

The Dominion Review.

VOL. I.

JUNE, 1896.

NO. 4.

LIFE ETERNAL.

BY WOODS HUTCHINSON, A.M., M.D., OF IOWA UNIVERSITY.

LIFE is the greatest thing in the world. It is a pleasure to simply exist, to respond to our environment, to absorb the forces of nature, to grow and to help others to grow. What wonder, then, that the darling desire of man's heart in all ages is to secure Life Eternal.

But is it not possible for this instinct, this passion, like any other, to overleap itself? May we not, by unduly exalting its importance, by dwelling upon it to the neglect of other equally God-given impulses and desires, develop it into positively abnormal if not morbid forms? Can we not, by cherishing false ideals in connection with it, fall into serious error, and even so change its tendency as to make it a source of more distress, apprehension, and bitterness, than of joy, confidence and hope?

It is hardly necessary to answer the question: it not only may be, but it has been done in many a demonology and also a few theologies, until at more than one period of the world's history, men have been, in the pathetic language of the Great Apostle, "through the fear of death, all their life long, subject to bondage." Like any other instinct unbalanced by counteracting impulses, it has too often brought its own punishment with it, and has multiplied the natural fear of death by the dread of what may follow in the "life beyond." That tragedy of the ages, "Hamlet," is at heart a titanic picture of a noble nature, a courageous soul, a magnificent intellect, palsied, unbalanced, and ultimately all but ruined by too keen an appreciation of the possibilities of the after-world. At every turn his "native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought"—of this thought, his righteous longing for vengeance upon the skulking assassin, his fierce desire to be the instrument of heaven's retribution, when failing him no other *can* be, are sternly suppressed lest he should "couple Hell" with his mission of justice. This leaves him inspired by absolutely no o'er-mastering passion save a sense of the horrors of his father's condition and the utter hopelessness of relieving them by any effort on his part. What wonder this failed to spur him to action? His constant fear is that the ghost "may be a devil" who "out of my weakness and my melancholy abuses me to damn me." Contrast his attitude with that of that commonplace but hot-blooded young fellow, Laertes, who bursts into the presence of royalty itself with the furious declaration,

"To hell allegiance.
 To this point I stand
 That *both the worlds* I give to negligence.
 Let come what comes, only I'll be revenged
 Most thoroughly for my father."

Which is the nobler attitude, the "natural" or the "celestial" one? Hamlet refuses to slay the vile murderer of his father, because forsooth he finds him at his prayers, and dreads that this may bar his punishment in the future world and send him to heaven, which would be "hire and salary, not revenge." He utterly and fatally mistakes the proportion of things in this life by persistently regarding them in the light of a future one. And we have most of us, alas! been personally acquainted with a Hamlet.

The earliest and perhaps most commonly accepted conception of eternal life is an indefinite continuation of our personal existence. It is this childish view which is still largely responsible for the way in which we, even in the nineteenth century, regard death as the "King of Terrors," the chief of evils. Theologically, it has developed into the theory that death is a punishment for and result of sin, and it is generally assumed to have come into the world at the Fall in the Garden of Eden, although, strangely enough, there is absolutely no foundation for such a conception of death in the narrative of that matchless parable itself, and very little in any other part of Scripture outside of the splendid imagery of Paul. Indeed, the poem itself implies the contrary, inasmuch as our first parents were turned out of Eden "lest they eat of the tree of life and live forever," cease to be mortal, in fact. In short, this view of death is taught neither by science nor by Scripture, reasonably interpreted. Death is essentially a vital process of transcendent importance, a blessing instead of a curse, a reward, not a punishment.

Whence, then, comes this fear of death, of which we hear so much and which is so continually appealed to as one of the most overmastering passions of humanity? Is it a natural or manufactured dread? Mainly, the latter.

There is unquestionably a genuine natural basis for it in the instinctive shrinking from the pain of wounds, the weakness and weariness of the sick-bed, the thickening speech, the darkening eye; but this shrivels in a moment in the glow of any powerful emotion, such as love, or ambition, even hunger, or revenge. As Bacon quaintly remarks: "It is worth noting that there is no passion in the mind of man so weak, but it meets and masters the fear of death."

There is also the shudder at the pall, the hearse, Seneca's "array of the death-bed which has more horrors than death itself," the darkness and cold of the tomb, the tooth of the worm, the rain and the storm. But the main and real bitterness of death is the dread of a Future Life.

One of the principal "consolations" of religion consists in allaying the fear which it has itself conjured up. "Men fear death, as children

fear to go
is the othe

The sim
of a pers
beliefs of
manians a
of men bec
its origin
deceased f
exist. Th
and storms
the living.
in this "h
human bei
utensils, an
dream-visio
the corpse,

As the tr
fancies ass
sort of ord
"forces-of-
patron spir
responding
place of res
or "future-
resort to be
situated on
the nearest
the earth:
penetrated.
until it rea
exemplified
life is a fran
colored rep

It has bee
every tribe
lower and m
of civilizatio
separated in
the Tartars o
our own anc
spirits of th
which are gro
weapons and

fear to go in the dark, and as that natural fear is *increased with tales*, so is the other." (Bacon)

The simplest and most primitive form in which this wide-spread idea of a personal existence after death is found to exist is in the religious beliefs of most savage tribes of a low grade of culture, such as the Tasmanians and Australians. Here it is simply a vague belief that the souls of men become demons or spirits after their death, and evidently owes its origin to the appearance in dreams of the images of ancestors or deceased friends, thus proving to the aboriginal mind that they still exist. These ancestral ghosts, together with the demons of the streams and storms, receive a fitful sort of worship, to keep them from injuring the living. There is, of course, no idea whatever of reward or punishment in this "heaven," and the "immortality" conception is not confined to human beings, but extends also to animals, and things such as weapons, utensils, and ornaments (which are seen upon or in the hands of the dream-visions aforesaid), which are accordingly buried or burned with the corpse, that their ghosts may accompany him to the hereafter.

As the tribe rises notch by notch in the scale, these vague and misty fancies assume gradually more and more definite and orderly forms. A sort of order of rank is established among the ancestor ghosts and "forces-of-nature" demons, and from the chief among them are selected patron spirits and deities of the tribe. Thus the gods are born. Corresponding with this increase of dignity comes the necessity of a definite place of residence for beings of such exalted rank, and the "hereafter" or "future-world" is assigned to them, whither the spirits of the dead resort to become their subjects, and Heaven is invented. This is usually situated on the other side of some impassable mountain-chain, or across the nearest lake or ocean, or at the end of some cavern in the bowels of the earth: any place, in fact, where no member of the tribe has ever penetrated. This conception is gradually developed and embellished until it reaches the familiar "happy hunting-ground" stage, so well exemplified in the legends of our North American Indians. This future life is a frank and obvious copy of the present one, a gilded and rose-colored reproduction and continuation of the joys of earthly existence.

"Heaven but the vision of fulfilled desire,
And Hell the shadow of a soul on fire."

It has been held in identical or strikingly similar forms by almost every tribe or race in the world: in the upper stages of savagery, the lower and middle of barbarism, and even on into well-developed stages of civilization. It is, or was, the belief, for instance, of tribes so widely separated in space, in time, and in culture as the South Sea Islanders, the Tartars of Siberia, the Apaches, and the Germans of Tacitus's time, our own ancestors. *Mutatis mutandis* the spirits of the dead hunt the spirits of the buffaloes, which never cease to be plentiful, over prairies which are green the year round, upon horses which never tire, and with weapons and garments that never grow old.

One of the most interesting things about this stage of the belief is, that, as in the former one, the immortality is not confined to human beings, but embraces the animals of the chase, horses, dogs, bows and arrows, cooking utensils, garments, and even articles of food, which are buried with him, so that their spirits may accompany his on his distant journey. This has developed unfortunately into some of the most hideous and ghastly rites known to history, such as the killing or burning of wives, soldiers, and others upon the grave or pyre, in order that the dead man may have the benefit of their company and services.

As the tribe grows, expands, and advances, wars are waged, ships are built, voyages and expeditions of discovery are undertaken, until geography is born, and the idea of a future world somewhere upon earth's surface has to be abandoned. Henceforward, it is relegated either to the region of the sky, the name of which, "heaven," is still borne by the most advanced and modern conception of it, or to the bowels of the earth, as its other classical modern name, the "infernal" ["inferior"] regions," still implies. In most cases, the belief soon comes to include both localities.

A well-known illustration of this early stage of the idea is the Greek Olympus-Hades. The "upper" world did not even quite reach the sky, but was on the summit of Mount Olympus, and was tenanted solely by the gods and by a few nymphs and mortals of such extraordinary merit or beauty or direct blood-relationship to the divinities as to render them worthy of elevation to divine honors. The "lower" world was a cold, comfortless, shadowy region below the earth, where the "shades" of all mortals save the brilliant exceptions mentioned were condemned to pace out a monotonous existence in the meadows of asphodel. Even such redoubtable heroes as Achilles, Agamemnon and Hector could not escape it. The shades were represented as being literally "ghosts of their former selves," still hearing and showing the wounds that caused their death, mourning the loss of their joyous earth-life, their friends, their horses and cattle, their wine and gold, their very voices faded to a gibbering squeak. Achilles longs to come up to earth again, even though it were as the meanest slave that toils. The devoutest Greek departed this life with extreme reluctance, and with nothing but sighs and regrets for the joys he was leaving. He made all he possibly could out of this life, for he expected nothing in the next. And, take him altogether, he was about the best and most useful citizen the world has ever had, and has actually achieved the most glorious immortality. Perhaps on this very account; perhaps not.

Cruder in some particulars and infinitely less artistic, but with a rough justice and fearless manliness about it which lifts it far above Olympus, was the Valhalla of our fierce Norse ancestors. This has many points of resemblance to the "happy hunting-grounds," for we find the heroes

"In the halls where Runic Odin howls his war-song to the gate,"
seated around the massive board, loaded with the souls of their favorite

meats, d
forth ev
in furie
from th
It was a
ters; its
who decl
want to
warriors
The vast
abode in
by the ea

If the
a far mor
to which
travesty

The Ma
higher in
warlike co
self-indul
except in
of "faith
its garden
reproduct
the story
such a "p
sible moun
followers
After bein
would aga
others on
As with V
port, and
the two ra
our statem
the dread

Another
pletely suc
were intenc
conception
of an ever-
human for
whose only
ment upon
deeds done
scales of T

meats, drinking mead out of cups which could never be emptied, issuing forth every morning, not only to fight, but actually to slay and be slain in furious combat; victors and vanquished alike, however, recovering from their wounds or coming to life again in time for the night's carouse. It was a frank copy of the joys of this life writ in large childish characters; its *nairete* reminds one of the enthusiasm of a celebrated surgeon, who declared that, if there were no amputations in heaven, he didn't want to go there. It was essentially a fighter's paradise, to which only warriors and their wives, mothers, or daughters could gain admittance. The vast majority of the race were forced to content themselves with an abode in chilly, foggy regions in the bowels of the earth, presided over by the earth-goddess Hela, whose name has been modified into "hell."

If the Norse ideal of heaven was far below the Christian, its hell was a far more humane conception than that fierce and gloomy Oriental idea to which its name has been transferred, and which has become by a sad travesty the peculiar possession and pride of the "Gospel of Love."

The Mahomedan Paradise was another conception of the same class, higher in that it recognized broader grounds of admission than simple warlike courage and truthfulness, but infinitely lower in the sensual and self-indulgent character of the rewards offered, the exclusion of woman except in so far as she can gratify man's passions, and the recognition of "faith" as a substitute for "works." Its hours, palms, and divans, its gardens, fountains, and delicious fruits, are such obvious and vulgar reproductions of earthly ones, that there is little difficulty in believing the story told by certain historians that Mahomet actually constructed such a "paradise" as the Koran describes in some lovely but inaccessible mountain-valley, to which from time to time certain of his faithful followers would be transported while under the influence of an opiate. After being permitted to remain there a few hours or days, their food would again be drugged, and they would be brought back, to testify to others on their return to consciousness that the half had not been told. As with Valhalla, death in battle against the infidel was its surest passport, and the absolutely reckless bravery which this belief developed in the two races is, to say the least, a highly suggestive commentary upon our statement that the greatest factor in producing the fear of death is the dread of a future life.

Another great group of beliefs, the Egyptian Mysteries, have so completely succeeded in remaining what their name implied (as, indeed, they were intended to remain), that little or no idea can be formed of their conception of a future life. We catch nothing but occasional glimpses of an ever-shifting and misty group of deities, some in animal, some in human form,—Osiris and Amenti, Thoth and Ptah, Anubis and Isis,—whose only definite function appears that of a court of inquiry and judgment upon the souls of the dead. They require a strict account of the deeds done in the body, the heart of the dead man is weighed in the scales of Truth, etc. Morality rather than piety seems to be demanded

by them, but as to the nature of the rewards granted or punishments inflicted we are left almost entirely in the dark. Simply a dim, but majestic vision of a judgment after death, in which Virtue is its own reward and Sin its own punishment.

