official, trust him to appoint the state veterinarian, and the coroner, and the state auditor. Such sweeping changes are not likely to come about in a day. It is out of the question for the United States now to go back to the point where British and American paths forked, and take the road to cabinet government. But some approximation to our system is coming to appear likely. The success of city commission government is almost entirely due to the concentration—perhaps in excessive degree—of power in a few hands. "Short ballot" reform is advocated by men like Justice Hughes and President Woodrow Wilson as the most pressing political need of the United States to-day. The fact that the Federal Government has been much more honest and efficient than state governments is due in no small measure to the fact that the electors vote only for president, representative and, in some cases, senator; the president appoints the tens of thousands of subordinate officials. It is a striking and significant fact that the group of men chiefly responsible for the adoption of direct legislation in Oregon and its extension throughout the United States, the People's Power League, have come to see that it is not a cure-all, and are

now advocating the reform of the representative system by concentrating power, abolishing the senate, reducing very materially the number of elective officials, and giving the governor and his cabinet seats on the floor of the house with power to initiate and defend measures. "When they accomplish the reorganization of public authority that they intend, they expect to drop the initiative and referendum out of ordinary use. They will then be kept in reserve simply for emergency use," so Dr. Henry Jones Ford reports. That is, in their eyes the chief value of the initiative and referendum is the opportunity it gives to introduce a system approximating the cabinet form of government which we possess already. Until representative government has been given a fair trial in the United States it is idle to talk of its breakdown.

Elsewhere than in the United States the referendum is not usually demanded because of the individual dishonesty or incapacity of the people's representatives. Rather it is urged as a check on party tyranny and factional zeal, a means of ensuring legislation which is reasonably honest and reasonably efficient, being also in accord with the will of the majority of the people. The representative system is criticised because it does not really represent the people's will. What means have the citizens of the United Kingdom, or of Canada, of declaring their will on public issues? Two or more political parties frame lengthy programmes of miscellaneous and unconnected demands. Once in four or five years the electorate is given an opportunity to pass on these programmes. They must be passed on in bulk: there is no opportunity to pick and choose; the British voter who favours free trade must also accept Home Rule and Lloyd-George taxation. Nor can the elector vote directly even for these heterogeneous programmes; he must vote for candidates more or less strictly pledged to support them. Often his choice must lie between a good member and a bad policy, or a good policy and a poor member. Once the election is over, the majority may proceed to pass some

measure to which little heed was given during the election, or to legislate on matters which were not then above the horizon. Nor is it certain that these measures, though passed, will have the convinced support even of the dominant party; noisy and aggressive minorities may force their will upon it or log-rolling factions barter mutual support for measures, none of which is really acceptable to the whole party. Under these conditions, it is claimed, representative institutions cease to represent.

The indictment is a serious one, but it requires qualification. How far is it desirable that legislation should reflect the people's conscious and explicit will? On the one hand, few would deny that on vital issues the nation's firm and settled conviction should be strictly heeded. It may be, as the critics of democracy urge, that the mass of the electorate are more conservative on religious or social issues, more radical on economic issues, more parsimonious, more short-sighted, than their representatives; it may well be that the Catholic Emancipation Act, or that laws reforming the calendar, or putting an end to the burning of witches, would have received only a minority of popular votes. Yet that issue is decided. Democracy means the blessed privilege of making our own mistakes. On the other hand, it does not follow that it is desirable to secure the explicit approval of the people for every legislative act or administrative policy. The task of legislation grows more perplexing every year. Every year new burdens are thrown upon Parliament, more people look to it for redress of all their ills. The scope of law-making widens, the complexity of each subject increases with the growing complexity of the industrial community, the need of expert guidance through the maze of statutes becomes cumulatively greater. It tasks the energy and conscience of the member of parliament to keep informed on the measures placed before him, and for some the task is too great. For the average private citizen, engrossed in his business cares, such a task is hopelessly out of the question. On the minor issues he must trust

to the discretion of his representative, and even on the major he can rarely do more than lay down the general policy, choose a representative with a certain attitude of mind, and leave to parliament the more difficult task of deciding on details, of planning ways and means, or accepting half loaves. We cannot to-day subscribe to Burke's high doctrine that the member should maintain his constituent's interests against their opinions, but neither can we desire to see the member made merely a rubber stamp in the hands of Demos, or his self-appointed and irresponsible advisers.

Granting, then, that on important issues the will of the people should be ascertained, can it be ascertained under our representative system? Are party programmes always haphazard and incoherent? Surely not. In Britain the industrial and commercial classes who have formed the backbone of Liberalism, and who favour free trade because free trade means cheap food and raw materials, are by virtue of their broader commercial intercourse more cosmopolitan in sympathy, more desirous of international peace, and more friendly to the national aspirations of an Ireland or South Africa than the more aggressively insular patriots of the country party; they are in large proportion Non-conformists, for Protestantism and "the dissidence of dissent" have long been closely identified with devotion to industry and commerce, Calvinism and Capitalism have been foster brothers; they are normally opposed to an Upper House where their antagonists in all spheres of life are entrenched. Free trade, reluctance to pile up naval and military armament, Home Rule and colonial autonomy, non-denominational schools, and hostility to the Lords, are all policies organically related. So with the policy of the Unionists. Social issues, it is true, are cutting athwart old lines, but even when both parties devote themselves to advanced social reform there continues a vital difference, notably in the decision as to who is to pay the bills—the dukes, says the Radical, the foreigner, says the Tariff Reformer. In Canada, with our greater uniformity of social and economic



outlook, party differences have not of recent years been vital, but to-day the lines are being more sharply drawn both in domestic and in foreign relations, and coherent and vital programmes are taking shape and bulk, approval or rejection becoming more defensible.

Where the issues are not related, it may be urged that in general elections one issue is usually uppermost, and that on this, at least, a pronouncement is secured; obviously, however, not with the clear-cut certainty of a referendum. By-elections show the way the wind is blowing. The press focuses and reflects public opinion, subject to varying discount for partizan prejudice and financial control. Members of parliament keep more or less in touch with their constituents; the old practice of discussion of current issues by public meetings in the ridings between general elections, is slowly reviving. Yet while normally the legislature may reflect public opinion, when there is any to reflect, there are undoubtedly exceptions, cases where a government by too long term of office has unconsciously fallen out of touch, misled by noisy cliques or assertive and flattering interests, or where it consciously opposes the country's will, whether from the patriot's conviction of deeper insight and wider horizon which time will justify, or from the grafter's hope that popular memories will prove as ever short. There are few citizens who take an interest in public affairs, who have not at some time felt that the government was riding roughshod over the majority's convictions, and sighed for the referendum, if but for once.

If the use of the referendum could be restricted to exceptional occasions, where vital and irremediable interests were at stake, and faction was sweeping all before it, much could be said for it. It appears to be the best expedient for solving an important deadlock between the two houses of Parliament, or for making changes in the constitution, so far as it exists in written form. The general and fundamental character of our Canadian constitutions would be likely to prevent, for some time at least, that introduction

of ordinary statutes under the guise of constitutional amendments which has marked the experiment in the United States. The adoption of the Australian plan of amendment by majority both of the total vote and of the separate states would seem to be a vast improvement over the present anomalous and dangerous provision for amendment of our Federal constitution. But when we come to consider the use of the referendum on ordinary legislative acts, the difficulty of setting a limit becomes a very real and practical one. Men's estimates of what is vital or what is pernicious vary most widely. The measure which bounds the whole horizon of one enthusiast is entirely ignored by another. Navy policy, bank reform, single tax, tariff reduction, woman suffrage, trust regulation, government ownership, an eight-hour day, Japanese immigration, temperance reform, and scores of other issues are equally likely to provoke the referendum or the initiative. It is difficult to tell beforehand what acts will be called in question. In South Dakota recently a referendum vote was demanded on three acts of the legislature, one aiming to make the state no longer the Mecca of get-divorced-quick aspirants by requiring a year's qualifying residence, the second prohibiting the shooting of quail for five years, and the third prohibiting circuses and theatrical exhibitions on Sunday. Experience bears out the fear of multiplicity of appeals. When in Oregon in 1906 eleven measures were submitted, the advocates of direct legislation foretold that once this preliminary house-cleaning was over the mere fear of the use of the referendum and initiative would make frequent use unnecessary; as a matter of fact in 1908, nineteen, and in 1910 thirty-two measures were voted upon. Some were of broad interest, woman suffrage, taxation, and constitutional reform suggestions, but others dealt with minor and local issues such as the establishment of a branch insane asylum, creating new counties, fixing the term of the supreme court, and increasing the salary of the judge of the eighth district. The latter suggestion was, of course, rejected, by 71,000 to 13,000 votes.

The difficulty, then, is this: No method has yet been devised of restricting the number of measures submitted; the most obvious expedient, raising the proportion of signatures to a very high percentage, puts a premium on organization and long purses. If the number is not limited, it is doubtful whether the mass of the people will vote at all, and whether they can afford the time to vote with discrimination. In Oregon the results are more favourable than in most other states, thanks in part to the use of publicity pamphlets, but more to the temporary blessing of leadership by an unusually able group of men composing the People's Power League; "there are two legislatures in Oregon, one sitting at Portland, and the other under Mr. W. S. U'ren's hat." Elsewhere it is frequent for constitutional or statutory referenda to fail to attract one half, or even one fourth, the vote cast for governor. The danger is precisely parallel to that which has bedevilled the choice of state officials. Eighty years ago in the United States, Jacksonian democrats urged that the only way for the people to rule was to elect every state or local official directly, and for short terms; they put upon democracy a burden it could not bear, and the result, as has been seen above, has been chaos and corruption, and the absolute necessity of boss rule to give outside the constitution the concentrated power denied within it. It is only fair to ask the friends of the referendum to show that multiplicity of submitted measures will not prove, like multiplicity of elected offices, only sham democracy.

It is not without significance that neither of the countries in which the referendum has been adopted possesses cabinet government. The executive in an American state holds office for the full calendar term, rain or shine; whether the legislature is of its mind, or rather their minds, matters little. In Switzerland the ministers are more like civil servants than party leaders; the one party, the Radicals, has been in power for fifty years; if the policy of the ministers is not endorsed by the legislature they simply change it and continue in office. The British system of a cabinet

responsible to parliament, and retaining office only so long as supported by the majority, lends itself much less easily to the working of the referendum. The government cannot remain neutral in the contest, especially since under our system the opposition would often be responsible for invoking the referendum; it is its measure, or its failure to enact a measure, that is in debate. If the vote goes against it and it still clings to office its prestige will be sorely damaged, and its position made extremely difficult. From this practical point of view a general election, on our navy question, for example, while not so ideally decisive, is more workable than the referendum.

One of the most taking aspects of the referendum is the promise it holds out of education of the voters. If the referenda could be confined within reasonable limits there would be much force in this argument. But perhaps equally important is the question of the effect upon the legislature. Make parliament a mere drafting commission, take away its discretion, its responsibility, and it will cease to attract strong men. Would not an ambitious Oregonian prefer to be a member of the inner circle of the People's Power League to being merely a member of the legislature? And assuming that the task of legislating is carried on as effectively, this is not the whole picture. Parliament would be weakened for its other tasks, for control of foreign policy, for criticism of administration, or for the details of committee work, tasks which the referendum cannot undertake.

What is the chief criticism passed upon our representatives, say at Ottawa, and their work? Not individual inefficiency; not crude or careless legislation; but sacrifice of public interests to party and to pocket. It is the brazen insolence of the system by which the money of the people of Canada is spent to maintain a party in power that constitutes the strongest indictment against our political life. A new comer to our shores is astounded by the constant stream of newspaper and parliamentary charges of "maladministration, stealing, looting, and grafting," to use Mr. Borden's

phrase, to which the main reply is a *tu quoque*. One should be fair: there is more smoke than fire; our representatives are as good as we deserve and as we want; the standard of ethics in our private business is not unimpeachable; our governments have, on the whole, been very much more honest and efficient than the state governments to the south, though not up to the level of the United States Federal government in the rareness of personal scandal; the average member of parliament or of the ministry, if he errs, errs not from personal approval or participation in crookedness but from too much party opportunism, too great a tendency to wink at the necessary wicked partner. But, all allowances made, our record and reputation are such as to make us ashamed of what we have made of this, democracy's last fresh chance in the world. We bribe whole provinces by special subsidies or railroad extensions; we give cold justice to the districts ill-advised enough to differ in politics from Ottawa, and warm favours to the discreet. We bribe constituencies with public works, needed or not, placed where they will do most good to the party. We bribe individuals by giving them contracts for which the country pays, or, if less important, by jobs in the country's service, or, if still less respectable, by ten dollar bills which come directly from contractors or manufacturers or office seekers and in the long run out of the country's pocket, with compound and complex interest. And even the members are not free from temptation, with the prospect of senatorships, judgeships, commissionerships, held out as the reward of regularity, and the threat of loss of renomination or share of campaign fund if too independent.

How could a referendum be held on the action of the Minister of Public Works, almost naïve in its frank directness, in attempting to influence the Antigonish by-election by disclosing the provisions to be included in the estimates for public works in that constituency? As the estimates had not even been submitted to parliament, a referendum would at least be premature. Or could a referendum have affected that deal under his predecessor wherein a seven

hundred dollar sawdust wharf in Richibucto was sold to the government for five thousand dollars just before an election? Could a referendum have stayed the voyage of the *Minnie M.*, or prevented the gross abuse of magistrates' power in the Macdonald by-election? Would it prevent a government paying four thousand six hundred dollars for four hundred dollar diaphones, or buying only from firms on the patronage list, or giving its friends inside prices or information on townsites or timber limits, or dismissing a collector of customs, whose offensive partizanship consisted of a mild and general remark that people with unsavory political reputation should not run for parliament? Would it prevent the gift of judgeships to men who had proved their capacity for impartial and independent decision by always voting straight, or make it unnecessary for certain M.P.s to open a special office to receive applicants for jobs? I do not wish to imply that a measure is to be rejected simply because it is not a cure-all. What cures are to be found or are being found for this dangerous concentration of patronage which makes every hamlet, every interest, tributary to the political capitals, is beyond the limits of this article to discuss. This only may be safely asserted that, whatever accompanying changes in political machinery or in public policy are urged, the one essential safeguard must lie in the character and force of our representatives in parliament. Weaken parliament's power to pass laws, which possibly the electorate may exercise as well, and you weaken its capacity to do the many tasks which the general electorate cannot even attempt. Make a parliamentary career less a prize for ambition, and the men who will fill the seats in parliament will be little likely to make a stand against this corroding menace to our national life.

O. D. SKELTON

## THE GAME OF POLITICS

THE history of representative government in the United States is lacking in the venerable traditions of the English parliament. From the very beginning of its proceedings Congress was regarded with a certain degree of suspicion by the people of the several states. It succeeded to the place and to many of the powers of the British parliament. It was a distant and almost absentee government. The unlimited pretensions of the English parliament had convinced the colonists of the necessity of placing constitutional limitations upon the legislature in favour of individual rights. It was feared that Congress in turn might seek to magnify its powers, and, unless restrained by express inhibitions, might develop into a political Moloch, as dangerous to their hard won liberties and independence as the English parliament itself.

The political philosophy of the time reflected these views most clearly. The leaders of the revolution had drunk deep of the political principles of John Locke in favour of personal liberty, the inviolability of property, and the right of revolution. The Declaration of Independence voiced the new gospel of individual freedom. In place of the old theory of parliamentary supremacy there was set up a new theory of popular sovereignty. This is the spirit of the American revolution. Into the newly framed State constitutions there were incorporated elaborate Bills of Rights designed to protect the inalienable rights of the public against the insidious encroachments of wicked governments. The federal constitution was made to conform to the same type. To Congress was delegated but a limited range of powers. In the eyes of foreign states the national government was singularly weak in influence and prestige. But, fortunately for the new republic, the

inherent weakness of the national government was largely offset by the superior ability of many of the men who filled the presidential chair or occupied seats in Congress.

The triumph of the Western democracy under Jackson tended to emphasize still further the doctrine of popular sovereignty by placing the balance of political power in the hands of the independent, but somewhat narrow-minded, middle class. Following close upon the train of the new régime there appeared a series of evils,—the political boss and machine, the manipulation of party caucuses and conventions, and the degradation of the public service by the spoils system,—all of which threatened to impair the confidence of the nation in the purity and efficiency of the representative system. But the growing spirit of disaffection was stifled for the time being by the struggle of the North and South. The Civil War was followed by a period of remarkable industrial and commercial activity. The entire face of the country was changed. A social and economic revolution was under way. The capitalistic era was ushered in. A great, landless working class emerged out of the revolution. The financial interests were not unmindful of the advantages which flow from the possession of power. They played the political game with consummate skill and adroitness; so much so that they obtained the same predominant influence in and over the party organizations that they possessed in the realm of finance.

The general public were slow to appreciate the significance of the course of events. But when they at last awakened to the fact that an economic and political transformation was taking place which had already endangered their economic independence and was threatening the further loss of their political freedom, they threw themselves energetically into the struggle for the maintenance of their liberties. The moral and social conscience of the nation was aroused against the perversion of government to selfish ends. The whole governmental organization fell under suspicion. The State legislatures were especially singled



out for attack, though Congress also was subjected to a great deal of criticism. The public hit back blindly at their despoilers. As the legislatures had abused their powers, it seemed both just and wise that their powers henceforth should be curtailed. The constitutions of the states were converted into veritable codes. In many states the legislatures were reduced to the level of glorified county councils. Their sessions were curtailed, their procedure prescribed, their financial powers limited, and their general competency restricted by comprehensive inhibitions of special legislation. The courts, moreover, were endowed with far-reaching powers of safe-guarding the constitution.

But all these measures failed to bring about the desired reforms in the government. The old abuses still continued. The reformers found themselves thwarted at every turn by the clever manipulations of corrupt politicians and by the secret influence of powerful financial interests. The legislatures were as weak, incompetent, and corrupt as ever. So notoriously venal were the legislatures of some states that none was so mean as to do them reverence. Public service was no longer considered an honour, but rather a stigma of reproach. Many of the reformers, especially those of advanced opinions, became convinced that the legislatures were hopelessly corrupt. Representative government, in their opinion, had proved a failure. In place thereof they proposed to set up the direct rule of the people through the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall. The true sovereignty of the people would be established upon the ruins of a specious democracy. The new movement has swept with great rapidity over the West and the Middle West, and is now invading the more conservative East. It may be safely affirmed that unless the legislatures seriously undertake the task of reforming their procedure and improving their relations to the public, they will be reduced to the level of the Rump of the Long Parliament and can scarcely hope to escape the fate that befell that discredited body.

The character of politics is determined to a large extent by the class of men who engage in political life and by the rules under which the game is played. In American politics, as in sport, there is an inordinate desire to win. Success is the sun-god of the American public. In order to attain party success a strong political organization has been built up under the direction and control of a class of expert politicians. To this organization there has been entrusted a large measure of political power. The party boss and the political machine are the natural and inevitable result of the professionalization of politics.

The average American politician is not a man of social or intellectual distinction, though fortunately, the intellectual type is increasing in numbers. He is usually a person of humble origin or a representative of the well-to-do middle class, who has worked himself up from the ranks of the party to a place of influence and power by reason of personal popularity or by means of skilful manipulation. He owes his position to his ability as a political organizer and his capacity to win elections. He is, almost without exception, an able, and, according to the ethics of the profession, also an honest, loyal-hearted man. But he can never afford to lose sight of the fact that he must lead his party to victory on pain of losing his position as a political leader. And in order to win, he is sometimes led, or even forced, to resort to doubtful means of accomplishing his ends. It is safe to assert that the ordinary politician does not regard the manipulation of the rules of the House, the packing of a committee, the gerrymander of a constituency, or the abuse of party patronage, as essentially reprehensible acts unworthy of a great political party. With him all such devices are merely tricks of the game, which either party is at liberty to play at the expense of the other. To work them successfully is an evidence of superior skill and not a mark of dishonour. The most serious penalty attached for such sharp practices is the certainty of retaliation when the opposition in turn comes into power. In brief, each political party feels justified in dishing its opponents.

The prevalence of this practice brings out clearly one of the inherent defects of the American system of government. No effective legal or constitutional machinery has been devised to check the abuses of partizanship within the law. The judiciary, it is true, can nullify all illegal acts of the government, but they have little or no control over parliamentary procedure or political campaigning. The framers of the constitution were evidently of the opinion that the elaborate system of checks and balances which they incorporated into the organic law would suffice to prevent not only the legal abuse of powers by the various organs of the State, but also the less obvious but more insidious evils of extreme partizanship. That system has undoubtedly defeated much hasty and ill-considered legislation on the part of an arbitrary and high-handed majority in Congress, but it has failed to protect the rights and liberties of a minority against the excesses of a victorious party which has gained control over the whole governmental organization. The rules of the House, and to a less extent of the Senate, have been powerless to secure to the defeated party a proper share in the determination of matters of State. In truth, the American system of government has failed to provide for a constitutional referee or referees to enforce the rules of the political game and to guarantee fair play as between the contending parties.

A few illustrations will serve to make the matter clear. Take, for example, the organization of the House of Representatives. Over the deliberations of this body, presides the Speaker. Nominally he is selected by the House, but, in reality, is chosen by a caucus of the dominant party. The qualifications for the office are not, primarily, dignity, urbanity, and impartiality, as is the case with the English Speaker, but rather the gifts and arts of a successful politician. He must be something more than a master of parliamentary rules and practice; he must be an influential member of the party and support all party measures. His election to the Speakership carries with it the practical leadership

of the party in the House. The Speaker occupies a dual position; he is the presiding officer of the House and its representative on all formal occasions; and he is also a leader of the dominant party in the chamber. In his former capacity he performs the same functions as the English Speaker; in the latter he assumes to play the part, though rather imperfectly, of the leader of the government in the House of Commons. Of these two rôles, the latter has in course of time become the more important. The gradual transformation of the Speaker from an impartial presiding officer into a party leader has been partly due to the internal disorganization of the House consequent upon the plethora of legislation and the multiplicity of committees, and partly also to the strict application of the principle of the separation of powers, which has shut off the Executive from Congress and prevented the President and members of the Cabinet from assuming that ascendancy in and over the deliberations of the House which their superior ability, expert knowledge, and official position would naturally command for them, as is the case with the ministry in the House of Commons. Political necessity demanded party leadership. The authority of the Speaker was called into requisition to save the House from falling into a state of chronic anarchy. Upon the Speaker was thrown the duty and responsibility of leading the House and putting through the party programme.

But a more unfortunate choice of leaders could scarcely have been made. The functions of Speaker as presiding officer and of party leader are absolutely incompatible. As chairman of the House, the Speaker should be a fair-minded parliamentary referee; as party leader he is captain of one of the rival teams. The combination of these two offices violates every canon of justice and equity. According to equitable principles, a suitor may not be a judge in his own case. But this sound principle finds little recognition in the conduct of the Speaker or in the procedure of the House. The two conflicting personalities of the Speaker,

the judicial and the partizan, have long been warring against one another for possession of his soul. Out of the struggle the partizan personality of Mr. Hyde has emerged victorious. As leader of the party the Speaker is responsible for the parliamentary tactics of the session, for the maintenance of party discipline, and for the passage of the legislative programme of the party. He is expected to outgeneral, and, if possible, to overthrow the forces of the opposition. His influence in the House and prominence in the counsels of the party depend upon his success as a party leader. A commanding Speaker, such as Reed or Cannon, is scarcely less powerful than the President himself; indeed, in respect to legislation he is much more influential. In many cases he can defeat or checkmate the policy of the Executive. It is this power of controlling the course of legislation which has enabled the Speaker to win and maintain his personal ascendancy in the House. The successive leaders of the Republican and Democratic parties have seized upon the chair of the Speaker and enthroned themselves in power as dictators of the House. The arbitrary power of the Speaker has well earned for him the title of Czar. His political opponents lie helpless before him, so long as he can command the faithful support of his fellow partizans. The only danger to his rule comes from within: in the possibility of revolt or internal dissensions in the party. But ordinarily he rules the House with a rod of iron. He systematically uses, and is expected to use, his office for personal and partizan purposes. His conduct is openly and flagrantly partizan. He promotes the bills of his friends, decides doubtful points of order in favour of his party, recognizes those only whom he wishes to speak, and votes and speaks on the floor of the House when occasion demands it. Defeat and closure are the fate of the opposition.

Formerly the whole organization of the House was designed to strengthen and assure the authority of the Speaker. His control over the committees was scarcely less effective than over the House. He selected the members

of all the committees and named the chairman of each. Through his power of appointment he was able to reward the fidelity of his friends, promote the discipline of his party, and penalize the presumptuous activity of his enemies. He was in a position to make or unmake the reputation of any member of the House. His influence on legislation was equally in evidence. He could settle the fate of many a bill by referring it to a favourable or adverse committee, according to his own secret will. As Chairman of the Committee on Rules he determined, to a large degree, the order of business in the House, and, what was even more important, what bills should receive parliamentary consideration. During the closing days of a session, when business was congested, his authority was almost absolute and unrestrained.

The recent revision of the procedure of the House has considerably impaired the autocracy of the Speaker. First, and most important of all, the Committee on Rules has been revolutionized: the Speaker has been removed from the committee, its membership has been enlarged, and the House itself has assumed the duty of choosing its members. Since the victory of the Democrats in the last election to the House, the powers of the Speaker have been further curtailed. The selection of the various committees of the House is now lodged in the hands of a Committee on Committees, the members of which are chosen by the House. An attempt has been made to withdraw the Speaker from the centre of the parliamentary arena by the appointment of the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means as floor leader of the party in the House. It would be a mistake, however, to believe that the Speaker has been reduced to the position of a mere presiding officer. He is still a party leader, and as such takes an active part in political matters outside the House as well as within. He is an influential, perhaps the most influential, member of the party caucus. Inside the House, he exercises a power and influence equal to, if not greater than, that of the floor leader. He may still leave the chair if he sees fit and engage

in a debate on the floor of the House. He continues to direct the course of congressional business from the chair, and actively assists, as formerly, in putting through the party programme for the session. His office is still used for the discomfiture of his political opponents. Outside the House, he ranks high in the counsels of the party and in the estimation of the public. In fact, there is no office in the gift of the nation to which he may not justly aspire by reason of faithful service and public distinction.

Although the Speaker has been robbed of much of his autocratic power, the position of the minority party in the House has been bettered but little, if any, by the recent changes. There has been a change of masters but not of political principles or practices. The powers of the Speaker as a party leader have been put into commission. They have been assumed by the caucus or delegated by it to a steering committee. The caucus determines the policy of the party and arranges in advance the course of legislation. The Committee on Committees finds places for faithful party henchmen on all important committees. The floor leader of the party then proceeds, with the able coöperation of the Speaker, to railroad through the House the various party measures, according to the most approved partisan methods. So far as the minority are concerned, the old principles of despotism still reign supreme. The tyranny of an oligarchy has been substituted for the despotism of a Czar; that is all. The minority are still ground down under the heels of the majority. They cry out against the abuses of congressional procedure, but their protests are as unheeded as of yore. "The right of the minority," declared the late Speaker Reed, "is to draw its salary, and its function is to make a quorum." And notwithstanding the bitter complaints of members, the changes in party ascendancy and the modification in the rules of the House, the rights of the minority have not extended much beyond the limits so aptly described by the late statesman from Maine.

In truth, the House of Representatives has ceased to be a deliberative body. It is no longer the high court of the nation in which all private grievances may be voiced and all public questions be fairly discussed. In place of an open parliament, there has been set up the decision of a pledge-bound caucus, the ruling of a partisan speaker, and the manipulation of secret committees. Representative government, according to English forms and principles, has practically disappeared from the lower chamber. Seldom, if ever, does the House now attempt to decide any great issue in open assembly after free and unlimited debate. Government by caucus and committee is the practice.

The organization and procedure of the committees are characterized by the same arbitrary partizanship. The chairmen of the several committees are carefully selected from among the leading members of the dominant party. Within the committee, the chairman seeks to exercise an authority somewhat similar to that of the Speaker over the House. He is distinctly a party man, and uses his position for party purposes. All the important committees are judiciously packed with faithful party men. The minority are given representation on all committees, but are afforded but little opportunity of determining the course of legislation. Measures favoured by the majority are reported to the House in due course, whereas the bills of the minority are either killed in committee or adversely reported. The minority in a committee are in an even more helpless position than in the House, since they have no opportunity of giving publicity to their opinions. The meetings of the committee are in most cases secret. Seldom is the public fully informed as to the deliberations of these quiet conclaves. For the most part, the outside public is dependent for its faulty information on vague rumours or the indiscretion of some indignant or loquacious member. The privacy of the committees has almost destroyed the principle of the responsibility of a representative to his constituents. Under these circumstances it is little wonder



that the opinion is gaining ground that representative government is a failure. Secrecy has bred suspicion on the part of the public,—a suspicion which only the full publicity of parliamentary procedure can effectively remove.

But it is not only in respect to the organization and procedure of the legislative department of the government that the absence of a constitutional umpire results in the abuse of political powers. The Executive is subject equally to the same perverse influences.

The framers of the constitution intended to make of the President a great commanding figure above the turmoil of party politics, a worthy representative of the whole nation. But this design was soon defeated by the bitterness of the partizan struggles which attended the early years of the republic. The presidency became the grand prize of aspiring political leaders. The constitution had entrusted the most extensive powers to the President, far exceeding those possessed by any constitutional monarch, and the political leaders of the day were not slow to perceive the paramount importance of securing control of the administration. The introduction of the spoils system marked the transformation of the President from a national representative into a party leader. The system of national conventions, the principle of popular election, the nationalization of party organizations, the growth of political patronage, and the multiplication of offices, have all combined to develop the power and authority of the President within the party. Only in respect to foreign affairs has the President maintained the former tradition of a national Executive. In domestic affairs, save in the matter of social relations, the tradition has long since fallen into abeyance. By the public at large the President is regarded as essentially a party officer and a party leader. A protest against the growing practice of presidential campaigning is sometimes raised by a Mugwump, on the ground that it tends to degrade the dignity of the office, but the protest meets with but a feeble response on the part of the public. Even the recent exchange of Billings-

gate compliments between rival candidates for the presidency appears to have occasioned more amusement than humiliation to the nation at large. The electorate have come to recognize that the exigencies of party politics force the President, whether willingly or unwillingly, into the political arena in defence of his administration. The primal law of self-preservation is perhaps stronger among politicians than in any other class of the community.