The most singular conception of the life to come is that held by that religion which in age, dignity, and number of adherents stands at the head of the great world-religions. At first sight it appears to be the very apotheosis of pessimism and nihilism, and yet it is the most ingenious, philosophic and logical working-out of the supernatural idea that the world has ever seen. Much of its thought is magnificent. Its great fundamental conception—that the only immortal thing is character (*karma*) and that a million generations have been needed to develop it, that many of its stages are passed in animal form, and that there is an essential, spiritual relationship between men, animals, and even plants,—is not only matchless in its poetic beauty, but almost scientific in its truthfulness.

The transmigration of souls is a mystic foreshadowing of Darwinism. It is by far the justest and most sweetly reasonable conception of an individual future life which has ever yet been developed. But, like other religions, it is weakest at the point at which it boasts itself most loudly. Its scheme of development up to the level of "*Homo integer citae*" is superb in its insight, its logic, its truthfulness. Its view of the past is inspiring, noble; but for the future, it has nothing to offer but a wearisome repetition of former stages of incarnation, until at last, in the very weariness of despair, the soul is glad to take refuge in Nirvana, "neither consciousness nor unconsciousness," "absorption into the soul of the universe," individual annihilation, eternal rest. As a scheme of the past, it is beautiful, fascinating; as a scheme of the future, it is found wanting. And, just as elsewhere, the prospect of a gloomy after-world has multiplied tenfold the fear of death. But it is a superb allegory. Rid the pany individual of this world-burden of unending existence and eternal responsibility; let the growth of karma be that of the race, and each incarnation a new, glad personality; let the good that was in each, in its influence and its memory, become a part of the constitution of the race—immortal, in fact—and the Darwinist may declare to the Buddhist, as Paul did to the Athenians on Mars Hill: "Whom, therefore, ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you."

When we attempt to study that view of the future life known as the Christian Heaven, we quickly find that we have to deal with two almost wholly distinct and widely different conceptions. One of these is the popular, orthodox Heaven of the prayer-meeting and Sunday-school, the other the "Kingdom of Heaven" of Christ's teachings—two altogether dissimilar regions.

Briefly, the essential features of the old-fashioned orthodox heaven are—a city of great beauty, whose streets are paved with gold, whose twelve gates are constructed each of a single pearl, its walls of jasper,

and its
while th
bearing
and ev
their he
acquire
occupied
throne;
effort; a
bodily eff
hymn-wr

Not far
gulf whic
across it,
race are c
heat, by r
that the i
beautiful c
From a m
interfere
could read
ones; but
they do n
specially d
congratula
heaven.

Of this
almost abs
Its inferior
In short, it
saintly and
and savag
The "Kin
of the Mast
and temper
and fearless
Evil, which
Gospels. E
falsehood w
shall inheri
geographica
It is enough
now; nay, t
us, among u

and its foundations of precious stones. There is no night, and no sea; while through the midst of the city flows a sparkling river with ever-bearing fruit-trees on either bank. Here the redeemed abide "for ever and ever," clad in white and shining garments, with crowns of gold upon their heads, with harps and palm-branches in their hands. They also acquire the power of flying and become "angels." Their entire time is occupied in chanting praises and in bowing down before a great white throne; as all mysteries are revealed to them, there is no need of mental effort; and as there is neither hunger nor thirst, nor pain of any kind, bodily effort is equally unnecessary. In short, it is, as one godly old hymn-writer has expressed it, a place

"Where congregations ne'er break up,
And Sabbaths have no end."

Not far from the walls of this city, separated from it only by a great gulf which is so narrow as to readily permit recognition to take place across it, is a fiery pit, the abode of the lost. Here nine-tenths of the race are condemned to writhe through all eternity, tortured by blistering heat, by raging thirst, by suffocating sulphur-fumes, and every agony that the ingenuity of devils can devise; so that, in clear view of the beautiful city, "the smoke of their torment ascendeth for ever and ever." From a mere human standpoint, one would suppose that this would interfere with the peace of mind of the redeemed, especially as they could readily recognize the voices of a majority of their friends and loved ones; but their dispositions have become so spiritual and celestial that they do not mind it at all. Indeed, one good Calvinistic divine has specially dwelt upon the watching of the tortures of the damned, and congratulating oneself upon escaping therefrom, as one of the joys of heaven.

Of this whole popular conception, it may simply be said that it is almost absolutely without foundation in the teachings of the Master. Its inferior and attendant spirits are taken bodily from Dante and Milton. In short, it is simply a "happy hunting-ground" arranged according to saintly and feminine ideas, combined with a Hades which for injustice and savage vindictiveness is unparalleled even in the cannibal islands.

The "Kingdom of Heaven," "Kingdom of God," "Life Everlasting," of the Master's own teachings is a conception of widely-different form and temper. Its description consists principally of a noble strain of lofty and fearless prophecy of the ultimate triumph of Good and defeat of Evil, which throbs like an everlasting *Leitmotiv* through all of the four Gospels. Righteousness and Truth must and shall prevail. Evil and falsehood will certainly both punish and defeat themselves: "The meek shall inherit the earth;" this is the burden of his song. As to the geographical where? and the chronological when? he is divinely silent. It is enough for us to know that it shall be hereafter and that it begins now; nay, that this divine process is actually going on within us, about us, among us, if we will only open our clouded eyes to see it. "The

Kingdom of God is within you." "This is life everlasting, that they may know thee, the only true God." This is no mere endless prolongation of petty individual existence. It is something far nobler and higher than this. Hear Farrar's burning words :

"The use of the word *aionios* and of its Hebrew equivalent *olam*, throughout the whole of Scripture, ought to have been sufficient to prove to every thoughtful and unbiassed student that it altogether transcends the thoroughly vulgar and unmeaning conception of 'endless.' Nothing, perhaps, tends to prove more clearly the difficulty of eradicating an error that has once taken deep and age-long root in the minds of 'theologians,' than the fact that it should still be necessary to prove that the word 'eternal,' far from being a mere equivalent for 'everlasting,' never means 'everlasting' at all, except by reflexion from the substantives to which it is joined; that it is only joined to those substantives because it connotes ideas which transcend all time; that to make it mean nothing but time endlessly prolonged is to degrade it by filling it with a merely relative conception which it is meant to supersede, and by emptying it of all the highest conceptions which it properly includes."

As to a continued individual existence after death, it is nowhere definitely taught by the Master, and is only even implied on any broad and reasonable principle of interpretation in three of his sayings. This may seem an extreme statement, but I challenge proof to the contrary from the Gospels. The three passages alluded to are the parable of Dives and Lazarus, the decision upon the case of the woman who had seven husbands, and the promise to the thief on the cross.

All other references of this sort which have even the appearance of being personal are to a mysterious "second coming" "in the clouds of heaven," which it is distinctly stated shall take place within the lifetime of that generation (Matt. 16 : 28 ; Mark 12 : 25 ; Luke 20 : 35 and 24 : 34), but as to whose occurrence history is silent. Even that matchless epitome of the wants and aspirations of the human heart, the Lord's Prayer (in Luke, Rev. Ver.), contains not a word of allusion to such a region. The grandly majestic "Last Judgment" is the Verdict of History, and nothing could be more "unorthodox" than its superb criterion, which is neither creed, nor faith, nor even intentional service of God ("Lord, when saw we thee an hungered and fed thee?"), but the broad and noble principle of common humanity, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me." In short, the *Zoe aionios* of Christ is literally the "Life of the Ages" of Darwin.

To what conclusion, now, are we led by this review of the type-religions of the world, as to the effect of a belief in a future life upon the fear of death? Only one seems possible, that it vastly increases it. The happy hunting-ground is reserved only for chiefs and warriors of highest renown, and many are the risks which even these have to run upon their passage thither. Only a few of the most favored of mortals can hope to scale Olympus. The halls of Odin open to none save heroes of renown or faultless courage. The paradise of Mahomet is reserved for the faithful

who have
women n
tiveness
gate an
that find
that more
Indeed, I
themselves
trust. In
the vast n
of absolut
terrors.

As to th
extent to
this is cor
natures ne
Assure a s
is unfortun
the next or
constable a
hell? Thi
of to-day,

Besides,
usually tha
Church. 'I
it is notori
devout his
English pe
open his c
remark, "I
with crime.
ill-disposed,
that whatev
torturings,
burning, Je
polygamy, a
it alone.

We person
don. We a
lived from t
shall live th
existence ou
good, all tha
us and in ou
has been pai

who have sealed their devotion with their blood, and admits neither women nor children. Nirvana is a "heaven" of very doubtful attractiveness; while as to the orthodox Christian heaven: "Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto Life, and few there be that find it." Its most enthusiastic proclaimers do not offer the hope that more than a very small percentage of the race will ever reach it. Indeed, they seem inclined to gloat over the prospect of having it all to themselves. None but "desirable" people will be admitted there, they trust. In brief, every conception of an individual future life condemns the vast majority of men to a state of either cheerless, ghostly gloom or of absolute torment. Destroy such a belief, and you rob death of half its terrors. 'Tis not dying that men dread so much as living again, and

"Thus conscience doth make cowards of us all."

As to the so-called "restraining influence" of such a belief and the extent to which it supports and enforces morality, the more attentively this is considered the less will be found to be its value. High, noble natures need no such incentive; base ones are but little affected by it. Assure a scoundrel of immunity from punishment in this world, which is unfortunately usually implied in the orthodox view, and he will risk the next one. If he is willing to run the gauntlet of the immediate constable and gaol, how much more that of the remote possibilities of hell? The criminal is essentially the man who blindly gluts the craving of to-day, with an utter disregard for to-morrow.

Besides, there is always the chance of a "death-bed repentance" and usually that of buying absolution by devoting part of the spoils to the Church. "Charity covereth a multitude of sins." In Catholic countries it is notorious that the more colossally villainous the brigand the more devout his piety and magnificent his offerings. Indeed, a distinguished English penologist (Havelock Ellis: "The Criminal,") goes so far as to open his chapter on "Religion of the Criminal" with the horrifying remark, "In all countries religion or superstition is intimately connected with crime." As a check for the well-disposed it is unnecessary; for the ill-disposed, worthless or worse. Furthermore, it must not be overlooked that whatever value it may have in this respect has to be offset by the torturings, human sacrifices, funeral victims, "head hunting," child-burning, Jesuit massacres, thuggism, "infant damnation," Mormon polygamy, and other such observances and beliefs which are inspired *by it alone*.

We personally fought at the battle of Hastings and shall in Armageddon. We are a part of all that ever has been or is to come. We have lived from the earliest appearance of life upon this cooling globe, and shall live through all eternity in our descendants or in those whose existence ours has helped to make possible. All that is true, all that is good, all that is brave and virtuous, that "makes for righteousness" in us and in our influence, *cannot* die, but has become part of the universe, has been painted in the great picture-gallery of nature to bless and cheer

generations yet unborn. This, to my vision, is the true "Eternal Life," or, as *Zoe aionios* is better translated, "the life of the æons," "The Life of the Ages." All in us that is base, all that is cowardly, all that is untrue, falls by its own weight, decays by "the worm that dieth not," is consumed "by the fire that is not quenched."

What wonder that the righteous are described as "saved," and the unrighteous as "lost." The question of salvation becomes, not the selfish one, "shall I as an individual live after death in a state of happiness or misery?" but the nobler, unselfish one, "How much of all my work, my character, my influence, my *self* will become part of the progress of the race and of the history of the universe?"

All faiths, all views agree in this one grand, consoling thought, that every brave deed, every noble effort, is of itself immortal. That the good *cannot* die, and that every effort, however feeble or apparently unsuccessful, to make the world happier for our having lived in it, shall have its reward.*

Men foolishly think that the gods are born like as men are,
And have, too, a dress like their own, and their voice and their figure ;
But if oxen and lions had hands like ours, and fingers,
Then would horses, like unto horses, and oxen to oxen,
Paint and fashion their god-forms, and give to them bodies
Of like shape to their own, as they themselves too are fashioned.

— *Xenophanes*, B.C. 569.

In the plain of Memphis, the Egyptians had their great cemetery, where they cut deep holes, or vaults, into the sandstone bottom, after first removing the surface sand from the spot, and then, when they had deposited the dead, they threw three handfuls of sand into the grave, bidding the departed thrice "adieu," and they covered the hole with a slab of stone, leaving the surface sand to blow over it. This was the origin of the three handfuls, or three shovelfuls, of dirt being thrown into the graves of the departed.—*B. C. Jones*, "Lectures on Greek Mythology, etc."

In 1453, the capture of Constantinople by the Turks under Mahommed II. had scattered the learning of the Greeks among all the nations of the west. The universities were soon supplied with professors, who displayed the hitherto unexplored treasures of the language of Pericles and Demosthenes. Everywhere a spirit of enquiry began to reawaken, but limited as yet to subjects of philosophy and antiquity. Erasmus was alarmed at the state of feeling in 1516, and expressed his belief that, if those Grecian studies were pursued, the ancient deities would resume their sway.—*Menzies' Middle Ages*, page 286.

* Reprinted from THE OPEN COURT, Chicago.

HE closed
of po use ;
got any ec
I read the
tion," show
got muddle
inconsisten
and that a
only writer
surdly on th
prove, and,
I am in des
bimetallism,
Good argum
as hopeful a

Thomas Pain
of Washingto
books nor stu
Would it b
ments of nat
definitions of
we shall come
about, and go
see how barte
and honest.
discuss, and
Suppose we
occupants. T
garden to terri
life. There w
to the destruct
as the climate
need neither sl

SWAPPING.