The position of the President is, in fact, both difficult and dangerous, difficult in so far as he endeavours to maintain a strictly national character in the face of adverse party influences, and dangerous in so far as he treats his high office as a mere agency for promoting partizan ends and distributing liberal patronage. There is in the presidential office much the same incompatibility of functions as in the chair of the Speaker. There is the same tendency, amounting almost to a necessity, for the President to subordinate the high duties of his office as chief executive of the nation to insistent demands of party policy. He is oftentimes tempted to forget that he is the representative of all the people, and not of one political faction only. He is prone to act as a mere politician, and can scarcely be blamed for so acting since he is treated as such. As a party leader he is frequently called upon to resort to devious devices which, as an independent and high-minded President, he would not think of countenancing. As President of the United States it is his duty to see that the laws are faithfully observed, but as a skilful politician he may find it to his interest to suspend the operation of the law in some cases in favour of his political friends and supporters. It should be his aim as chief executive to afford to the electorate the fullest opportunity of expressing a free and independent judgement upon the course of political events, but as a party leader he will find it to his advantage to shut his eyes to, if not openly approve, the gerrymandering of constituencies, the abuse of political patronage, the packing of national conventions, the manipulation of presidential primaries, the levying of campaign contributions upon

protected and corporate interests, and many other insidious artifices for defeating the public will and corrupting the purity of the political institutions of the country. He is constantly in a strait betwixt public duty and party loyalty. And, unfortunately for the American people, his freedom of choice is not subject to that high restraining influence which, under the cabinet system of government, is exercisable by an impartial constitutional ruler such as the King in England, the President in France, or the Governor-General in the British Colonies. The King is the public censor to whom the Prime Minister must submit the policy and the acts of the administration. But in the United States there is no constitutional censor, no titular representative of the national conscience. The President is made a judge over his own acts. He is his own father confessor. During his term of office he is practically independent of Congress and the electorate alike. Politically he is responsible only to his own party for the conduct of the administration. To the nation at large he owes only a moral obligation which the electorate have no effective means of enforcing during his term of office, however effective that obligation may be made on election day.

In final analysis, the political liberty of the nation depends, not upon constitutional guarantees of legal rights, but upon the independence and integrity of the electorate. Should the moral fibre of the American people ever become weakened, it would be easy for the presidency to develop, under a strong-willed ruler, into an autocracy, or, under a weak and corrupt Executive, to degenerate into a mere party appanage. Such a President would be little better than a Roman emperor of the green or blue faction.

Both, then, in respect to the organization of the Executive and the procedure of the popular chamber, do we find a fundamental difference in the character of the English and American constitutions. In the English constitution, no legal provisions can be found to protect the civil and religious rights of the citizen against the arbitrary action of parliament. On the other hand, a system of constitutional

conventions has been developed by which the political liberties of the nation are protected against the possible abuse of powers on the part of a dominant faction. But the reverse is the case in the United States. The American constitution contains the most elaborate guarantees of the civil and political rights of American citizens against any possible violation on the part of Congress or the Executive, but it signally fails to afford any adequate protection against the still greater danger of the political abuse of powers by self-seeking politicians within the terms of the constitution. In short, the American constitution has aimed at the protection of the legal rights of citizens; the English, at the preservation of political liberties. If the political liberties of British subjects are once assured in practice, the English believe that the maintenance of their legal rights will ensue as a matter of course. The rights of person and property under this system rest, however, not upon the basis of constitutional limitations as to due process of law or the impairment of the obligation of a contract, but upon the more solid foundation of national justice and an enlightened public opinion. So far as the actual operations of government are concerned, the people of England seem to secure much more satisfactory results from their simple constitution than their American kinsmen from their much more elaborate instrument of government.

The question then arises, cannot some means be devised to correct this manifest defect in the American constitution? So far as the abuse of power in the legislature is concerned, the difficulty could be solved by a simple change in the practice of the House, by which the Speaker would be divested of his political functions and restored to his former position of an impartial presiding officer. It is extremely doubtful, however, if the Speaker would voluntarily surrender his present powers; and it is even more unlikely that the majority would of their own free will initiate a change in the rules of the House by which they would lose the special advantages of controlling the business of the country from the Speaker's desk. Such a modification of congressional

procedure will only take place as a result of strong public feeling. The recent proposal of President Taft to permit members of the Cabinet to speak in Congress will, if adopted, undoubtedly affect somewhat adversely the political powers of the Speaker, by throwing some of the responsibility for initiating and passing legislation upon the Executive. But so long as the principle of the separation of powers prevails, ultimate responsibility for legislation must rest with the Speaker or such other leader as the House may select.

The problem in the case of the Executive is much more serious. The English principle of a royal referee is manifestly incompatible with American institutions. The theory of the separation of powers bars the way to any effective control by Congress over the Executive in matters of administration. The constitution is silent; Congress is helpless. The democracy of the country must itself provide the means of checking the malevolent humours of a partizan President. Will it be equal to this task, as it has been to the many serious problems of the past?

It must be admitted that the democracy of the United States, as compared with that of England, is singularly weak and inefficient during the term of the President. The personal guarantees of the federal and state constitutions have lulled the American public into a state of false security. The electors give themselves over to business or the pursuit of pleasure. From time to time they are suddenly aroused from political sleep by the incompetence and corruption in high places which is revealed before their eyes. When the day of election draws near they rise in righteous indignation and smite the Philistines who have been despoiling the land. The verdict of the polls is decisive for the time being. But the fear of the electorate is soon forgotten by the arrant politician. The old abuses soon creep back into the administration. The public is deceived once more. Much of the suspicion which the people entertain of the Executive and legislature is undoubtedly due to this general feeling of helplessness in the face of such recurrent political conditions. The government of the country has apparently

passed out of their hands into the control of a political machine. They must feebly or fretfully stand aside and witness their own undoing. What is required is, not only a permanent awaking of the political consciousness of the nation, but also some political machinery by which the force of public opinion may be made effective between elections as well as on polling day. Such an instrumentality may possibly be found in the Referendum and the Recall. With these powerful weapons in their hands the new democracy can stand guard over their own political liberties and prevent any invasion of their rights or abuse of powers on the part of their agents. The proceedings of the legislature and the conduct of the Executive will be subject to careful scrutiny at all times. The nation itself will attempt to referee the game between the political parties.

But whether the principle of popular constitutional review will ever prove as successful in practice as the English constitutional system, is exceedingly doubtful. The spectators on the side lines can scarcely be expected to be as impartial in their judgement or as familiar with the rules of the game as the official umpire on the field. Too often the bleachers will be found to be bitterly partizan in their attitude and most intolerant of the rights of the weaker or opposing team. Unfortunately the temper of the electorate partakes too largely of the spirit of the bleachers. The democracy of America is often fretful and intemperate in its political activities. It has not yet acquired the habit of liberality of judgement and strong self-control. It is apt to be intolerant of the opinions of the minority.

The task of popular arbitrament is rendered all the more difficult by reason of the multiplicity of elections. The public are becoming satiated with politics. Through sheer weariness they are assuming an attitude of passive resistance, and in increasing numbers refuse to be led or driven to the polls. Notwithstanding the spectacular character of the recent presidential contest, a smaller proportion of the voters bothered to go to the polls than in the prosaic election of 1908. The same tendency has been revealed in the primary

and state elections. Even in the West, in the recent referenda in Oregon and Washington, some of the most important constitutional measures were adopted by a small minority of the electorate. Democracy appears to have overrun itself. The indifference of the public threatens to defeat the very purpose of the reformers in seeking to set up the direct rule of the people.

But, however uncertain the outcome, the experiment of entrusting the people with political power is well worth trying. It will put the democracy of the country to the severest test. It will impose on the electorate a heavier public burden than has been assumed by the democracy of any other country. It will demand of the nation a higher moral character and political capacity than was to be found in Athens in her palmyest days. It will determine the truth or falsity of the principle of pure democracy.

It is fortunate, indeed, that the experiment is now being tested on a small scale in some of the progressive Western States. Thus far the results have been generally encouraging; politics have been purified, a higher class of men have been drawn into the service of the State, and many legislative and administrative reforms have been brought about. But some dangerous tendencies are already in evidence. The so-called progressives have not hesitated in many cases to employ the same unscrupulous methods as were used by the old machine. Justice has been perverted to obtain party ends. The ultimate outcome is still in doubt. Unless the new democracy can free itself from the harmful traditions of the old party organizations and develop in the electorate an independent and judicial habit of mind, the last state of the country may be worse than the present. If, however, the experiment proves the success which its Western supporters maintain, it can then be applied with greater assurance to the more difficult and complex organization of the federal government.

C. D. ALLIN

## THE FARM LABOUR PROBLEM

**T**H**ERE** is no other problem before the Canadian farmer of such magnitude as that of farm labour. It has a direct bearing on land values, affects crop production, makes farming operations difficult, hampers rural improvement, drives the young people from the land, destroys the reputation of the farming community, limits the resources of national wealth, and increases the cost of food supplies. The scarcity of farm help has produced an economic crisis in the history of Canadian agriculture. With each recurring season conditions seem to be getting worse. While, from time to time, more land is brought under cultivation, the proportion of the population devoted to the production of food supplies steadily declines. It is a matter of common observation that in the older settled districts of this country the incompetent, costly and meagre farm help is the direct cause of large and increasing areas being removed from profitable cultivation. In far too many instances the management of the average farm is travelling in a vicious circle.

It is generally agreed that Canada is a country which possesses almost inexhaustible agricultural resources. Nature has through countless ages stored in the soil plant food of almost infinite commercial value. There is arable and pasture land enough in Canada, if it were under intensive cultivation, to produce abundance of food for all the millions of people who dwell under the British flag. If this be true, or only in a measure true, there seems to be no fundamental reason for a shortage of food supplies; and yet the tendency of the cost of living is upward, ever upward.

It is true that only a portion of the available arable land in this country is occupied, while there are numerous and formidable obstructions stopping the flow of the tide of distribution; but there must be production before there can



be distribution. It is in this latter respect that the country is largely at fault. Intensive systems of cultivation are not the rule and practice of more than a small part of the farming community. The systems of soil management and cultivation that prevail are, in the aggregate, the very antithesis of intensive farming, while the crops secured from a given area are correspondingly poor in quality and small in quantity. The reason for this condition, which unfortunately is general throughout the country, is not so much the ignorance of modern scientific teaching, or the lack of business acumen on the part of the farmer, as it is the unreliable character and meagreness of farm help. A cultivator of the soil who would reduce his work to an intensive or even semi-intensive system under existing conditions must have surplus capital and rare courage.

Mr. J. H. Grisdale, Director of the Dominion Experimental Farms, writes: "The average Canadian farmer spent in 1912 about \$10.50 per acre in wages on his farm. He reaped crops to the value of \$16.50 per acre; leaving a profit of \$6.50 per acre. Compare with this the balance of profit secured at the Experimental Farm at Ottawa. With no special advantage of soil or climate, and using no fertilizers except barnyard manure produced on the farm, a net profit of \$33.70 per acre—which is five times the profit of the average farmer, was secured. With a net expenditure of \$11.77 per acre on cultural operations in a scientific and thorough manner, the crops produced averaged a net return of \$45.77 per acre."

In the course of his address on "Improving Canadian Agriculture," as published in the Third Annual Report of the Commission of Conservation, 1912, Dr. James W. Robertson said: "The field crops in Canada last year had a value, at the places of production, of \$565,000,000. This amount could be doubled in ten years if all the farmers would adopt and follow the systems and methods that were followed on the best 10 per cent. of the 1,212 farms examined for the Commission of Conservation." Dr. Robertson credits Dr. C. C. James with the statement that "Ontario has entered upon

a great upward movement in its agriculture." Dr. Robertson adds that, "If they can have the work they are already carrying on extended, the crops of Ontario will be doubled in value in ten years." In 1911 the field crops of Ontario were worth \$193,000,000. If the field crops are doubled, it would mean an increase of about \$1,100 in the revenue from this source for each farm.

There are a few other facts in this connexion which may be taken from the 1912 Report of the Commission of Conservation, for example: "The yield of the crops per acre in Canada on the whole is not satisfactory." "In Nova Scotia only 8 per cent of the farmers followed any systematic rotation of crops; in Prince Edward Island 4 per cent. on a small part of the farm; in New Brunswick 13 per cent.; in Quebec only 4 per cent. and in Ontario 53 per cent." "In the Province of Nova Scotia 49 per cent. of the farmers, whose farms were examined, report larger yields than they had ten years ago. From Prince Edward Island 51 per cent. report increases dating from fifteen to eighteen years ago. In New Brunswick 24 per cent. report an increase, and 12 per cent. a decrease. In Quebec 39 per cent. report an increase, and 4 per cent. a decrease. In Ontario, in good sections, 24 per cent. report an increase of 50 per cent. in their crops as compared with ten years ago. Only 4 per cent. of those examined report a decrease. In Manitoba not one farmer reports an increase in the yield per acre and 46 per cent. report an actual decrease. The decrease of yield per acre in that province must be concurrent with exhaustion of fertility." "Carelessness, neglect, and general shiftlessness were evident on many farms." "The annual losses from weeds, insects, and plant diseases, are, according to the judgment of the farmers themselves, between \$75 and \$100 per farm." "In some districts there are farms now abandoned; the people were pushed off the land by the prevalence of weeds."

What do these extracts from the reports quoted mean? They illustrate a fact, which is patent to every observer, that crop production in Canada is generally away below what it

should be, that clean methods of cultivation and systematic rotation of crops are followed by few of the farmers of this country, that carelessness and shiftlessness in even the best counties are too apparent to indicate a thrifty people and a prosperous community, and that there is a serious and a threatening menace from the multiplication of weed pests. May not all these conditions be attributable to a shortage of farm labour?

There is no disagreement among agricultural experts regarding the possibility of increasing the crop yields. If good seed be sown, thorough tillage practised, a proper system of crop rotation followed, and sufficient fertilizer added to the soil, there is no doubt that the aggregate in crop yields would be enormously increased. If these conditions were met in the province of Ontario alone, those who are in a position to estimate the results are confident in the belief that the yields of grain, roots, meat, dairy products, potatoes, and fruits, from the fields and farms of this province may be increased easily fourfold or more without adding a single acre to the areas that are now, or have been, under cultivation. If this is true, why do the farmers of the country who have received instruction from all the available sources and have access to all the data in respect to modern scientific methods fail to produce the results of which the soil is admittedly capable? The difficulty is the lack of farm labour. It becomes, therefore, not merely a personal question with the farmer, although he feels it perhaps more acutely than anyone else, it is, in fact, a national question and concerns the responsible ministers of the government, the provincial legislators, and Parliament itself, because it hampers the development of the nation's greatest source of wealth, and curtails the advancement of industry, commerce, and all the attributes of social and intellectual excellence derived therefrom.

The rural labour famine is felt in all its severity, not only in the Maritime Provinces and in Ontario, but in British Columbia, and at certain seasons of the year in the central provinces of the West also. Indirectly it is felt in every

town market-place and on every city street. Let the unprejudiced observer go out into the country and study the conditions as he finds them. In some of the best counties in many of the older sections of the country he will discover the same conditions that were found by the investigators who made a survey of many farms in each province for the Commission of Conservation. Noxious weeds are gaining ground and are over-running the most fertile fields, much land is in grass, while hundreds of orchards show signs of neglect and are infested with disease. The fields in crop are often indifferently cultivated. Crops are put in too late and harvested late. Insufficient preparation of the soil, poor cultivation, late planting, and late harvesting mean inferior yields, both as to quality and quantity. The farm buildings and fences show unmistakably the effects of long use coupled with neglect. The farmers cannot get the men to assist them to take care of their orchards, to cultivate the soil, or to sow and reap the crops, while carpenters, masons, and other rural mechanics are so few in number that it is impossible for them to keep up with the most pressing demands. They are not, as a rule, competent workmen and are costly in the extreme. There are thousands of acres that require tile drainage, but how is this work to be done when there are no men available to open the drains or lay the tile?

There are many excellent farms in Canada in which a large amount of capital has been invested which are to-day yielding to their owners scarcely more than a bare living, simply because one man cannot do all the work needed to make each of these farms profitable. No man can work 100 or more acres alone and do it profitably. When he is working with all his might and is physically exhausted at the end of every day, it is impossible for him to deal mentally with the countless number of problems that present themselves for solution. His intellect is anything but keen, his observation faulty, and his outlook circumscribed. He has no time or strength to keep things about the place neat or tidy; and the result is that after a few years he finds himself indifferent to

his surroundings and incapable of improving them. Such a policy, when pursued by force of circumstances, reduces a farmer and his family to a condition scarcely less reprehensible than slavery. The vicious circle soon becomes apparent. Weeds gain the upperhand, soil moisture is depleted, crops are poor, there is less food for live stock, and no money to buy supplementary foods, the buildings become dilapidated, and necessary improvements are not made, makeshifts in breeding stock are resorted to, the live stock on the farm declines in value, more hay, straw, and grain are sold off the farm, the annual yield of manure is insufficient at best and becomes less, crop rotations are abandoned and profitable results forfeited.

The under-manned farm becomes a source of worry to its owner, a detriment to the community, and a drag on the State. There are scores of farmers in Canada who are land-poor. Under the conditions that prevail, their hands are tied. They are helpless, notwithstanding their better knowledge of agriculture, for they have neither the money nor the strength to develop their holdings. Under these conditions it seems like a waste of energy and of public money to carry on aggressive educational effort. Without an adequate supply of labour, agriculture is a hopeless industry. What is the use of spending money on farmers' institutes, short courses in agriculture, field and orchard demonstrations, when the farmer cannot get the help to do the necessary work? It is a poor time to preach repentance to a social outcast when his body is covered with filth and clothed in rags, when he is shivering with cold or starving. His immediate necessities are so pressing that he cannot consider the supreme need of his life. He must be warmed, washed, clothed, and fed, and then his ears are open to hear the "glad tidings." So it is with the farmer. Those in authority are working at the wrong end of the tangled skein. Make it possible first for the farmer to receive adequate help, and then show him how to make his farm more remunerative to himself and more profitable to the community.

It is human nature, and political, and government nature also, to do the things that are easiest and procrastinate about the hard things until they become imperative. It is so much easier, for example, to preach peace to women and children, than it is to go out into the streets and highways and recruit a battalion of soldiers. It is no trouble to send out lecturers and demonstrators by the score to tell, and show, farmers how to improve their methods; but the seed sown falls on stony ground. The real need among the farmers of Canada is not so easily supplied. What they want is manual labour, and plenty of it, and then they will be able to put their knowledge into practice.

What are the causes that have led to the present aggravating and perplexing condition of labour scarcity? If we strike out of our list those causes that are common to all countries and consider the situation in Canada alone, it is clear that we shall have a better grasp of the whole question as it presents itself here.

The first cause is too much striving for industrial development. Since the time of Canadian Confederation, the trend of political policy and of legislation has been to encourage the building of smoke-stacks and the growth of towns; consequently there has been an unmistakable shift of population from the rural districts to the urban centres. This movement varies, from time to time, in its intensity, but it is practically continuous.

The second cause for the rural labour scarcity is our unpractical systems of education. We are, in practice, still clinging to the idea of the ancient philosophers, who taught that it is beneath the dignity of a man of education and ability to do any useful thing. We hasten to acknowledge our inconsistency, but the flavour of the classics of antiquity still perfumes our lips and lies like a sweet morsel under our tongues. Stern necessity has insisted on compromise, while our educational leaders have responded by framing a school system where the public school feeds the high school, and the high school feeds the university, and they all drain the farm.

The whole educational energy of the country has been too largely employed to create a few professional men. During recent years a change for the better has been made. Technical education, including instruction in agriculture and household science, has had a beginning; but the public schools of country and city alike—the schools where seven-eighths of the people receive their whole school training—are still governed by regulations and methods which are planned for and are applicable to those who expect to work out their careers away from the land.

A third cause for the rural labour scarcity is the lure of the West. There men may still grow rich on the accumulated stores of plant food nature has put into the soil. Land speculation, based on the unknown richness of the virgin soil, is rife, while millions of British and foreign gold are poured annually into the West. Before those provinces were opened for rapid settlement, our ambition as a nation was to excel industrially. We made great sacrifices for this purpose. Every possible inducement was offered to get the men on the farms to send their sons to build factories, and transfer the industries of the rural home and the village to the large towns and cities. Then, when the lands of the West became available, the appeal was made again, not to clerks and factory hands, but to farmers, to farmers' sons, and to rural laborers to go West and grow up with the country. They have gone by thousands. They are the best men there. They have redeemed, in all probability, that vast territory for our race and flag. No matter now how many foreigners may come, the backbone of the community is already formed. It is strong and cannot be broken so long as the vitality of the race remains unimpaired. It consists of bone of our bone, and blood of our blood. "Jack Canuck rules the West," and the whole country glories in that fact; but, in the meantime, it looks as though rural Ontario and the rural districts of the provinces by the sea may be bled to death. Our fathers were pioneers and our sons also, but we must have hired labourers to help us to do the work that keeps the country

growing and the machinery of commerce and industry full-charged and profitably employed. It is a thrilling spectacle to see seven or eight million people take possession of half a continent, especially when they have the courage and the self-confidence that insures ultimate success; but the strain is often severe. Under these circumstances it is wonderful what patience the people exercise on behalf of those who are, for the time being, placed in positions of responsibility. Why should the incapacity or indifference of public servants be allowed, even for the space of one hour, to render the condition of any portion of the people unendurable?

Is the farmer himself in any way to blame for the scarcity of farm help? In a measure he is. There is fault on all sides. In many instances the farmer is too much of a fatalist and too little of a business man. Looking at the situation in its larger aspects, it is clear that in perhaps the vast majority of cases the methods of farm practice permit a farmer to employ hired labour for only four or five months in the year. Where such practice prevails there is no hope for a solution of the labour problem. Hired labourers will not, and cannot, live on the wages earned during only a few months in the summer. The risk of finding suitable employment for the other seven or eight months of the year is too hazardous. No self-respecting man will take this risk unless forced to do it by necessity. The men who employ labour for twelve months in the year are agreed that they have less trouble in getting enough hired labour and good labour for the whole year than for part of it only. This fact suggests a partial solution that is wholly within the means of the men who own and cultivate the soil. They should increase the quantity and quality of their live stock and provide employment for their hired men throughout the twelve months of the year. It is not always possible to get men who are skilled in farm work and they must be taught how to do many things. Where the hired help remains inefficient, it is because of the lack of proper instruction. Here, again, the farmer often fails. He is a poor teacher when



he is unskilled himself. Sometimes, too, the absence of system in farm management produces friction between the farmer and his employees. The hours of labour for each season are not carefully worked out and thoroughly understood. The chores, stock-feeding, milking, instead of being extra time, should be counted in the regular hours of work. Tasks that can be done under cover should be reserved for rainy days. A fair day's work should be insisted on, and loafing ought not to be tolerated. It must be admitted that many farmers set their employees bad examples. They work very hard for a few months and then loaf the balance of the year. When the day's work is done the help should be free to do as they please. The encouragement of rural sports and pastimes assists materially in keeping the workers contented and happy, and sweetens their toil. When hired men are treated with consideration they will, as a rule, show their gratitude to their employer by making themselves invaluable to him. It is in one or more of these respects that some farmers fail to do their duty, thus contributing their share towards rendering the employment of hired help difficult.

There is a good deal of misapprehension in public and agricultural circles regarding the farm labour problem. It is admittedly one of the most annoying of the difficulties with which agriculturists have to contend; but that it is an unsolvable problem no one who has studied it at all thoroughly believes. The farm labour problem may be considered an economic disease. Are there any remedies? Yes, there are public remedies, coöperative remedies, social remedies, and remedies that the farmer himself may provide. What is needed is a comprehensive recognition of the conditions by the people of Canada, and then the coöperation of the forces controlled by the government, both federal and provincial, with the men on the land who need the labourers. While there are thousands of people in the large towns and cities of Canada and Great Britain who are seeking employment, and at the same time there are vast areas of agricultural land calling loudly for labourers, there can be no

hopelessness in the situation. The whole question is, How shall we bring the people who want work to the fields where workers are required?

The condition of the poor people in the congested centres of population is often pitiful. They live altogether too close to the line where starvation stalks and crime and destitution reign. They are the subjects of charity and the objects of commiseration and social anxiety. Their poverty is a blot on our civilization, and yet we fail in the solution of our social problems by the multiplication of slums in our cities and by the abandonment of rich areas of productive soils merely because there are not the people available to cultivate them. It is futile to say that these people who are born and reared under the conditions that prevail in certain of our larger cities are of no use on the land. It is inhuman to suggest there is no hope for them. There is, on the other hand, abundance of evidence to prove that by a short preliminary training or by proper supervision and instruction for the first year or two of their experience in the open country, they can be made effective and wholly satisfactory labourers. It is the business of the government to provide for the instruction of these people so that they may not only be able to earn livings for themselves, but that they may also be of some value to the great industry of agriculture which stands so much in need of their assistance.

The people who do the manual labour on the farms are not the type of people who can withstand the lure of the towns and cities. It is only to be expected that they would be in the vanguard of the exodus of the rural population, which is characteristic of every civilized country in the age in which we live. The people who have the fewest ties can move the easiest. Those who are depending solely on their two hands for their living are not at best a stable class of workers. They are here to-day and they are gone to-morrow. They fluctuate with the demand. It is to this class that the manufacturing industries make their strongest appeal. The strange thing is that the so-called unskilled labourer should

be willing to do the hardest kind of drudgery in a factory every day in the week and live under the most uncomfortable conditions in the city rather than work shorter hours at a greater variety of tasks, and live under the more wholesome conditions that prevail on the average farm. The reason seems to be because he is happier when in personal contact with a number of his kind. He can work with them or play with them, feast with them or starve with them. When the whistle blows at night his task is done, and he is free to be a fool or a saint till morning. He lives for what he can eat and drink and the pleasures that come to him between the hours of labour and sleep.

Among the remedies suggested are: first, the restoration of the balance between agricultural and industrial development; secondly, the promotion of vocational training and education in rural schools and in county high schools set apart for the purpose, the development of demonstration farms in municipalities, and increased emphasis on the teaching of agricultural economics coördinating with the teaching of science in agricultural colleges; and thirdly, the vigorous championship of its own farming opportunities and agricultural resources by each province. These are remedies that are general in character, but at the same time vital. They may be provided through properly constituted authority by force of public opinion.

But the work of the government of the country should not stop there. Immigration should be gone after with constantly increasing determination by the provincial authorities. Labour colonies should be established on Canadian soil. Labour schools might be organized by the provincial governments on Canadian farms where Old Country boys and girls could be taught the elements of agriculture and how to perform the simplest mechanical tasks about the farm. These farm schools would become distributing stations for youthful farm help in each local centre. One reliable farmer could also be found in each township who could make it his business to train each year eight or ten young men,

and perhaps two or more young women, in farm work, and find permanent employment for them among his neighbours. The government bonus for this work need not be large.

The farmers of each county might coöperate in securing help from the Old Country by authorizing the county council to engage booking agents in Great Britain to act for them. The expenses incurred would be paid, first, by the farmers who were provided with men and women workers, and, ultimately, taken out of the wages of the workers themselves. Each and every county council in Ontario, for example, might employ this method to great advantage. The work should be carried on by coöperation between the county council and the provincial Immigration Bureau.

Old Country tenant farmers and Canadian city men who would like to go into farming should be encouraged to rent or buy farms in the longer settled districts of the country and receive the advice and assistance of government agricultural specialists for two or three years, until they were able to manage alone. There are scores of people in these classes who would be an acquisition to the rural districts and who would gladly go into farming in Canada if they were encouraged to do so. In many instances they would make better farmers than many of those who now occupy the soil.

Everything that will help to make rural life more interesting and more attractive will help also to make the solution of the farm labour problem easier. The beautification of the country, improved and more intensive systems of soil culture, the development of literary, musical, and athletic entertainments and pastimes, the improvement of rural highways, the extension of the telephone lines, free rural mail delivery and parcel-post,—in brief, everything that counts in bringing about a more profitable farm practice and the social betterment of rural people will aid directly and materially in adding to the number of people living on the land, and in solving the problem of farm labour.

The farmer is the individual most concerned. He can do far more than he is doing to solve his special problems;

but he is, in countless numbers of instances, disheartened. Because of his low morale he is not fighting the battle to win. His courage and his resource are at a discount. He cannot make his farming operations pay because his soil has been depleted of its virgin fertility, and no labour is available, that he thinks he can afford to hire, to help him to put in and harvest his crops. He cannot sell his farm for a reasonable price, as there are no buyers. Every article he buys costs him more than it did a few years ago. He believes he is the victim of a cruel and relentless fate. This is the man who needs help. The personal equation, however, must be taken into account. If the farmer is under forty years of age or has a son or two to give him hope, he will put up a good fight, and if properly directed and assisted he will win; but if he is feeling weary with protracted toil, his condition is almost hopeless. Farmers are notoriously poor business men and worse book-keepers. It takes them a long time to realize the value and importance of a profit and loss account. They do not readily change their methods or improve their practice. Wages paid to the labourers are, in their opinion, dead loss. The increase of horse and mechanical power mean only added expense, and better machinery merely more bills payable to meet.

Such is the farm labour problem sketched in outline. It is not simple, neither is it incapable of solution. It is a shame to ignore it, or to allow time alone to work out a possible remedy. The instincts of constructive statesmanship should lead those in authority to grapple with it now and make its immediate solution their first consideration. The needs of the country demand it; the time to take action is opportune, while the agricultural destiny of Canada is in the balance. Is the city labourer's child to feel the pinch of hunger? Shall the cry of the rural multitude be heard in vain?

WALTER JAMES BROWN

## A BREVIARY OF THE FIELDS

While the chill dews lie grey upon the sward,  
And the tired world yet sleeps, from grief set free,  
The white-throat's plaintive matins rise, "Oh, Lord,  
Pity me, pity me."

The sunlight fills the east; the shadows fly,  
The sad world wakes, again to do and bear.  
"Cheer up; wake up!" their lauds the robins cry;  
"Work, work,"—for work is prayer.

Mid-morn bring tierce, third of the blessed hours,  
And summer's orisons are carried on  
By warbling goldfinches, like living flowers,  
Till the sweet chimes at noon,

The angelus bells, when "Hail" is said again  
To her most bless'd, whose heart the sword pierced through;  
And with its soft jarred note, half joy, half pain,  
The blue-bird passes, wearing Mary's blue.

Nones,—'tis the hour when Christ died on the cross  
That man's long strife with man and God might cease;  
See love's own colour where the elm boughs toss!  
It is the red-bird! Listen! He says "Peace."

Vespers! Along the fields a level glow,  
The humble happy things God looks upon  
With love—even the sparrows—trilling low,  
Offer their simple, tender orison.

And last there comes—for seven bless'd hours there are—  
When the night wind says to the pine-trees, "Hush,"  
Compline; with after glow and evening star,  
And "Holy, holy," sings the hermit-thrush.

MAUD GOING

## THE CIVIL SERVICE

THERE is no sound reason why the business of the people, the government of the country, should not be conducted by modern methods; why the principles of organization and efficiency, which have been successfully adopted in business establishments, should not be applied to the administration of the affairs of the nation. It is a laudable ambition for Canada that it should lay the foundation for a great technical service, into which the best talent of the country might be drawn, with opportunity to develop, so that a few years hence this country would be able to put forward a group of thoroughly trained men equal to those in any other service. To say that there is no such service to-day in Canada does not imply that we lack men of ability and experience. There are many such in the federal service at Ottawa, but they are scattered through a dozen different departments, without cohesion or coöperation. There is little in the technical branches of the government, as they exist to-day, to attract a young man of ambition. Could we, however, consolidate the scattered groups into a strong technical force, we would create a power which would draw into the service of the country many of the young men of talent, who now drift into private employment, or are driven abroad through lack of opportunity in their own country.

Every street corner can produce an orator to boast of Canada's greatness. How many talk of its responsibilities? We are all pretty much of one mind in the conviction that we have a country of vast natural resources; and, fortunately for us, a rigorous climate has done much to keep them intact. We hold a strategic position in the world of commerce. There are vast problems of development ahead of us; and with a large revenue and the optimism of a young people, we are plunging into these problems before

they have been thoroughly investigated and the data collected and studied. Hence we find ourselves entangled in such great projects as a National Transcontinental Railway, a Hudson Bay Railway, a deeper Welland Canal, and a Georgian Bay Canal. These gigantic problems demand expert knowledge and technical efficiency of the highest order, with a force trained and organized to handle such intricate questions. But still these problems keep rolling up, while the unorganized technical officers of the country race behind, overlapping in one direction, dropping behind in another, always trying, with inadequate means, to pick up here and there some data bearing on the questions as they are pushed forward.

Our greatest problem is probably that of transportation. Our canals penetrate from the Atlantic coast well in towards the backbone of the country. They can only be operated for six or seven months each year, and, even then, not only without profit, but at considerable cost to the State; a policy with which no one can quarrel. But what about the other five or six months when all our freight must be carried by the railways, with their rates necessarily higher than obtainable by water? The situation is even worse on account of the transcontinental lines east of Winnipeg passing through several hundred miles of non-traffic producing territory. The upkeep of railways through that territory must naturally fall upon the business obtained from traffic producing areas.

The rapid development of Canada's vast interior will preclude any possibility of holding back trade for the more favourable transportation facilities which the summer season offers through the Lakes from Fort William eastward. A problem, therefore, well worthy of consideration is whether it is feasible for Canada to make use of its National Transcontinental Railway now under construction from Winnipeg to the Atlantic, and to operate it in such a way that the other great railways may use that road so as to enable them to put into effect freight rates on farm products



that would at least be as low during the winter months as the combined rail and water rates of summer; in other words, to extend, in a measure only, the policy for the operation of the canals to a trunk line through the profitless freight producing territory which separates east and west. It is possible that the Grand Trunk Pacific might be willing to have its contract for the operation of the National Transcontinental cancelled. Such an arrangement would have to be carried out without damage to existing railway systems, and would involve the double tracking of the railway, and possibly four tracks before many years. The question is, Is it practicable? And, if so, should it take precedence over further development of existing canals and other waterways?

Prosperity has spelt ruin to many an individual, and though the State is itself an aggregation of individuals, it is, in the case of a young country like Canada, something more. It is a corporation, with such vast resources that ordinary inefficiency, which would bankrupt any of the richest companies operating within it, does not seriously impair its stability. Yet the danger of such inefficiency to the State is none the less real, and the value of efficiency equally obvious. Give the State the same degree of efficiency that exists in successful business institutions, and you ensure the saving of millions to the tax-payer of the future.

In putting forward this plea for greater efficiency, I have only in mind the improvement of the technical services of the government. The more I have investigated, the more I have become convinced of the absolute need for some organization,—I can hardly say reorganization. For instance, we have several public departments claiming administrative rights in the waters of the country, but no coöperation among the technical men. They are like so many loose threads needing some central authority to bind them into a strong cord.

The technical man in the service is controlled by the non-technical, and the latter, more often than not, organizes

the technical branch of his department with the aid and advice of some interested person looking for a more stable position. The man is not to blame; but the result is, in most cases, that essential factors of a technical character are overlooked. There is no one to look ahead and prepare for the problems looming up on the horizon. The technical men lack proper organization; many do too much detail work that should be in the hands of subordinates, and consequently have no time to fertilize their minds with what is being done elsewhere.

There is need to look ahead. Slum life, for instance, is beginning to get a foothold in this country. Are we going to leave that problem to the intermittent attacks of philanthropists, or will the State do its duty? What about the growth of corporations? Corporations we need, and with them we must be fair. Some of them will be unfair to us,—that is the human characteristic,—unless we have men specially trained to watch their activities, so as to enable us to keep them in proper control. Is there not considerable unrest to-day in the United States over corporations and their control? Are not we to take advantage of the mistakes of our neighbours? The country is only on the threshold of its development. Some of these corporations may naturally be expected to share in that development. It is hardly possible to imagine the tremendous power they may yet wield in this country. How are we equipping ourselves to meet emergencies that may arise—not to destroy or even embarrass the corporation, but to know what it is doing and how it is being done,—so as to ensure fair play towards the people?

Some one blundered when Public Health was handed over to provincial control. The idea might have been good in the Stone Age, but population is yearly becoming more liquid, owing to the cheapness and ease of travel. The universities are turning out a fine body of medical men. The State, however, should fasten on to the Chinese idea of paying to keep its citizens in sound health, thereby

increasing their efficiency, by rigid laws enforcing cleanliness throughout the land. The United States Army Engineers are receiving great credit for the successful construction of the Panama Canal. It is questionable if the Public Health and Marine Corps of the United States are not entitled to greater credit. They converted the canal zone from a pest house into one of the healthiest spots in America. Some of the provinces are seriously grappling with this subject, but that does not relieve the Federal government from its responsibility. Social unrest—so serious in Europe—is in a measure the outcome of conditions which failed to take into account the importance of public cleanliness, housing of the poor, and town planning.

Every business organization is crying out for system and better system, and yet the greatest business organization in the country, the country itself, with vast undeveloped wealth, is the least organized, with departments duplicating work, and total absence of proper coördination. It is not unusual to find comparatively small corporations with men drawing a yearly salary of from ten to twenty thousand dollars, and not because the directors are concerned about making positions for friends. Their only patronage is efficiency. And those directors do not work like slaves, nor deem it necessary to pass the equivalent of Orders-in-Council on matters for which heads of departments should be held responsible. Of course, an Order-in-Council is useful for shifting responsibility from the individual, but that is neither good nor sound business.

The first question then is, What is the plan? And the next, how to get the government to accept it. In March last I offered prizes for the two best essays on the subject. Some very excellent ones were presented. To carry out some of the valuable suggestions in the essays would necessitate cutting down to probably half a dozen departments the existing fifteen, with a total of eighteen Cabinet ministers. The tendency here is not to cut down, but to disintegrate the service to keep pace with political exigencies. The departments

of Finance, Customs and Inland Revenue might very well be merged into one service. If it were possible to have all public works in one department, the problem would present an easier solution. Canada has a Public Works Department, but different from the one it started with. For political reasons, as the country developed, it became necessary to lop off portions of the original department, thereby forming Railways and Canals and Marine and Fisheries.

A very valuable report was issued on November 30th last by Sir George H. Murray, on "The Organization of the Public Service of Canada." He deals with the duplication of work by departments, refers to problems requiring "for their elucidation the highest technical and professional skill which can be made available," and suggests a "permanent commission of three or, at the most, five members who should be assisted by a staff of the best experts procurable either in Canada or elsewhere . . . . directly responsible to, and under the general control of, the Prime Minister," the commission to be "a thinking, planning, advising, and training body with no executive functions."

While several plans have been presented for the improvement of the technical branches of the public service, I think the suggestion of a permanent commission, which might also be termed a consulting board (available for use by the Cabinet or any individual minister) is the simplest, and one which in no way need clash with departmental authority. The political head is responsible for the expenditures of his department. Therefore his technical men must be controlled within that department. To wrench the public service by any drastic readjustment of work of the same character, as between several departments, is something that would not be tolerated. That apparently can only be accomplished by a gradual process. A board such as suggested could draw on the interested departments for men for consulting purposes. It would be an agency for bringing together the scientific men in the service. It could offer suggestions as to data that should

be collected, in connexion with problems looming up, which in due course would reach the government. If the board proved effective, its influence would gradually extend into the several departments, and it could render valuable aid to the government in carrying out a reorganization of all technical work, so as to secure a very high standard of efficiency. For instance, canals, irrigation, and water powers are now to be found in several departments. Eventually they might all be brought under one minister.

I consider such a board would not serve the purpose for which it would be created unless it possessed men highly trained in: (a) business administration; (b) engineering; (c) public health; (d) statistics.

As our development problems will largely be of an engineering character, this board of five might therefore consist of two engineers of note, one of whom might very properly be expected to have some knowledge of military engineering; a public health official; a statistician; and a chairman trained in some large railway corporation, with a capacity for organization and administration. The question has been asked, Why should a director of statistics be on such a board? The answer appears obvious. A great statistician, in the centre of the departments, whose services will be available to all those dealing in statistics—agriculture, development of corporations, immigration, labour, public health, railway and water freights, trade and commerce—could harmonize their work and be the agency through which statistical information would freely flow from one to the other of the departments so engaged. And by a "great statistician," is not necessarily meant a specialist in one line of investigation, but rather one with a great capacity to develop methods for assembling facts and working them together so as to give to the people the greatest measure of benefit that a full and proper study of those statistics will warrant. It is quite unfair to public men to have them forced to deal with many problems, the solution of which of necessity largely depends on statistics that are not available.

Wherein is the Director of Public Health of service on such a board? He, too, will need statistics. He should have something to say about their collection. Keep him out in the open with four large-minded associates, and eventually we may have developed a great Public Health Service in Canada. Store him away in a department, and his usefulness will largely be destroyed. He would then be confined within the four walls of his department and controlled by the policy of a minister who may have little appreciation of the value of scientific investigation, and especially of its continuity.

Without attempting to be critical of ministers of state, it is well known that provincial representation largely prevails, therefore the provincial view point is ever present, to the detriment frequently of the wider Dominion horizon. Will any one say that there have not been technical men under some minister of the Crown who have not had their views influenced owing to the contact of that minister's political ear with the ground?

Such a board could aid the government in watching the universities for bright young men who might be worked into the technical services. It could develop plans for giving men postgraduate courses in the best universities abroad, and especially for giving engineers greater opportunities to study the problems of older countries.

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with its very small holding as compared with Canada's native wealth still in possession of the country, has developed a Natural Resources Department. It has been casting about for men, and has found them, but it pays the price. If the government hesitates to adopt the principle of a permanent consulting board, as a beginning it can at least try the plan; and if not successful, the men, if the right kind, can easily go back into the business world, and pick up their clients again. The highly efficient man never worries about a position. The position seeks him.

No one who has studied the political history of Canada can fail to see the need of some organization that will lend

cohesion to the scattered technical services of the government. These services have been created, and divided, and again subdivided, from time to time, to meet needs growing out of the rapid development of the country. Their tendency has been to grow farther apart, and every step in that direction has meant loss of general efficiency. It has meant, also, the burdening of the political heads of departments with the settlement of purely technical questions and details of which they had no exact knowledge, and which necessarily made demands upon their time and energy that should have been devoted to questions of great national policy.

In the United States, whose political system differs in some respects from ours, the members of the Cabinet are not obliged to attend Congress or employ their time in transacting mere party business. They have, therefore, more leisure than Canadian ministers to devote to the work of their departments. Yet, at Washington the heads of departments have experts of every description ready at a moment's notice to deal intelligently with any subject that may come before the Cabinet. Consequently, whenever the United States is engaged in a controversy with another nation, the other side is always surprised and astonished at the amount of information which the American representatives possess, and at the intelligence and skill with which their case has been prepared.

In England, too, though the ministers have, as in Canada, to attend to their parliamentary duties, they possess the advantage in their departmental work of having always at hand numerous experts and specialists, the product of long generations of culture. The rapid development of Canada, with the innumerable and pressing problems arising out of that development, emphasizes the need in this country of a strong and harmonious technical service, thereby obtaining that greater efficiency which prevails in every large business corporation, and is essential to the well-being of the country.

C. A. MAGRATH

## DESIDERIO MODUS

“Silent singer, let me hear the lilt  
That haunts thine inexpressive melodies:  
The sun grows cold, and all his gold  
Is spilt  
Down dull horizons of brown days.  
The flowers wilt, and the birds' praise  
Is no more bold in the cool ways  
Of green majestic trees.  
So, lacking joy of these,  
My heart is all desirous, all ablaze,  
Desirous of thy sweet, sad melodies.”

The far-off murmur died  
To the silence of despair.  
The song his mind so curiously tried  
To catch from the still air  
Died, and a mocking voice gave answer there:  
“King Pan makes hymns for birds and bees,  
You have no share in these.”

“Burning lover, let me taste the joys  
That make thy life seem so magnificent:  
My heart is sad—the spells it had  
Are spent  
On fickle toys, inconstant things.  
Sweet merriment is dead, whose wings  
Passion made glad, and dry the springs  
Of laughter-lit content.  
So, sorrow's innocent,  
Expectantly I yearn where all Earth sings  
Of thy triumphant and most mystic joys.”



Then on the wreath-crown'd throng  
 There was dumbness at his pray'r,  
 Nor any sound of celebrating song,  
 Where song had been so fair.

Only a tender voice gave answer there:—  
 "The Cyprian loves these girls and boys;  
 You may not share their joys."

"Faithful prophet, let me learn the creed  
 That gives thine inspiration steadfastness:  
 Belief grows dim, and no strong hymn  
 May speed  
 Faithborne to conquer Paradise.  
 Grim doubt my meed, each vision flies;  
 No Cherubim in adoring skies  
 Are potent now to bless.  
 So, suppliant, in distress,  
 I come to crave the gift no God denies,  
 A votary of thy life-giving creed."

Swift darkness wrapp'd them round,  
 The ador'd, adoring pair—  
 The Priest, the God: no more th' aspiring sound  
 Climb'd Heaven's holy stair.  
 Only a stern, sad voice gave answer there:—  
 "Whom God hath fed, those God will feed;  
 You cannot share this creed."

LIONEL SMITH-GORDON

## FEMINISM AND EDUCATION

THE recent remarkable occurrences in the House of Commons in connexion with woman suffrage reveal the progress made by the woman "movement" towards acceptance as one of the problems of the day. A few years ago woman suffrage was regarded with amused tolerance, as the crank of a few faddists; now it enjoys the distinction of being the rock on which a powerful government threatens to split. Observers from a distance must not suppose that the question of the parliamentary vote is the real driving force behind the movement. Many strong feminists, indeed, regard the concentration on this particular privilege as disastrous to the broader interests of their sex. The women who have done and suffered most in the cause of votes for women are often both ignorant and apathetic regarding political methods. Their hopeless misunderstanding of parliamentary procedure and ministerial responsibility has been evidenced again and again by their demand that a government which contains almost as many anti-suffragists as suffragists, which has never placed the question before the electorate, and whose Prime Minister has declared that to enfranchise women would be a "political mistake of a disastrous character," should yet make itself responsible for a woman suffrage bill.

It is true that some of the leaders of the movement are perfectly aware of the true situation, but for their own purpose they maintain the attitude of asking for more than can possibly be granted, and inflame their followers by cries of injustice when their claims are denied. To the rank and file, however, it is a shibboleth that they are being tricked and cheated, and this because not one woman in a hundred has a clear conception of the Constitution or of the methods of parliamentary government. Nor are they any clearer

in their ideas as to what they can actually do with the vote, as is plainly shewn in innumerable pamphlets which promise the abolition of sweating, vice, prostitution, infant mortality, and kindred evils as the result of women's votes, although there is no attempt by women to devise any constructive legislation dealing with these questions, and no evidence that any remedial legislation which might be brought forward would not be equally supported by men.

The perception of the essentially non-political character of the so-called woman movement in Great Britain came first to the present writer through the discovery that those of her friends who are most interested in political work are least interested in the suffrage question. Three large party associations of women exist for political purposes. One, the Women's Liberal Association, adopted the suffrage platform officially, after much dissension, but its local branches are by no means unanimous on the question. The other two, the Women's Unionist and Tariff Reform Association, and the Primrose League, are absolutely neutral, no propaganda on either side being permitted under their ægis. The writer, who has addressed many audiences composed of the members of these Leagues in different parts of the country, has been surprised to find that the neutrality did not need to be enforced—suffrage and anti-suffrage being both regarded with apathy.

The question of the driving force behind the suffrage movement was first illuminated by the publication of a weekly feminist paper, of such pronounced views that it was shortly repudiated by the leader of the more conservative suffragists. Following the lines indicated by this sign-post, one was able, very quickly, to discover a mass of pamphlets, booklets, and other propaganda material. Briefly summarized, these constitute the feminist creed, and it is that injustice to woman is the inevitable result of any differentiation between the sexes. The claim is for equal knowledge, equal liberty, equal opportunity for women with men in matters sexual as well as social. Political equality

is regarded by the advanced feminist as a symbol rather than a weapon for use. The passion and intensity with which this creed has been received by a section of women needs to be seen to be believed, and the excesses of the militant suffragists are its most eloquent testimony. The writer has always regretted the attitude of amusement, varied with brutality, which these outbursts have evoked. From the first it was apparent, to the seeing eye, that they were the symptoms and not the disease, that no method of dealing with them would be permanently successful which did not strike at the root of the evil. Wrought up to a pitch of fanatical devotion by the recital of their sex's wrongs, ridicule and publicity were the two factors most calculated to encourage the pseudo-martyr spirit. But among thousands of women who would shrink from militant excesses there exists the same feeling which is the motive power for window breaking or post-box damage—the sense of frustration. Woman, struggling blindly up through the social upheavals of a new era, finds herself unaccountably at odds with her environment. Her conventional training of the last half century leads her to look for the reason of her discontent to any cause save the true one. She has so long been taught to subdue the flesh that she cannot recognize the call of nature. Her new feminist leaders, it is true, preach a doctrine in which bodily needs are given full value, but the average woman, even while she absorbs these doctrines, distrusts them. Her instincts are against the remedies proposed. Vaguely searching for the cause of her growing discontent, she is taught by her blind leaders to fix the blame on Man, chiefly because he seems to have solved the problem of life in a more satisfactory way. He has the air of being “master of his Fate, captain of his soul,” while woman feels she is caught in a vast and pitiless machine. A woman teacher recently, after a speech by the writer of this article, asked, with the white face and darkened eyes of the true fanatic, “Does not woman need a vote as a protection from Man?” The question sums up a great deal

of the feminist movement and explains its connexion with suffragism. So far has this poison gone that a prominent leader of the moderate suffragists, in the hearing of the writer, told her audience that, although men had granted women some privileges, as in the Married Women's Property Act, women had no guarantee that these would not be taken away. In short, the feminist movement is being turned aside from its true objective, the uplifting of womanhood, and is feeding that most dangerous social evil, sex-antagonism. A straw shews how the winds blows. A typical British matron, devoted wife, and mother of five children, when shopping with the writer recently, had occasion to give her name, which she did in the usual form: "Mrs. Tom Jones." Then, in a fierce aside, "Why should I be called *Mrs. Tom Jones*, as if I had no individuality apart from my husband?" For, by a strange but not uncharacteristic development, the woman movement has become identified with certain concrete demands—the right to bear one's own name after marriage, to possess a separate income, to have a latch-key (with all that it implies), or a vote—material possessions which have little enough to do with real liberty. And wherever these demands are met they are usually fortified by an intense and unreasoned belief that man refuses, for selfish purposes, to share these liberties with women.

It is no part of the writer's intention to discuss the broad problem of sex relationship raised by the feminist propaganda. The purpose of this article is to shew that militant suffragism, feminist sex-antagonism, and the woman problem in general, have their roots in the mal-adjustment of modern woman to her surroundings, and that a great part of that mal-adjustment is due to a false scheme of education and the spurious ideals for which it is responsible. It is a commonplace of feminism that the home is no longer an adequate sphere for woman, because home industries have been taken from her into factories, and that, as economic pressure drives her more and more to work for wages outside the home,

her functions approximate more and more closely to man's. But the observer who accepts these axioms may still be permitted to note that home life, a vital factor in race evolution, is dwindling in attractiveness, that the efficient housewife and mother is becoming rarer and rarer, and that the peculiarly feminine problems connected with domestic labour are, apparently, further from solution every year. Are we to understand that the adjustment of woman to the economic and industrial conditions of the day involves the disappearance of the individual home? That is the solution offered by many feminists who maintain that the line of progress is to be sought in the departmentalizing of all fields of human labour, and that each woman, instead of working in her own home, shall have an outside occupation like a man, while the simplified home, with communal feeding, recreation rooms, and nurseries shall be dealt with by "experts." It is obviously only by some such scheme that the individual woman, even in these machine-made days, can be freed from the multitude of small home duties which are now her daily task. It is impossible, say the feminists, for man and woman to be truly equal, while she is thus tied and bound, and her emancipation from the thrall of home drudgery is needed in the interests of her developing personality. The keynote of all such suggested "reforms" is found in the assumption that what is good for man must equally be good for woman, that because man attains his fullest development in a life of regular and often monotonous work outside the home, returning only at intervals for rest and refreshment, the same way of life is equally suitable for women.

The presumption underlying this hypothesis is answerable for the fatal mistake which, to the writer's mind, sowed the seed resulting in our present feminist crop. Fifty years ago the pioneers of higher education for women insisted that what was needed to enable women to find a higher place in a rapidly changing social system was a closer approximation of the education of girls to that of boys. In an interesting book on "Feminism and Education in the United

States," Professor Earl Barnes remarks that no attempt has ever been made, even in women's universities which are closed to men, to evolve a distinctive type of education specially suited for women. On the contrary, the aim has been to follow, as closely as possible, the male model. In Great Britain women's colleges are merely annexes of the older universities or institutions which prepare for a graduate course at these or at the newer universities; and at both old and new universities the training has been framed for male needs and the woman student fits in as best she may. The courses at elementary State schools differentiate between the sexes only in respect of certain technical classes, the girls taking cooking or sewing where the boys would take carpentering. The time given is brief, the curriculum being crowded, and in many cases the theory inculcated has little connexion in the mind of the pupil with actual practice. Secondary education offers girls opportunities to specialize in domestic training in the shape of cookery scholarships, which, however, at any rate in the London County area, are but little sought after. The fact is that the girl whose parents are willing to sacrifice the possibility of her immediate earnings is usually ambitious of becoming "something more than a domestic servant,"—to wit, a teacher.

The high schools and colleges which have superseded the old fashioned "ladies finishing establishments" have followed blindly the lead of the "higher education." Indeed, when the university standard is set up at the top, there is little chance of differentiation below. For three generations, therefore, we have given a good trial to the theory that boys and girls should be educated on similar lines, and with what result? In the first place, starting at the bottom of the social ladder, with the result that the average factory hand, servant girl, or even lower-grade shop girl, can read and write but cannot sew or cook. As a wife and mother she is, with rare exceptions, a notorious failure. Her children survive chiefly through the increasing intervention of the State between them and parental incompetence. The high

school and college girl faces the problem in a different shape. Owing to social conditions over which she has no control, she must be prepared for the eventuality that she may not marry. In many cases economic pressure on middle-class homes, and the rising standard of expenditure, make it desirable that she should be a wage-earner. The choice of profession is singularly limited. A vast range of professions and trades open to men are closed to women for physical reasons. They cannot be soldiers, sailors, miners, civil engineers, mining engineers, railroad or ship builders, engineers, administrators or police officers in colonial dependencies, consuls at foreign ports. They have failed to get any real footing as merchants or financiers. Other professions are distasteful or uncongenial to women. Domestic occupations are despised, and Professor Barnes says that even a steady demand for science teachers does not induce women to specialize in a subject where abstract rather than concrete studies are necessary. The consequence of these restrictions, natural and artificial, is that the vast majority of "educated" women look to teaching as the one possible career. They are, for this reason, condemned to specialize early, because in the teaching profession proficiency in examination work is necessary, whereas many young men only need to begin their real professional training when college or school life is over. This accounts for a real difference of atmosphere in women's as compared to men's colleges. Women leave off learning at an age when men often begin life in earnest, and going from the cloistered and strenuous atmosphere of their college to a similar environment in some other educational establishment they take with them a narrow pedantic outlook and, very often, an overstrained nervous system. Condemned for life to a profession where prizes are few, rewards small, and in which the strain is hard to all who have not a natural aptitude, they not infrequently feel like the starling in the cage of Sterne's story—"I can't get out!" A full family life might help to develop the joyous side of such characters, but the smaller and more



scattered families of to-day render this a diminishing possibility and the result is that the teaching of our girls is rapidly passing into the hands of female celibate pedagogues, whose knowledge of the world or of the other sex is of an academic character varied by the lurid pictures of feminist imaginings.

It must be remembered that the school is more and more superseding the home as the moulding influence, both on girls and boys. Not only do school work and activities connected with it encroach on the time nominally spent at home, but the parent of to-day is increasingly anxious to eliminate the element of discipline in the home. He or she aims at being the companion rather than the mentor of his children in the rare intervals of intercourse permitted by school life and social obligations. The psychology of girl-life reveals the natural tendency, in the early years of adolescence, to idealize some person. That person nowadays is usually some unmarried teacher, and, whereas the "old maid" was the night-mare of girls fifty years ago, she is now on the high road to becoming their ideal. To the inexperienced eye the life of the female bachelor has charms which are not apparent in the hum-drum existence of the average matron, nor is there any attempt to counteract this influence. Parents and teachers alike feel it their duty to treat matrimony as an alternative only, to discourage sentiment, which may have no legitimate fruition, and to prepare every girl so that enforced celibacy will not destroy her chances of happiness. Kind-hearted persons and chivalrous men heap praise on single women who do public or philanthropic work,—and when in addition to all this there is superadded the poison of sex-antagonism, subtly distilled by frustrated women seeking to account for their own restless discontent, one has an atmosphere which cannot fail to breed some very peculiar problems, but is hardly likely to elucidate the main difficulty—how woman is to adjust herself to her environment.

The recent establishment of a school of Domestic Economy in connexion with the London University is the

first sign that our educational leaders are wavering from the theory that there is no need to differentiate in the education of the sexes. But little real advantage will be gained so long as domestic science is regarded as an alternative to other subjects which alone are the open sesame to higher education and academic honours. It is only when we recognize that home-making is the normal occupation of the average woman in her own interests and in the interests of the race, that we shall be able to devise an education for girls which will really prepare them for womanhood. We shall cease then to wear out their bodies in the competitive games which, without any corresponding physiological necessity, they have borrowed from boys. Feminists are fond of claiming for the women of the day an improved physique, but we have no data to support such a claim. A hockey field full of big, well developed, fresh coloured girls appears good evidence, but a few years later the same girls, as young wives or working spinsters, are found flagging physically, taking rest cures if they can afford it or bromide if they cannot. They have used up, in the strenuous atmosphere of competitive examinations and competitive games, the nervous force intended to be spread over a trying period of their lives. There has never been a time, according to eminent surgical authorities, when maternity was accompanied with so much difficulty and danger in precisely that class which has had the doubtful benefit of higher education and systematic outdoor exercise. The growing disinclination for motherhood among women of the "educated" class is an even more serious phenomenon.