BY CAPT. ROBERT C. ADAMS, MONTREAL.

HE closed the book and put it on the table. With a sigh he said : Emily, it's of no use ; I can't understand political economy or finance. I believe I haven't got any economic brains. I read book after book, and I accept each one until I read the next. There is Kitson, in "Scientific Solution of the Money Question," showing that Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill were all astray, that Jevons got muddled, that Ricardo's law of rent is faulty, that Henry George is utterly inconsistent, that all the definitions of value by previous economists are wrong, and that a thing cannot possess value : it can only have purchasing power. The only writer he compliments as teaching the truth is Macleod, who wrote so absurdly on the wrong side as to prove the very opposite of what he intended to prove, and, "like Samson Agonistes, in slaying his enemies he has slain himself." I am in despair at trying to decide this currency question,—monometallism, bimetalism, greenbackism, free coinage, free paper money. It is all confusion. Good arguments for each and tremendous objections against them all. It's about as hopeful as the effort of those who, Milton says,

" Reasoned high
Of Providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute ;
And found no end, in wand'ring mazes lost."

Thomas Paine, whose writings were said to be no less powerful than the cannon of Washington in the cause of American Independence, said : " I neither read books nor studied other men's opinions. I thought for myself."

Would it be possible for any one with common-sense logic and the plain sentiments of natural morality to think out these questions, even if he couldn't give definitions of wealth, capital, rent and value ? Suppose we try, and see where we shall come out. Let us use common words, that there can be no dispute about, and go back to a primitive state of society. Then step by step we will see how barter, trade, commerce, exchange might develop if people were sensible and honest. We will use a common word to express the topic that we shall discuss, and call it Swapping.

Suppose we were in the Garden of Eden, and Robert and Emily were the sole occupants. There was no serpent to tempt, no voice of one walking in the garden to terrify, no cherubim or flaming sword to keep the way of the tree of life. There were no laws, and apples were free. Being vegetarians and averse to the destruction of life, our food would be easily secured and prepared ; and, as the climate would be mild and no mosquitoes would be admitted, we should need neither skins nor fig-leaves, and there would be no labor spent in having

clothing made or repaired. Some rugs and shawls might come in handy ; but most of our wants would be supplied by nature as the result of our simple toil. How should we live and divide our efforts so as to secure the best results ?

The obvious way would be for each to do what was most suitable and agreeable and share results without any thought of swapping. Robert would till the ground, Emily would assist as far as strength permitted ; there would be no comparison of services, or estimate of the balance of trade, or " how much to boot," in the bargain. It would be " each for all and all for each"—pure communism—having " all things in common."

But one day John and Jane came down from the air, and, laying aside their wings, said this was the likeliest spot they had seen in their flight, and they would like to settle down. They erected a shelter, and began to live as Robert and Emily were doing. After a while, Robert said to John, " I can get food enough for four, why shouldn't you do something else ? You are a handy man ; make me some spades and hoes and ploughs. Emily can prepare the food for all, and Jane might make some bark rugs." So the labor was still further divided, but the results were shared according to needs. By and by, another couple flew by and caught sight of Paradise ; and they went off and gave such a report of its attractions, that they returned with a colony of settlers. Each couple began life as did Robert and Emily ; then they joined into groups to supply common needs ; then they found services that several groups or the whole community could unite in. At last, noticing the differences in ability and energy, the best workers began to be dissatisfied with the plan of sharing everything in common, and devised a system of swapping their products for such things as they required ; and they reckoned the amount of goods they should receive by a comparison of the time spent in the production of each article. But it came to be tedious, as the people increased and wants grew, to hunt around for a chance to swap and to haggle about the terms of exchange ; so at a public meeting the people settled the proportions that each product should bear to other articles, all based upon the labor time consumed in production. They appointed a storekeeper, who should receive and distribute the goods that might be brought to him, and who should pay to each producer pieces of printed paper, each representing a *day's labor*, and therefore called for shortness a *dalor*. Consumers purchased these products by payment in dalors or fractions thereof, at the original price paid to the producer, with only the cost of the store and the storekeeper's living added. Cost was the limit of price ; there was no profit. Occasionally, public meetings revised the prices of goods or of services rendered ; and in some cases, where special skill or long-continued education entered into the service, that was considered in fixing the price, and it was made larger than the mere time allowance would have warranted. But in no case did the individual fix the price of his labor. If this had been permitted, all the evils of the competitive system would

have con-
demands
because
judge of
it is this v
causes the
society.

unwilling
cost prices

The pap
their good
themselves
of labor, a

But, afte
steamboats
the outside
difficulty, h
dalors were
of Paradise

and measur
But the p
articles ? V
work to pro
these values,

" That ma
haven't adop

The Parad
the rest of th
useless labor
had better fi
force us to in
sole purpose
press can pri
exchanged for
The rest of th
adopt our the

The outside
tion to consi
appointed to
community ha
and that in eve

have come into existence, unless men were so conscientious as to limit their demands to the cost of production. People may say: Here your system fails, because you interfere with human liberty. Every one should have the right to judge of the worth of his efforts and get all he can for them. But, I would reply, it is this very liberty to practice extortion and profit by others' necessities that causes the inequalities in the distribution of wealth under the present system of society. I am supposing that in Eden people were so moral that they were unwilling to take profits, and that they voluntarily united to determine the just cost prices.

The paper dalors served every purpose of money in enabling people to swap their goods or services in a convenient way. The dalors were worth nothing of themselves, and only had purchasing power because they represented the products of labor, and had been agreed upon as the counters to make swapping easy.

But, after a while, Paradise got connected with the outer world, railroads and steamboats and air-ships found their way to it, and the people of Paradise and the outsiders began to desire to swap their productions. They encountered a difficulty, however, in finding a medium of exchange. The outsiders said the dalors were of no use to them in their own countries, and they advised the men of Paradise to dig in the earth for silver and gold with which to settle balances and measure bargains.

But the Paradise men said: "Why should we spend our labor on useless articles? We are not barbarians who use metals for ornament. We prefer to work to procure serviceable articles, and our paper dalors, issued to represent these values, are sound money, and no labor is wasted in making it."

"That may be good theory," said the outsiders, "but the rest of the world haven't adopted it yet, and it can't be applied. We have got to get coin."

The Paradise men replied: "We have lived a good while without trade with the rest of the world, and we might get along a while yet instead of undertaking useless labor to secure the advantage. If we have goods that you desire, you had better find some way of settling the balance of our exchanges that will not force us to injure ourselves by having to employ part of our population for the sole purpose of creating money that is chiefly valuable as counters. If a printing press can print a representative of the useful products of labor which can be exchanged for other products, why should people work to make a metal token? The rest of the world had better take a common sense view of the matter and adopt our theory."

The outsiders departed, and when they got home they called a great convention to consider how to trade with Paradise. As a result, a committee was appointed to study the financial system of Paradise. They reported that each community had its accounts inspected every six months by the central agency, and that in every locality there were mutual banks that issued new paper dalors

for half of the value of such approved securities as were deposited with them, and interest at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum was charged to cover expenses, any profit over expenses being spent in public works. They recommended the adoption of the system in their own country; and a treaty was soon after made with Paradise to accept each other's paper currency. Other countries followed suit. An international clearing-house was established, and balance-sheets were made up periodically. At first, there was some perplexity as to how to settle balances, and it seemed as though some commodity must be used as the last resort. But the paper money was based on real value, and confidence was maintained by strict inspection of securities. Perhaps at the next clearing the balance would turn against the nation in whose favor it was at the previous clearing, and it could all be settled by book-keeping.

Now, said Robert, I suppose a hundred finance writers could at once point out the utter folly and impossibility of such a scheme, and I don't suppose I could defend it. Yet it does seem to me that the solution of the money problem must come in some such line. Gold and silver were valued for ornaments by barbarous nations, and were so scarce that their value as commodities was equal to their currency value. But the supply of these metals being greater now and people more civilized, gold and silver as commodities are only worth about one-half of what they are worth as currency. If legal fiat can make 67 cents' worth of silver pass for a dollar, why should it not cause one cent's worth of paper to be worth 100 dollars, when 200 dollars' worth of property is pledged for its redemption?

Now, as far as I can see into the subject, it seems to me that, instead of re-monetizing silver, the thing to do is to demonetize gold, and have a paper currency based upon secured values and managed in a way that will assure absolute confidence at home and abroad. Everyone prefers clean paper money to handle excepting for amounts under one dollar. Iron, copper, aluminum, nickel, or whatever metals are cheapest and most favored can be bought and coined, this currency being based on the same security as the paper money.

This would do away with interest charges to such an extent that a multitude of industries could be carried on profitably, and the loss of gold and silver mining as an employment would be made up by the creation of new occupations of a less arduous nature.

However, I suppose somebody will at once show that I know nothing about the subject, and that all my ideas are absurd vagaries. If I have not thought out the matter with any degree of correctness, I shall say that the money problem is "something that no fellow can understand," or at any rate is beyond my comprehension.



H
At a reun
composed
city, and,
given the
derived his
the Associ
about the c
a lawyer by
the doctor
a captain w
an army, b
Mr. Hoo
judicial trib
Connecticu
what a "leg
lawyer in H
was settled d
very black, s
he was a fug
fears that he
colored -prea
correspond w
and that he c
give a little s
Hooker's first
for him. Th
who said that
in order to cl
\$150 for him
Europe. Wh
there made a
saying that he
but accepted i
he was a docto
The adminis
that he had no

HOW JOHN HOOKER BECAME A "D.D."

BY B. F. UNDERWOOD.

At a reunion of the Thomas Hooker Association at Hartford, Conn., which is composed of descendants of Rev. Thomas Hooker, one of the founders of that city, and, as one of the speakers said, "as truly a nobleman as if he had been given the patent of nobility by some king, and indeed more truly so, for he derived his nobility from the King of kings," the Hon. John Hooker, President of the Association, made a noteworthy speech in response to a call for remarks about the doctors of divinity in the Hooker family. He explained how, although a lawyer by profession, he was also a doctor of divinity. He placed his right to the doctorate, he said, not on the principle laid down by Xenophon, that he was a captain who had all the qualities of a commander, although he had never led an army, but on a sound legal basis.

Mr. Hooker is an able lawyer, who has had many years' experience with judicial tribunals, and is the author of thirty-three volumes of Reports of the Connecticut Supreme Court; and it may therefore be presumed that he knows what a "legal basis" is. When the fugitive slave law was passed, he was a young lawyer in Hartford where Rev. James W. C. Pennington, a colored preacher, was settled over a church of colored people. Mr. Pennington, whose skin was very black, sought a private interview with the young lawyer and told him that he was a fugitive slave, that his real name was Jim Pembroke; and he expressed fears that he might be caught, and wanted advice. It was decided that the colored preacher should go out of the country and that Mr. Hooker should correspond with the old master, "stating to him that Jim was out of the country and that he could have no hope of reclaiming him, but that he was willing to give a little something for his freedom." The master wrote in reply to Mr. Hooker's first letter that Jim was a good blacksmith and he demanded \$1,200 for him. This was discouraging. Months later a letter came from another man who said that Jim's master was dead, that he was administrator of the estate and in order to close up the business, as Jim was out of the country, he would accept \$150 for him. The money was sent. Meanwhile Pennington had gone to Europe. While abroad he went to Heidelberg and was by the famous university there made a doctor of divinity; which honor he accepted with great grace, saying that he was perfectly aware that he did not deserve it on his own account, but accepted it as a tribute to his race. So that at the time this money was sent he was a doctor of divinity.

The administrator had written Mr. Hooker that Jim was a part of the assets, that he had no power to set him free and that he could only sell him. "Accord-

ingly, on receiving the \$150," says Mr. Hooker, "he sent me a bill of sale of 'James Pembroke, a negro slave,' and for two or three days I was the owner of Rev. James W. C. Pennington, D.D.; probably the first instance in the history of the world when a man has been known in that sense to own a doctor of divinity. Sometimes they can be bought very cheaply, but not in this way. I had then acquired the title to him; it was in my power to set him free; and I executed the paper by which I set free 'James Pembroke, otherwise known as Rev. Dr. James W. C. Pennington,' and the deed of manumission is on record in the public records of Hartford. In doing this I merely took my hands off from him; I gave him nothing; I simply let him go out of my hands. It was one of the elementary principles of slave-law that a slave could own nothing. . . . Now the doctorate of divinity which Mr. Pennington fancied was his own property, was mine, and I never gave it up at all. So to this day, I am, by the best of legal titles, a doctor of divinity and therefore it was proper for me, if no one else responded to the call for doctors of divinity that are descended from Thomas Hooker, to present myself here, for the honor of our ancestor Thomas Hooker, as a doctor of divinity."

A narrative like this is strange reading to many of this generation, to those who have no remembrance of slavery in this country, no personal knowledge of the horrors of that system which was sustained by the conservative public sentiment of the North as well as by the pecuniary interests of the South. In those days the pulpit was on the side of slavery. "The language of the ministry and the practice of the church members," wrote Albert Barnes, "give such a sanction to this enormous evil as could be derived from no other source, and such that it is useless to convince the world of the evil." Alexander Campbell wrote: "There is not one verse in the Bible inhibiting it [slavery] but many regulating it. I would as soon become a socialist, or a freethinker, or a skeptic as say or think that it is immoral or un-Christian to hold a bond-servant in any case whatever or allow that a Christian man can have no property in man." Moses Stuart, of Anderson, defended slavery. Human flesh and blood were sold to satisfy mortgages in favor of theological schools and churches. Churches held slaves and paid their pastor from the labor of these slaves. Slaveholding preachers were often selected for missionaries to heathen lands. How different the public sentiment which now prevails in regard to slavery from that which existed when honest John Hooker bought the slave Pennington, and thereby came in legal possession of a doctorate of divinity! All honor to Hon. John Hooker, D D.



In the A
Washingt
a title bet
would be
tection an
Washingt
"legitimat
anything t
macy? I
of the play
authority,
In the U
was one of
Not one ou
Philadelph
a day, and
artisans out
built a turnp
many of the
Let us lo
"The well
community i
necessarily in
gate increase
tion; for the
times."
According
and times.
very large nu
from this clas
insult to the
that "the poc
to his article,
analogy. Tak
Hare and Bur
records? Do
cases? Do w

CRIME AND ITS REAL CAUSE.

BY CHARLES ELLIS, STRATFORD.

In the April issue of the *DOMINION REVIEW* there appeared an article by H. Washington, of Ottawa, on what he is pleased to term "Protection and Crime," a title between the two terms of which there is about as much analogy as there would be between Protection and Marriage, Protection and Grasshoppers, Protection and Mortality, and so on, any one of which would be as sensible as Mr. Washington's title. In France, where a bonus is given for the procreation of legitimate children, does any sane man pretend to believe that Protection has anything to do with the lack of conjugal love or the steady increase of illegitimacy? In the United States, we might as well say that Protection is the cause of the plagues of Colorado beetles and grasshoppers; for, according to this authority, the same conditions are at work in the latter country as in the former.

In the United States, from 1857 to the autumn of 1861 (a free trade period) was one of the darkest periods ever seen by the laboring people of America. Not one out of five skilled workmen of the country was steadily employed. In Philadelphia, the builders of a street railway advertised for 250 hands at 50 cts. a day, and there were over 5,000 applicants, a majority of them being skilled artisans out of work. A rolling mill, to save its skilled workmen from pauperism, built a turnpike, and their expert hands broke stone on it for 50 cts. a day, and many of them could not be employed even in this way.

Let us look at this argument of Mr. Washington's :
 "The well-known tendency of protection to force the accumulating wealth of the community into the hands of an ever-decreasing percentage of the people, which necessarily involves an increasing percentage of poor, no matter how great the aggregate increase of wealth, accounts for the increase of crime under the system of taxation; for the poor and crime increase and decrease together in all countries and times."

According to this logic, the poor are the direct cause of crime in all countries and times. Now, from personal knowledge, I am prepared to say that, though very large numbers of our workmen are poor, there are fewer criminals recruited from this class in Canada than in any country I know of. It is an uncalled-for insult to the great body of the poor working men in this country to insinuate that "the poor and crime increase and decrease together." As in the heading to his article, so in reference to the antithesis of poverty and crime, there is no analogy. Take the greatest criminals the world has seen—Lucrezia Borgia, Hare and Burke, Birchall, Holmes, and hundreds of others—and what are their records? Do we find penury and want from their cradle up in a majority of cases? Do we not find these criminals mostly in good circumstances?

In the matter of divorce, we find that in the United States the number of divorce cases increased from 9,937 in 1867 to 25,535 in 1886. Was it the poor working people or the affluent and well-to-do classes that figured mostly in the divorce courts?

The total amount of stealings in the United States during 1891 amounted to \$19,720,294. Who stole all this money, the poor or the wealthy classes? I do not say that the poor working class are any "better than they should be," but I do hurl back the broad misstatement that they are the cause of the crime of every country.

Then take the case of illegitimacy. From statistics published by Dr. Albert Leffingwell, of England, we see that the Irish are the most virtuous people in the world, the ratio of illegitimate to legitimate births being only 26 to 1,000. Now, according to the argument of Mr. Washington, Ireland should stand at the head of the criminal list, owing to the poverty of its people. The English rate is 42, and the Scotch rate 82 to 1,000. Thus, we may roughly say that, for every child born out of wedlock in England, two are born in England and three in Scotland. In Europe, Ireland is closely followed in its place of honor by Russia, with the low rate of 28, and Holland, with 32 per 1,000. The Italian and French rates are respectively 74 and 82, comparable with the Scotch rate. In Sweden, Saxony and Bavaria the rates vary from 100 to 140; and Austria shows the top figure of 146. In Ireland, the lowest rates are in the poorest counties. Russia is one of the poorest countries. And Dr. Leffingwell says:

"There is nowhere such uniform relation between the indigence of a people and the prevalence of illegitimacy as to justify the hypothesis that phases of moral delinquency in any district or country can be accurately described as caused by its poverty. As little can the influence of great cities account for the prevalence of illegitimacy."

As with other forms of crime, we must seek the real factors in race and heredity, legislative restraints upon marriage, social usage, and other circumstances. Turning to Mr. Washington's proposition again, I will quote Mr. Lea, a clever writer, who says:

"The increase of wealth among all classes is a cause for the increase of crime."

Mr. Morrison, another eminent writer, says:

"Every rise in the rate of wages is followed by an increase of offenders, so that the prisons are never so full as in a period of general prosperity and abundant work."

J. S. Robertson, a recent writer, says:

"This view of the case is confirmed by data from countries that have suffered famine and distress in their more aggravated forms. For example, we are told by Prof. Felix L. Oswald that, in Hindustan, a famine threatening the very existence of eleven million human beings resulted in nothing more criminal than an increase in vagrancy. During the fearful distress of the Silesian weavers in 1856 and 1858, the utmost good order prevailed. It is only when men give way to the drink habit in

times of
violence a

The vi
tice of

"The p
tunity to o
mitted for
that, if the
tumults, th
that time v
of excessiv

Judge C

"I never
nected with

Here we
possessed a
tively the c

Prison C
than 15,000

Danish s
lunacy, ove

In Ameri
well-known

the result of

Judge No
on the judic
our country

The Rev.
that 85 per c

A recent r
"Out of 28,

were either
drink"

Sir Oliver M
due to the liq

The conclu
giving the an

one of the ch
marked increa

the statistics o

Neither Pro
more than it is

times of distress and trial that they lose their heads and become guilty of acts of violence and crime."

The view expressed two hundred years ago by Sir Matthew Hale, Chief Justice of England, has been reiterated over and over again. He said :

"The place of judicature I have long held in this kingdom has given me an opportunity to observe the original cause of most of the enormities that have been committed for the space of nearly twenty years, and by due observation I have found that, if the murders and manslaughters, the burglaries and robberies, and riots and tumults, the adulteries, fornications, rapes, and other outrages that have happened in that time were divided into five parts, four of them have been the issues and products of excessive drinking."

Judge Coleridge, at a more recent date, put the case even more strongly :

"I never knew a case brought before me which was not directly or indirectly connected with intoxicating liquors."

Here we have the opinions of two of England's most eminent jurists, who possessed a thorough knowledge of the subject of crime, asserting most positively the contrary to what Mr. Washington contends for.

Prison Chaplain Eberts, of Brunswick, Germany, says : "I have heard more than 15,000 prisoners declare that drink had been their ruin."

Danish statistics credit about one-tenth of the accidents, one-eighth of the lunacy, over one-third of the pauperism, and 76 per cent. of the arrests to drink.

In America, drink causes three-fourths of the crime. Carroll D. Wright, the well-known United States statistician, says : "Ninety per cent. of our crime is the result of intoxicating liquors."

Judge Noah Davis has said : "An experience of more than twenty-five years on the judicial bench warrants me in saying that three-quarters of the crime in our country is the direct or indirect result of liquor."

The Rev. W. Searles, for sixteen years Chaplain of Auburn State Prison, said that 85 per cent. of the incarcerations in that prison were due to drink.

A recent report of the Prison Inspectors for Ontario and Quebec states that : "Out of 28,289 commitments to the gaols for the preceding three years 21,286 were either for drunkenness or for crimes perpetrated under the influence of drink."

Sir Oliver Mowat has asserted that three-fourths of the crime in Ontario is due to the liquor traffic.

The conclusion of Henry Charles Lee, in a contribution to the *Forum*, after giving the annual average of crime in the leading states of Europe, is, "that one of the chief causes at work to produce these disheartening results is the marked increase in the consumption of intoxicating liquors, which is shown by the statistics of almost every nation."

Neither Protection nor any other economic question is the cause of crime, any more than it is for saplings growing crooked, the rainy season, the drought, or

early frosts. Crime is the violation of social law. It proceeds, broadly speaking, either from ingrained vicious propensity or from strong temptation acting upon an ill-balanced nature. Heredity and environment lie at the root of all crime. A recent writer in the *Canadian Health Journal* says :

"It is now well known by all persons of intelligence and education, that all criminals are physically defective, in a smaller or greater degree ; and, furthermore, that all physical defects are the results of transgressions of physical laws—the laws or rules of health, by the ancestors, generations back of the criminals. These may be regarded as facts well established by anthropological studies, by the well-known evil consequences of a neglect through several generations of ordinary physical or hygienic requirements, and by the excellent results upon the mental faculties of criminals of proper physical culture, for even a short period. Even the adult brain may be improved by the various proceedings included under the head of physical culture."

I can only briefly refer to the economic side of the question referred to by Mr. Washington, in respect to England. Notwithstanding that she laid the foundation of her mercantile greatness and supremacy by the adoption of "free trade," to-day, by taxing imports, she levies a larger amount of customs taxation, both in amount and reckoned by head of population, than any country in Europe. The "free trade" of Great Britain is based on the exact opposite of the theory of free trade as recognized by all political economists. Free trade means free exchange ; that is, that countries shall freely exchange with each other the produce for which one country is naturally fitted and the other is not. Southern climes to exchange their fruits and the produce of their vines for the hardier products and manufactures of the north, and so on. But British free trade is based on the exact opposite of this. It says, in effect : If there is anything that another country produces which the United Kingdom cannot produce, and which is therefore especially wanted, let it be heavily taxed as an import for revenue ; but whenever a country can send what can be or is very well grown or produced internally, let it be encouraged to come in free, so that the profits and wages of producers at home may be knocked down to the lowest margin. And in this way free-trade England levies a larger amount of customs taxation than any other country in Europe. But she does so only on non-competing imports, while she admits free every commodity which competes with or undersells or extinguishes home production.

Now, according to Mr. Washington's theory, England should be a very bad country, and crime should flourish there owing to her extreme system of Protection. But, according to his article on "Protection and Crime," England, since she adopted this sort of "free trade," has decreased her criminal class.



TO CANADA.

BY WALT. A. RATCLIFFE.

LAND of the Maple and Fir,
Mighty Domain of the West,
Kissed by three oceans at once,
Thou art the home of my youth,
Thou art the land that I love !
Rich are thy prairies, and fair

The slopes where thy peach-orchards blush ;
Treasures of silver and gold,
Treasures of iron and coal,
Treasures of timber and corn,
Lie at the feet of thy sons.
Then whence is the spectre, Want ;
That with pitiless, hungry eyes,
And merciless fingers and gaunt,
Follows thy children who toil ?
Love thee ? Ah, love thee I do,
Else, like the tinklers in verse,
I had covered thee over with lies.
Have I not played in thy dells,
Dreamed by thy murmuring rills,
Lulled by the moan of thy pines ?
Now, when no longer a child,
I weep that the sons thou hast borne
Tarnish thy fame with their deeds ;
Weep that our law-givers clutch,
As babes clutch at bubbles of air,
At ribbons with pins for their coats,
Then ape all the follies, and worse,
Of their grandsires' grandsires gone ;
Weep o'er the discord and din,
That moan from the East to the West,
Over thy mountains and plains,
Like the wail of a gathering storm
That to-morrow in fury may burst,
And flood thee in blood and in tears !
Patriot, Plunderer, Fraud,
All sound the same in our ears.
Position, Property, Pelf,
Are jewels that dazzle the eye,

Till Honesty, Honor and Truth
 Are baubles for children and fools.
 And men, the creators of things,
 Are slaves to the things they have made.
 E'en the Pulpit has jostled the Pew,
 To fall at the feet of the calf.

Love thee! Ay, love thee and mourn
 That the crown of thy glory is dross.
 Tinsel and bunting and smoke
 Are not of greatness the pledge.
 When thy sons and thy daughters are free,
 Free from the thralldom of gold,
 Free from the wars of their creeds,
 Free from the terror of want,
 Free in the freedom of Love,
 Honesty, Honor and Truth,
 Then shalt thou truly be great,
 O Land of the Maple and Fir!

PROFESSOR ROMANES' RETURN TO CHRISTIANITY.

BY J. S. ELLIS.