It is not suggested that all the elements of a "liberal" education should be sacrificed in order to make women good cooks and housemaids. Nor is the writer presumptuous enough to attempt to suggest a curriculum calculated to meet all the needs of a modern woman. All she wishes to do is to point out that the growing discontent of woman in Great Britain has its source in the fact that she is being thrust more and more into a position where true self-com-

pletion and expression are impossible. This is no attempt to revert to the theory which is supposed to have governed our grandmothers—that wifehood and motherhood were the only possible employments for women. It is an assertion, unassailable on biological grounds, that each sex requires union with the other to attain physical maturity, and that women need, quite as much as men, to be able to secure that completion of their being by free choice, and in accordance with spiritual as well as physical affinities. The real problem is how, in a country where there are 1,300,000 more women than men, the former are to be assured of this elementary human right. It is often pointed out that the British Empire as a whole shews no such disparity, and that wholesale emigration would give the “odd women” a choice, at all events, between marriage and celibacy. But the kind of woman being manufactured by our present educational system is not wanted in any new country, and, moreover, she herself is not attracted by the prospects offered. It is reported that one of the suffragette leaders, returning from a recent visit to Canada, declared that it is “no country for an educated woman.” The vicious circle is completed by such an attitude, and there is no escape from it save by a drastic revolt from the utterly false standard set up and a frank recognition of woman’s real needs.

We can never go back to the point of view from which the unmarried woman was merely ludicrous, but we are permitting ourselves an entirely false perspective when we fail to perceive that she is tragic. The mischief of the present attitude among feminists is that by asserting woman’s essential independence they actually acquiesce in, and even help to perpetuate, a social difficulty and danger, instead of setting their wits to work on removing it. Once again, the fundamental need of all normal women is physical completion in marriage and maternity, and if modern woman feels a deep sense of unrest and frustration it is chiefly because, either in her own life or in the ideals by which she has steered, she has lost sight of this feminine pole star. A man, to

whom fatherhood, however sacred, has no real physical significance, and whose life can find full and satisfying expression in a hundred ways, cannot conceive what it means to be a childless woman. Nature has focussed woman's being on the maternal function, which conditions her activities, whether she be married or no, from adolescence to late middle life. Her mentality, despite the passionate denials of suffragists, is inevitably affected by a function which, by its claim on the nervous forces, is bound to affect the activity of the brain. What modern woman needs, therefore, is no apotheosis as a saint, prophetess, or queen, but a recognition of her rights as a human being, and such an adjustment of society as will give her the chance of exercising those rights under the most favourable conditions. It is necessary to recognize that, while natural, and domestic, functions are essential, public activities, however meritorious, are non-essential for the development of woman's nature, and until the home, in its true sense, and the care and nurture of children are once more put back into the forefront of woman's existence as her highest sphere and sweetest privilege, we cannot hope for a cure for the evil of feminine discontent. This readjustment need not involve the training of every woman as a mere household drudge; on the contrary, what we want is not the home without higher education but higher education which is something more than "an increased capacity for the recollection of unrelated statements" and which can be applied to the elucidation of home problems. A factor which the writer believes to be almost indispensable is the recovery by women of that manual skill, that joy of craftsmanship, which has been wholly lost in the struggle for book learning. To a vast number of women of the most discontented class, a little housework, intelligently done, would be an incalculable boon. This must sound strange to Canadian readers.

Of all the strange theories now current among women, and even accepted by some men, none is more mischievous than that which holds up "economic independence" as the

solution of the problem of sex relations. Women who have drawn a blank in the matrimonial stakes are descanting on the degradation, to other women, of being dependent on a man for food and housing. They point out that this relationship involves the married woman in an obligation to make herself useful and pleasant—as a slave. Such a view of wifely duty comes as a striking novelty to the majority of married women, more particularly to those of the artizan class, who have their husbands well in subjection, taking their week's earnings and allowing them a small percentage for pocket money. The inherent vanity of man is tickled by the picture of himself as a sort of hereditary tyrant, and the meeker he is, the more he will grieve in public over the servile condition of women. There is only one type of woman who can really be placed in subjection, that is, the woman who has got out of touch with the realities of life, and has therefore nothing to give in exchange for the voluntary servitude which is man's offering to his true mate. The real tyranny which women have to fear is that of one woman over another—a fact well recognized by all who have had to do with woman's work. The physical handicap of women is, however, a grim reality, and affected them even more in ages when force was the first, and not, as now, the last resort. The first lesson the sex had to learn was how to oppose strength with weakness—a lesson which the youngest daughters of Eve, the suffragettes, have learnt to perfection. The fatal mistake is that woman is now being urged to oppose strength with strength, a competition in which she will inevitably get the worst of it.

In Canada woman has not lost her touch on the realities of life. Long may it remain "no country for the 'educated' woman!" So will it be the home of the human, natural, real woman. The vote is a feminist symbol, of no value in itself but a potential danger. Women can do all the purifying and elevating they feel fit for without it, and with it they may be tempted to forget they are just women, and split up into political women and non-political women.

Then the former will despise the latter, and the latter will secretly envy the former, and that way lies destruction. Moreover, political life, to which the vote invites women, offers premiums to the child-free, de-sexualized woman, and that is a distinct danger in itself. The social virtues of womanhood—her strong individualism, sense of family responsibility, and even that mystic quality which is called "spirituality"—find their roots in her very being, of which motherhood is an essential part. In truth there are no factors, spiritual or material, which can be regarded as woman's distinctive contributions to the common weal save those which she draws from her supreme sex-function. There is no experience she can contribute which may not be equally the experience of man except that which centres round her maternal duties. When we write of woman's influence, therefore, let it be clearly understood that, while we recognize the useful work done by some single women, we cannot consent that their influence, either in politics or in education, should be the predominant one, and it is because the normal woman has specialized, individual duties to perform that her public and social activities are of minor importance.

ETHEL COLQUHOUN

## MARRIAGE LAW IN CANADA

**D**URING the last two or three years public opinion in Canada has been greatly stirred upon the subject of the marriage laws. As was only to be expected in a question of this kind, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant parts of the population showed a strong tendency to align themselves upon opposite sides, and there appeared to be some danger of the smouldering embers of the old "religious" feud being again fanned into a flame. The papal decree known as the *Ne Temere*, which came into force on Easter Sunday, 1908, and was promulgated in Canada by the Roman Catholic bishops, was regarded in many quarters as a claim on the part of the Church to alter the law of the land, and as an invasion of civil liberty.

In the province of Quebec, at any rate, such an interpretation of it was by no means unnatural, considering the state of the law. Remarkable haziness existed as to the precise boundary between the ecclesiastical and the civil sphere in the marriage of Roman Catholics, or in mixed marriages where one of the parties was a Roman Catholic. The matter was brought to a head by a judgement of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Montreal in his capacity as head of his ecclesiastical court, declaring a marriage celebrated by a Methodist minister null and void on the ground that the parties were Roman Catholics.

This judgement was expressly based upon the *Ne Temere* decree, and declared the marriage a nullity in the most sweeping terms, without any kind of reservation. The husband, at whose instance the action in the ecclesiastical court had been raised, next entered suit in the Superior Court of the province, narrating the archbishop's judgement and asking that the marriage which had thus been annulled *quoad vinculum* should by the civil court be declared null as

to its civil effects. This suit being undefended, judgement was rendered by default, the judge adopting *verbatim* the conclusions of the plaintiff, and thus appearing to recognize the authority of the archbishop to set aside the marriage itself, while the office of the civil court was confined to giving effect to this judgement so far as rights of property were concerned.

At a later stage the wife was allowed to challenge this judgement by the procedure known as an *opposition*, and another judge of the Superior Court—Mr. Justice Charbonneau—came to a conclusion opposed to that of his learned brother, and held that from the point of view of the civil law the marriage of these two Roman Catholics by a Protestant minister was valid. (*Hébert v. Clouâtre*, 1912, R.J.Q. 41 S.C. 249.)

In this second case a difficult question of procedure arose which, if answered in one way, would have made it unnecessary to give a judgement on the legal question as to the validity of the marriage. This, however, does not now concern us. The two facts that a bishop of the Roman Catholic church, founding on the *Ne Temere* decree, had declared in round terms a marriage null and void because not celebrated by a Roman Catholic priest, and that a judge of the Superior Court had adopted and confirmed this judgement, were quite enough to show that it was at least highly desirable to have a scientific delimitation of the frontier between the ecclesiastical and the civil spheres of influence.

Before proceeding further it will be best to explain the effect of the *Ne Temere* decree. That decree begins by referring to the previous law of the Council of Trent designed to prevent the rash celebration of clandestine marriages, under which it had been provided that marriages were null and void unless celebrated by the parish priest of one of the parties, or by a priest having his authority or that of the Ordinary, and before at least two witnesses. The *Ne Temere* narrates that, owing to the increased facility and celerity of intercommunication between different countries, and to



changes of residence within a single country, compliance with the decrees of the Council of Trent had become difficult. In many cases it was desired to celebrate a marriage in a place distant from the home of the parties, and sometimes it was not easy to say in what parish a person had his domicile. Accordingly, the *Ne Temere* declares that only those marriages shall be valid which are contracted before the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place of celebration, or a priest delegated by either of these and at least two witnesses. In other words, the proper priest is no longer to be the priest of the domicile of one of the parties but the priest of the place where the marriage is celebrated.

The radical nature of the change thus made is apt to escape people unacquainted with the history. The chief object of the decree of the Council of Trent was to prevent clandestine marriages and to secure publicity. It was conceived that the best way of securing this object was to make it essential that the parties should be married by the parish priest of one of them. He would be in a position to know whether the parties were of age and whether there was any impediment to the marriage. Even when no legal impediment existed, but the marriage appeared to the priest to be inexpedient, his influence on the parties or their families would often be strong enough to prevent it. For people of stationary habits, living all their lives in one parish, such regulations are very salutary, but it is easy to see that under modern conditions they are quite unworkable. Any advantage that there is in securing publicity in this method is more than counterbalanced by the risk of marriages being set aside on the ground that neither of the parties was domiciled at the place of celebration. The *Ne Temere*, therefore, throws overboard the old regulations for preventing clandestine marriages, and leaves it to the priest of the place of celebration to satisfy himself, by the publication of banns, or by the production of the marriage licence, and otherwise, that no impediment to the marriage exists.

The *Ne Temere* decree goes on to declare that it applies to all persons baptized in the Catholic Church, even though they no longer belong to it, and to marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics. It was the two last provisions which gave the greatest shock to Protestant feeling. If the *Ne Temere* decree was to affect the civil law of Quebec, where mixed marriages, celebrated by a Protestant minister had hitherto been considered valid, an alarming vista of invalid marriages at once presented itself to the imagination. A husband, who, for all that appeared, had always been a Presbyterian or a Methodist and had been married by his own minister, might get the marriage declared null and void by proving that he had been baptized as a Roman Catholic. Any Roman Catholic who had become a Protestant, or at least a non-Catholic, would have an easy way of getting out of a marriage with which he was dissatisfied. And in the case of mixed marriages, was it not contrary to the principle of religious equality that the non-Catholic party must consent, on pain of the nullity of the marriage, to have the ceremony performed by a Roman Catholic priest?

After the subject had been discussed and reported upon by synods and presbyteries, and the public mind had been thoroughly irritated and not a little confused, a member of the Dominion Parliament, Mr. Lancaster, introduced a Bill, the object of which was to create a uniform law for Canada by enacting substantially that the religion of the marriage officer was not to affect the validity of any marriage. The government saw themselves placed in an awkward predicament, in which they were extremely likely to give offence either to their Protestant supporters in Ontario or to their Catholic friends in Quebec. Fortunately for them a door of escape was opened. There was very serious doubt whether the proposed law was within the legislative competence of the Federal Parliament.

Under the British North America Act, which distributed the legislative powers between the Dominion and the provinces, the Federal Parliament was given exclusive legis-

lative authority over "marriage and divorce," (s. 91, n. 26). If there had been nothing in the Act to cut down the natural meaning of these words, the validity of such an enactment as that proposed by Mr. Lancaster would have been clear enough. But among the powers assigned to the legislatures of the provinces was the exclusive authority to make laws as to the "solemnization of marriage." The question therefore was, if a Bill defining the powers of a minister in regard to the ceremony of marriage ought to be considered as a Bill dealing with "marriage" or with the "solemnization of marriage."

It is not very unusual for Parliament to pass bills which are of doubtful validity, leaving it to the courts to judge of this when a proper case is presented. But in regard to the Lancaster Bill such a procedure was, on many grounds, to be deprecated. It was extremely undesirable to encourage people to rely on the competence of a marriage officer who might turn out after all to be incompetent to marry them. Nothing could be more against public policy than to bring about a new crop of doubtful marriages. Moreover, if the Bill was to be allowed to go through, the government would need to commit itself either in favour of it or against it, and this it was particularly anxious to avoid. A more excellent way of dealing with the problem occurred to them. Under the Canadian Supreme Court Act, which created a Supreme Court of appeal for Canada, the government may refer to the Supreme Court for an opinion (*inter alia*) on any important question of law or fact concerning the constitutionality of legislation (Rev. Stat. Can. c. 139, s. 60). It is true that the provinces recently disputed the right of the Dominion Parliament to give power to the Supreme Court to express opinions in this way upon the validity of provincial laws. The provinces maintained that the British North America Act gave Parliament power to create a court of appeal, but that the Supreme Court in giving opinions on references of this kind was not a court of appeal but merely a body of advisers of the government. This rather technical objection

to the validity of such references as to provincial laws has just been pronounced unsound by the Privy Council (Att. Gen. for Ont. v. Att. Gen. for Can. (1912) A. C. 571). The federal government accordingly availed themselves of their right to ask the Supreme Court for its opinion as to whether the Lancaster Bill would be a valid Act of Parliament if it passed. In order to elucidate the matter as much as possible they invited the Supreme Court to say further, whether in their opinion under the law of Quebec as it stood, a marriage between two Roman Catholics, or a marriage between persons, one of whom only was a Roman Catholic, was null and void unless celebrated by a Roman Catholic priest. All the points were fully argued by counsel appointed by the government of Canada and by such of the provinces as chose to avail themselves of the opportunity to appear, and the case has just been reported in the official reports. (In *re* Marriage Laws, 1912, 46 S.C.R. 132, Marriage Legislation in Canada, in *re* 1912, A.C. 880.) The answers of the learned judges are highly instructive and valuable, but it must not be forgotten that they are merely opinions which do not possess any binding authority. The courts of the province, when the same questions arise for decision will no doubt give respectful consideration to these opinions, but nevertheless will be quite free to come to a different conclusion. Two points and two only may be regarded as placed beyond further controversy.

The first is that the *Ne Temere* decree has not made any change in the law, and that no papal decree in future can make any change in the civil law of the Province of Quebec. When the Civil Code was prepared, the commissioners had to consider whether they would enumerate the different impediments to marriage and make them apply uniformly to all persons irrespective of their religion, or whether they would leave things as they were and let the different churches decide as to the impediments affecting their respective members. They chose the path of least resistance, and contented themselves with laying down the

impediments arising from relationship, such as that between brother and sister, uncle and niece, and so forth, and then went on to say, "The other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions, as resulting from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different churches and religious communities." (Art. 127.)

If, for example, two Roman Catholics, who were first or even fourth cousins could not validly marry each other before the date of the Code without getting a special dispensation, the Code did not perhaps place them in any better position, though it may be that as to impediments caused by relationship those named by the codifiers are meant to be a complete list. A case in which this argument has been rejected is, I believe, under appeal to the Privy Council. But at any rate it was only the impediments as at the date of the Code which were thus adopted and made a part of the civil law. There was no licence given to the authorities of the different churches to create new impediments *ad libitum*. Accordingly, even if we assume, for the sake of argument, that the want of the proper minister forms an "impediment" of the kind here referred to—an assumption which, as will appear later, is unwarranted—nevertheless, in judging of the competence of the minister we must take that as it stood on August 1st, 1866, when the Code came into force.

So clear is this that, in the case before the Supreme Court, it was admitted by the counsel who argued that the marriage of two Roman Catholics was null unless celebrated by a Roman Catholic priest, that this question must be determined by the law of the Council of Trent and the Benedictine Decree referred to later, which modified it. Both of these decrees it was maintained had been adopted in the Civil Code, but the *Ne Temere* decree, being of a date subsequent to the Code, could have nothing whatever to do with the matter. And this was the opinion of all the judges, including Anglin, J., the only one of the judges of the Supreme Court whose conclusion was that such a marriage was a nullity (46 S.C.R., p. 429).

The *Ne Temere* decree does not, then, affect the civil validity of marriages contracted in the province. It affects, of course, the consciences of Roman Catholics, and disobedience to it may entail for them ecclesiastical discipline, but the validity of a marriage in no way depends upon any papal decree, unless the legislature chooses to recognize and adopt it. If this point had been realized from the first, much less heat would have been imported into the discussion. The champions of civil liberty had a very strong case in protesting against any ecclesiastical authority having the power to make laws for them, but fortunately no such claim is made or is likely to be made.

The second point which has been clearly established is that the powers of the several provinces of Canada to legislate as to the "solemnization of marriage" entitles them to say, if they choose, that certain ministers or officers of civil status shall be competent to perform the ceremony of marriage for a certain class of persons only, for example, for members of the church to which the minister belongs, and that the Federal government cannot deprive them of this power by a law which says that any minister may marry anybody whether belonging to his church or another. By n. 26 of s. 91 of the British North America Act, the Dominion Parliament is given exclusive authority to legislate over "marriage and divorce," while by n. 12 of s. 92, the provincial legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to "the solemnization of marriage in the province." The difficulty of reconciling with one another these two grants of legislative power hardly needs to be stated. The decision that the provinces had the power and the exclusive power to determine the extent of the competence of the marriage officer was, of course, fatal to the Lancaster Bill, and as this was the only issue actually in controversy the Privy Council confined its opinion to this point and refused to give answers to the other questions submitted by the government.

The argument rejected by the courts was that the intention of the B.N.A. Act was to give to the Federal Parlia-

ment exclusive authority to legislate as to the contract of marriage and to say who should be capable of marriage and between what persons there should be an impediment. The power given to the province to legislate as to the solemnization of marriage extended to laws fixing what should be the evidence required for proof of a marriage. It was contended that by the law of Canada, as by the canon law before the Council of Trent, marriage itself might be constituted by the mere consent of the parties. In the great case of the *Queen v. Millis* it was held by the House of Lords that the law of England had departed from the law of Catholic Europe by making the presence of a mass priest necessary for the celebration of marriage (*The Queen v. Millis*, 1844, 10 C. & F. 534). But the contention of Mr. Nesbitt was that this case was not applicable to the colonies, the requirement of the presence of the mass priest being of the nature of a local regulation. (See the article by Sir Howard Elphinstone in 5 *Law Quarterly Review*, 44 at p. 57.) And in fact, although the decision in the *Queen v. Millis* is binding upon the English courts, there is a pretty general agreement among lawyers that it was based upon an insufficient study of the history, and that the truth of the matter is that by the English law until the Act of 1753, commonly called Lord Hardwicke's Act, marriage might be constituted by the mere consent of the parties. The importance of this for the present case was, according to the argument, that "marriage" and the "solemnization of marriage" were quite different things. There might be a marriage without any solemnization at all, unless the Dominion Parliament chose to prescribe otherwise. By giving to the provincial legislatures control over the "solemnization of marriage," it was never intended that they should be able to say such and such forms shall be necessary for the very existence of marriage. Their power was limited to prescribing certain limited forms of marriage and saying that want of compliance with these forms should expose the parties to penalties, such as, for example, that the wife should have no right to dower,

and so forth. But the province could not say that there should be no marriage, for this would be to legislate about "marriage" itself, and that was a Dominion matter, whereas the power of the province extended only to regulations as to the "solemnization of marriage." This ingenious argument was rejected, without hesitation, by four of the five judges of the Supreme Court, and their opinion on this point was sustained by the Privy Council.

Whatever may have been the law of England prior to 1753, it is undoubted that in 1867, the date of the B.N.A. Act, marriage, both in England and in Canada, required to be entered into before some official person, whether ecclesiastical or civil. "Solemnization" of some kind was essential to the validity of the marriage. Having this in mind, is it not natural to understand the distribution of powers made by the Act in this way? The Dominion is to say who shall be capable of marriage and what shall be the impediments. Accordingly, it has removed the impediments to the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister, or with a daughter of his deceased wife's sister. But the province alone can say what form is required for the marriage, and if it chooses to say that such and such an official may be competent to marry only persons belonging to a certain class, that is entirely within its competence. For the Dominion to step in and say that the officials who celebrate marriage shall be competent to marry persons irrespective of their religious beliefs, would be an invasion of provincial rights.

One of the arguments which was greatly pressed was what may be called the argument as to "overlapping," which deserves a word of explanation. In various cases it has been laid down that when a specific field of legislation has been assigned to the Federal Parliament, its powers to deal with it are not to be restricted, because in so doing it may invade one of the wide fields assigned as a whole to the provinces. For example, legislation as to certain classes of railways is a federal matter. If in federal railway Acts conditions are laid down affecting the expropriation of land



or the contracts which may be made between railway servants and their employers or between shippers of goods and the railway companies, these provisions, so far as they go, will alter the law of "property and civil rights," which as a whole is a provincial matter. But it has been held that so long as railway legislation is confined to matters ancillary to the operation of a federal railway it is within the competence of the federal Parliament. In like manner, the federal Parliament in dealing with such subjects as "banks and banking" or "bills of exchange" necessarily affects the civil law of the province. In order to give the Dominion the opportunity of dealing fully and effectively with such subjects, it is necessary to hold that the grant to the provinces of exclusive legislative authority over "property and civil rights" must be taken subject to the limitation that the federal Parliament shall have complete power to deal with the subjects assigned to it. It was argued that on the same principle when "marriage and divorce" were assigned to the Dominion, its power of legislation was not to be restricted by the fact that the province had control of the "solemnization of marriage." The answer was that the two cases were not really analogous. In the present case a special subject-matter, namely "marriage," had been assigned to the Dominion Parliament, but a portion of that subject, namely "solemnization," was not included in the grant but had been carved out and specially assigned to the province. If the Dominion could invade this area so expressly reserved, the exclusive authority of the province over "solemnization" would be entirely taken away.

The judgement of the Privy Council was confined to the constitutional question, and their lordships found it unnecessary to answer the questions as to the present state of the law of Quebec. The conclusion of the Supreme Court, affirmed by the Privy Council, that the Lancaster Bill could not validly have been enacted by the Dominion legislature, or, at any rate, if enacted, would have been a nullity, has extricated the federal government from a very awkward dilemma.

Having disposed of the constitutional point in this way, the judges of the Supreme Court addressed themselves to the second enquiry, divided into two heads, viz., whether by the law of Quebec as it stands a marriage not celebrated by a Roman Catholic priest is null and void, (a) if between two Roman Catholics, or, (b) if between two persons, one of whom only is a Roman Catholic. Chief-Justice Sir Charles Fitzpatrick declined to answer these questions on the ground that the answer to the first question made it superfluous to go further, and that, there being no appeal to the Supreme Court from a judgement of a court of Quebec determining the abstract question of the validity of a marriage, it was undesirable for the judges of the Supreme Court to express opinions which could only embarrass the judges of the province. The Privy Council took the same view that it was superfluous to answer these questions, but four of the judges of the Supreme Court felt it their duty to answer the questions which had been submitted to them by the government.

The arguments advanced upon this branch of the case were so elaborate that it is impossible to do justice to them without undue length. In outline, however, the argument upon what I may call the Roman Catholic side was this: (1) The Code upon this matter did not change the old law. (2) By the old law the title of all the marriage officers to celebrate marriage was derived from their ecclesiastical superiors who could not give them any competence except over members of their own community. Roman Catholics could only be married by their own parish priest. Among them at any rate the authorization given by the bishop to the priest was necessarily restricted to Roman Catholics, and in the case of ministers of other churches the same restriction must be implied, for otherwise their power would be wider than that of the Roman Catholic priests, which would be contrary to the principle of religious equality, which the law had always recognized. (3) The fundamental policy of the law had always been to prevent "clandestinity," and the only way of doing this was to secure

the celebration of the marriage in the place where the parties were known. The rule that Roman Catholics could only be married by the *propre curé* had been the law of Canada before the Cession, and being a part of the private law, had not been abrogated by the conquest of Canada by England. Having this in view it was absurd to suppose that the codifiers intended to make it possible for a Roman Catholic to be validly married anywhere in the province quite irrespective of his domicile. (4) By the Capitulations the Roman Catholics were granted the free exercise of their religion, and according to the doctrine of the church marriage was a sacrament, and the administration of the sacraments was confined to priests of that church. (5) The Code expressly declares by art. 127 that the "other impediments" recognized according to the different religious persuasions are to be retained, and by the law of the church it was an impediment to a marriage that it was not celebrated by the proper priest of the parties.

It will be observed that these arguments strike at the validity of the mixed marriage as much as that of the marriage of two Roman Catholics. But it was admitted that under the decree known as the Benedictine decree, which came into effect as far as Canada was concerned in 1764, the law of the Council of Trent had been relaxed and the validity of mixed marriages celebrated by a Protestant minister, being thus recognized by the Benedictine, had for two centuries and a half been admitted in Canada. No such marriage had, as a matter of fact, ever been annulled by the courts. If the *Ne Temere* decree had any civil effect it would have overruled the Benedictine, but, for the reasons given earlier, this is not the case. It seems also fair to say that the conclusion that a Roman Catholic can be married anywhere, irrespective of domicile, can hardly be a *reductio ad absurdum*, for the *Ne Temere* expressly gives him this freedom.

In the result, three out of four of the judges who answered these questions came to the conclusion that neither a mixed marriage nor a marriage of two Roman Catholics was invalid merely because it had not been solemnized by a Roman

Catholic priest. Their main grounds were: (1) The article C.C. 129, which says that all persons authorized to keep registers of civil status are competent to solemnize marriage, does not restrict their competence to members of their own communion. The article is perfectly clear in its terms and it is contrary to well recognized canons of construction to read into it qualifications and conditions. (See *Robinson v. C.P.R.*, 1892, A. C. p. 487.) (2) Even if the old law was otherwise we are bound to give effect to the article of the Code according to its plain terms. (3) But if we are to examine the old law it does not seem to have been otherwise. The law before the Conquest was that only Roman Catholic priests could celebrate marriage at all. When the English came in, the Anglican Church, as the Established Church of England, was recognized from the first, and clergymen were appointed by the Crown to benefices. The Anglican clergy celebrated marriages without the necessity for any statutory authorization. The Roman Catholics had been granted the free exercise of their religion, but this was always subject to the King's supremacy, as is clearly stated in the Quebec Act, and it would be contrary to all principle to assume that the conqueror intended to give to the conquered any exclusive powers in regard to marriage which the clergy of the English Church were not to enjoy. The view taken from the first was that the Anglican clergy were competent to marry all persons to whatsoever religion they might belong. If it had not been for this general understanding, the validity of the mixed marriages could not have gone unquestioned. (4) In all the various statutes giving authority to the ministers of numerous sects to celebrate marriage it is not said that they must marry only members of their own community, and it is impossible to read such a limitation into the statutes. The case of the Quakers is the exception which proves the rule. When the legislature wanted to make the limitation they did so in plain terms. (5) If the argument for the contrary view were sound, it would be impossible to find any ground for holding mixed marriages valid. And a mixed marriage between members of different Protestant

churches would be just as much a nullity as a marriage between a Roman Catholic and a Protestant. In fact, if every minister could only marry a member of his own religious communion every mixed marriage would need to be celebrated by two ministers, one of the church of the bride and one of the church of the bridegroom. It would be impossible for a Presbyterian minister, for example, to marry a Presbyterian and a Baptist, or for a Baptist minister to marry a Baptist and a Congregationalist, yet such marriages have been constantly performed in the past without challenge, and the result of accepting the present argument would be to invalidate an enormous number of marriages. (6) If the authority of the minister is derived solely from his ecclesiastical superior, the State only recognizing his competence so far as he has received this ecclesiastical authority, it is illogical to admit the validity of any mixed marriage celebrated by the minister of one of the parties. But if for the sake of argument, the validity of the marriage of a Roman Catholic and a Protestant by a Protestant minister should be admitted, there would still be no officer of civil status competent to marry two unbelievers, or two persons who belonged to a religious communion which had received no statutory recognition from our legislature. If two Hindus or two Turks, or two Chinese, or two Japanese desired to marry there would not be any possible way of their doing so. Considering that our shores are open to immigrants from all countries and that large numbers of people reside in Canada who either have no religious minister or whose ministers have obtained no authority from the State to act as registers of civil status, there would be a very considerable number of persons condemned to celibacy for want of a person competent to perform the ceremony of marriage for them. It is extremely unlikely that the legislature should have left things in so absurd a position, and the courts would be very unwilling to give such an interpretation to the Civil Code as would lead to this conclusion. No doubt they would be bound to do so if the Code were capable of no other interpretation. But seeing that it says that every minister of

civil status shall be competent to solemnize marriage without stating any restrictions on their competence, it is much more natural to interpret this article as giving them power to solemnize the marriage of any two persons between whom no impediment exists. (7) The argument which was strongly pressed that among the "impediments" retained by Article 127 must be included the impediment created by the incompetence of the minister, is unsound. It is easy to make this clear to any one with a Civil Code in his hand who studies its scheme. The first chapter of the title dealing with marriage is headed "of the qualities and conditions necessary for contracting marriage." This chapter does not refer at all to the marriage officer but deals only with the parties to the marriage, with the consents required by law, and with the impediments arising from relationship or affinity which prevent the intermarriage of two persons. Article 127, which is the last article in the chapter, contains the provision as to the "other impediments." By every canon of construction this must be interpreted as referring to impediments of the same kind as those previously mentioned, namely, such impediments as exist in the parties themselves. By the canon law there are many such impediments; for example, that arising from relationship in the collateral line within the fourth degree according to the canon law method of computation. Thus, there is an impediment between the marriage of second and even of fourth cousins. There is also an impediment to the marriage of a person who has taken solemn vows as a monk or a nun, or is in holy orders, so long as such persons are Catholics, and there are many such impediments well known to students of the canon law. From most of these impediments it is possible to obtain a dispensation, but a marriage celebrated without first obtaining a dispensation is absolutely null. It is impediments of this kind which, as regards Roman Catholics, are retained in force by Article 127, unless, as regards relationship, the enumeration by the codifiers is held to be intended to be restrictive. In a broad sense, the incompetence of the clergyman to perform a particular mar-

riage might be called an "impediment" to that marriage, but it is certainly not an impediment of the kind here referred to.