THE publication of Professor Romanes' "Thoughts on Religion," about a year ago, gave rise to a large amount of comment, especially on the part of sectarian journals, in which it was generally claimed that Professor Romanes had deliberately rejected his scientific conclusions, and had fully rejoined the church of which in early life he had been a devoted adherent. As represented, the circumstances were unique. Here was a scientist of the first rank, a man only second to Darwin himself, who, after having inquired into the Christian evidences, had deliberately rejected them; and yet who, after again examining them, had as deliberately retraced his steps. Looking at the case, however, as simply a personal one, we cannot admit that the doubts and difficulties of one man, however clever and cultured, can be of any avail to support creeds and dogmas which his learning had led him, in his active and virile days, deliberately to reject. Whatever decision Professor Romanes may have come to as to the validity of the Christian evidences, that decision will not weigh one iota with an intelligent inquirer, unless the grounds on which it was reached are as intelligible and valid for him as they were for Romanes. The question for us, therefore, is, Do the causes which led Professor Romanes finally to decide in favor of some sort of Chris-

tianity, a
 desponde
 actually

Our T
 entitled,
 dealt with

"The in
 scepticism t
 our time."

Certain
 event. B
 determinin
 reader of t
 this passag

"In becom
 I used my re
 other, becau
 believing on
 But my act o
 Presby
 but still in a
 nature. In b
 my natural be
 of what I prev

This sort
 mind. Th
 "babes and
 to resign to
 them no sol
 popular faith
 It is, indeed,
 any one relig
 weakness in
 faith, and thi
 the lessons c
 forward by R
 And so far, in
 that of "reas
 in line with
 that it was at
 In looking a
 sympathizing
 and his regre
 religious train
 had how Rom

tianity, appeal to us as they appealed to the Professor in the days of his despondency? And another question of importance is, Did these causes actually lead Prof. Romanes back to his starting-point of orthodoxy?

Our Toronto contemporary, *The Week* (lately deceased), had an article entitled, "The Confessions of an Agnostic," in which these questions are dealt with from an orthodox standpoint; and which begins thus:

"The intellectual conversion of Mr. G. S. Romanes, from a position of reasoned scepticism to a position of reasoned belief, is an event in the history of the thought of our time."

Certainly, it is an event; we may say, an important and instructive event. But let us not be over hasty in estimating its importance, or in determining the value of the lesson it teaches. Let the Protestant reader of the *Week* glance at the preceding article, where he will find this passage, taken from Brownson:

"In becoming a Presbyterian I abandoned the use of reason; in becoming a Catholic I used my reason. In the one case I submitted because I despaired of reason; in the other, because I confided in it. . . . All the objections usually urged against believing on authority were valid against my act of submission to Presbyterianism. But my act of submission to the Catholic Church was an intelligent, a reasonable act. . . . Presbyterianism contradicted reason; Catholicity was above reason, indeed, but still in accordance with it, and therefore credible without violence to reason or nature. In becoming a Presbyterian, I had to surrender common sense and give up my natural beliefs and convictions; in becoming a Catholic, I had very little to reject of what I previously held."

This sort of thing, indeed, is not at all new in the history of the human mind. The Christian religion, we have been told, was intended for "babes and sucklings"—that is, for men and women who were willing to resign to some extent their reason to authority, because reason gave them no solid standing-ground amid the speculations raised by the popular faiths—no standing-ground, that is, short of their total rejection. It is, indeed, absurd to suppose that reason can be utilized in accepting any one religious schism rather than another. There must be a radical weakness in the mind which, after deliberately rejecting the orthodox faith, and this after careful examination, allows itself to be led back to the lessons of its childish days by such considerations as those put forward by Romanes—"The human heart is miserable without God!" And so far, indeed, from the position finally taken up by Romanes being that of "reasoned belief," we shall see that Romanes distinctly places it in line with that of Brownson, whose faith was "above reason," and that it was attained by abandoning reason.

In looking at the confessions of a man like Romanes, one cannot help sympathizing with the agonizing doubts and difficulties he experienced, and his regrets at the loss of the sentiments inspired by his early religious training, after he had rejected Christianity. But, while we read how Romanes let his mind dwell on "the memory of those sacred

associations which, to me at least, were the sweetest that life has given," and how he contrasted "the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine," with "the lonely mystery of existence *as now I find it*," we are led to ask whether Romanes ever really contemplated the Christian theology as taught by, say, Spurgeon, or Talmage, or Joseph Cook, or even by such men as Farrar or Beecher? It is evident that, in carrying back his mind to the boyish conceptions of his school-days, Romanes allowed it to dwell, not upon the orthodox conception of a god, a heaven, a hell, and a savior, founded upon the dogmas of the church and the teachings of the Bible, but upon an ideal Father, the creation of his own mild and sensitive nature.

Tracing Romanes' mental travels, first from complete and trustful faith in the orthodox religion to entire repudiation of it, and then back (as the writer says) "to full communion with the Church of Jesus Christ," we are told that in 1873 Romanes, then 25 years old, gained the Burnley prize for an essay on "Christian Prayer, considered in relation to the belief that the Almighty governs the world by general laws;" and that only three years later he published, under the *nom de plume* of "Physicus," a work entitled "A Candid Examination of Theism," in which he boldly takes a sceptical position in regard to the existence of God. He said:

"So far as I am individually concerned, the result of this analysis has been to show that, as regards the problem of Theism, it becomes my obvious duty to stifle all belief of the kind which I conceive to be the noblest and to discipline my intellect with regard to this matter into an attitude of purest scepticism. . . . I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God, the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness; and although from henceforth the precept 'to work while it is day' will doubtless but gain an intensified force from the terribly intensified meaning of the words that 'the night cometh when no man can work,' yet when at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence as now I find it, at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible. For whether it be due to my intelligence not being sufficiently advanced to meet the requirements of the age, or whether it be due to the memory of those sacred associations, which to me, at least, were the sweetest that life has given, I cannot but feel that for me, and for others who think as I do, there is a dreadful truth in those words of Hamilton: 'Philosophy having become a meditation, not merely of death, but of annihilation, the precept *Know thyself* has been transformed into the terrific oracle to *Ædipus*: Mayest thou ne'er know the truth of what thou art.'"

We see here that, though Romanes had arrived at a mental state in which he was obliged to own the falsity of his old-time notions, he yet continued to regard those notions as "the noblest" he could conceive; that, though he felt bound by his reason to "virtually negate God," he yet thought the idea of God "the soul of loveliness" in the universe. Surely, for a man in such a peculiar mental condition, forced to admit

the valid
to find a
of his yo
journey
from lun

Among
a few sen
their pur
of logical
some form
teology
narrow ba
whole." T
that the o
fesses that
man we te
gion at the
lectual con

In these
reverence f
ideas arisi
habit and c
ing it impo
see a condi
to a wave o
tion, and w

But, we a
communion
an assertion
object of his
he arrived a

"I intend to
such, and to sh
the former, the
highest genera
be regarded as

That is to
examination,
solid founda
abandonment

"True religio
of fighting, and
her error lies—
of the earth, the

And he equ

the validity of the results of his examination, yet willing, nay, anxious, to find a road back to the "hallowed glory" and "sacred associations" of his younger days, the way would easily be indicated, even if the journey were perilously near the boundary-line which separates reason from lunacy.

Among the peculiar expressions which mark this period, we may quote a few sentences which show the unsettled condition of his mind. "In their purest forms," he says, "science and religion really have no point of logical contact;" and it is clear that he here means by "religion" some form of supernatural belief; yet he says: "If the argument from teleology is to be saved at all, it can only be so by shifting it from the narrow basis of special adaptations to the broad area of Nature as a whole." This means, putting it on a scientific basis. Having concluded that the order of Nature points to "mental order in Creation," he confesses that there is "an apparent absence in Nature of that which in man we term morality." No wonder he concludes that "Natural religion at the present time can only be regarded as a system full of intellectual contradictions and moral perplexities."

In these passages, we see an earnest student, deeply imbued with a reverence for truth, yet fully as deeply tinctured with the sentiments and ideas arising from his early orthodox training. We see the result of habit and dogmatic teaching upon an acute and sensitive mind, rendering it impervious to the play of reason in that special direction. We see a condition of polarity set up in the brain, which responds at once to a wave of the emotion which had been at one time its normal condition, and which the assaults of reason could only partially overcome.

But, we are told, Prof. Romanes was led back to "*full and complete communion with the Church of Christ.*" To show the utter fallacy of such an assertion, we need only let Romanes himself tell us what was the object of his inquiry, what was his method, and what was the conclusion he arrived at. He says:

"I intend to take science and religion in their present highly developed states as such, and to show that, on a systematic examination of the latter by the methods of the former, the conflict between the two may be not merely reconciled, as regards the highest generalities of each, but entirely abolished in all matters of detail which can be regarded as of any great importance."

That is to say, he intended to find out, by a rigidly logical method of examination, what there was true in religion, and thus place it upon a solid foundation. In accordance with this plan, he insists upon the abandonment of the old-time orthodox positions, and says:

"True religion is indeed learning her lesson that something is wrong in her method of fighting, and many of her soldiers are now waking up to the fact that it is here that her error lies—as in past times they woke up to see the error in denying the movement of the earth, the antiquity of the earth, the origin of species by evolution, etc."

And he equally disputes the supernatural claims of religion. All we

know must be natural. "Once grant," he says, "that the supernatural is 'natural,' and all possible ground of dispute is removed." Just so. But will Christians be satisfied with a convert made upon such a plan? Romanes himself was not satisfied with the result. Deeply imbued with the religious emotionalism of his youthful days, yet keenly alive to the demands of a cultured intellect, he saw at last no way out of the difficulty but by stifling the intellect. Even then, did Prof. Romanes get back to his former position? By no means. He altogether repudiated the ordinary orthodox Christian idea of God. He says, speaking of pain and contemplating the agonies of a rabbit caught in a steel trap :

"What are we to think of a Being who, with yet higher faculties of thought and knowledge, and with an unlimited choice of means to secure his ends, has contrived untold thousands of mechanisms no less diabolical? In short, so far as Nature can teach us, or 'observation can extend,' it does appear that the scheme, if scheme it is, is the product of a Mind which differs from the more highly evolved type of human mind in that it is immensely more intellectual without being nearly so moral."

This does not sound like the opinion of a faithful believer in the God of the Hebrews. If God were, indeed, the designer, creator, and regulator of the universe, if he pre-ordained all of its developments, then there seems to be no escape for him from condemnation as an un-moral, if not decidedly an immoral being. And Romanes acknowledges this :

"For aught that we can tell to the contrary, it may be quite as 'anthropomorphic' a notion to attribute morality to God as it would be to attribute those capacities for sensuous enjoyment with which the Greeks endowed their divinities. The Deity may be as high above the one as the other—or rather, perhaps, we may say, as much external to the one as to the other. Without being supra-moral, and still less im-moral, He may be un-moral : our ideas of morality may have no meaning as applied to him."

He saw, in fact, that the only way in which it was (for him) possible to accept even his "purified Christianity" (Christianity, that is, emasculated of all that is distinctively Christian) was to stultify his intellect and to let his emotions have full play :

"No one can believe in God or *a fortiori* in Christ, without a severe effort of will. Yet the desire is not strong enough to sustain the will in perpetual action, so as to make the continual sacrifices which Christianity entails. Perhaps the hardest of these sacrifices—to an intelligent man—is that of *his own intellect*. At least, I am certain this is so in my own case."

Such was the effect of his early training, that he really did make the attempt to force himself to believe in spite of his reason. His efforts to find excuses for this course are to be seen in many passages of this book, and resulted in a peculiar form of Agnosticism, which contemplated the entire severance, instead of a reconciliation, of religion and science, and which led him to some extent into the mental groove cut out for Romish novitiates. He says :

"The force of Butler's argument about us being incompetent judges is being more

and more
to be, in t

When
passage,
the men
pole from

"Yet I
For instan
tianty sho
ascertain
of view, it
to some sci
'superstiti
to religion-
century, sin
cally, that,
attempt."

How ut
into full e
of his def

"The me
Christianity
above' as yo

So far f
result of hi
the premis
and "as a
serious flav
many year

He appe
conclusion
dreamt of
this residu

"Although
superfluous
clearly opene
Deity : so th
deductions ap
relative sense
an unexplaine
harmony."

In the las
which must
passages so

and more increased. The unbiassed argument of pure Agnosticism ought reasonably to be, in the words of John Hunter, 'Do not think. Try!'"

Whether Romanes really succeeded may be judged from the following passage, which shows him, at the end of the struggle, to be as far from the mental condition of a pious and prayerful believer as is the north pole from the south:

"Yet I cannot bring myself so much as to make a venture in the direction of faith. For instance, regarded from one point of view, it seems reasonable enough that Christianity should have enjoined the *doing* of the doctrine as a necessary condition to ascertaining (i.e., *believing*) its truth). But from another, and my more habitual, point of view, it seems an affront to reason to make any such 'fool's experiment'—just as to some scientific men it seems absurd and childish to expect them to investigate the 'superstitious follies' of modern spiritualism. Even the simplest act of will in regard to religion—that of prayer—has not been performed by me for at least a quarter of a century, simply because it has seemed so impossible to pray, as it were, hypothetically, that, much as I have always desired to be able to pray, I cannot will the attempt."