The second chapter of the title of marriage is headed "of the formalities relating to the solemnization of marriage." This deals with the marriage officer, with banns and with licenses. If the religion of the officer were, in the intention of the codifiers, to make him incompetent to perform certain marriages, it is certainly in this chapter that this restriction would have been placed.

It is difficult not to yield assent to these reasons. Unfortunately, however, these opinions of three judges of the Supreme Court, however weighty they may be in themselves, must be considered as merely academic. So far as the matter has been dealt with by the courts of the province of Quebec, the decisions of the judges of the Superior Court are hopelessly conflicting, and when the question comes up again, either in the Superior Court or in the Court of King's Bench, the judges will not be in any way bound by the opinions expressed in the Supreme Court. The opinions will no doubt receive what is called respectful consideration, but it may be consideration of a purely Platonic kind.

From the point of view of the practical man who has an interest in being quite sure whether he is married or not married, the present state of the law is highly unsatisfactory. It is true that so far no mixed marriage celebrated by a Protestant minister has been annulled, but it is equally true that its validity cannot logically be supported upon reasons which would not apply with the same force to the marriage of two Roman Catholics by a Protestant minister. To the plain man it would seem that, if there was one thing about which the law ought to be transparently clear, it would be the conditions of a valid marriage. As things stand, the matter is involved in such obscurity that a large number of persons are in the ambiguous position of not being sure whether they are married or not.

F. P. WALTON.

## THE WING-FOOTED OR SHINING ONE

THE worse the going the better for the horse. This paradox of the road is true within its proper limits, and one should not ask more of a paradox; but if the saying seem obscure it may be expedient to show the reason whereon it rests. You readily grant me "it is the pace that kills." Never was animal foundered at four miles an hour on the longest course between daylight and dark; look to him well, though, if you urge him over the distance in half the time. Speed is impossible where ruts are axle-deep, bridges rotten, hills like the bouldered channels of a water-course, but the sorer your own sides the safer your horse will be. The humane man does well to snatch at such compensation as this, for there is little of mere physical delight in a day's travel on those roads which "*le bon Dieu arrange.*"

The happy phrase, for which I am indebted to a philosopher of the highway, does not always apply, for the government is apt to interfere with the processes of nature on the eve of an election. At the moment, I do not call to mind any other useful by-product of those political spasms which lead to so much job and place hunting, and cause such bitterness even in a quiet countryside; but it is at least something that the honest fisherman travels more comfortably.

Unfortunately for us, no recent need had arisen to educate the minds of the electors upon those great questions which divide the Ins and Outs, and every one of our forty-seven miles demanded full credit for its constituent rods and furlongs. When, with twelve good leagues behind us, we labour up the Grand Passe, and, a thousand feet nearer the hurrying clouds, get a last glimpse of the St. Lawrence, the late afternoon sun is casting shadows over the fertile



valley of the Gouffre. A few miles of deeply rutted road carry us by the immense granite cliffs where eagles nest undisturbed, and the steep defile of the second Pass gives the Coq more stiff collar-work, even with his passengers afoot. The summit attained, walking is still to be preferred to driving in the rolling and pitching buckboard, so do we trudge through the sloughs of the Cabâne à Yves, and past the four crossings of the Ruisseau des Chasseurs, judging ourselves fortunate when we sink only to the ankle.

If there be a horse in the province of Quebec competent to conduct four wheels intelligently and discreetly over such a track, it is our long-legged, uncomely gray, but the stream of admonition, entreaty, encouragement and reproach from his driver ceases not. Between any two telegraph poles on this highway of the king, but which His Majesty in all and every executive manifestation leaves a Higher Power to arrange, such discourse as this meets the ear: "*Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coqué, Coqué, Coqué! Ho donc, arriè', arriè'! Marche! Fais attention! Mangeur, sacré mangeur, paresseux, Coq! N'aie pas peur, arrête! Hue, hue, hue! Coq! Passe donc par là, avance, Coq! Marche—toi! Ho, arriè', regarde bien, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coq, Coqué, Coqué, Coqué! Marche!*"

Perhaps instruments of precision might disclose a relation between these commands and the movements of the Coq; it is not apparent to the unassisted eye. Yet one does not like to think of this excellent conversation as wasted: it may in some indefinable way create a sentiment, and have its use, like sermons, and editorials, and magazine articles.

At length do we emerge from the *savannes* into a region of gravel and sand twenty-six hundred feet above sea-level. Here, by reason of the nature of the ground, and not because of human intervention, the travelling is better; our eyes can be spared to see that on these heights the spring has barely arrived; tamaracks are budding; birches, aspens, and alders begin to show leaf; cherry and Indian pear are in bloom; Labrador tea and mountain laurel hint at the

flowers to come. Mid-June is a month behind the St. Lawrence littoral in plant and insect life, and the fresh foliage of the spruces is quite untouched by the pest of caterpillars which is browning the hillsides below. It is not the least lovely spring-coming to one whose happy fortune it has already been to see the arrival of three other springs in Devon, Yorkshire, and Murray Bay.

This lateness of the season promises ill for us in our quest of the Shining Ones, who only make holiday in the air and sunshine when summoned to the surface of the water by the manna which the skies afford. No figure of speech this, or at any rate none of mine. The Mayfly which swarms in such countless numbers that the fish grow fat on it, is here called *la manne*, and M. Sylva Clapin supplies me with the meaning of the word. The conditions which are favourable to the birth of the blackfly, sandfly, horsefly and mosquito, govern the coming of the Mayfly as well, and it is sadly the fact that he who would pursue the gamest and most beautiful of the charrs must make up his mind to face the fourth plague of Pharaoh.

The present moment is as good as another to explain the alternative title to this paper. Wise men are arrayed in two camps as to the proper name of the fish we are seeking,—some declare for *salvelinus nitidus*, and some for *salvelinus alipes*: there are those again who suggest that further research will show the two sub-species to be identical. Richardson in his "Fauna Boreali Americana" (1835) pictures both, and on the basis of a comparison of specimens with these plates, the authorities of the Smithsonian Institute give decision in favour of *nitidus*. To the untrained eye, attracted too much perhaps by form and colour, they appear to resemble *alipes*,—a long and peculiarly graceful fish without spots,—rather than *nitidus* which is stockier and strikingly spotted. It is fair to observe, however, that Richardson's observations were made upon dried skins of *alipes*, and we all know how rapidly the life-hues of the charrs change and fade. One is almost open to form his own opinion upon the

question, for a scientific description discloses as the only evident differences the somewhat longer dorsal and pectoral fins of *alipes*. All are agreed that we have here a variety of the widely distributed Alpine charr, and that the home of this stranger is Greenland and Boothia Felix.

The thing that amazes and fascinates is that the wanderer should be discovered in a lakelet forty miles from the St. Lawrence and two thousand feet above it, at so great a distance from his true range. Two other lakes a dozen miles away and on a higher level are supposed to contain these fish, but only a few have been taken and they have never been properly identified. The Lac de Marbre trout or *marstoni*, which ichthyologists do not class under *alpinus*, show points of resemblance, but also differences greater than can be accounted for on the basis of mere environment. The Sunapee trout, a sub-species of *alpinus*, also disclose a family likeness, and have taken to themselves the title *aureolus*, which one would have wished to confer on our wing-footed ones if the field were open. It is evident that there is a good deal of work for biologists before the species and sub-species already mentioned are sorted out and placed in their proper relation with *arcturus* and *stagnalis*. To attempt this is far beyond the writer's abilities, nor would the reader have patience with minute descriptions of gill-rakers, opercles, and preopercles. For the present purpose it suffices to say that we have to do with a new game fish hitherto only found in the far north, and brought here, as the song runs—"How, you nor I nor nobody knows."

Other discoveries in neighbouring waters adapted for these fish would be by no means surprising. The lake we are all too slowly approaching, though it lies within a few yards of a highway in constant use for over fifty years, has always been regarded as barren of fish, but this may be explained by the fact that the creatures only reveal themselves for a few days every year, at a time when not many fishermen venture into the woods, and all who can do so leave them. After the hatch of the Mayfly, and at least

until the spawning season, it is impossible to get a rise or see a fish moving; and they appear to take neither spoon nor minnow.

The Esquimaux have a generic name covering the northern charrs,—*eekalook peedeook*, and a specific name for *nitidus*,—*angmalook*. These, which may be deemed euphonious under the Arctic Circle, seem ugly mouthfuls to apply to our beautiful and graceful aliped. "Golden trout" suggests itself, and nothing could be more descriptive, but the name is already bespoken. The Latin term is apt, for he is in very truth a "shining one," but the translation would scarcely answer for everyday use. Until a better name be given I take the liberty of calling him "Malbaie trout" from the lake where he is found.

By this time the Coq is well breathed and we must press on to the camp at Lac à la Galette, where one is sure of a pleasant welcome, a comfortable bed, and the best of country fare. Not an easy commissariat this to sustain, for chickens, eggs, and even hay must be brought from our host's farm at St. Urbain, eighteen miles down the road we have just travelled. Yonder disconsolate cow, that has learned to eat many things besides grass, is probably thinking of the cold journey over the snow she will make on a *traineau* in February to her stable in the valley, or perhaps she mourns the companion that wandered too far from the house, and, as Madame tells us, was "*devorée par les ours*."

In "The Forest" Stewart Edward White has written of the "Jumping-off place." I am not for trying to follow lamely in his footsteps. Let his pen paint for you the outpost in touch, faintly and intermittently it may be but still in touch, with London and Paris and New York, with politics, stock-markets, courts, theatres, clubs,—the whole apparatus of the town-dweller's life, but where the one further step severs you from all of these instantly and completely. By more or less regular means of conveyance you approach the jumping-off place. Boats and trains abide their appointed times. Horses ply on roads beside which runs

a telegraph line. Still the day has twenty-four hours, the hour sixty minutes. But now these slavish subdivisions of time disappear. The evening and the morning are the first and every following day. Distance is measured no longer by miles but by the sun's ascension and declension, the ebb of physical strength, the primitive needs of food and repose. Things that filled the whole horizon dwindle and vanish; what was of no consequence becomes serious and vital. Arms, and legs, and lungs begin to matter, and money loses its purchasing power.

Somewhere in all this lies the magic, not in the slaying of beasts and fishes,—the magic that conjures up at sight of this solitary house visions of lakes innumerable, of the tiny beginnings of rivers, of far-stretching barrens lonely as the sea, of mountain-tops from which all earth and sky are possessed as your own. Plain and broad before you lies the trail that will carry you onward, that will fork, and fork again, flicker out and die at the Rivière du Chemin de Canôt, le Petit Lac derrière la cabâne de Médée, Lac des Neiges, and Lac du Sault, in the desolations of the Enfer and the swamps of the Grand Savanne, or where lakes Trois Loups Cerviers, Sans Oreilles, and Couchée de Femmes lie very silent in their silent encircling hills.

For this is indeed one of the chief gateways into that great tract which the province of Quebec, with high wisdom and foresight, set apart near twenty years ago "as a forest reservation, fish and game preserve, public park and pleasure ground." Administered as it always has been, there is no reason why the furthest generation should not continue here to find and enjoy what must become rarer and more precious with the years; nor can one think of any legacy so unique and priceless to be handed on whole and unwasted in perpetual inheritance. So the founders intended, for the Article reads:

"No person shall, except under lease, license, or permit, locate, settle upon, use, or occupy any portion of the said park, nor shall any lease, license, or permit be made, granted, or issued which will in any way impair the usefulness of the park."

With no little regret does one record the passing of an Order-in-Council, in July, 1912, authorizing a Pulp and Power Company to build and maintain a dam at the very heart of the park and in perhaps the best game country to be found within its borders,—the country chosen for a visit of the Governor-General of Canada in the season of 1911. The government will receive a rental of a hundred and fifty dollars a year, and, not to take very high ground, will probably lose more than this amount annually in shooting licenses. The assigned reason for permitting this invasion is that an industry established at the mouth of a river which has its source in the park finds that, through miscalculation or lack of calculation, it has not at all seasons an adequate supply of water. Engineers admit that the proposed dam will, at best, give only very trifling assistance. There are men, and no doubt very worthy and honest men, who think that when they have said "commerce before sport" the last and only word on the subject has been uttered. One would wish to suggest to them that sport has a commercial side, and one of great present and future importance. Nor at this hour should it be necessary to draw their attention also to the fact that not only is there a commercial side to sport but a rather desperately sporting side to commerce.

Twelve miles of yet more villainous road remain which a *planche*, if it survive, will traverse in four hours, and which may be done in less time on foot with greater comfort and safety. Neither the steep pitches of the Côte des Mouches, nor grievous alternations of rut and boulder, nor trembling bridges, have terrors for the Coq or his master, but the latter is seriously perturbed by the prospect of meeting a certain dog of very evil reputation at the journey's end. We learn much of this animal from Pommereau, how useless are attempts to placate, how kindness is interpreted as masked guile, how perilous in his presence it is either to advance, stand still, or retire, and how safety from his horrid fangs can only be won by remaining in the buckboard until he is tied up. Borrowing a useful word where he finds it, Pommereau adds,—"*et il ne faut pas le laisser loose.*"

The programme is indeed carried out. The great brindled beast is made fast to a comfortably stout post, whence he regards us with bloodshot eye and twitching jowl. Sorrowing as it seems that a disposition should be so perverted, in a tone judicial and devoid of anger, Pomereau addresses the poor ugly creature who counts all mankind his enemy,—“A—a—h, mon cr—r—riminel!”

Here, then, are we at the Petit Lac Malbaie, but do not be too sure of the spot, for at least three other lakes also bear this name. Soon shall be revealed to us the truth about the stranger fish who first made this their home some hundreds of thousands of years ago, when the last glacier that graved these hill-tops and delved these hollows disappeared, and the Laurentians were two thousand feet lower than they are to-day. What impertinence for the parvenu Man to beguile, examine, and eat the descendants of this so ancient race. May this, and other things, be pardoned unto him.

The lake lies under a June sky of softest blue. Diffused through the air, and dulling the sun's light and heat, is a haze so delicate that sometimes we thought it vapour and sometimes smoke. Not yet were we to know at what cost to many an unfortunate soul this lovely veil was cast over the little Fujiyama rising in perfect outline before us. Along the lake-edge wild cherry is in flower and the birches are sketching out their new summer dresses. White spruces, wearing the lovely green of springtime, draw prim skirts about their modest feet. Again we “hear lake water lapping,” and click of reel, and swish of line: our hearts are very glad.

No trout is it that comes to the fly like a bar of sunlight and is instantly gone: never did trout rise so swiftly or show such colours. The stranger cannot be mistaken, and you must be quick indeed, if the barb is to be driven home. A strike which would snatch the fly away from the slower moving *fontinalis* is barely fast enough for the Malbaie trout; moreover, he gives you one chance and only one. More alert at the next rise, the fish is struck, and now other

differences are revealed. The struggle is one of rapid, baffling turns, of singing line and complaining reel, of swiftest runs and unexpected jumps. There are no moments of quiet tugging, no dogged soundings or sullen head-shakings. To keep a steady and an even strain upon this creature flashing hither and thither in water or air, occupies you continuously and engrossingly. Nor is the battle soon over; with greater power and swiftness he has also more endurance than the brook-trout, and weight for weight, outlasts him. Opportunity for comparison is at hand, since the lake contains as fine trout as ever rose to a fly. Three years ago a few score of fingerlings taken from a neighbouring river were placed in this water, then supposed to be uninhabited. They came of a famous breed, for the trout of the river run to eight pounds and fight to the death. In these new quarters they prospered on the best of feed, and averaging to-day nearly a pound and a-half, are fat, lusty, and in prime condition. They take the fly with dash, play long and hard, and are a very pretty handful for the fisherman; still their distant cousins from the far north are the bonnier fighters.

Let me now attempt to describe the first Malbaie trout which the landing-net brought in, as it lies on the thwart after the *coup de grâce*. The scales, though small, are quite visible, and each one looks like a flake of gold,—pale gold, in which perhaps there is some admixture of silver. The colour is uniform, except that on the back the gold predominates and on the belly the silver. The characteristic spots of *fontinalis* seem to be entirely lacking, nor is there any trace of vermiculation. The lateral line is strongly marked, so that the creature's resplendent garment appears to be made in two pieces joined at the sides by the cunning art of the goldsmith. The tail is forked, but not very deeply, and in a gentle curve. Dorsal, pectoral and ventral fins are long, and they, with the tail, suggest power and swiftness. In comparison, the trout looks under-finned. The head is small and the body long and shapely. Without



the depth of the trout, there is almost equal weight for length, by reason of a roundness of model, which, especially towards the tail, recalls the mackerel.

The Malbaie trout, in this environment at least, are not anadromous. They spawn in the shallows of the open lake and do not frequent the streams which feed it or flow from it, nor are their young found therein. The brook-trout, which dwell in apparent harmony with them, go down the *décharge* to spawn, and at that season absolutely desert the lake, but none of the stranger fish are found among them. Not the slightest evidence of cross-breeding was noted, and this in a water barely a mile long and not half a mile wide.

The specimen we have been examining was a female. Two or three times a male gave us vision of a side adorned, as the eye caught it, with a band of vivid scarlet two fingers broad running the whole length of the fish below the lateral line. The only one hooked beat the angler fairly and got away. It is a simple fact of natural history that the gentler sex, whether you have to do with trout, mosquitoes, or suffragettes, bite more freely than the males.

A few of the gauzy-winged Mayflies were fluttering through the air, and a few of the Malbaie trout were on the lookout for them. This was only an advance guard, and it was not until the time of the *gros coup de mouches*, five days later, that the surface of the lake was everywhere broken by feeding fish. One would like to know whether in this the Malbaie trout have developed a new habit under a new set of conditions, or are merely following the custom of their ancestors at Regent's Inlet.

Evening falls while we are at the foot of the lake. A huge cow moose completes the wilderness picture by swimming across the bay where we are fishing, taking the land a few yards away, and gazing at us long in stolid, stupid unconcern.

Next day the Malbaie trout rose rather more freely, and always in the same swift, dainty fashion; their vivacious movements frequently bringing to mind the rapid tactics

of grilse fresh from the sea. The fish, well scattered over the lake, were picked up here and there, now a Malbaie, now a brook trout, and both yielding to the butt only at the end of an honourable contest. Such sport makes one forget fatigues, and fills a pleasant page for memory to turn of a winter evening.

Time reluctantly to depart, but first the reckoning: "We are much in your debt, Monsieur, and for more than lodging and food: for these what do we owe you?"

"You speak of what you owe me?"

"Of that precisely, Monsieur."

"But, Monsieur, you owe me nothing."

"It is not reasonable: you have brought eggs and milk and bread a long thirty miles for our better entertainment, and you yourself were on the lake before sunrise and for ten hours have paddled us in your *chaland*."

"You are good enough, Monsieur, to say that you have been pleased: pray be assured that this was still more pleasant for me. I must entreat you not to spoil it." And so it had to be.

Here and there the ancient virtue of hospitality survives,—in stately hall, in cabin of hewn logs, but whether administered by peer or peasant it is one and the same thing, nor can the quality of it be mistaken.

While the woods held us many things were happening in the world of men, but nature remained singularly unstirred. Our neighbours to the south, in the choosing of a presidential candidate, had once again exhibited the simplicity and dignity of Republican institutions; Arnold Bennett was delivered of a fresh masterpiece. Yet no echo troubled the solitudes. Only had been announced in the sky the burning of unhappy Chicoutimi.

W. H. BLAKE

## IN AN OLD VINEYARD

Timbrel, lute, and roses bring;  
Deck'd with ivy, dance and sing:  
Sing the wonder of the vine  
Turning water into wine;

Turning ashes of the earth  
Into purple globes of mirth,  
While the voices of the vine  
Whisper,—“*Come, O God of wine!*”

Loud and clear Iacchus call  
In the midnight festival:  
“Come, O golden youth divine,  
God of rapture, god of wine!”

Call him, born of Fire and Dew;  
Whirl the blazing wands anew:  
Hear ye not the yearning vine  
Whisp'ring still, “*Come, god of wine!*”

Call him from the Argos sea;  
Call him loud in holy glee:  
“Waits for thee the panting vine;  
Come, Iacchus, god of wine!”

Timbrel, lute, and roses bring,  
Dancing, singing, worshipping.  
O the wondrous violet vine,  
Turning sun and sea to wine!

ROBERT STANLEY WEIR

## THE 'INTELLIGENTSIA' AND REVOLUTION

SINCE the Russian revolutionary movements of 1905 and 1906, there has been going on in the Russian magazines and in separate publications a very instructive discussion upon the causes of the failure of these movements. Among the most vigorous of the discussions has been one upon the rôle of the "intelligentsia" in the revolution. The debate is not without significance for the study of social movements in Western Europe and in America, because, although the groups of Russian "intelligentsia" have a special character which differentiates them from the "intelligents" of other countries, there is, nevertheless, a certain similarity between their "state of mind" and that of the corresponding groups elsewhere.

The expression, "intelligentsia," is used in current phraseology in Russian in a double sense. It is used to designate the "general intelligentsia," or those who in all classes of society are engaged in the pursuit of intellectual interests, whether they earn their living by this pursuit or not; and it is also used to designate those who obtain their living exclusively by mental labour. In the former sense the expression includes those who adopt a certain critical attitude towards life, whatever their economical and social status may be; in the latter sense it is possible to separate from the social mass a specific group and to regard this group as "intelligentsia." In this sense the "intelligentsia" appears as an integral social layer intermediate between the exploited and the exploiting classes, to use the phraseology of the Social Democrats. In its upper and more specifically professional layers this class naturally allies itself with the class of capitalist employers or "proprietary bourgeoisie," while the lower and less secure

layers naturally ally themselves with the proletariat or labouring mass. The upper layers of the "intelligentsia" are composed of the managers and the superior technical experts of industrial and similar enterprises, and the lower layers of the clerks and foremen of these. The "intelligentsia," considered as a class, is thus less uniform in its economical status than other classes of society, and its different layers must therefore gravitate both politically and socially to those different classes of society with which they are more or less nearly allied. While the absence of education and culture among the peasants, on the one hand, and the comparatively slender development of higher education among the gentry and the merchant classes, on the other, prevents in Russia so complete an identification of the "intelligentsia" with one or other of the classes mentioned, as might be shown to exist in Germany and in England, for instance, there was in Russia prior to the revolution a certain amount of this identification. For example, in the Zemstvos, the "intelligentsia" allied themselves with the more intelligent of the Zemstvo gentry. For a time during the last ten years of the nineteenth century and the first five years of the twentieth, the "intelligentsia" succeeded by means of this alliance in directing the activities of the Zemstvos. During these years the "intelligentsia" attempted to make the Zemstvos the "crowbar" of the movement against the government. Simultaneously the more revolutionary of the "intelligentsia" went among the peasantry as similar enthusiasts went in the "v Narod" movement of the seventies. They tried to identify themselves with the peasant points of view and to stimulate the peasants into political action; yet in neither case did the "intelligentsia" succeed in leavening the masses, on the one hand, of the land-owning gentry, or, on the other, of the peasantry. In the first case the land-owning gentry became frightened at the prospect of the goal to which the "intelligentsia" were leading them, and began to lose faith in the efficacy of the educational and other

movements into which they were being drawn. The result of this state of mind made itself evident in the so-called "righting of the Zemstvos," and in the expulsion from them of the "intelligentsia." This proceeding had the ulterior effects of the voluntary exclusion from the Zemstvos of numbers of intelligent gentry who disapproved of the return to reaction, and of the definite alliance of these with certain of the "intelligentsia" in the formation of a new political party, namely, the party of Constitutional Democrats. Thus the city professional men and the more liberal land-owners were for the first time united in their political aims. Although the number of the gentry who united themselves in this manner with the "intelligentsia" was not great in proportion to the total number of land-owning gentry, it was, nevertheless, considerable. The "intelligentsia" who had been at work among the peasants were not able to draw from them any similar group, nor were they able to endow the peasant movement with any such definite political character. They did not represent the peasant masses and the peasant masses did not, as a whole, absorb their political doctrines. This was true of Social Democrat, Social Revolutionary, and non-party "intelligentsia" alike. Yet undoubtedly the professional "intelligentsia" constituted the backbone of the revolutionary movement. They seized liberties, when these could be seized, and they directed against the government all the forces they could muster; but their influence over the classes with which they had allied themselves was inadequate to effect a political and social union sufficiently powerful to overthrow the autocracy.

The reason for this failure may, probably, be fairly regarded as two-fold. First, the masses of the people were not ready for such action as might lead to the overthrow of the autocracy; and second, the "intelligentsia" were divided into two main fractions. These fractions were, on the one hand, the groups who trusted in revolutionary methods, pure and simple; and, on the other hand, those

who believed in political action properly so-called. The first fraction was not numerically powerful, and perhaps was not skilful enough in the special kind of skill which was necessary to create a situation in which the autocracy must collapse, while the second fraction was not sufficiently experienced in political methods to turn to the best advantage the universal discontent. This division into two fractions, while quite inevitable in certain phases of all such movements, must have been fatal to the complete realization of the revolution, even although each fraction had been more widely supported than was the case.

Much importance must also, however, be attached to the fact that the overthrow of the autocracy was a political measure, while the advocacy and the struggle of both fractions were not merely political, but were also social. The aims of the "intelligentsia," as a whole, were two-fold. They desired a political revolution and they desired a drastic social change. The origins of this double aim must be sought for in the historical circumstances which gave the Russian "intelligentsia" its special character.

Professor Tugan-Baronovsky finds the chief mark of distinction between the development of Western Europe and the development of Russia to lie in the presence in the former, and the absence in the latter, of the gild organization of industry. This organization, in Professor Tugan-Baronovsky's view, was largely instrumental in the creation in Western Europe of a class of cultivated bourgeoisie, which not merely acquired predominant political power but which represented the intellectual force of its time. The greater bourgeoisie had no monopoly of culture; for culture was also shared by the smaller bourgeoisie who played a leading social and political rôle for several centuries. In Russia the greater bourgeoisie, or trading-capitalist class, was not cultivated, and the small bourgeois class did not exist. In Western Europe the professions were chiefly recruited from the small bourgeoisie. Sons of the small manufacturers became statesmen, lawyers, clergy, and men of letters, and gave to society such intel-

lectual and cultivated tone as it possessed. Moreover, they acted as a connecting link between the upper and lower layers of society. Out of this condition there arose in Western Europe the sense of citizenship which, common to all classes, served to bind society together. Such a state of mind did not exist in Russia, because that country did not possess the class in whose minds it could take root.

Peter the Great was one of the first to recognize that Russia could never become a powerful empire without the aid of educated men. He therefore encouraged and required the nobility to devote themselves to education in order to provide the State with the instruments necessary for administration. The duty thus laid upon the nobility and the gentry, and the practical exclusion from the higher service of the State of all but these, resulted in the exclusion from the ranks of the "intelligentsia," up till the middle of the nineteenth century, of all but members of the nobility and gentry, officers of the army and civil officials predominating. The type of educated men thus formed was essentially different from the type produced in Western Europe by continual accessions to the ranks of the educated classes from the ranks of the small bourgeoisie. The "intelligentsia" of Western Europe derived from, and sympathizing with, the bourgeoisie, shared its interests, and, therefore, not only threw itself as a class into the political struggles of the eighteenth century, which, early in the nineteenth century, resulted in the victory of the bourgeoisie and in their capture of political power; but when that phase of political struggle was over and the proletariat attempted to displace the bourgeoisie and to seize the reins of power, the "intelligentsia" in general was ranged not on the side of the proletariat, but against it. The origin and history of the "intelligentsia" of Western Europe thus account for the antagonism of the "intelligentsia" to socialism. The origin and history of the "intelligentsia" in Russia, on the other hand, predispose the "intelligentsia" of that country towards socialism. Their sympathies and interest



do not incline them towards the bourgeoisie, and since the smaller bourgeoisie does not as a class exist in Russia, the advent of socialism would produce by no means so great an economic disturbance in Russia as must inevitably be the case elsewhere. It must be acknowledged, moreover, that the "intelligentsia" are perhaps the only socialists in Russia. The peasant masses cannot be transformed into Social Democrats, and the working-men of the industrial centres are not sufficiently well educated to entertain any but crude ideas of socialism, even when they are in general well affected towards socialist ideas as presented to them by the Social Democrats.

The Russian "intelligentsia" have, moreover, by origin and tradition, a profound lack of faith in the autocratic state. Russian evolution has for them meant the development of absolutism, therefore they are opposed to the Russian State in its present form. Under the pre-revolution conditions, Russian men of letters and jurists exercised no influence upon the government. This exclusion from political power, for the exercise of which they conceived themselves to be well fitted, was the chief cause of their oppositional activity. They threw themselves into the struggle against the autocracy, and in this struggle the "intelligentsia" naturally allied themselves with the parties which devoted themselves to "active resistance."