How utterly false is the notion put forward that Romanes "re-entered into full communion with the Church of Christ" may be seen from one of his definitions of Christianity:

"The metaphysics of Christianity may be all false in fact, and yet the spirit of Christianity may be true in substance—i.e., it may be the highest 'good gift from above' as yet given to man."

So far from giving up the positions he had formerly arrived at as the result of his examination of theism, Romanes distinctly asserts that "from the premises there laid down the conclusions result in due logical order;" and "as a matter of mere ratiocination, I am not likely to detect any serious flaws, especially as this has not been done by anybody during the many years of its existence."

He appears, indeed, like many another anxious one, to have come to the conclusion that "there is more in heaven and earth than had been dreamt of in his philosophy," and that it was permissible to attribute this residuum to the action of some "deity":

"Although the latter deductions have clearly shown the existence of Deity to be superfluous in a scientific sense, the formal considerations in question have no less clearly opened up beyond the sphere of science a possible *locus* for the existence of Deity: so that if there are any facts supplied by existence for which the atheistic deductions appear insufficient to account, we are still free to account for them in a relative sense by the hypothesis of Theism. And, it may be urged, we do find such an unexplained residuum in the correlation of general laws in the production of cosmic harmony."

In the last published work of Romanes, "Darwin and After Darwin," which must be taken to contain his last deliberate utterance (for all the passages so far quoted have been taken from the volume published by

Canon Gore, and are merely rough and disconnected notes made with no intention of having them published in any such shape), he puts despairingly the question, "Where is now thy God?" He answers it thus:

"The external world appears to be at variance with our moral sense; and when the antagonism is brought home to the religious mind, it must ever be with a shock of terrified surprise. It has been newly brought home to us by the generalizations of Darwin; and therefore, as I said at the beginning, the religious thought of our generation has been more than ever staggered by the question—Where is now thy God? But I have endeavored to show that the logical standing of the case has not been materially changed; and when this cry of Reason pierces the heart of Faith, it remains for Faith to answer now, as she has always answered before,—and answered with that trust which is at once her beauty and her life,—**VERILY, THOU ART A GOD THAT HIDEST THYSELF!**"

The attempts of the Christian fathers to show that the truths of ancient philosophy were borrowed from Scripture are due in some cases to ignorance, and in some to a want of perfect honesty in controversial dealing. That Gideon (Jerubbabel) is identical with the priest Hierombalos, who supplied information to Sanchoniathon, the Berytian, that Thales pieced together a philosophy from fragments of Jewish truth learned in Phœnicia; that Pythagoras and Democritus availed themselves of Hebraic traditions, collected during their travels; that Plato is a mere "Atticising Moses"; that Aristotle picked up his ethical system from a Jew whom he met in Asia; that Seneca corresponded with St. Paul; are assertions every bit as unhistorical and false as that Homer was thinking of Genesis when he described the shield of Achilles, or (as Clemens of Alexandria gravely informs us) that Miltiades won the battle of Marathon by copying the strategy of the battle of Beth-Horon! To say that Pagan morality "kindled its faded taper at the-Gospel light, whether furtively or unconsciously taken," and that it "dissembled the obligation and made a boast of the splendour as though it were originally her own, or were sufficient in her hands for the moral illumination of the world," is to make an assertion wholly untenable.—*Canon Farrar (F. W.) "Marcus Aurelius."*

The first characteristic of nineteenth century religion is that it must satisfy reason. It must answer to-day's questions, and not merely those of four hundred or four thousand years ago. It must be in respect to beliefs *en rapport* with the modern mind. It must keep pace with the progress of thought; be afraid of no discovery of science; face the intellect of the future, and not that of the past. It must allay superstitions, not foster them. It must venerate truth rather than tradition. It must accept truth as its proper food. The love of truth must be its impelling enthusiasm, the pursuit of truth its engrossing object, the living of truth its supreme pleasure. On no other terms can religion meet the conditions of existence in this modern era; it must first of all respect the liberty of the human mind; it must be free.—*B. F. Underwood.*

The Shah

Sun (Ba

Oriental po

He had a t

European c

Rumor cred

proceeds of

1873 did n

perfectly ign

wasteful and

when he as

area, Russia

the Caspian.

have been n

Some years

keep an eye

sea that way.

and less cap

extremely jea

The New Fr

American

Opportunist r

the support of

which were th

Chamber. but

bitter in their

Radicals and

any serious cr

in France—on

fare, and leav

enough of poli

else in the wo

presence of M

policy. There

The Italic Wo

The Truth (

of the Bible ar

our transiators

writings, or ren

well-meaning th

they have not

no impossible is

I hate though

God has said,

written;" man

CURRENT OPINIONS.

The Shah of Persia.

Sau (Baltimore): Nassr ed-Dine was a shrewd and capable ruler from the Oriental point of view, but has done very little for the improvement of his realm. He had a talent for amassing money. As long as he could sell concessions to European capitalists he rivaled the presidents of Venezuela in that sort of thrift. Rumor credits him with the possession of some \$60,000,000 in cold cash, the proceeds of taxes, bribes, monopolies and concessions. His visit to Europe in 1873 did not teach him much. Of the modern art of government he was perfectly ignorant, and his people, ground down by taxes collected under the wasteful and oppressive Oriental system, are probably fewer and poorer now than when he ascended the throne in October, 1848. His dominions are of less area, Russia having appropriated much of his territory east, west, and south of the Caspian. Persia is now, it is said, at the mercy of Russia, and preparations have been made by that power for an advance southward to the Indian ocean. Some years ago England and Russia were rivals at Teheran. They both still keep an eye on events there, as England is averse to having Russia reach the sea that way. The Shah's successor, Muzaffer ed-Dine, is a more self-indulgent and less capable man, it is said, than his father. The latter, however, was extremely jealous of him and never gave him a fair chance to show his powers.

The New French Cabinet.

American (Baltimore): The cabinet is a compromise, or, more properly, an Opportunist ministry. The Radicals in it are not typical, and it will not receive the support of either the extreme Radicals or the Socialists. These two groups, which were the main support of Bourgeois, do not constitute a majority of the Chamber, but the other groups are so wide apart upon some questions, and so bitter in their rivalry, that it is difficult to keep them in line for a ministry. The Radicals and Socialists thus become a very formidable minority, able at almost any serious crisis to overthrow the government. Such a cabinet is needed now in France—one that will address itself conscientiously to the general public welfare, and leave political pyrotechnics severely alone. France has had quite enough of political crises. They seem to do less harm in France than anywhere else in the world, but the constant repetition of them is not desirable. The presence of M. Hanotaux at the foreign office is a guaranty of consistent foreign policy. There will be no surprises.

The Italic Words in the Bible added by the Translators to Make Sense.

The Truth (New York): Every one, of course, knows that the italicised words of the Bible are of human origin, and form no part of holy Scripture. No doubt our translators sincerely believed that they could add to the force of the original writings, or render their meaning more clearly; but they greatly erred in their well-meaning though mistaken attempt. There is scarcely an instance in which they have not obscured the sense or perverted the teachings of the Holy Ghost, impossible is it for man to improve upon what God has said: God has said, "I hate thoughts;" man has added, "I hate *vain* thoughts" (Ps. 119: 113). God has said, "That ye might learn in us not to think above that which is written;" man has added, "That ye might learn in us not to think *of men*

above that which is written" (1 Cor. 4 : 6). A wise student of the Bible will omit the words in italics.

McKinley the "Advance Agent of Prosperity."

Harper's Weekly : If, as seems likely, Mr. McKinley is to be the candidate of the Republican party, his nomination will be logical and fitting if the chief object of the party is to be the maintenance of high tariff taxation at any cost, even the cost of an unsound policy and of National dishonor. This is what Mr. McKinley stands for, and his supporters, led by men who have made vast sums of money from a system of taxation of which he is the chief apostle, and who favor him in anticipation of what he can again accomplish for their pecuniary profit, are calling him the "advance agent of prosperity." This is to be the McKinley cry of the campaign, but it is a false and misleading cry. Shall we go back to the system of the advance agent of bankruptcy, or shall we insist that our public finances shall be administered by men of common sense and common honesty ?

Success of the International Arbitration Congress.

Evening Post (New York) : The success of the International Arbitration Congress was assured in advance, and the distinguished jurists, educators, and clergy, both Catholic and Protestant, who attended, lent the weight of high character and great influence, as well as of sound reason, to the principles adopted. These recite the uncertain and oppressive nature of war as a means of settling international disputes, to say nothing of its immense evils, and affirm the superiority of arbitration, as well on grounds of material interests and permanency as because of the demands of religion, humanity and justice. A settled system of arbitration established by treaty is urged as an immediate duty on the governments of the United States and Great Britain, and the extension of arbitration demanded to all civilized nations at the earliest possible day. Thus this congress has proved a fitting climax to the series of local congresses with the same object, and has given expression to the deliberate and intelligent opposition of the men of light and leading in this country to the whole jingo madness that has been raging in press and Congress for four months past.

The Boer and the Englishman in South Africa.

H. A. Boyden in Nineteenth Century : It has, unhappily, always been the case that very few Englishmen have taken the trouble to understand the South African Dutchman. Because he speaks in a guttural tongue, because he dresses in rough clothes ; because he is shaggy, uncouth, and somewhat dirty, the average Englishman, even in South Africa, passes him in a disdainful ignorance, laughs scornfully at his somewhat outlandish neighbor, never takes the trouble to acquire his language or find out anything about him. Yet this Dutchman of the Cape is, after all, very nearly allied in blood to ourselves. He comes, as Mr. Theal, the Cape historian, tells us, from "that sturdy Nether-Teuton stock" from which we ourselves largely spring. He is, once you get past that strong barrier of reserve and suspicion, behind which he shelters himself, just as good a man just as honest, brave, and kindly, as we are ourselves. He is more ignorant, it is true, and has not acquired the polish gained by contact with the outer world but the Cape Dutchman possesses just as strong and sterling a character as the Anglo-Saxon. As it is, the average Boer knows that the average Englishman laughs at him and despises his uncouth ways ; he resents it accordingly, and continues to isolate himself among his own kith and kin in remote farm places



THE

Bishops w

There ne
"let the ca
minds of ra
satisfied wit
that can be
utterances w
only be infe
vin, or from
case of Bish
game in his
with nothing
in Manitoba
might produ
Montreal to
the Bill as it
finally, he de
amended—ju
the certificate
The latter B
church orders
have no right
are bound to
contest will g

Shall we Adv

Canadian p
party division
inconsistent w
wherever prac
as to make the
ward ? that i
politicians a q
have decided t
have a grievan
the people wh
shown that, in
ent school law
system of educ

What the pass

It cannot be
rite of all the
ten as good a
that, wherever r

FROM OUR OWN OBSERVATORY.

THE BISHOPS AND THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Bishops who tell us the Real Sentiments of the Hierarchy.

There need be no question that the Bishop of Three Rivers has very plainly "let the cat out of the bag." Not that there ever has been any doubt in the minds of rational and unprejudiced men that the Quebec bishops will not be satisfied with anything short of complete control of the schools, if by any means that can be secured. But, as a rule, the priests are somewhat guarded in their interferences when seeking to push their interests; and their real sentiments can only be inferred from their own inconsistencies; and their real sentiments can only be inferred from their own unwitting admissions and indiscreet declarations, as in the case of Bishop Lafleche. The former gentleman, when he thought he had the game in his own hands, first declared at Winnipeg that he would be satisfied with nothing short of a complete restoration of the school system in existence in Manitoba prior to 1890; then, when he thought a more conciliatory attitude might produce some effect upon the Dominion Parliament, he telegraphed from Montreal to Ottawa that he ("the Manitoba minority") would be satisfied with the Bill as it stood as a perfectly satisfactory and final measure of relief; and finally, he declared that he would be satisfied with the Bill when very slightly amended—just so as to give the bishops full control of the school finances and the certificates of the teachers—two quite unimportant amendments, of course. The latter Bishop very plainly tells his people that their duty is to vote as the church orders, and that, one and all, Government and citizens, as good Catholics, have no right to have one authority for religion and another for politics, but are bound to submit in all things to the ecclesiastical authority. The present contest will go a long way, we hope, towards breaking up this odious tyranny.

Shall we Advance or go back to the Dark Ages.

Canadian politics have been in an unfortunate position for many years. The party divisions have enabled the Romish hierarchy to exert an influence utterly inconsistent with a free government. They have claimed, and have secured wherever practicable, complete control of the schools; and the results are such as to make the question we have asked anything but a joke. Forward or backward? that is the question. Because a bargain was entered into by place-hunting politicians a quarter of a century ago, and because the Privy Council of England have decided that, interpreting the law strictly, the Catholic minority in Manitoba have a grievance; are we to hand over to the powers of darkness a section of the people who, up to this time, have not asked for any remedy, and who have shown that, in the main, they are well satisfied with the status in which the present school law places them, securing for their children, as it does, a reasonable system of education?

What the passing of the Remedial Bill would mean.