The attitude towards life and towards the evolution of society, which is adopted by the Russian "intelligentsia," is thus quite different from that adopted by analogous groups in Western Europe. From the beginning of the nineteenth century, the class in Russia was growing in numbers; its education was frequently of the highest order, yet its influence upon the conduct of affairs was nil; under these circumstances, the "intelligentsia" threw itself with ardour into the struggle for a change. The Dekabristi were among the first to be influenced by Western European thought, and each successive group of the "intelligentsia" was more and more influenced by it. Whether or not Pestel was

inspired by contemporary French writers, like Saint-Simon, for example, or whether he arrived spontaneously at doctrines very similar to those of that writer, may not be susceptible of determination; but later groups were undoubtedly influenced by their French and German contemporaries. The current of ideas which is vaguely known as Socialism swept the Russian "intelligentsia" along in numbers proportionately much greater than was the case in any other country. It is necessary to study carefully the causes of this ready absorption by the Russian "intelligentsia" of doctrines which won their way very slowly in Western Europe, and have never been accepted with any ardour by first-rate minds, although in one or another form they have been embraced by writers of enthusiastic and impulsive temperament. Probably the causes may be found in two characteristics of Russian life: first, the detachment of the intellectual Russian from the sordid materialism of the peasant and the merchant; and second, the detachment, in an intellectual and moral sense, which arose out of the existence of political despotism and ecclesiastical stagnation, and the consequent diversion of his mind from the political and ecclesiastical spheres to purely intellectual and moral spheres. This detachment on two important sides of his life has endowed the intellectual Russian with a sense of freedom and an indifference to tradition which have marked him off especially from Frenchmen and Englishmen of the same degree of ability and education, in whose minds political interests have assumed a large place and have served, as it were, to adulterate their intellectual products. The Western European is thus by no means so free from intellectual and moral pre-judgements as the Russian. The purely intellectual and critical attitude of mind of the Russian may be held to have exposed him in an especial manner to socialist convictions; because, prevented as the intellectual Russian was from entering the political field, he was not accustomed to regard that field as enclosing any but a part of the national life; and finding in the national life much

to condemn, and much to reform, he proposed to seek the direction of reform not within the field of politics but altogether outside of the contemporary political conventions. He was thus led to consider a complete social change as the indispensable condition of progress. For these reasons he was most likely to embrace socialism, whose offers of regeneration were the most generous in the intellectual market.

The ideals offered by Liberalism sufficed to stimulate the intellectuals of Western Europe, but for the Russian they paled before more ample promises. A constitutional monarchical State firmly based upon the support of the capitalist and land-owning classes had no attraction for the Russian "intelligent." The historical moment for embracing an ideal of that kind had passed long since. For him the State did not require to be strengthened; it was already too strong. The development of the Russian State had brought its power to the utmost limits, so far as concerned its relations with the Russian people; nothing more could be hoped from that development. It was necessary to go outside the field of Russian political and social thought to discover a new ideal. The selection of this ideal might be accomplished by abstract methods and in a disinterested manner. The change must be a drastic one in any case. Why not at once aim at the result most highly desirable within the range of contemporary human vision?

Moreover, in Russia the struggle between classes was of an essentially different character from that which obtained in Western Europe. In the latter region, the classes were engaged for centuries in a series of contests for the mastery of political power. In Russia no such contests took place. No class had any political power; there was thus little class solidarity either for defensive or for offensive purposes. From the beginning of the Moscow State the power of its princes had been directed towards the organization of the community into officers and rankers. Every nobleman had his function—military or civil—to perform; and every

peasant had his place and his obligations. There were no others, excepting the clergy; and these also had their rights and duties. All were under the control of the great "leveller," the Tsar. Thus, in Russia the building up of self-conscious classes has yet to begin. In no case have the classes of which society is composed acted together for any length of time, nor have they even acted separately with any degree of interior cohesion. The mere existence in Russia of the "intelligentsia," belonging as it does to various classes, is a proof of the absence in that country of class solidarity. Up till the period of Emancipation the Russian "intelligentsia" comprised chiefly members of aristocratic families, with a few sons of the clergy, and a few sons of professional men; these being connected, directly or indirectly, either with the aristocracy or with the Church. The wealthier bourgeoisie also contributed to the "intelligentsia," but to a slender extent. After Emancipation, in 1861, the "intelligentsia" was subjected to an invasion, and its character was altered. This was the invasion by "raznachintsi," or plebeians, who now, undeterred by legal barriers, came out from the people. The "intelligentsia" was thus, as it were, democratized, and the consequence is apparent in the facile adoption by the new elements of the socialist ideas of that period. Thus the "intelligentsia," recruited by new, active, and highly articulate groups, came to be regarded by the world at large as consisting wholly of these groups, and the forms of socialism which they had accepted came to be looked upon as representing the attitude of the "intelligentsia" as a whole. The new members of the "intelligentsia," teachers, physicians, Zemstvo clerks, journalists, etc., belonged to the people by birth and early training, and belonged to the intellectual group by higher education. They had the faults of their qualities, and the strength and weakness of the class from which they sprang. They were full of hope and enthusiasm; yet their social and mental equilibrium was not secure. They felt themselves at war with the peasant conditions which they had abandoned, and they

disliked the vulgar ostentation of the more conspicuous of the superior classes, while they had little opportunity of knowing the charm of the simplicity and refinement of mature social types. Their views of society thus lacked perspective. Their criteria and relative values were imperfect, and they attached to certain phases of life exaggerated importance. The outcome of all this was a certain fanatical enthusiasm,—in extreme cases tending to merely futile visions or to violent action with intent to produce immediate results. This group has been defined by a recent writer, as “a number of militant monks of the Nihilist religion of earthly well-being. This group, so strange to the monastic system, declares war against the world in order forcibly to benefit it, and, as it were in spite of itself, to satisfy its material needs. The whole energy of this monkish army is directed towards the material interests and needs for the creation of a terrestrial paradise of abundance and security. Everything that is transcendental, every faith in absolute values is a hateful enemy.” This view of the Russian “intelligentsia,” or rather of that large portion of it which has been recruited from the inferior social layers, is contained in one of the essays which compose a singular volume entitled “Vyekhē.” (The word means the tall posts which are set up to indicate the road in the winter while the country is covered with deep snow.) These essays offer, in general, the same interpretation of the relation to the revolution of the “intelligentsia.” According to this interpretation the rôle of the “intelligentsia” in the revolution failed because of the fundamentally erroneous ideals of the group. These ideals, being based exclusively upon material things, lacked the spiritual character which alone can stimulate people to heroic deeds. To accomplish the overthrow of the autocracy such deeds were indispensable; but the spiritual force being lacking they were not accomplished. This criticism involves the postulate that spiritual life is supreme, both “theoretically and practically, over the external forms of social life.” The exaggerated importance which was attached

to these external forms led the "intelligentsia" to neglect the interior life of society, and thus to inability to act as guide towards the emancipation of the people.

The critical attack upon the "intelligentsia" in the pages of "Vyekhē" is not conducted by reactionaries but by writers who may fairly be regarded as themselves belonging to the "intelligentsia"; many of them being Constitutional Democrats. "We do not," they say, "judge the past, because its historical inevitability is clear; but we do point out that the path which Russian society has trodden, has brought it to this impasse."

The state of mind which "Vyekhē" and the literature which has sprung up round it reveals, is evidently due to reaction after the revolution. That this reaction should assume a semblance of pietism is no novelty. Outbursts of religious fervour after great emotional strain are common alike in individual and in national life. The authors of "Vyekhē" make their position quite plain in a casual phrase in their preface. "This very point [the main point they urge, that is, the supremacy of the spiritual over the material forces] has been untiringly repeated from Chaadayev to Solovyev and Tolstoy, by all our profound thinkers. They were not listened to. The 'intelligentsia' went past them. Perhaps now, awakened as by an earthquake, they will listen to weaker voices." That is to say, that after the turmoil of the revolution is over the exhausted spirit turns to the seers or to the confessional and the stool of repentance.

In his very able and interesting criticism of "Vyekhē," Professor Tugan-Baronovsky observes that the opposition which the authors of that volume have discovered between external social reforms and the interior development of personality, is not at all fundamental; but on the contrary, the elements of this alleged opposition are indissolubly connected with one another. Social forms, he says, and human personality do not represent two distinct social categories. It is equally right to say that personality creates social forms as to say that social forms create personality.

Each limits and determines the other. The authors of "Vyekh" regard the "intelligentsia" as a separate social group, and they attribute to this social group the principal rôle in the revolution. There is much to be said for this view; but their continuation is more doubtful. This group, they say, is making for the disintegration of the Russian Empire; it is therefore their duty to dissolve themselves and to fall back into the classes to which they respectively belong; because, says Struvë, the foundations of politics are to be discovered not in the organization of society, but in the "internal self-development of the man." It is true that a bad man cannot make a good citizen, but it is not advisable, even if it were possible, to hold society as dissolved until each person in it is improved to the desired pitch.

The "intelligentsia," with all its faults, is clearly a present fact of Russian social life. It has been the inevitable result of the conditions of Russian society of the past hundred years. Moreover, for the reasons explained above, the "intelligentsia" is to be regarded "rather as a social-ethical than as a social-economic category;" that is, it is not a social class, but a group in a certain scheme of social classification. Although a large number, perhaps the majority of the Russian "intelligentsia," have been swept along by the socialist wave, as Social Democrats or Socialist Revolutionists, yet it would not be safe to suppose that there was only an insignificant minority. This minority may be held to be composed of those of more placid temperament, who are not readily carried away by the currents of fashion, and who are disposed to look at social progress as the result of the interaction of many forces.

In Germany, France, England, and in the United States, there has undoubtedly appeared during recent years a social phenomenon which corresponds more or less to the description of it given by Kautsky. The development of capitalism, he says in effect, has resulted in the appearance of a special class hired by the capitalist. This class is required to perform operations for which high mental ability

and scientific education are necessary. One of the frequent, though not invariable, concomitants of this high mental ability and specialized education is capacity to think abstractly, and another is detachment from special class interests. There is, thus, a new class within a class which possesses a "wider spiritual horizon" than any other. This new class has therefore before it, not class interests but the wider interests of society as a whole. The aims of this class, to begin with, are likely to be of an ethical character. They thus tend towards Katheder Sozialism, the coöperative movement, arbitration, and the like.

Jaurès, the French Revisionist, notices also the rise of this class and predicts that, "insulted by a Society based on coarse mercantile interests and disappointed with bourgeois domination," this class will become socialist. The consequence to socialism is, however, not regarded with equanimity by orthodox Marxists, who consider that the socialist party is in the throes of a crisis owing to the influx into its ranks of large numbers of "bourgeois intelligents."

From these and other considerations Tugan-Baronovsky arrives at the conclusion that the "intelligent" is drifting away from the bourgeoisie, to which he belongs by birth and training, and is approaching the proletariat. Assuming that this means an approach towards socialism, he meets the argument that it means also the débâcle of socialism, by expressing the opinion that, while it may involve the passing of Marxism, it need not involve the passing of socialism, "which existed before Marx and is likely to exist after him." In any case he thinks that the democratization of Western Europe is probably making in this direction, and that in this respect Russia is likely to follow the West.

It must be observed, however, that the great changes which have occurred in Russian public life through the institution of the Duma, and the greater freedom of the press, have altered materially the conditions which promoted the influence of socialism upon the minds of the "intelligentsia." There must be a tendency to draw at all events the milder



types into the current of political discussion and to the expenditure of their energies in that direction rather than in the direction of discussions of social change of a drastic order. Besides, socialism denuded of Marxism may probably so alter in character and in political and social aims as to demand a new name. For Marxism, after all, afforded a certain fixed *credo* to which appeal could be made from the heretics; and the abandonment of this fixity is not unlikely to result, for a time, in vague and fluctuating positions useless for purposes of propaganda.

Necessary as "revision" had come to be, it meant the inclusion in the socialist ranks of many who were not, in the older sense, fairly to be regarded as socialists. Therefore, the new ranks, useful and progressive as they may have been, are, strictly speaking, other than socialist, however convenient the retention of the traditional name may be, and however difficult it is for the public to learn any other.

JAMES MAVOR

## IN MEMORIAM

1913

Fringed with the frozen foam of sunless seas,  
 Frontier'd by unseen foes man dare not scorn,  
 There lies a land forsaken and forlorn,  
 Drownsed with pale dreams of pathless centuries.  
 There, where Thought yearns through Time's immensities,  
 A man's strong soul went out to meet the morn;  
 Went with his comrades to that farther bourn  
 That swallows up life's little victories.  
 There laid they down the burden of their quest,  
 Leal to the last, and loyal to their race:  
 Swathed in their shroud of silence, let them rest  
 Within the splendid solitudes of space.  
 Because these men proved tempered to the test,  
 We reach with firmer feet a prouder place.

BLANCHE E. HOLT MURISON

## THE SETTLEMENT SPIRIT

**A**LTHOUGH it is almost twenty-three years since the first settlement was established in America, and much longer than that since the work was initiated in England, the word "settlement" still seems to hold a quality of mystery to the majority of people who hear it. "What is a settlement?" is constantly asked of those who work in them. "What do you do there?" "Do you think you are doing any good?"

The first question is to be answered in a simple and easy way. The others require more thought. To give them anything like adequate replies one must consider the settlement spirit as an entity, a manifestation of our times which has come, and is worthy of close consideration by all thinking people, whether they are possessed by a passion for service, or not.

Let us imagine that a family, for some other reason than absolute necessity, goes to live in one of the poorer quarters of a great city. Let this family inhabit a house similar to those of the vicinity, with the same conditions surrounding it. Certain differences will soon show themselves, for this family brings with it ideals and traditions which are higher in standard and broader in horizon than those of their new environment. These differences may show themselves first in such concrete, extraneous forms as a tidy doorway, clean windows, neat curtains, a bit of grass in front of the house, if there is ground to spare. Neighbours in the rear will notice that the tiny back yard soon becomes converted into a small garden of green vines and gay-coloured plants, and that the ashes and other household refuse are tidily disposed of. These are, if you like, humble manifestations of an inward and spiritual grace; nevertheless, they are productive of rapid results in that neighbourhood.

The newcomers are looked upon with natural curiosity by the older inhabitants. Their doings inspire wonder, some criticism, and later a stimulus to imitation.

If, as will be natural, some slight social relations are established between the members of this family and those about them, it will be observed that the inside of the dwelling shows a different order from that prevailing near at hand. The pictures on the wall, the books on shelf and table, the plant in the window, may all be of the most inexpensive sort, but they acknowledge the belief, none the less, that life holds other things besides work and sleep, food and drink.

Finding these new neighbours kindly and unassuming, the people soon begin to have confidence in them. They share the joys and sorrows of their lives with each other. Our family has become, perhaps quite unconsciously, a "social centre." As they come to be more intimately concerned in the welfare of those about them, they may form little groups to study such matters as the training and educating of the children, proper cooking, hygiene, nursing, and, perhaps, finding that they are not competent to answer all the questions aroused through the newly awakened enthusiasms of their neighbours, they call upon those among their former neighbours who are best adapted to answer these questions, for assistance. These, again, bring their experience to share it in brotherly and sisterly fashion, and the "centre" has become a "settlement." If these people who come to advise, help, and form new interests where few, or none, existed before, happen to be university people, the group will naturally rally round the standard of their *alma mater*, and call themselves a University Settlement. If they are people from some society, or representing some especial creed, their settlement will probably get its designation from one of these sources. It is all as simple as that.

It is unfortunate that we must always label impulses, so that they become "movements," for after all any family

living a life of sincere kindness and simplicity is a spreading influence for good, but we do not label it a "social centre." Any little group of people working in a community for high ideals of service and mutual helpfulness is a social settlement, but if the people they work among are equally blest with fortune and education as themselves, these ideals of helpfulness and service are allowed to remain hidden under their old names of friendship and sociability.

It seems to be a rather general belief that settlement work is a profession; that in order to do this work one must have a special training, dig deep into theories of sociology, read books rather outside the lines of the ordinary library, and do other mysterious things likely to be beyond the experience of every day mortals.

It is true that many settlements do engage a professional worker who is trained in methodical ways, enabling him, or her, to organize work, study neighbourhood conditions, and guide and advise the voluntary workers. Nevertheless, I am convinced that it is among the voluntary workers that we must look for the true settlement spirit, and particularly among the younger ones. The spirit of youth and the spirit of the settlement go side by side, almost hand in hand. Our maturer years are apt to be governed by expediency. Youth acknowledges its impulses. It has a sort of fierce courage; a passion for readjustment and an elasticity after rebuff and disappointment, which will be lost later on. These qualities of youth are valuable assets. They more than balance youth's inexperience, about which far too much is said. A gift of ripened fruit may be useful, nutritious, but it does not approximate the gift of the blossom. The sage who recommended that if we have money to buy two loaves of bread, we buy but one and spend the rest of our little all for hyacinths, struck a deep note in human nature. It is hyacinths, not bread only, that the settlement spirit would give to those among whom it passes.

The volunteer workers bring from their own home environment a fresh outlook, and they will take back from their work a new insight, a deepened understanding which

will in time form a sturdy link in the ever lengthening chain of human brotherhood. Many magazines and editorials sound warning notes concerning mistakes likely to be made by untrained workers, and dwell at great length upon the need of tact. Inexperience does not last long, and as for tact, sincerity soon outstrips it in the race. There is no human relationship where inexperience does not make mistakes, and settlement work is only a phase of human relationship. We do not allow inexperience to prevent us from forming friendships, yet who has not at some time hurt the feelings of a friend? Who has not had his own sensibilities wounded? Wives and husbands, parents and children, must make errors in judgement, and sometimes inflict deep wounds, before the true adjustment in these relationships can take place: yet we do not suggest professionalizing them on that account. If they get beyond adjustment there are laws to help, it is true: but mankind at large feels contempt for those who cannot settle human relationships by a combination of affection and common sense.

The most tactless individual living may be cured of that fault by doing a little neighbourhood visiting. A few pertinent questions from a woman disturbed at her washboard, or an impassioned address from the ruffled mother who thinks some of her brood unfairly dealt with, may work a speedier and more salutary cure for tactlessness than fasting and much prayer. Even if a person can bring to neighbourhood visiting no other qualification than that of being a new audience, that is something. The fact that some one steps aside from the busy highway long enough to listen to our stories is worth a good deal. Much help is done by indirect teaching. Any of us, looking back upon childhood, will remember that many of the most valuable lessons in conduct were given us, not by those who said didactically, "Thou shalt," and "Thou shalt not," but by those who were probably quite unconscious that we were patterning after them. A child is far oftener inspired to truthful dealings because some one whose approval it

desires regards untruthfulness as ugly and "not playing the game," than by those who simply hammer away at him with the general aphorism that lies are wicked. Abstractions make small appeal to the plastic mind of the child. A group of untidy girls will be quite likely to be influenced in the direction of neatness and pretty ways of conduct by a girl a few years older than themselves, who is herself neat and possessed of pretty ways. An older woman, or man, may lecture on the same qualities as ethical abstracts until the stars grow cold, and never get results.

Let us not, however, belittle the value of experience. The woman who can begin a talk to mothers with the simple opening, "I remember when my baby was ill," will command instant attention, and gain the confidence of her audience. The wisest doctor, the most experienced trained nurse, failing that one shibboleth will have to break through certain hedges of reserve before reaching the ground whence the first speaker started. Lack of experience in some cases may be a severe handicap. Without it teaching is merely academic, and advice too impersonal. Personality is scarcely to be overestimated in work of this character, or in any work for that matter. Even in affairs purely academic, it is, after all, the lecturer who is able to project his personality over that gap between platform and benches whose words will sink deepest, and be most gladly remembered.

Thus it happens that when people ask, "What do you do at the settlement?" it is not easy to answer. There may be times when you will feel that perhaps you are doing nothing at all. Discouragements are bound to come.

The third question is one the worker will ask himself in wakeful hours of the night, when the will is almost sleeping, and little evil genii of doubt and disillusion break out of the stoppered bottles and assume vast proportions. "Are you doing any good?" they cry tauntingly. The more conscientious the worker the more insistent are these questions. The answer is "Yes." No instrument is yet invented which can measure such good, but statistics of the future may show it. Every hour that a child is kept in a healthy,

happy, clean environment, protected from the physical and mental dangers of the street, is a gain to the race, however infinitesimal it may seem in the aggregate. If during such hours the child's hands, brain, or both, are usefully employed, the gain is greater. If these employments of hand and brain are such as shall fit that child for a more normal and useful life later on, increasing his physical well-being and his earning capacity, these hours will benefit, not only the existent child but his child in turn.

Sympathetic talk with the mothers of children on advice concerning the upkeep of their homes, proper feeding, the value of fresh air and cleanliness, all these simple things which the least professional of us now-a-days has some knowledge of, may be of a far-reaching, inestimable benefit, though no direct results are noticed.

In moments of deepest discouragement, if no proof that your work has been useful elsewhere is available, look deep in your own heart. There at least you will, if you are sincere with yourself, be forced to acknowledge that there is a change. Another bridge, slight it may be, but nevertheless permanent, has been thrown across that river of misunderstanding which has flowed so long between the two great divisions of society, the employers and the workers. The poets long ago planned these bridges, but we of a so-called practical age have been left to build them, and each of us has some qualification for such work, and the work is waiting.

If we have no other outlet for our energies, the settlements are always at hand needing people like ourselves. If they are not at hand, people like ourselves can start them, humbly, simply, in a spirit of true neighbourliness, keeping the ideal of the settlement spirit in constant sight :

“ Not what we give, but what we share,  
For the gift without the giver is bare.  
Who gives himself with his alms, feeds three,  
Himself, his hungering neighbour, and Me.”

ANNE HIGGINSON SPICER

## WILLIAM CAXTON, "SIMPLE PERSON"

IT is not easy for us to-day, in the plenitude of printed literature, to conceive of what life must have been in the Middle Ages, when "twenty bokes clad in blak or red" were all the learned clerk dared hope for, and when a hundred volumes constituted a plethoric library. To acquire such a library cost a fortune, and even a single volume was not to be had without lavish expenditure. Old Richard de Bury who made a practice of exacting rare manuscripts of those who sought his favour with his master, Edward III, avers that "no dearness of price ought to hinder a man from the buying of books, if he has the money that is demanded for them;" and quaintly considers that the very bookshelves should be held sacred, as the rich setting of a precious jewel. "Moses, the gentlest of men, teaches us to make bookcases most neatly, wherein they may be protected from any injury: 'Take,' he says, 'this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God.' O fitting place and appropriate for a library, which was made of imperishable shittim-wood, and was all covered within and without with gold!"

No wonder the mediæval collector prized his book; for a single copy represented months and perhaps years of toil on the part of the monk in his scriptorium or the scribe in his closet; and the very slowness with which the text had been transcribed warranted the expenditure of further years of toil in the fitting decoration of it. This laboriousness of production spelled rarity and costliness. Learning and culture, if not aristocratic, were at least exclusive; and when, in the fruition of time, the Renaissance came to loosen the intellectual bonds of the Middle Ages, learning and culture would still have remained the perquisites of wealth or of religious seclusion, had it not been



for one of those timely miracles that illuminate the pages of history.

"In a silent laboratory," says M. Jusserand in the prelude to his "Literary History of England in the Renaissance," "among blackened tables, surrounded by prentices who have sworn secrecy, the master sets in line with patient hand small pieces of metal; like an alchemist he seems, composing the formula which will unlock the secret of gold. He is as yet alone of his kind, his hand hesitates, and his invention is incomplete; but he will act more powerfully on the future of mankind than the inventors of steam or of gunpowder. His craft has no name of its own: he calls it 'the art of writing artificially'."

Of these artizan-prophets, Faust and Gutenberg had not yet achieved their "*monumentum aere perennius*," the great Gutenberg or Mazarin Bible, and Aldus Manutius and Henri Estienne were not yet born, when an English boy, native of Kent, and speaking a dialect which he himself describes as "broad and rude," left London, where he had been apprenticed to a mercer, and established himself in Bruges in the Low Countries. There, and in other parts of the Low Countries, Caxton continued, as he says in his first preface, for the space of thirty years. In Bruges he prospered, becoming, indeed, the first governor appointed by the Mercers' Association to pass upon all commercial problems arising through the transactions of the Mercers' Company. One might think that the busy merchant and commercial governor of Bruges would have had scant time for literature; but all his life Caxton seems to have been strangely haunted by the fear of that one of the Seven Deadly Sins from which we should imagine him most free. And so, in the year 1468, in order to exorcise the demon Idleness, he sets himself to translate (in long hand, of course,) a popular French compilation, "The Recuyell of the Histories of Troy."

"When I remember," he explains in the "Prologue" to the completed work, "that every man is bounden by

the commandment and counsel of the wise man to eschew sloth and idleness, which is mother and nourisher of vices, and ought to put himself unto virtuous occupation and business, then I, having no great charge of occupation, following the said counsel, took a French book, and read therein many strange and marvellous histories, wherein I had great pleasure and delight, as well for the novelty of the same as for the fair language of French, which was in prose so well and compendiously set and written, which methought I understood the sentence and substance of every matter. And for so much as this book was new and late made and drawn into French, and never had seen it in our English tongue, I thought in myself it should be a good business to translate it into our English, to the end that it might be had as well in the royaume of England as in other lands, and also for to pass therewith the time, and thus concluded in myself to begin this said work."

The translation thus undertaken to exorcise the demon Idleness, was laid aside after a time, because of the "simplicity and imperfectness" which Caxton confessed to, in both French and English. Meanwhile, he had given up his commercial activities and had entered into the household service of the Duchess of Burgundy, "the right high, excellent and right virtuous Princess, my right redoubted Lady, my Lady Margaret, by the grace of God, sister unto the King of England and of France." At her behest, he ingenuously explains, "whose dreadful commandment I durst in no wise disobey, because I am a servant unto her said Grace and receive of her yearly fee and other many good and great benefits and also hope many more to receive of her Highness," he devoted himself anew to the translation of the Recuyell. The translation prospered, but the translator waxed weary. The toil of writing out the text in the slow and precise script of the period began to tell upon Caxton; and the matter was further complicated by the appeals from many quarters for copies of the book. If one copy taxed him so heavily, how should he satisfy the noble gentlemen, his friends, who desired other copies?

The solution was at hand. Living at Bruges, he had heard talk of this new art of printing. Caxton was nothing if not thorough. Giving up everything else, he set himself to learn; and having learned he returned to the Recuyell, ready to satisfy his noble friends. "And forasmuch as in the writing of the same my pen is worn, my hand weary and not steadfast, mine eyne dimmed with overmuch looking on the white paper, and my courage not so prone and ready to labour as it hath been, and that age creepeth on me daily and feebleth all the body; and also because I have promised to divers gentlemen and to my friends to address to them as hastily as I might this said book, therefore, I have practised and learned at my great charge and dispense to ordain this said book in print after the manner and form as ye may here see, and is not written with pen and ink as other books be, to the end that every man may have them at once." And then follows an explanation which seems childish, until we look through Caxton's eyes. The long toil of completing a new copy of a manuscript meant that many months would intervene between the completion of one copy and the completion of the next. But now when the type was all set, a number of copies could be turned off on the same day. Wonderful! Caxton can hardly apprehend it himself. He feels that he ought to call public attention to the phenomenon. And so he adds: "For all the books (that is, copies) of this story, named 'The Recuyell of the Histories of Troy,' thus imprinted as ye here see, were begun in one day and also finished in one day." And thus casually, being begun to avoid idleness, and being in this wise finished to save trouble, the first English book got itself printed. And thus, though not yet on English soil, was uttered the *fiat lux* in the creation of modern England.

For, casual as was the printing of the Recuyell, it had immediate and momentous consequences. Caxton forthwith translated into English and printed another book, "The Game and Playe of the Chesse." By this time he had become wholly absorbed in his new occupation. He

threw aside everything else, returned to England, set up his press beside or in Westminster Abbey, and on November 18th, 1477, printed the first English book ever struck off on English soil, "The Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers." It is not without significance that whereas Caxton's earlier printings had followed the practice of the time in making no reference to the date and the name of the printer, this book gives in the colophon Caxton's name, and the date and place of printing. It was worth while. Printing was started in England; and implicit in that crude machine at Westminster was the ceaseless activity of the modern presses, disseminating news and knowledge, stimulus and instruction, wisdom and perhaps not a little folly as well, throughout the English-speaking world.

From this 18th day of November, 1477, until his death, fourteen years later, Caxton displayed the most unexampled activity. He still refers now and again in his prefaces to his desire to escape the demon Idleness; but it is hard to see how he found time even to eat and sleep. With his little corps of assistants—never more than three and often only one—he printed nearly eighty separate works, and, including later editions of the same author, over one hundred different books, or, on the whole, over eighteen thousand pages. He himself translated from French and Latin twenty-one books, and revised the translations of many others. For each of the works which came from his press he wrote a preface, describing the circumstances which led him to select it for publication, making comments which sometimes amount to genuine critiques, and never failing in his quaint and earnest way to point out to the reader the moral profit which he may derive from the perusal of the book. And through all these prefaces run certain strongly marked personal characteristics which help us to see the man not as a mere mechanic, immortalized by a lucky chance, and turned into dust five centuries ago, but as a very vital, human, and personable man, not soon to vanish from our ken.

And first of all is the simplicity, the naïvete, the humility of his spirit. "I, William Caxton, simple person"—so he describes himself in the preface to the "Morte D'Arthur." "I laboured in the said translation after my simple and poor cunning"—is his favourite account of his work as a translator. For any faults in the work the author should not be held responsible. Instead, the reader should "arette it to my cunning which is full small in this behalf." He constantly refers to himself as "indigne and unworthy." No accumulation of epithets seems sufficient adequately to express his reverence for his mistress, the Duchess of Burgundy, whose fee he has received and whose further favours he ingenuously permits himself to expect. When Earl Rivers translates the "Dictes," and Caxton proposes to print it, the "noble and puissant lord" suggests that Caxton should "oversee" the translation. He can hardly bring himself to take such a liberty and consents only after much urging. And when he undertakes to restore a passage which the noble translator has omitted, the printer is dismayed at the liberty which he contemplates, and sets himself, with quaint humour, to find excuses for the Earl's omission,—"forasmuch," he says, "as I am not certain whether it was in my Lord's copy or not, or else, peradventure, that the wind had blown over the leaf at the time of translation." And if any reader should not approve of Caxton's restoration, let him "rend the leaf out of the book." A book, too, which Caxton prints, however humble the printer, is designed to be read only by gentlemen. "It is not for a rude uplandish man to labour therein ne read it but only for a clerk and noble gentlemen. . . . For this book is not for every rude and uncunning man to see, but to clerks and very gentlemen that understand gentleness and science."