It cannot be too often repeated, and especially at this critical time, that, in spite of all the protests of the priests as to their desire to secure for their children as good an education as that given to Protestant children, the facts show that, wherever the priests are allowed to control the schools, the education of

the children is neglected. That this should be so is only a reasonable result, when we remember that the bishops themselves acknowledge that their object is to introduce into the schools a larger degree of religious instruction. This could only be accomplished by sacrificing the secular education. That this has heretofore been the result is evident from the facts that have been made public in reference to the schools both of Quebec and of Manitoba prior to 1890. To allow such a condition of things to be re-established after being once abolished would be a crime against liberty and civilization.

Are Separate Schools More Godly than the Public Schools?

The following paragraph from the report of a special committee appointed by the Montreal Ministerial Association to inquire into the subject gives some facts which go to supplement the statement made in the official reports of some of the Quebec school inspectors, that in many schools no attempt whatever had been made to educate the children, and that, while many of the teachers were totally incompetent, large numbers of the children left school without any teaching other than enough of the catechism to enable them to pass the first communion! This is what the committee reported in answer to the question, "Do the separate Roman Catholic schools produce a higher degree of godliness and Christian morality than our government schools, and has the history of separate schools given proof of higher educational standing than our Government schools?"

"The first part of the question we prefer not to dwell upon. The published statistics of immorality and crime in the provinces of the Dominion would not sustain the contention, if such were made, that separate schools produce a higher degree of Godliness and Christian morality than Government schools. There is abundant evidence that the history of separate schools has not given proof of higher educational standing than Government schools. When we examine the educational statistics of our own province, we find that, with a population of only a little more than one-half of Ontario, Quebec possesses a teaching staff nearly double that of Ontario, yet so difficult is it to get men 'able to read and write,' to act as chairmen of school boards in rural districts, that an effort has been made in the Quebec Legislature to rescind this qualification from the code, and it is also found that the returns from many school districts are signed by the 'mark' of the school commissioners, instead of their signatures. When we consider the deplorable condition of things in the late separate schools of Manitoba, so far as the facts have been made public, and when we remember that, in Ontario, where every effort is made to maintain and increase the efficiency of separate schools, a large number of Roman Catholics prefer to send their children to the public schools, we are forced to the conclusion that Roman Catholic separate schools do not afford as high a standard of education as Government or public schools. Nor is it possible for them to do so, when so much of the pupil's time is consumed in the study of the catechism and the forms and tenets of the Roman Catholic Church."

How a Bishop Answered an Appeal for Better Catholic Education.

Among the little events which show the desire of the hierarchy to forward education, we may recall the case of the Kingston *Freeman*, whose editor, for asking very temperately for some improvement in Catholic education, was roundly abused and threatened by Bishop Cleary, and was compelled to eat the leek to save his paper and himself from the Bishop's anathema. In view of all these

considera
Romish b
it to the d
political
should be

Freedom of

This is t
the pastora
need no co
in politics

"Mr. Nes

"SIR,—I
ing stateme
first editoria
contained gr
sary, becaus
an opportun
parties.

"Failing p
panying it, h
for the spirit
faithful of t

"We deep
deceived by c
which contain
his Lordship
and subversiv

"2. We rec
legitimate, his
in the equitabl

Surely thes
Japanese of t
equivalent to
the mind of t

The Quebec B

The value o
to control the
intrinsic merit
these all edu
labored senten
to the priestho
become to the

considerations, we can only conclude that, to comply with the demands of the Romish bishops would be to hand over Manitoba to the hierarchy, and to subject it to the demoralizing influences to which Quebec is at present in slavery. No political compact that has ever been made, no law that has ever been passed, should be invoked to consummate such a crime.

Freedom of the Press in Quebec.

This is the way in which Mgr. Lebreque imitates Mgr. Cleary in exercising the pastoral duty of looking after the consciences of his people. The documents need no comment—except the oft-repeated one, “the hierarchy never interfere in politics:”

“Bishop’s Palace, Chicoutimi, Feb. 6, 1896.

“*SIR*,—I am instructed by the Bishop of Chicoutimi to transmit to you the following statement, which you will please publish in your next issue immediately after your first editorial, as a retraction of the article of the 28th January in your paper, which contained grave abuse of his lordship. This reparation seems to him just and necessary, because a large number of his diocesans, only reading the *Electeur*, have not had an opportunity to see the refutation published by the well-meaning press of both the parties.

“Failing publication of the present letter, and the statement or declaration accompanying it, his Lordship requests me to notify you that he will be regretfully forced, for the spiritual welfare of his flock, to prohibit the reading of your journal by the faithful of the diocese of Chicoutimi and the Apostolic prefecture.

“Believe me to be, etc., your humble servant,

“F. X. E. FRENETTE, Priest, Secretary.”

“THE RETRACTION.

“We deeply regret that unfortunate article which, in a moment of excitement, and deceived by our correspondents, we published in our issue of the 28th of January last, which contained grave abuse of a member of the Catholic hierarchy of this province, his Lordship the Bishop of Chicoutimi. We declare the same to be scandalous, false and subversive of ecclesiastical authority.

“2. We recognize that in interfering in Charlevoix within the limits which he deemed legitimate, his Lordship of Chicoutimi was only guided by the interest which he takes in the equitable settlement of the Manitoba school question.”

Surely these Quebec Canadians know as little of real freedom as did the Japanese of thirty years ago, when their language was said to contain no word equivalent to “freedom.” And the only notion the word seems to convey to the mind of the habitant is—liberty to obey the priest.

The Quebec Bishops’ Mandement.

The value of the instrument by which the Bishops of Quebec have endeavored to control the votes of the electors is to be gauged, unfortunately, not by its intrinsic merits, but by the mental state of those to whom it is addressed. Were these all educated and independent thinkers, they would laugh to scorn its labored sentences and its dictatorial tone; but, trained to complete subservience to the priesthood, words which appear ridiculous and childish to a free citizen become to them endowed with a divine power and meaning.

John Ross Robertson for East Toronto.

The nomination of J. Ross Robertson as an Anti-Remedialist Conservative for East Toronto is one that should have the support of all Liberals. John Ross may have his faults; but we believe that, as far as he is able to do so, he will expose and oppose tooth and nail anything like corruption that he may come across; and he will not back down on the principle upon which he will be elected.

The Catholics in the United States.

The Montreal *Presse* publishes the following statistics, taken from the last issue of the official Roman Catholic almanac for the United States. The Catholics in the United States number 9,410,770; governed by 14 archbishops (including a cardinal) and 69 bishops. Territorially there are 14 archbishoprics and 71 dioceses. There are 7,756 secular clergy and 2,592 monks—a total of 10,348 priests; 9,301 churches (including 3,648 missions) and 5,393 chapels. There are nine universities; 26 secular seminaries, with 1,968 students; 82 religious seminaries, with 8,713 students; 187 superior schools for boys and 633 for girls; 3,361 parish schools, with 796,348 children; 243 orphanages, with 33,004 children. The chief centres of Catholicism are shown by the population of the principal dioceses as follows:—New York, 800,000; Boston and Chicago, each 600,000; Brooklyn 500,000; Philadelphia, 415,000; New Orleans, 325,000; St. Paul, 210,000; Providence, Springfield, Mass., Milwaukee, and St. Louis, each 200,000. The *Presse* remarks:

"As will be seen, the Catholic population does not yet reach ten million souls. Nevertheless, the Irish exodus is calculated to have brought to these shores thirteen million immigrants, most of whom were Catholics. Add to that number a million French-Canadians, several millions of German and other Catholics, and you cannot help coming to the conclusion that there have been numerous, very numerous defections in the ranks of the Catholics in the United States. There should be in the United States from twenty to twenty-five million persons professing the religion to which we ourselves belong."

Toronto's New "Board of Control."

The new institution is now in full work, but it is too early yet to pass any opinion as to its probable permanence or real utility. Good as its members may be, it will require some time to eliminate the "manners and customs" of the old aldermanic system—the petty tricks, efforts to throw the onus of objectionable work on others, and so on. It will, no doubt, take time to bring forward men of a really solid and business-like character, above suspicion of being actuated by petty motives. And it seems to us that, in any event, if the Board's services secure its permanence, it will be a strong argument in favor of electing its members for at least two years. It can hardly be expected that the best results could be attained by allowing men to leave the city's service just when they have acquired a fair knowledge of its business.

The Public School Board and Teachers' Salaries.

We fully agree with Mr. Lee's objection to the present system of giving to all teachers indiscriminately an annual increase of salary, irrespective of the character of their work. Only competent teachers should be engaged, and each class should receive a fair salary from the first. If some extra pay or bonus is to be given, let it depend upon the results shown by the teacher's work.

THE thea
end; it h
public sup
has been
told—wha

are no w
degenerat
This was i

season we
Marie Tat
indeed, to

intentional
harm, as t
appeared i

formance,
matter of f
several art

weakest an
"Carmen,"
such a rep

Romani, M
one expect
we did see

watched ea
—and very
musical ed

"Cavalleria
wonder wh

Toronto ins
students pat
thereby gain
darkness at

was an agre
As usual,
theatrical se

cosy little th
performances
satisfaction o
in Toronto th

The music
chiefly amate
concerned.

Orchestral Se
function was
and the large

THE STAGE AND ORCHESTRA.

THE theatrical season in Toronto has come to a commonplace and an inglorious end; it has simply died of inanition. Since Christmas especially, the lack of public support to what good plays, presented by good players, have come here has been painfully pronounced. It may be a kind of negative satisfaction to be told—that I have the best reason for believing is true—that in this respect we are no worse off than other places. Still, the fact remains that Toronto has degenerated as a theatrical and musical centre, be the reasons what they may. This was most forcibly illustrated in the case of the Tavery Opera Company; last season we did not have one performance of grand opera, and yet when Madame Marie Tavery and her troupe were at the Grand Opera House they played, indeed, to a beggarly array of empty seats. Of course the "mistake"—real or intentional, matters not—of billing Chevalier Guille among the company did harm, as the Chevalier's letter repudiating any connection with the company appeared in the dramatic columns of the *Mail* on the morning of the first performance, and caused a general idea that the whole thing was a fraud. As a matter of fact, the company was an exceedingly good one, containing not one but several artists of reputation and ability, Madame Tavery being probably the weakest among them all. The operas played were "Lucia di Lammermoor," "Carmen," "Il Trovatore," "Cavalleria Rusticana," and "I Pagliacci." With such a repertoire supported by such artists as Madame Theo-Doiré, Madame Romani, Madame Letcher, Mr. Payne Clarke, Max Eugene, and Signor Abramoff, one expected to see representative audiences if not crowded houses; but what we did see at each performance was a small and commonplace crowd; and as I watched each performance I could not help feeling very sorry for the company—and very sorry for Toronto too. I quite endorse the remark made by the musical editor of the *Mail*, who said: "When two such modern operas as "Cavalleria" and "Pagliacci" fail to attract a fair-sized audience, one begins to wonder where are the hundreds of students who are being taught music in Toronto institutions. In Italy, France, Germany, and even England, musical students patronize grand opera very freely, believing that the knowledge they thereby gain is a necessary element in their education." After three weeks of darkness at the Grand Opera House the re-appearance here of Stuart Robson was an agreeable relief.

As usual, the Toronto Opera House has the distinction of closing the theatrical season in Toronto. And while I think the persistent patrons of this cosy little theatre have cause to complain of the monotonous mediocrity of the performances presented for the last couple of months, Manager Small has the satisfaction of knowing that his house is perhaps the only place of amusement in Toronto that has made money this season.

The musical events of the month are comparatively unimportant, having been chiefly amateur and local, and only of interest to the small circles immediately concerned. Not to be included in this generalization, however, is the Toronto Orchestral School, which gave its fifth annual concert at the Massey Hall. The function was noticeable both for the very satisfactory nature of the work done and the large and representative audience that assembled to hear the young

amateur instrumentalists of this city show how effectively they had been taught the art of playing in orchestra. Mr. F. H. Torrington is to be complimented and congratulated on a result so satisfactory alike to his pupils and himself. He is doing good work, and I wish him all possible success.

PROFESSIONAL NEWS AND GOSSIP.

All the leading theatres in New York are closed for the season. Business at some houses has been good all along, but as a rule the box-office receipts have been below the average, an unsatisfactory result generally attributed by theatrical managers not so much to hard times as to the prevalence everywhere of what they call "the bicycle craze."

The large number of Torontonians to whom Mr. O. B. Sheppard is a familiar figure, if not a personal friend, will be pleased to hear that his recent official appointment as Inspector of Fisheries will not interfere with his managerial work. Next season he will be prominently in evidence at the Grand or the Princess, or probably at both.

I am pleased to see that Mr. George Edwardes is being well supported by the London papers for his timely protest against the "speech" nuisance. He courteously but firmly declined to make a speech the other evening at the end of a performance, though I read "the calls for a speech lasted fully fifteen minutes."

Mr. Richard Malchien (Captain Dick) has resigned his position as manager of the Robert Mantell company. Mr. Malchien will be in Toronto next week.

Mr. Lewis Browne and Mr. Schuch have both resigned from St. James Cathedral, one as organist, the other as choir-master. Both were capable men in the right place. What is the matter?

Robert Mantell has a record of more than 1,200 performances of the "Corsican Brothers."