Side by side with this personal humility runs a strain of idealism—a steadfast stream, both fine and clear. The books which he selects for printing, even the romances, must be good for the soul. The "Golden Legend" shall

be a "profit to all them that shall read or hear it read, and may increase in them virtue and expell vice and sin." The citizens of London are growing selfish. "There is almost none that intendeth to the common weal, but only every man for his singular profit;" and so, for their example and behoof, he prints a commentary on Cato, the noble Roman, because, says Caxton, "Unto the noble, ancient and renowned city, the city of London, in England, I, William Caxton, owe of right my service and good-will, and of very duty am bounden naturally to assist, aid, and counsel, as far forth as I can to my power, as to my mother of whom I have received my nurture and living." "Boethius" is reprinted in order that his readers may "learn to have and keep the better patience in adversities;" Malory's "King Arthur," that the "noble lords and ladies and all other estates of what estate or degree they be of, may see and learn the noble acts of chivalry, the gentle and virtuous deeds that some Knights used in those days, humbly beseeching that they take the good and honest acts in their remembrance to follow the same, wherein they shall find many joyous and pleasant histories and noble and renowned acts of humanity, gentleness, and chivalry. For herein may be seen noble chivalry, courtesy, humanity, friendliness, hardyhood, love, friendship, cowardice, murder, hate, virtue, and sin. Do after the good and leave the evil, and it shall bring you to good fame and renown."

Nor would Caxton, in these imprintings, willingly do injustice to any man. He had printed Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales" from a version which he afterwards discovered to be inaccurate. When this matter was revealed to him, he hastened to make amends by printing a second edition of the "Canterbury Tales" from a better manuscript, and in so doing felt as lively a responsibility as if the old poet, dead nigh a hundred years, stood before him in the flesh. "I would endeavour me to imprint it again for to satisfy the author, whereas before by ignorance I erred in hurting and defaming his book in divers places, in setting in some

things that he never said he made, and leaving out many things that he made which be requisite to be set in it."

Nor was Caxton an idealist only in the content of the books which he printed. The manner, too, gave him lively concern. In that day when prose was a mere tool, a clumsy medium, looked upon as the baser sister of poetry, undeserving of attention from the artist, Caxton had an ideal of prose style which, in aspiration if not in accomplishment, would have done credit to the stylists of a far later day. Chaucer he revered because the father of English poetry, who "embellished, ornated and made fair our English," which before his day was "rude and incongruous." But Chaucer's service was primarily to poetry; and Caxton, simple printer as he was, did what he could to ennoble the humbler medium of prose. He confesses that some critics have blamed him "saying that in my translations I had over curious terms, which could not be understood of common people," and that they have urged him to "use old and homely terms." To satisfy them, he has read old books as models of style; but "the English was so rude and broad that I could not well understand it." He laments the confusion of vocabulary and dialects in England—the lack of a uniform literary standard of English prose. "Certainly," he says, "it is hard to please every man because of diversity and change of language." Other "honest and great clerks" have advised him "to write the most curious terms" that he could find, "And thus between plain, rude, and curious I stand abashed." And so he resolves to write in a fashion "not over rude ne curious, but in such terms as shall be understood, by God's grace, according to my copy"—a sound and honest resolution, not unworthy of any man, in the twentieth century as in the fifteenth.

It was in the faithful practice of this resolution that Caxton spent many busy years of his old age at Westminster. When death called him in the year 1491, it chanced that he was at work printing a book entitled "The Art and Craft to know well how to die." The close of his busy life is

typical of the whole of it—a steadfast, honest, industrious man, earnestly endeavouring to do the work from day to day which Providence set before him—a simple-hearted printer, careless alike of glory and of material reward. The personality of the man is ideally summed up in an anecdote which he himself tells as an epilogue to his reprint of *Æsop's "Fables."* A wealthy dean, visiting a little parish, came by chance upon an old friend of his who had remained but a simple parish priest. "I pray you," said the dean, "what is this benefice worth to you a year?" "Forsooth," said the good, simple man, "I wot never, for I make never account thereof how well I have had it four or five years!" "And know ye not," said he, "what it is worth? It should seem a good benefice." "No, forsooth," said he, "but I wot well what it shall be worth to me." "Why," said he, "what shall it be worth?" "Forsooth," said he, "if I do my true diligence in the cure of my parishioners in preaching and teaching, and do my part longing to my cure, I shall have heaven, therefore; and if their souls be lost, or any of them by my default, I shall be punished therefore, and hereof am I sure." And with that word the rich dean was abashed, and thought he should do the better and take more heed to his cures and benefices than he had done. And Caxton adds, "This was a good answer of a good priest and an honest."

E. K. BROADUS



## WATTS-DUNTON

ALL well-read persons, and some who are not well-read, know Theodore Watts-Dunton as the author of "Aylwin," the most remarkable prose-romance in our language, of the nineteenth century. They know him also as a poet in "The Coming of Love: Rhona Boswell's Story," a poetical romance as remarkable, and in many noble poems, notably "Christmas at the Mermaid." Not only is he a great novelist and a great poet, but he is the deepest and clearest literary critic living. Watts-Dunton's learning is as profound as it is wide and versatile. He was a critic long before he was a novelist, though only by urging was he induced to put pen to paper. In 1874, Professor Minto, then editor of the *Examiner*, managed to extract an anonymous article from him, on what subject I am not able to find out, for I cannot lay my hands upon the old file. From that day Theodore Watts, as his name then was, could choose among the first literary journals in the kingdom. Minto was heard to say long after that his criticisms buried in old journals were so many gold mines in which the rest of the writing men were wont to dig, involuntarily forgetting that the nuggets "were Theodore Watts's, who is too lazy to peg out his claim." And to this day there lies buried in the pages of the *Examiner*, the *Athenæum*, the *Fortnightly*, and other reviews, *Harper's Monthly*, and Art magazines, a great mass of material which, added to his well-known essays in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and Chambers' "Cyclopædia of English Literature," make up a critical system which will very likely one day rank first in our literary history.

Over and over again have publishers besought him for permission to print these buried essays with or without revision. I doubt if he ever wrote an ephemeral line.

Rossetti used to say that Watts-Dunton sought obscurity as "other men seek fame," and his career would seem to prove it. "He is the first critic of our time, perhaps the largest-minded and surest-sighted of any age," said Swinburne, who well knew the insight, the judgement, the sympathy, and the sound learning of his friend. We shall, no doubt, have to wait until after his death for the books containing the body of his critical writing, and also for that novel "Carniola" which the Harpers had in proof several years ago. Indeed, it has frequently been said that when "Aylwin" took the public by storm—it was in its twenty-sixth edition two years ago—several American magazines offered Watts-Dunton any sum he might name for the serial rights of his next story. But this writer was not writing for money. Over twenty years ago, and many times since, he has refused permission for so much as a bibliography of his critical writings in the journals; and the reason we have in his own words to Mr. James Douglas, whose monograph on Watts-Dunton ought to be on every reading gentleman's bookshelf: "Although I had put into these articles the best thought at my command, I considered them too formless to have other than an ephemeral life. . . . I had for years cherished the idea that some day I might be able to take my various expressions of opinion upon literature, especially upon poetry, and mould them into a coherent and, perhaps, harmonious whole. . . . But year by year the body of my critical writing has grown, and I feel more and more unequal to the task of grappling with such a mass." He continues to say that he greatly regrets not having selected and edited essays from all that material: "but the impulse to do so is gone." The unexpected popularity of "The Coming of Love," and of "Aylwin" diverted his mind, and since 1898 he has practically ceased to write criticism. It was hoped that he would write Rossetti's "Life," whose close and enduring friend he was, and who wished him to write it. Mr. W. M. Rossetti waited, expecting and hoping, and finally

himself did his brother's biography. And now we hear that he, who knows most and is best fitted for the affectionate task, is not to write the "Life of Swinburne." Mr. Rossetti said that no man was so capable of writing the "Life of Tennyson" as Watts-Dunton. "He knew the Laureate well, admired him deeply, and knows—none better—what it is right to say and not to say, from all points of view."

Walter Theodore Watts was born at St. Ives on October 12th, 1832. His father, a lawyer by profession, was deeply interested in science and closely connected with the British Association, the Anthropological and other learned societies; and in St. Ives was known as the Gilbert White of the Ouse Valley. His mother's name, Dunton, was added to his own in 1896, by deed of chancery. Mr. Douglas tells how the boy had a wonderful capacity for knowledge and used to surprise his father sometimes with opinions and expressions. When a mere child—how old we are not told—he detected a Shakespearean error in the correspondence of the *Athenæum*. "He had stumbled on the matter in question while reading one of his father's books." And he wrote to the editor correcting John P. Collier, his correction appearing in the *Literary Gossip*. Shortly after, Mr. Watts found a pencil mark in the book and rebuked his son for disobedience, as that was against the rules. "But I was interested in the point." "Why, somebody has been writing about this very passage to the *Athenæum*." "Yes, father; it was me." "You, Walter! you!"

It seems that the poet-critic owed more to his uncle, James Orlando Watts, than to any other. This uncle is the prototype of the father of Aylwin. He was a deep student of the drama, Greek, English, Spanish, and German, and a lover of the theatre. He had a passion for languages and for occultism, and is said to have known more about Vaughan's mystics than Vaughan himself. He delighted in physical sciences, especially astronomy, was keenly inter-

ested in rubbings from old brass monuments, and of course he was known to the sellers of rare and curious books. But he was a great mystic in spite of his extraordinary learning; and in Philip Aylwin, Watts-Dunton keeps close to his model. In "Notes and Queries," August 2nd, 1902, will be found a sketch of him by T. St. E. Hake. Another brilliant relative was a brother, Alfred E. Watts, who was the prototype of Cyril Aylwin. The brothers studied law with their father and practised for a time in London, going about a good deal in society. In the early seventies Alfred died suddenly. He is described by Mr. Hake as a brilliant *raconteur* with an American style of humour, who without a smile could keep a company in laughter. His personal appearance and character are portrayed to the life in "Aylwin."

After his brother's death Watts-Dunton took chambers near Swinburne in Great James Street. As all the world knows, the two friends and poets afterwards took up residence at the Pines, Putney Hill, where they lived together for thirty years, the marriage of one making no difference in domestic affairs, and the partnership ending only with Swinburne's death. In Great James Street "Aylwin" was written, and in six months' time, though in what year I am unable to find out. It was first published in 1898; and in the Snowdon edition of 1901 the author confides that it was kept in manuscript for many years, owing to various reasons, the final one being diffidence. How often have we read in high places that its composition occupied twenty years. Very likely the leaven of it was working in his mind for twenty years, for no man could produce such a book without long preparation and much brooding. "Aylwin" was begun in poetry, but, the plot growing too complex for that medium, it was turned into prose, and a prose poem it is throughout. It was dictated from beginning to end. Says his amanuensis, Mr. Hake: "If any one were to peruse the original manuscript he would find it in four different handwritings—my late father's [Dr. Gordon Hake, the parable poet and friend of Borrow], and two of my brothers'

and mine, but principally mine." That such finished prose could be dictated is easily explained. Before he was a writer, Watts-Dunton was a learned and brilliant talker; his conversations in the now famous gatherings at Chalk Farm, Cheyne Walk, Kelmscott Manor, and other rendezvous won him high reputation as critic and savant among the knowing ones, and Rossetti used to call him "The Symposiarch." What a pity that oral criticism with all its conversational charm escaped the recorder, albeit no doubt many of the opinions expressed in those exclusive companies of wits have gone into the critic's now buried essays. In his speech the phrases fell from his lips perfect as "fitted jewels." If only some stenographer had been present with Watts-Dunton at some of Whistler's breakfasts! Referring to the time when he used to go about in society, Whistler inscribed a presentation copy of "The Gentle Art of Making Enemies" to "Theodore Watts, the Worldling."

Mr. Douglas tells how Professor Minto secured the talker for his journal, the *Examiner*, so getting an honest advantage over other editors. But presently Mr. Norman McColl, editor of the *Athenæum*, made a tempting offer, and Professor Minto advised him to accept, knowing, as he said, that the loss to his own paper could not be redeemed. Such gentlemen were both contributor and editor. And it came about that Watts-Dunton's first article in the *Athenæum* appeared July 8th, 1876. In the *Examiner* he had used the signature, T. W.; henceforth his contributions would be unsigned according to the custom of the paper, though every one can to-day be identified. For twenty-five years, until he published his first book, "The Coming of Love," Watts-Dunton was the chief critic of this, the most influential literary paper in Britain. That first article must have made even the most intellectual readers of the *Athenæum* "sit up and take notice." It was a review of Sir John Skelton's "Comedy of the Noctes Ambrosianæ." The new critic only had one afternoon in which to prepare it, and it was dictated as fast as the

amanuensis (not a stenographer) could write it down. It begins with a satirical allegory on the squeezing of books, and the reader is plainly told that the current literature of England is in a fair way of dying for want of a Grand Squeezer. It is an entirely constructive criticism, and it places the humour of Christopher North where it belongs,—and Wilson himself. Long after this, in the great essay "The Renascence of Wonder in Poetry," Watts-Dunton gave us those elaborate and lucid definitions of absolute and relative humour. That phrase has passed into the language and has been, at least by one writer, adapted to religion. He first used it in the article on Rossetti in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and it is the sub-title of "Aylwin." Indeed, it was his first choice of a title for that book. Concerning the "Renascence of the Spirit of Wonder in Poetry and Art," he points out that the movement was entirely English in its origin and not German, nor French. These were bold words to write touching the French romanticism, but he knew, who wrote them, namely, that even in the conventional eighteenth century, the English mind had not altogether forgotten the "high palaces of romance . . . whose mystic gates no Frenchman ever yet unlocked."

Sir John Skelton, or "Shirley" as he was called, found no note of unkindness in Watts-Dunton's pronouncement on the comedy of the "Noctes," nor can such a note be detected in any criticism from his pen. His views on the honourable obligations imposed by anonymous criticism are contained in the special article contributed to the *Athenæum* on its seventieth birthday. From the very beginning, he tells us, the *Athenæum* set its face against ridicule and smart slating, of all forms of writing the "cheapest and also the most despicable." This kind of reviewing, said a great wit of the last century, can be taught in six lessons. "The smart reviewer, however, mistakes insolence for wit, and among the low-minded insolence needs no teaching." The critic's "primary duty is to seek and to bring to light those treasures of art and literature

that the busy world is only too apt to pass by." And so has the *Athenæum* been conducted since its beginnings, when Maurice and Sterling and their kind were its chief writers.

Before going on to quote from one of these essays in the *Athenæum*, it will be interesting to note a delightful bit of evidence of the difficulty in catching Watts-Dunton napping. Reviewing Frederick Tennyson's poems, he incidentally recalled how Herbert Spencer had once compared a metaphor of Alexander Smith's with the metaphors of Shakespeare—Alexander Smith who now lives mainly in "Dreamthorpe" and "A Summer in Skye," but once holding rank as a poet. Spencer was annoyed, and wrote immediately to the editor of the *Athenæum*: "Will the writer of the review . . . please say where I have compared the metaphors of Shakespeare and Alexander Smith?" The editor, thinking that at last his reviewer "had come down a cropper," sent a proof of Spencer's touchy little note to Watts-Dunton, with the suggestion that it had better appear without comment. The proof was at once returned with a note beginning: "It is many years since Mr. Herbert Spencer printed in one of the magazines an essay dealing with the laws of cause and effect in literary art—an essay so searching in its analyses, and so original in its method and conclusions, that the workers in pure literature may well be envious of science for enticing such a leader away from their ranks—and it is many years since we had the pleasure of reading it. Our memory is therefore, somewhat hazy as to the way in which he introduced such metaphors by Alexander Smith as 'I speared him with a jest, etc.'" And the note proceeds to explain why the subject had been alluded to. Reading it Spencer laughed and said, "Of course the article was Theodore Watts's. I had entirely forgotten what I said about Shakespeare and Alexander Smith."

The temptation is great to quote from Watts-Dunton's pronouncement on "Kidnapped" and "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," as well as from Stevenson's genial note of acknow-

ledgment, but I want to find room for some passages from an article in the *Athenæum* in 1877—an article that was accredited to nearly every specialist in Europe and in America. Pouring scorn on certain persistent attempts to versify the Psalms in western idiom, this critic reminds us that the Bible, even in a literary sense, is a sacred book—in that, too, the great “Book of Wonder,” and eternal, albeit a great living savant has named it a collection of rude Syrian imaginings, and “the worn-out bottle of Judaism into which the generous new wine of science is being poured.” The savant was angry, not so this critic, who acknowledges the new wine to be a generous vintage and entitled to respect. “So do those who make it and serve it out; they have so much intelligence; they are so honest and so fearless. But whatever may become of their wine in a few years, when the wine dealers shall have passed away, when the savant is forgotten as any star-gazer of Chaldea,—the ‘old bottle’ is going to be older yet,—the Bible is going to be eternal. For that which decides the vitality of any book is precisely that which decides the value of any human soul—not the knowledge it contains, but simply the attitude it assumes towards the universe, unseen as well as seen.” The quintessence of the Bible is the Psalms, he says; and while loath to skip the paragraphs of grim humour which deal with the various doggerellized versions, I confine myself to the essayist’s pregnant word on “Old Testament Style,” the Great Style that can “do no wrong.” In literature style can no more be defined than in life. In both it is unconscious power or unconscious grace. “But the Great Style in literature and in life, is unconscious power and unconscious grace in one.” And there you have a sentence worth summering and wintering with. He goes on to show that this Great Style is Semitic, which is a difference not to be confounded with “Asiatic”—though this is a matter for scholars. Now, in the English Bible we have kept the Great Style; and Coleridge was tempted to think that the translators must have been inspired. Take a few sentences from Watts-Dunton. After pointing



out that from Cædmon Anglo-Saxon literature grew more and more Hebraic he shows that other conditions were necessary to reproduce the Great Style of the original in a western idiom: "The temper of the people receiving must, notwithstanding all differences of habitation and civilization, be elementally in harmony with that of the people giving; that is, it must be poetic rather than ratiocinative. Society must not be too complex; its tone must not be too knowing and self-glorifying. The accepted psychology of the time must not be the psychology of the scalpel; the metaphysics must not be the metaphysics of newspaper cynicism; above all, enthusiasm and vulgarity must not be considered synonymous terms. Briefly, the tone of the time must be free of the faintest suspicion of nineteenth century flavour. . . . It was the temper of the English nation when the Bible was translated; that noble heroism—born of faith in God and belief in the high duties of man, which we have lost for the hour—was in the very atmosphere that hung over the island. And style in real life, which now does not exist at all among Englishmen, and only among a very few Englishwomen—having given place in all classes to manner—flourished then in all its charm. And in literature it was the same." Another, and shorter, passage on the rhythm of the Psalms: "The great features of Bible rhythm are a recognized music apart from a recognized law—artifice so completely abandoned that we forget we are in the realm of art—pauses so divinely set that they seem to be 'wood-notes wild,' though all the while they are, and must be, governed by a mysterious law too subtly sweet to be formulated; and all kinds of beauties infinitely beyond the triumph of the metricist, but beauties that are unexpected. There is a metre, to be sure, but it is that of the moving music which is life; it is the living metre of the surging sea within the soul of him who speaks; it is the free effluence of the emotions and the passions which are passing into the words. And if this is so in other parts of the Bible, what is it in the Psalms, where the flaming steeds of song, though really

kept strong in hand, seem to run reinless as 'the wild horses of the wind?'

I have left myself no room for any satisfactory note on "Aylwin" or on its very beautiful poetic sequel, "The Coming of Love," and the rest of the published poetry. Watts-Dunton has in these two books, done much more than give immortal pictures of Romany character and life. Both are as profound studies of the human heart and soul as they are fascinating tales. Put "Aylwin" into the hands of any imaginative child of fourteen, and that child will presently be thrall to the story. On the other hand, as knowing readers discerned of those first editions that captured the public, it is an "expression of a creed." So its author admitted to enquiring correspondents. That creed is contained in the nutshell of its sub-title and elaborated in the romance. When it appeared, it was said that six separate specialists in science and æsthetics were necessary to review the book adequately, so diverse was the learning manifested. But that is a matter for scholars and savants. To the ordinary reader of sober or sorrowful experience, it contains a message on a vital subject,—in its author's own words "love's warfare with death." One lesson of the book is in an epigrammatic saying of Sinfi, the gypsy heroine, "You must dig deep to bury your daddy."

Watts-Dunton knows gypsies as well as gypsy lore. There is a difference. It was in early boyhood that he made friends with the Gryengroes, the gypsy horse-dealers, those aristocratic Romanies of Borrow, and Gordon Hake, and Francis Hindes Groome; and his Romany heroines, Sinfi and Rhona, are transcripts from the life. Outside "Aylwin" he has paid high tribute to Sinfi. Evangelist Gypsy Smith has declared that Watts-Dunton's pictures and interpretations of the gypsy are true. It is a pity that this high class of gypsy has now almost vanished from England, emigrating to America for various reasons. The strange thing is that Borrow, who so loved the gypsies and was so loved by them (barring Mrs. Herne)—the strange thing

is that Borrow's famous heroine, Isopel Berners was not a gypsy at all but an Anglo-Saxon roadgirl; and what a heroine she is! By the way, "Herne the Scollard" in the "Coming of Love" is of the family of Mrs. Herne who tried and nearly succeeded in poisoning Borrow. By the way again, Watts-Dunton has an unpublished autobiographical romance in which Borrow appears as "Dereham," and Gordon Hake as "Gordon." In it a literal account is given of his first meeting with Borrow, being introduced by Hake in the summer of 1872 on Wimbledon Common. Some passages have been introduced in Watts-Dunton's essay appearing in Ward Lock's & Co.'s edition of "Lavengro."

"The Coming of Love" is, like "Aylwin," a romance of love at war with death, and besides is a lyrical expression of gypsy life and passion. The lyrics in which Rhona speaks, her lilting English broken with Romany, are pure song, and show how the Romany thinks in terms of nature. Take two passages from the letter to her lover, Percy Aylwin, who has been sent to the South Seas by his proud family. After telling him of Herne the Scollard's taunt that he has abandoned her, she explains how her dead mammy's mollo (spirit) knows better, and has come to tell her so:

Rhona, she sez, that tarno rye you love,  
He's thinkin' on you; don't you go and rove;  
You'll see him at the comin' o' the swallow.

The elements of earth and air in the changing season are taken up into the poem to express her loneliness and longing, and her mammy's mollo ends with this sweet comfort:

She sez, The whinchat soon wi' silver throat  
Will meet the stonechat in the buddin' whin,  
And soon the blackcap's airliest ghyllie ull float  
From light-green boughs through leaves a peepin' thin;  
The wheat-ear soon ull bring the willow-wren,  
And then the fust fond nightingale ull follow,  
A callin' 'Come, dear,' to his laggin' hen  
Still out at sea, 'the spring is in our glen;  
Come, darlin', wi' the comin' o' the swallow.'

The descriptions of sea and land are many and lovely whether Percy or Rhona is the speaker, and there are two powerful alpine poems in this most exquisite dramatic idyl of the century past. Watts-Dunton and Swinburne spent many a day by the sea and many an hour in the sea, and both sang of the sea as few poets have sung. Watts-Dunton's naval lyrics ought to be learned by heart, as the significant old-fashioned term is, by every schoolboy—that is, if we are in earnest about the navy. Listen to David Gwynn, the Welsh seaman of the *Armada*, whom Raleigh has taken as his guest to the Mermaid where Ben Jonson sits dealing out the wassail to that choice Elizabethan company:

Spain's murderous breath of blood shall foul no more  
The righteous sea.

Listen to the chorus sung at intervals by that great company reconstructed in the poet's imagination:

The sea!  
Thus did England fight;  
And shall not England smite  
With Drake's strong stroke in battles yet to be:  
And while the winds have power  
Shall England lose the dower  
She won in that great hour?—  
The sea!

I am greatly indebted to Mr. James Douglas's book on Watts-Dunton,—it tells so much about his early career and his friendships and the circumstances under which he began to write criticism. But we are affectionately curious to know more, who have had such delight, and have learned so many things from his two romances of the open air, "Aylwin" and "The Coming of Love."

ROBERT ROBERTS

## MEREDITH'S LETTERS

THE familiar letters of a man reveal him to their readers with a degree of completeness second only to that given by personal intercourse. As the letter becomes official, so that it is written with a consciousness, on either side of the threshold, that it may be read by many, that it may be quoted in controversy, that it may be printed in a "Life and Letters," it loses this value. The recently published letters of George Meredith possess the merits of the unconstrained in the highest degree. With scarcely an exception they are letters to intimate friends, to his family, or to those seeking literary or personal counsel. Their value is as great to those who do not know, or do not like, his books as to those who are grateful to him for rare experiences,—and this because they reveal qualities of head and heart, good to read about whether they come from the pen of a poet or a farmer. The biographical sketch is short; the connective tissue and the notes are slight so that the whole effect is given by his own words.

Meredith began to publish in 1849. He was poor and never felt at ease, even by his own modest standards, for two score years. An early marriage was a disaster; a second one was supremely happy. In later life his health was bad. After sixty he underwent three times a serious operation. When, after middle life, recognition came to him, it found him ready to value it serenely at its true worth. Friends he always had; choice spirits loved him. The able were glad to seek his company. A small income never checked his boundless hospitality. It only made him warn the new comer of the narrow quarters which, with a welcome, awaited him. He never cared for money; but his store was never so low that he had to deny himself the pleasure of giving to those he loved, even during those long years when he toiled

at journeyman's work to provide for those dependent on him. He longed for his friends. Some of the letters he wrote asking them to come to him are as full of tender affection as are humble those in which he acknowledged the appreciation of his admirers.

It would be useless to try to convey by quotations any adequate impression of the letters, particularly of those to his children. Suffice it to say that Meredith was poor and yet free-handed; unsuccessful and yet sweet tempered; suffering and yet serene; with the gift of irony, but tender; with the wisdom of deep experience but a lover of youth and nature; with his powers acknowledged by the competent, and yet modest. Such is the effect of reading these letters. High as is this achievement, in character building there were yet higher in Meredith's life. He believed "that all right use of life, and the one secret of life, is to pave ways for the firmer footing of those who succeed us." The knowledge of life he had gained he gave freely, and to the end he caught "intelligible signs of the beneficent order of the universe from a heart newly confirmed in its grasp of the principle of human goodness . . . ; confirmed in its belief in the ultimate victory of good within us, without which nature has neither music nor meaning, and is rock, stone, tree, and nothing more."

The phrase, just used, of Meredith giving in his books experiences to his readers seems accurate. It must, however, be understood in the sense of his making a presentment which one can collate with one's own. They mean less to those who have no touchstone to apply. Let personal experience here take the place of the universality of the reviewer. I was an undergraduate when, in the late autumn of 1875, I picked up the then latest number of the *Fortnightly*. It contained the concluding chapters of "Beauchamp's Career." After reading it, I went backwards over all Meredith had written up to that time, and since, as they came out, his later books. Re-reading them at intervals I have found things in them which I had previously passed over, not on account of the

obscurity of the words, but because I did not in previous readings know enough to grasp their full significance.

He is a writer for the mature. George Eliot, whom we of that generation were reading with avidity, was a teacher of the ignorant. Hers was the art of putting things so that those who knew little could grasp something of their true intent and meaning, and this by no means because what she had to say was commonplace or within the lines of mid-Victorian conventions. She who wrote the two chapters of the journey of Hetty knew the depths of human motives and human emotions. Why was she getting eight thousand pounds for the serial rights of her new novel?—on which the impecunious Meredith wistfully comments. He was wise and witty, as high minded, with as earnest a desire to better his fellows; and yet he was over sixty before he had any recognition. This recognition, even then, came mostly from his fellow craftsmen and not from the public. The principal difference between these two writers was in the type of characters they presented to their readers.

George Eliot's people are normal. One recognizes them as moulded from the same clay as we ourselves. A Lydgate is in every profession. Dorothea, to-day with a wider scope for her overflowing desire for helpfulness, speaks at Women's Clubs. The passionate devotion of Maggie, and the arbitrariness of Tom, continue in countless homes. Mrs. Poyser is, alas! too rare, but in degree rather than in kind. We may have to look back to the ages of Griselda for a Romola, but Tito is with us. The possibilities of Arthur Donnithorne are those of all whose lines have fallen to them in pleasant places. We can claim kinship with any of her people we find attractive. We can find a likeness to those we do not like in kinsfolk and friends.

There are in the pages of Meredith but few of his principal characters in whom the normal would like to find a resemblance to themselves. In nearly all his men there is something mad, fantastic, or foolish. What youth of parts would be an Evan, a Richard Feverel, a Harry Richmond?

Each of them in school boy phrase was "a silly ass." What man in his prime would be a Sir Austin? What family would be Poles? Splendid or charming as are his women, to which of them does he give fair play? Take two of them, Vittoria and Diana. The incident of the secret is remembered by all. He paints Vittoria as worthy of meeting on a mountain top the leader of the Italian revolution and his principal aids. She, within a few minutes of their leaving her, writes a note which might have gravely compromised them, because some old English friends are near and the movements of the conspirators might cause them discomfort in their Italian tour. With the ordinary reader no art is able to prevent the jar given by weaknesses so out of character as these. This unfortunate choice of type accounts fully for the difference in fame and emoluments of the two writers.

There were other causes which contributed to this result. Meredith began his literary career with two fantastic tales. The browser among the tables of "Recent Publications," who bought and read either "The Shaving of Shagpat" or "Farina," would not be likely to buy a later work by their then unknown author. The liking for the fantastic these books display, pursued him to the end. It has its place. Dante was the only seer into the depths who did not rebound. Meredith had no such sense of proportion, as, for example, had the worker at Lincoln who put but one little goblin leering down at the high altar. He put his grandparents, his aunts, and his most intimate friends, into "Evan Harrington," his domestic tragedy into "Modern Love," Admiral Maxse into "Beauchamp," and founded most of his novels on tales known in real life in his own circle. Nevertheless in real life such people as his principals are hard to find.

It is therefore one of his crowning achievements that, in reading about people who seem so strange, so often the inward voice says, "Thou art the man"; or happily, "There but for the grace of God. . . ."



In the construction of his books and their style there is much which enhances this initial difficulty to the reader. Meredith was fond of recondite mythological allusions. He broke, too often, with paragraphs of comment and exposition, the course of action which one was following with interest. Much of his dialogue is as wearisome as watching ping-pong, and as rapid in its stroke and counter stroke. Opening at random "The Egoist," one finds two pages and a half of description and comment followed by dialogue, only one remark in which has a score or so of words, and most answers and questions only three or four. Again, he had so much to say that he condensed unduly. The epigrams and the wit are not led up to, and the experience of writers and speakers has been that it is necessary to prepare for their effects. There is also in clowning and comic relief the same surfeiting excess as in the fantastic. There is not too much of dear delightful Mrs. Berry; but of Mrs. Chump, Pericles, Skipsey, and the rest one could rise happier with less.

The reader of his books who feels these annoyances in them naturally expected that the letters would show the same qualities in a higher degree. It is not the case; on the contrary, the expression is limpid, the bits of fun, the tender whimsicalities, the playful affection, have rather the restraint and proportion of the printed page than the exuberance of the running pen. Those who read the letters before any of his novels will be surprised that the novels are so individual and unusual. Was this because he was one who said: "Thus can I and not otherwise, for this is my vision of life and my transcription thereof"? It may be, but my view is that Meredith had a singular incapacity for self-criticism. Singular because he was a reader for publishers who paid for manuscripts he selected and remained solvent. The literary advice in his letters strikes one as sound. He speaks as a master of the art of composition, and his dicta were accepted. Yet his poems never paid the expenses of publication, and the returns of his novels were meagre. The letters give us no evidence on this point except in one case. He tells a corres-

pondent that "Rhoda Fleming" is not worth reading. This book was written in the prime of life, and as he was a conscientious worker he must have thought it good at the time it went to the publisher.

Meredith's own explanation of the failure of his work to win a wide approval seems to be that thought is tough and such must be its expression. But it is when his thought goes deepest into the springs of human nature that his words are most flexible, and most dexterously marshalled into fitting expression. Read again those paragraphs about Sir Austin in the avenue, about Harry and the Princess in the library, Beauchamp and Renée watching from the Adriatic the sunrise on the Alps. These are not the passages which are difficult. When there is difficulty, it is the wanderings of his comment, his soarings on the Hippogriff which puzzle and annoy.

One might wish that his experience had been like that of another writer, like Meredith essentially a teacher, like him, witty, profound, a respecter of women, who also after writing unsuccessful novels took to the drama. Had Meredith done this, he perchance had been famed among men as is Mr. G. B. Shaw. The rigid conventions of the play would have been good for him. Irrelevant comment has no place on the boards. Dialogue must be rapidly intelligible to an audience. Comic relief must be adequate and no more. One cannot fancy a leading lady able to play Vittoria remaining in a play in which so stiff a *jeune premier* as young Pole, or such comic reliefs as Pericles and the blacksmith could occupy the centre of the stage, as they do in the book.

Hypotheses as to what this discipline might have done is fruitless. For what we have we are grateful. It is, to some, more than they owe to any of our time. It is the work of a man who hated the false, who revered the free woman, and showed how splendid a mate she will be, who from eating his pot of honey on the grave to seeing his own star fade into the splendour of a universal and ever enduring love, gave all he had acquired between this universal nay and yea.

His most intimate expression of what was in him, as shown in these letters, takes equal rank with his books. They show a life singularly consistent, humble and noble.

Recast into the language of sober seriousness the melodious lines of Rostand:

'CYRANO. Il y a malgré vous quelque chose  
Que j'emporte, et ce soir, quand j'entrerai chez Dieu,  
Mon salut balaiera largement le seuil bleu  
Quelque chose que sans un pli sans une tache  
J'emporte malgré vous, et c'est . . . mon panache.'

We find that to none of these generations are the last words of Cyrano more fitting than to Meredith; but none less likely than he to say them save with that profound gravity with which Pilgrim and his like speak of the good fight in which they overcame.

J. S. McLENNAN

## THE NIGHT COMETH

Cometh the night. The wind falls low,  
The trees swing slowly to and fro:

Around the church the headstones grey  
Cluster, like children strayed away  
But found again, and folded so.

No chiding look doth she bestow:  
If she is glad, they cannot know;  
If ill or well they spend their day,  
Cometh the night.

Singing or sad, intent they go:  
They do not see the shadows grow;  
"There yet is time," they lightly say,  
"Before our work aside we lay";  
Their task is but half-done, and lo!  
Cometh the night.

JOHN McCRAE

## UNTO THE CHURCH

THE church has never run an easy course. At times it came within a little of perishing by internal conflict, and again by losing its way in the wilderness. It has been in perils by its own and in perils by the heathen. Yet, in the end, it has always prevailed, and is to-day the only human institution which has survived from antiquity, a habitation for men and a repository for religion, a means of carrying on God's work in the world by perfecting the individual. An edifice constructed by men, like all works of finite intelligence, it is subject to time and chance, since every system of human contrivance has in itself the seeds of decay, and death goes hand in hand with life.

There is nothing new in these mutations of decay. Jeremiah, the prophet, has made us familiar with one period in which the condition must have been very bad. Wesley and his followers have made us familiar with another. And yet, when the formality of the Anglican church was most lifeless and the fatalism of the Presbyterian church was at its deadliest, men who had been nurtured in them made a rediscovery of the love of God, and demonstrated anew to the world those universals of Methodism, that all men need salvation, that all men may be saved, and know themselves to be saved, and that all may attain to holiness. They rediscovered that conduct arises out of a state of mind, and that it was the business of the church to effect a state of mind out of which right conduct would arise; in short, to convert the mind by a process of conversion.

Never in its history has the church been called upon to solve a harder problem than the one with which it is face to face to-day. Never did it meet the difficulty with greater earnestness and sincerity, and never did it so require, and deserve, the sympathy and coöperation of all good men.

For a variety of reasons the church is not now so well equipped intellectually as it used to be. In former times the most powerful minds were drawn toward the service of religion, men of mental resource in theology and dialectics, and of such courage and hardihood that they disposed of some obstacles by not seeing them, and of others by beating them down with a heavy hand. By gathering itself together, opposing, cursing, persecuting, the mediæval Papacy, in spite of its theoretical imperfections, maintained the very existence of a religious organization. In exactly the same spirit the writers of the Pastoral and Johannine epistles defended Christianity against Jewish exclusiveness, Greek philosophy, and Oriental asceticism.

In a new country, and in a new age, there is a louder call from other walks of life, and material pursuits promise great material gain. Men, who in other ages would have become cardinals, bishops, or moderators of assemblies, are now engaged exploiting industries or manipulating finance; and the stuff of which martyrs are made is frittered away in small causes. In Canada the case is particularly hard, just because the land is so new and rich, and the social order increasing and shifting so rapidly.

The mind of the world is like the crust of the earth. For a long time it endures stress and strain in silence. Suddenly there is a dislocation, or readjustment, accompanied by much violence. Such a convulsion of mind has occurred in our own times, and we have not yet come into a condition of equilibrium. A similar mental phenomenon, which goes by the name of the Renaissance, was followed by a religious experience which, with some degree of ambiguity and assumption, was described as the Reformation, and is known to us as Protestantism. A movement continues long after the initial force is expended. Inertia which keeps a body at rest will also keep it in motion. In our time Protestantism has encountered new forces, and has come to a stand-still. As a justification of its continued existence, the Protestant church for a long time found it necessary to magnify those

grounds of protest upon which it arose, and even to create them where they did not exist. Similarly, between the various divisions of that church it was considered an obligation to insist upon the reasons for dissent. But the spirit and the circumstances of the time have been too obdurate. Men find themselves in agreement whether they will or not.

For, in truth, all churches are one church. Any difference between them is apparent rather than real. The lily does not obviously resemble its humble congener, the onion; both belong to the same species, and when scrutinized closely are found to be identical in structure and in function. Even the churches themselves recognize this essential sameness by their desire to bear the designation of "catholic." In that sum of saving knowledge which is the ultimate confession of Presbyterian faith, there is formal declaration of belief in "the holy catholick church"; and many members of the Church of England choose to describe themselves as English Catholics. Indeed, a certain section is willing to abandon the implication which lies in the designation of Protestant, and find refuge in some larger area of the church militant, since a church which had its origin in protestation and dissent finds its reason for existence less valid as the grounds for protest and dissent are removed.

There has been much change in the last forty years, and Protestantism has felt its full effect. If a Catholic enquires, What is truth?—he has for reply, the teaching of the church; and he would be a rash man who should say what the teaching of the church really is upon any specific question, since any given dogma is qualified by other dogmas, half-dogmas, directions, opinions, and propositions. But when a Protestant enquires, he is referred to a book which any one who has skill in the use of letters may read, a book, too, which is always open, as the boast is, which every man is free to read and, what is more, not only free, but also encouraged, to interpret for himself. In our own time this book has received a fresh appraisal; and most Protestants are now agreed that its value is relative rather than absolute. The

validity of a book-religion then varies according to the validity of the book; and it is one of those pleasant ironies of history that it is in the Catholic church the Bible now has its chief authority on the ground of supernatural origin.

The spirit of Protestantism is passing, and we in these latter days are less concerned about protesting than we are about providing remedies. Cardinal Newman observed the beginnings of this change in his own time, and he lamented it. He thought "it would be a gain to the country were it vastly more superstitious, more bigoted, more gloomy, more fierce in its religion, than at present it shows itself to be." It may be so; but we do not believe it. The Protestant churches are working in a contrary direction to find, if they can, not grounds of dissent but grounds of agreement and union.

Union is strength, but desire for union is inspired rather by a sense of comparative weakness than by a feeling of confidence. Amongst the various churches of the Protestant principle, there is a running together and an obliteration of old lines. A basis of union with the Methodist and Congregational churches has long since been approved by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church in Canada, and was sent down to the various sessions and congregations. The Assembly had previously placed itself on record as being in favour of the union, and a majority of the presbyteries expressed the same judgement. This movement had its origin as far back as the year 1899, when the Assembly, at the request of its Home Mission Committee, appointed a small committee to confer with representatives from other evangelical churches, so that mission work might be co-ordinated. The General Conference of the Methodist church accepted the proposal in 1902, and appointed a similar committee. The two bodies met on three different occasions, and a series of resolutions was adopted under which overlapping and duplication were avoided.

In the meantime, a definite proposal for the organic union of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational churches

emanated from the Methodist church. The General Conference at its quadrennial meeting in Winnipeg, in September, 1902, declared that it would regard such a movement "with great gratification," and embodied the deliverance in a formal resolution. This resolution was submitted to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, which was held at Vancouver, in June, 1903, and by it was referred to its committee on correspondence with other churches. That committee met on April 21st, 1904, in conference with the committees of the Methodist and Congregational churches. Members of this general committee were able to report that they were "of one mind that organic union was both desirable and practicable." This finding was duly reported to the General Assembly in St. John in the following June, to the Congregational Union of Ontario and Quebec in the same month, and to the Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in July. Committees were appointed by these two churches to confer with the one previously appointed by the Methodist church. This joint committee met in Toronto on December 21st, 1904, again in December, 1905, and again in September, 1906.

At the third meeting it was decided to address a friendly letter to the Baptist church and to the Church of England in Canada inviting them "to send delegates to participate in the discussions, should they consider it advisable to do so." The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, in their reply to the invitation, set forth in a remarkably powerful document the distinctive principles of their church, and stated that, because of those principles, they considered it "necessary to maintain a separate organized existence," and "to propagate their views throughout the world." The Anglican synod was willing to accept the invitation, provided that the conclusions of the "Lambeth Conference," held the same year, would be accepted as a basis. But as those resolutions seemed to require the acceptance of episcopacy, the committee was unable to accede to the condition.



Another meeting was held in 1907, and at the final session in 1908, the committee regarded their work as completed, and formally acknowledged "the goodness of God manifested in all their meetings." The "Basis of Union" was then sent down to sessions and congregations. The document itself was prepared with extraordinary skill, and is homiletical rather than dogmatic in character. It was not to be expected that it would escape criticism at the hands of the theologians—lay and clerical—of the three churches. Many alterations were suggested, which disclosed a severe scrutiny, especially from the church in Peterborough, which appears to be gifted with much theological acumen. The important relation of a minister to the doctrines of the church is defined in terms so general that it would be difficult to discover within them the slightest ground for a charge of heresy. Apparently, the laudable attempt of the committee to avoid any rock of offence in this most difficult field did not meet with universal favour. Two critics, at least, were not disposed to let the minister off so easily. They suggested that he be compelled to declare if he believed in the virgin birth of Christ, and if Jesus was God. The committee did not descend to such particulars, but they produced one of the most Christian deliverances which ever emanated from any church.

It would be tedious to lay readers to follow in further detail these intricate negotiations. The situation now is that a majority of bodies within the three churches and a majority of members have declared for the union. In view, however, of the extent of the minority, especially in the Presbyterian church, which is not yet convinced that organic union is the best method of expressing the union sincerely desired by all, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church deemed it unwise immediately to proceed to consummate the union, but believed that by further efforts and discussion practically unanimous action could be secured within a reasonable time. These are the official words, and they may be taken to represent the mind of the other churches as well.

To "gloomy and fierce" men of a generation ago it must have appeared that the present situation could be achieved by nothing short of a miracle. Yet the differences between Methodists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians, were no greater than that between Presbyterians and the Evangelical division of the Church of England, or between that division and the High Church, or between the High Church and the Roman Catholic. It should not be more difficult to eliminate all these differences than it was to eliminate the subsidiary ones, and a unified prospect is opening up like the vision of a prophet. In one Canadian city, at least, four theological colleges have banded themselves together, under the ægis of a university, for the better education of the ministry, and no calamity has yet befallen.

Whilst this New Church is formulating itself, the time is to enquire what is the place and business of that, or any, church in the world. Is it a place for worship, or is it a place for "work"? Is it to be a spiritual or an institutional church? Whenever the church has failed, it failed because it yielded to the temptation of the obvious, to follow the easy way. Prayer and fasting is a hard rule, and it is so much easier to get near to men, as the saying is, than to keep near to God. Impatient of spiritual weapons, the church has occasionally taken the sword in its hand, and it always perished by the sword. In our own time we have seen the churches striving for the legislator's chair, and reaching out for the policeman's baton. Losing faith in the law of God, they seek summonses in the Recorder's Court. The world has reason to fear the church in the day of its power, and to seek safety by the encouragement of internal dissensions.

The mission of the church is to sinners: there is not so much need of preaching to the converted and calling the righteous to repentance. The church, by the enactment and enforcement of laws, may succeed in closing a theatre in which licentious performances are given, or places of resort in which alcohol is sold, without in the least inculcating the virtues of purity and temperance. The man who was

filthy will be filthy still, and his heart will be hardened, so that his last state will be worse than the first. By placing vices in the category of crimes, and enacting laws against them, which cannot be enforced, all law is brought into contempt and the guardians of the public safety are corrupted. This is the genesis of the thing which is called police corruption in the United States. A man is properly jealous of his personal liberty. When the church becomes militant it falls into the worst faults of Puritanism and puts freedom in jeopardy. It is then that the spirit of religion is in danger too. This is a danger which the New Church would do well to descry far in advance.

Ecclesiastics who are in the habit of forming deputations to haunt the crowded lobbies of legislative assemblies and municipal halls, urging that fresh restrictions and new by-laws be passed, would do well to reflect that they have already an admirable code in their hands, which, according to their own acknowledgement, was delivered to them direct from the hand of God. It is a wonder that some municipal Solon does not recall to their minds the reception which another "morality squad" received at the hands of their Master. The case was one, which is always dear to prurient minds, concerning a woman taken in pursuit of a profession which even at that time was an ancient one. The modest Master conducted himself as though he heard them not. We do not know if the woman obeyed the divine injunction to go, and sin no more, after she went uncondemned and unstoned, because her accusers, convicted by their own conscience, disappeared one by one, beginning at the eldest unto the last. But we have ample evidence that the fines and imprisonments which are instigated by the professional moralists are productive of no better results. The Master looked at the situation through the eyes of the Woman. She beheld the church and the law banded together in a ferocious conspiracy against her, and none but herself aware in how far she was the innocent victim of a social environment which she had not created. If one of these modern "judges

after the flesh" were to stand up in the midst of his sombre brethren, and declare to the Woman: He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life,— we may well wonder what her reply would be. Possibly it would be described by the police reporter as a shriek of mirthless laughter.

The present tendency of the church towards a worldly policy, which the New Church would do well to avoid, is indicated by the conduct of that body, which bears the formidable title of the Executive Commission of the Western Section of the World's Presbyterian Alliance, at its meeting in Montreal on February 18th, when it was formally affirmed that the church must "stand for" a political programme which has never yet been equalled in comprehensiveness. It includes equal rights and justice for all classes of men; the protection of the family by uniform divorce laws, proper regulation of marriage and housing; the fullest development for children, their education and recreation; the abolition of child labour; regulations of conditions governing female labour; safeguarding the moral and physical health of the community; the abatement and prevention of poverty; the prevention of the liquor traffic; the conservation of health; protection of the worker from accident and disease; the right of all men to the opportunity for self-maintenance and protection from enforced employment; provision for the old age of workers; the right of employers and workers to organize; release from employment one day in seven; the gradual reduction of labouring hours to the lowest possible point, and a degree of leisure for all; a living minimum wage for every industry and the highest wage that industry can afford; a new emphasis on the application of the Christian principles of acquisition of property, and the most equitable division of the product of industry. By adopting such a propaganda the church will become merely a political party, attempting to change the environment of men instead of their characters and, as Dr. Hanson said, providing them with new houses instead of new hearts. To the church

the individual is the world. When it deals with the mass, it becomes a politician at the worst, and at best a political economist.

The term "institutional church," is now in every Protestant mouth. It is an acknowledgement that the old order has changed, that the old fabric is shaken. It is a confession, too, that merely as a place of worship the churches have failed: they must now be made a place of "work." They are to be institutes. Classes are to be held. Young women are to be taught writing by signs, the schools having failed to do much good by teaching them to write with letters. Clubs are to be formed, places of rest established for girls who work in factory and shop, and halls opened for the queer practice of dancing. Lectures are to be given on politics, medicine, and sanitation; and men and women who would otherwise be idle are to engage in "social service" and in the "uplift of the poor." Dissatisfied with their mission to the souls of men, the churches now propose to minister to their bodies, adding all things to them so that afterwards they will be induced to seek the kingdom of Heaven. As the spirit decays the institution takes its place; and the churches now propose to compete with the schools in teaching trades, and with the powers of darkness by providing amusement. The churches are beaten at the start in that course.

It is important to discover if there is a real need for an institutional church, and, if the need exists, to enquire if such an institution will meet it. The assumption upon which it is based is that the misery of the poor is overwhelming, that it is a new development, that the danger of their destruction is so imminent that the church must turn aside from its course, to engage in a desperate attempt to avert the threatened calamity. All's as right with the world as it ever was, or ever will be. Our present trouble is that people do not think so; and when we think wrong about a thing it becomes wrong to the extent of our thinking. At one time the belief in witchcraft was implicit. That belief was unfounded, as we have since discovered; but it created

the crime, and out of a superstition made a reality, at least to the unfortunate creatures who were punished for the offence. This misery of the poor is our new superstition, the last expression of our materialism. It is a literary creation of those who write, incited by those who publish.

The poor are not so miserable as we think they are. Their misery is a figment of the imagination, created for them by idle and ignorant busybodies who, like spectators at a play, find a morbid pleasure in contemplating a spectacle of sorrow in which they have no part. A woman in a theatre cries because she is happy. If her boot pinches, all sense of her fictitious misery disappears. When a person begins to be miserable his misery ceases automatically. With poor as well as rich the mind is its own place, and in itself can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.

Probably people never were less miserable than they are to-day; yet those who write were never so unhappy about them. Driven by satiety in search of new emotions, inexperienced idlers sought a temporary refuge from ennui amongst those who do the work of the world, and they found a certain exhilaration in what they saw. Their senses were stimulated; an idle curiosity assumed the guise of a charitable interest. In time they tired of their labours and were willing to receive accounts at second hand of the suffering which humanity was enduring. Writers were not slow to minister to their entertainment, and for many years past periodical literature has fattened upon the sufferings of the poor.

This has always been the practice of the indolent, to comfort themselves by contemplating the misery of others, and where misery does not exist to create it for their own contemplation. The Romans in their circuses were the finest epicures in this form of diversion; but they were quite honest in their enjoyment and did not pretend to a sympathy which they did not feel. Possibly they were haunted by the suspicion that the life of the average gladiator was quite as rich and as satisfying as the average of their own. But in our time those who are technically described as the poor

are in the habit of reading what is written about them, and they learn with surprise how miserable they are. This is the origin of much of the discontent amongst those who work, and discontent is the worst kind of misery.

But the evil does not stop at the creation of discontent. It is made worse by the clumsy efforts which are made to alleviate sufferings which do not exist. The volume of oxygen which is necessary in inspired air; the percentage of nitrogen, of carbon, and of carbohydrates in food; the employment of water for external application, these things are largely a matter of individual idiosyncrasy or the habit of a class. Persons who can afford to heat a continuous current of fresh air, who are so enfeebled that they must have a varied dietary, and regard perspiration as an unclean thing, are dangerous advisers of those who work, when they strive to engraft their own luxurious habits upon those who have neither the need nor the desire to adopt them.

From common men we obtain the conservation, from great minds the intellectual advancement, of the species, is a true saying, although it is Max Nordau who makes it. But those who save themselves from the penalties of idleness by what they are pleased to term "work" amongst the poor are not commonly credited with activity in either one or the other of these two spheres of human endeavour. They are, in part at least, celibate females who regard prolificacy as a proof of profligacy, and inculcate secretly the falser aspects of the Malthusian doctrine. They corrupt the life of the poor at its source, and bring dissension where harmony previously prevailed. Knowing nothing of motherhood, they instil the belief that the bearing of children is the last infamy that can be imposed upon a woman.

Hedged in from chance and sheltered from the vicissitudes of life, existence for them is a dull, joyless affair. Passionless themselves, they are insensible to that pleasure which lies in the indulgence of passion, even of those which are commonly described as low. Life for the poor is full of interest just because it is so uncertain. It is free from

sorrow because it affords no time for indulgence in that form of luxury. A German saying runs: there is no sorrow when there is bread in the house. The exact contrary is true. Sorrow begins when the possession of bread is sure, and leisure remains for the magnification of the common ills. The poor have something of the pleasure which the sportsman experiences when his evening meal depends upon his own unaided effort, and both are aware that to go without is nothing very dreadful after all. When they have food they are assured of the sauce of hunger.

Happiness is not a perquisite of any one class. Literature is full of the adventures of vagabonds whose excuse for existence is their capacity for enjoyment. It is hard to say what will amuse another. It is all an affair of culture, and each degree of culture entails its own disability. An ear which is ravished by an opera is outraged by street sounds which are inaudible to the uninitiated. A fine sensibility to the beauty of pictorial art makes a man miserable when he considers the taste of his neighbours. A nice taste in literature forbids the reading of a newspaper. To the fundamental material pleasures of life, namely, those which are associated with the propagation of the species and the various forms of intoxication and narcosis, the peasant is as responsive as the peer. Indeed, as La Fontaine says: *un muletier à ces jeux vaut trois rois*.

The church is a house of prayer—that, and nothing more, now, or at any other time. The state of prayer is one of unconscious gratitude, and that alone is happiness. It is the spirit of religion. But the spirit of religion is a product of slow growth. It integrates into itself all that is precious in the lives of men. It is a thing of joy and of sorrow, made up of individual memories, instincts, and reminiscences which extend backward to the very beginnings of humanity. It increases by association and fixes its own form. It creates its own holy places, its temples, sanctuaries, and churches. These places of worship become holy because men worship in them; and men become holy as they



worship there. In time the grove, or spring, or mountain, or edifice becomes sacred, because they are associated with the deepest experiences in the lives of the worshippers. Objects acquire a new meaning. They are glorified. A book, a font, an image, a candle, two pieces of crossed metal, are no longer material things. They are emblems, reminders. Eventually they become so closely associated with the experiences which they recall that they are identical with the thing itself. Accordingly, no adult Protestant can in any real sense become a Catholic. One must be born a Catholic, and witness from childhood the mystery of the deification, as the Host is elevated and the silver bell is rung. He sees the something more in it, as the eye of the poet sees something more than a daffodil in the yellow flower by the river's brim. And a Catholic does not consciously become a Protestant, though occasionally he makes the discovery that he is one. Observances, rites, ceremonies, in time become a part of religion, and part of the life of the man who worships, because he has lived in them and they in him. This, also, the New Church would do well to reflect upon.

It is only by long familiarity that these ministrations come to acquire significance. That principle accounts for the development of a ritual in every form of service, to meet this need for uniformity. No matter how he may protest, the most dissenting Protestant yields to this necessity; and he finds himself building up a ritual with the material at his hand, in much the same way as a beaver in a zoological garden gathers together a few sticks in the spring time because he must build a dam. Eventually the demands of the ritual determine the form which the edifice shall assume. It is not by accident that cathedrals are all built from the same plan, and Protestant churches are formless according as their ritual is unfixed. A Catholic church is useful only for the purposes of religion. In a less degree this is true also of the Anglican churches. By long usage the edifices acquire a sacred character; or, at least, a sacrosanct quality is imputed to them. They are emblems, a witness to the

world that the spirit of religion is not yet vanished, and that some humanity remains.

The traffic of London breaks upon such churches and flows around them as the sea flows around a rock. The spires point upward as a sign that men are not condemned to live eternally in the mire. As a man passes by he will say, here was I enrolled as a Christian, here youth and love compassed me about, here sorrow overwhelmed me, here will be my resting place for a little while before the earth closes over me. A man who walks the streets of Protestant Canada will have quite other reflections.

In Montreal people are growing rich by selling their real estate to one another. They have chosen the present moment to seize upon the increment in value which has been created by the whole community, to apply it to their own use, and burden posterity with increased rentals. The churches also find themselves in a peculiarly advantageous situation. Their inheritance of land has proved to be very valuable. It has shared in the general increase, although it has borne no burden of taxation. Here was an opportunity for the churches to declare to the world that there are other considerations than those which can be reckoned in money. The very existence of a church—the more humble the better—occupying an expensive site in company with buildings which scrape the sky, as the saying is, would be a perpetual protest against the practices which go on in those buildings, more powerful than the words of any preacher.

Trinity and St. Paul's are the one human element in lower New York. Nearly all of the holy places for Protestants in Montreal have been desecrated by the churches themselves. Within the past few years seventeen churches have been sold, and five others are in the market. All denominations have been equally culpable. The Presbyterians sold Erskine, St. Giles', St. Gabriel's, and two others. The Methodists sold St. James', Dominion Square, and two others. The Congregationalists sold Emmanuel, Calvary, and Bethlehem. The Baptists sold Olivet, and First. The

Anglicans have sold St. George's. The Reformed Episcopal and Unitarian churches were also sold. Erskine church is occupied by stores. Emmanuel, and one other, are used for moving pictures. St. George's is to be replaced by a hotel, and the Methodist church at the corner of Craig and Sanguinet Street is occupied as a morgue. Dealers are now busy over the probable fate of Christ Church cathedral and of St. James and Sherbrooke Street Methodist churches.

One cannot fail to remark that in this ominous list there is not the name of a single Catholic church; and I am informed by Mr. Fitzjames Brown that, in his long experience of real estate, he cannot recall any transaction by which a Catholic church was alienated from the purposes of religion, unless one in which a building was removed in the process of street widening. He does remember, however, a sale which was made by Anglicans to Catholics. To a Hebrew prophet this desecration of the holy places would be a fruitful theme.

Nor is the church an institution for dispensing charity. It is rather an object upon which charity may be bestowed. It is more blessed to give than to receive, that is, more blessed to the giver. The bestowal of charity upon an individual is fraught with peril, unless to the frank beggar who is already so shameless that he cannot be further destroyed; and most organized charity is really a means of prolonging the misery of those to whom it is directed by adding to their length of days. Charity bestowed upon the church in times past remains to us in monuments of beauty, and the church, by its calculated poverty, still makes many to rejoice by the disposition which it made of the gifts it had inspired. The New Church might well revive the tradition of Christian architecture, and check the present tendency to follow the design of a club, a mosque, or a pagan temple, which as institutions are excellent, as churches a failure.

Forty years ago the word went forth that, as we gained enough science, we should do very well without religion; but science is not now so cock-sure of itself. It is a useful Caliban,

but not really indispensable. To the eyes of Jesus and of Plato the sun rose anew every morning; and there are yet many wise and excellent men who cannot tell you why the moon looks different on successive evenings. It does not matter how far forward the borders of knowledge are pushed; the infinite remains. With things of the temporal world the church has nothing to do. It has to do only with the one idea that religious aspiration is a prime instinct, set side by side with the desire for food or the passion for propagating the species. It "revives, reflowerishes, then vigorous most, when most inactive deemed"; and this movement toward unity is a sign that the time of its revival is at hand.

Each church must bring to the New Church its own peculiar excellence. If it is a church for "work" or for the propagation of ideas, it will fail. It will only succeed if it affords a place of calm for the senses, a retreat from the world of work and of thought, if it provides an incentive to worship for which the most debased soul yearns, and a stimulus for the religious emotion which, suffusing the whole being, translates the world of reality into the sphere of the imagination, so that the transitory and perishable will be lost in the contemplation of heavenly things. To such a church men will resort for the sheer pleasure of losing themselves in the infinite. The church justifies itself, not by reason of what it does but in virtue of what it is.

ANDREW MACPHAIL