Mrs. Potter and Mr. Bellew opened their Australian tour on May 30 at Sydney, with a performance of "As You Like It."

Sir Henry Irving's elder son is coming to America next season with his wife, to play in "The Sign of the Cross" with Wilson Barrett. Miss Baird was the Haymarket Trilby to Mr. Tree's Svengali.

What is the matter with Mr. Jerome Klapla Jerome? This versatile gentleman is bitterly complaining of the reckless way in which his dialogue and arrangement have been treated by the syndicate which bought his "Biarritz." Nobody knows what it was like in its original shape, but as it is now played it has excited the utmost derision of most of the London newspaper critics, and Mr. Jerome naturally is disinclined to be held responsible for the alleged stupidity of the stage managers and actors who have been trying to improve upon his work.

There is a movement in London to restore the ballet to its former popularity. Sir Arthur Sullivan is going to write a ballet for the Alhambra, and the names of Mr. Cowen and Mr. German have been mentioned in connection with a similar task for the Empire. A class for the composition of ballet and light music has also been formed at the Royal College of Music, and at its head has been placed that eminent hero of a hundred ballets, M. George Jacobi.

Mr. "Ted" London from Chicago successful city, for pays in Chic

The Irving out the season will carry business wishes of the says the New our esteem for press the assistance Terry and the may never grow

Rose Cogh will probably

Mrs. Leslie drama, at the a comic song

As a curtain 100 nights at London by sto in a nutshell. companions, loathe of her father's when this love who as well as tidal rage, and

The matinee Sardou has ju Several young

desirous of see always been told girls." As the lions used by matinee maiden inexperienced e passages, and th pretty girls.

The opera se largest subscrip prominent Amer and Juliet," with

The Italian ar detestation, h recently changed hat her America

Mr. "Teddy" Marks, manager for Mdlle. Yvette Guilbert, has arrived in London from Chicago, and I understand never tires of talking about his big Chicago success. He is naturally jubilant at the result achieved in that wonderful city, for nine concerts resulted in a profit of \$24,000. Evidently "piquancy" pays in Chicago.

The Irving-Terry tour on this continent has been most prosperous. Throughout the season the receipts have averaged about \$15,000 a week, and Sir Henry will carry back to England \$75,000 as his personal earnings, along with the good wishes of the Canadian and American people. "He has given us excellent art," says the New York *Press*, "and in the theatre and out of it he has maintained our esteem for a true knight, a fine actor, and a gentleman. We desire to express the assurance of our distinguished consideration for Henry Irving, Ellen Terry and the members of this famous company, and hope that their shadows may never grow less."

Rose Coghlan has secured the American rights of Max O'Rell's new play, which will probably be named "Heart's Ease."

Mrs. Leslie Carter's realization of the curfew legend in David Belasco's great drama, at the Herald Square theatre, New York, has been made the subject of a comic song in the London music halls.

As a curtain raiser for "The Chili Widow," which has been running for nearly 300 nights at the London Royalty Theatre, is used a one act play which has taken London by storm. It is called "Monsieur de Paris," and is described as a tragedy in a nutshell. The daughter of an executioner of Paris, jeered at by her companions, loathed by her neighbors and bearing on her innocent breast the crime of her father's trade, at last finds one man to give her the love that heals. But when this lover discovers who the maiden is, he is about leaving her, and she—who as well as being innocent and pretty is devilish—flies into a temper of homicidal rage, and stabs her lover to death with a large knife.

The matinee girl is becoming particular, and in Paris, too! Even the great Sardou has just gracefully yielded a point to the *chic* Parisian demoiselles. Several young women belonging to the best Parisian society have long been desirous of seeing Coquelin in "Thermidor" at the Porte St. Martin, but have always been told by their chaperons that the piece was "not written for young girls." As the only parts that could offend were contained in the coarse expressions used by the *citoyennes* in regard to the maternity of Fabienne, the matinee maidens wrote to Sardou, asking that the play be made more fit for their experienced ears. The great author, though amused, excised the offending passages, and the adored Coquelin now finds himself playing daily to crowds of pretty girls.

The opera season in London has opened with what is claimed to be the largest subscription list ever known in the history of Italian opera. All the prominent Americans in town were present at the opening performance, "Romeo and Juliet," with De Reske and Emma Eames in the leading roles.

The Italian artiste, Eleonora Duse, is said to hold the "windy city" of Chicago in detestation, and on one occasion refused to appear there any more. But she recently changed her mind after a three days' auction for seats. I understand that her American tour for next season is now "booked solid."

WILFRID WISGAST.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE ARENA for June is the opening number of its sixteenth volume, and makes its appearance in a new dress of type and with every evidence of editorial earnestness in the declaration: "It is our determination to make this volume eclipse all previous volumes in ability and vigor, no less than in the conscience element, which, one correspondent observes, 'makes the *Arena* unique among the great and original reviews and magazines, in a wilderness of literature characterized by no special progressive idea, conviction, courage, or virility.'" The frontispiece of the number is a very fine portrait of the poet Whittier, of whom the editor gives a lengthy sketch entitled "A Prophet of Freedom," beginning with a quotation from the poet:

"O Freedom! if to me belong
Nor mighty Milton's gift divine,
Nor Marvell's wit and graceful song,
Still, with a love as deep and strong
As theirs, I lay, like them, my best gifts on thy shrine!"

Among the important articles that fill the number, the first, "Celsus, the First Pagan Critic of Christianity, and his Anticipation of Modern Thought," is a very clever and scholarly production by the Rev. Samuel J. Barrows, D.D., who fully recognizes the validity of criticisms which less cultured men affect to belittle, but which have been unanswerably put forward against the superstitions of the vulgar by thoughtful men in every civilized age. We hope to be able to reproduce the article next month, but every thinker should read it. The rest of the contents cover a wide range of subjects, and several are finely illustrated. (176 pages, 25c., \$3 per ann. Published by the *Arena* Publ'g Co., Copley Sq., Boston.)

The Lamp, the organ of the Toronto Theosophists, is a neatly-printed periodical, issued at the modest rate of 25c. per year. The May number contains the announcement that "H. P. B. has called out the reserves." We thought poor Blavatsky had ceased from labour.

The Philosophical Journal has removed its chief office from Chicago to San Diego. In an editorial note we read: "This move was, we are told, pre-arranged many years ago in the Spirit World, and is now carried out by direction of the intelligences there, without the approval of the editor and publisher." After a description of the severance of business and social ties at the celestial orders and an appeal for support from the Pacific Coast Spiritualists, the editor says that "Angels and mortals are watching the result of this proposition"—to obtain 1,000 new subscribers in order "to show our willingness to co-operate with our angel-friends in this effort to bring about a glorious manifestation of Spirit-power and millennial glory."

The Metaphysical Magazine for May opens with an article, "The Three Kinds of Karma," by Charles Johnston, M.R.A.S., who has spent many years in the East, during which he became thoroughly conversant with the classics of the ancient Sanscrit and Pali languages, thus acquiring a knowledge of Eastern philosophy from original sources. The present article is the first of a series which will no doubt be a valuable contribution to Oriental studies.

The Cleveland Medical Gazette for May has a very able article on "Personal Identification," chiefly of a legal character, by H. Remington, Attorney-at-law.

GRAVE AND GAY.

OH, YES, THE SUN DO MOVE.

THEY were sitting in the reading-room of the Atlantic Hotel, 63 Bowery. The old sea Captain with the long white beard brought on the argument by recalling the times when he went cocoanut hunting in the tropics, and had "passed through eleven wrecks and more storms than any sea dog that ever bunked at Snug Harbor." "Well, the umbrella man, remember I some very bad storms, too, because his factory one time was kept running day and night. That was when he lived in Jersey, and could draw his check for \$50,000. Real estate speculation ruined him. Tim, the astronomer, knew what it was to have the money-lender's foot on him.

"They even took my factory, where I turned out optical goods enough to supply half the people of the United States," Tim said. "After that I turned in to peddling spectacles and eyeglasses, and at night, when I got home, I'd go to my books on astronomy. The stars were always my pets. I think every man should make himself familiar with them."

"That's my opinion," said Electrician Frank Baldwin. "I like to sit and figure out the number of miles the earth has travelled since I was born, and then I get figuring on the sun's movements, and so on."

"Come off, now; the sun don't move," interrupted Sailor McMahan. And he insisted his hat nervously as he did on the Saturday when he was asking the commander of the ram Katahdin if he could get away from the Navy Yard for a day or two, so as to spend Sunday with his folks in New York.

"Don't get excited," said the electrician. "When I talk of planets I know

what I'm talking about. I say the sun does move."

"It do not," insisted the sailor.

"It does."

"Well, I'll betcher."

"I'll betcher."

"Well, bet."

"Put up your money. There's \$5 says the sun does move. You understand?"

"And there's \$5 says the sun do not move," answered Sailor McMahan.

"I'll act as stakeholder," said Jim Moore, one of the boarders.

"We'll leave it to an editor," said the sailor.

So, followed by a crowd, the disputants walked to the office of the *Sun*, and, to avoid mistakes, the referee got a telegraph blank and wrote the questions to be submitted thus:

"City Editor,—Can you answer these questions?—

"Is the sun stationary?"

"Does the earth revolve round the sun?"

"Please answer. Big money on it."

The authority consulted wrote on the top of Referee Moore's paper this legend, "YES, TO BOTH QUESTIONS," and then opposite each question a decisive Yes!

These answers did not satisfy Electrician Baldwin, and he suggested that the City Editor be called out, so as to give his authority for them. He came out, and was questioned by Baldwin.

"Authority for the statement?" said he. "Why, you damned ass, any school-boy two years old knows that the sun don't move. You were thinking of the earth when you bet your money. You're a damned ass."

"Well," said Baldwin, "I'm willing to leave it to your office boy." And, accordingly, the questions were submitted to the boy whose office it is to keep the ink-

wells filled. He borrowed a pencil from the horse editor and wrote :

"The sun has three motions : An axial rotation which it performs in 25 days 8 hours and 9 minutes ; a sort of orbital motion around the centre of inertia of itself and its system of planets ; and a progressive movement through space in the direction of the constellation Hercules at the rate of 154,185,000 miles a year. The earth revolves around the sun."

"Well, I'll be keel-hauled," exclaimed the sailor man, "if that don't beat all. Here, take the money, Baldy, take the money. This is a lad that knows things, and I'm willing to lose and treat besides."

So they went out and beat the Raines law.—*N. Y. Sun.*

One of the funniest of the would-be wise-sawyers of to-day is he who goes by the name of "Ram's Horn." Over his mendacious signature appear some of the most flagitious plagiarisms that it is possible to conceive, and these are often murdered in a ludicrous fashion. The other week "Ram's Horn" re-hashed an old story of a well-fed dog succoring a "tramp" dog. The latter was described in these terms : "He was blear-eyed and skinny, and so poor that when his tail wagged in appreciation of Roger's bringing him the bones, *his joints would make a noise like a sandpaper rustle!*" There is no sign that this was intended as a rough exaggeration ; it is a tale of "dog heroism," supposed to be told with "Ram's Horn's" usual devotion to religious truth.

Oh, tandem, you're a poor device
For lovers twain, alack!
She cannot see her swain at all,
While I behold her back.

No tender glances are exchanged,
Indeed, the case is sad,
No arm can gently steal around
To make waist places glad.

—*Detroit News.*

Mr. Fuzzy—I don't see why you wear those ridiculously big sleeves, when you have nothing to fill them.

Mrs. Fuzzy—Does your head fill your silk hat?

WHY PEOPLE GO TO CHURCH.

A CLERGYMAN'S PRIZE POEM.

The following are the opening lines of the poem which gained the £100 prize for the best essay on "What is Public Worship." They are by Rev. J. S. Boucher, of Carnarvon, Wales :

Some go to church just for a walk,
Some to stare, to laugh and talk.
Some go there to meet a friend,
Some their idle time to spend.
Some for general observation;
Some for private speculation.
Some to seek or find a lover;
Some a courtship to discover,
Some go there to use their eyes,
And newest fashions to criticise
Some to show their own smart dress,
Some their neighbors to assess.
Some to scan a robe or bonnet,
Some to price the ribbons on it.
Some to learn the latest news,
That friends at home they may amuse,
Some to gossip false and true,
Safe hid within the sheltering pew.
Some go there to please the squire,
Some his daughter to admire.
Some the parson go to fawn;
Some to lounge and some to yawn
Some to claim the parish doles,
Some for bread and some for coals.
Some because it's thought genteel;
Some to count their pious zeal.
Some to show how sweet they sing;
Some how sweet their voices ring.
Some the preacher go to hear,
His style and voice to praise or jeer;
Some forgiveness to implore;
Some their sins to varnish o'er.
Some to sit and doze and nod.
But few to kneel and worship God.

A dear old Christian said, when spoken to of the joy of the eternal home with Him—probably so near, "I am in heaven now." "Oh, yes," urged the visitor, "but I mean when you leave the body and are at home forever." She smiled as she replied, "I dwell there." "But you do not quite understand me. I mean what will it be to be really there, and sing the new song?" "I sing there now every night," was the quiet response, for the presence of Jesus made her days as the "days of heaven upon earth."—*Lucy A. Bennett.*