



THE UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED: FEBRUARY, APRIL, OCTOBER, DECEMBER,
IN MONTREAL.

OCTOBER 1908

	PAGE
A Forgotten Poet—E. B. Greenshields	343
Co-operation in Historical Research—Lawrence J. Burpee	360
The Many Mansioned House—Edward W. Thomson	371
The South African Situation—H. S. Denny	377
British Diplomacy and Canada: III. Oregon and San Juan Boundaries—James White	398
Tariffs, Bounties, and the Farmer—W. C. Good	415
Manufactures and Shipping—Archibald McGoun	437
Quebec—John McCrae	456
A Study in Imperialism—Keith G. Fieling	457
Alice in Wonderland—Archibald MacMechan	465
An Old Woman—Marjory MacMurchy	487
The Evolution of Religion—E. W. MacBride	495

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA

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

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

Editor: ANDREW MACPHAIL, 216 Peel Street, Montreal.

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

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

All communications, including subscriptions and remittances, should be sent to the Editor. The subscription price is one dollar a year for four numbers, containing about 700 pages. Copies are on sale at all book stores for twenty-five cents each.

A FORGOTTEN POET

FORTY YEARS ago might have been seen walking along the streets of Montreal to his daily task of drudgery at the journalist's desk, a man slightly over middle age, with stooping shoulders and not very noticeable physique—an ordinary enough figure to the casual looker-on. But the careful observer would have noted the expressive gray-blue eye, the clean cut features, the lofty intellectual forehead, and would have known the poet and the dreamer of dreams.

“He walked our streets and no one knew
That something of celestial hue
Had passed along.”

So, pondering on the tragic stories of the Old Testament, for that was the bent of his mind, and deeply impressed with those wonderful tales of events in the dim dawn of history, weaving his weird fancies about them into poems of great imagination and charm, Charles Heavyside spent the quiet years of a life of toil in the City of Montreal, unknown except to a few appreciative friends.

His writings were at first published anonymously and they were received in silence. Then, after a few years, they attracted some notice and were favourably reviewed by Coventry Patmore in the *North American Review*, by Charles Lanman in the *New York Evening Post*, by Bayard Taylor in the *Atlantic Monthly*, and in other magazines, and Longfellow and Emerson wrote praising them. But this interest died down and his works never became known to the reading public. The best and fullest account of them is to be found in Mr. Burpee's essay, read before the Royal Society of Canada in 1901. But this and the inclusion of some extracts, and a few of the

shorter poems in W. D. Lighthall's "Songs of the Great Dominion," and the Anthologies of E. C. Stedman and William Sharp, and in other collections are the only references in years to one whose name should be well known all over Canada and familiar to every reader of English poetry. Yet it is true that if his name be mentioned in any gathering, most of the people know it not, and only a few are aware that he was the author of a drama called "Saul," of which they only remember the name. And how can it well be otherwise when his books have not been republished and cannot be purchased at any booksellers? "Almost unread in this country and very little known in America," writes William Sharp. Surely this general neglect warrants our calling him a forgotten poet!

"What is the boasted bubble, reputation?
To-day it is the world's loud cry
Which may to-morrow die,
Or roll from generation unto generation
And magnify and grow to fame,
That quenchless glory round a great man's name."

So he sings in his sonnet on "Good Deeds," and if to-day that cry sounds far off and faint, we feel sure that the future holds in store an abiding fame for the most imaginative poet that has ever lived in Canada. It is much to be hoped that a new edition of his poems will be published, so that they may be accessible to every one.

Charles Heavyside was born in England in 1816 and came to Canada with his family in 1853. He says in one of his letters that from the age of nine, except for a short period spent at school, it had been his lot to labour from ten to thirteen hours daily. He was always thoughtful and observant of man and nature and from childhood felt the stirrings of poetry within him. His occupation for some time was that of a wood carver in a furniture factory. While working he was able to think over his subjects and compose his poems. He regretted afterwards that he gave this up, but he thought

journalism would suit him better and he joined the staff of the *Montreal Witness*. He was not trained, however, for this work nor was he rapid in writing out reports, and he found it all very laborious. The only time he had for poetry was in the evening at home, surrounded by his family. His reading was not varied, and to acquire general culture he never had the leisure. His favourite studies were the Bible and Shakespeare. His recreation was taken on Mount Royal, where he never tired of watching the varying sunshine and storm passing over the distant stretches of the landscape around him. So passed until his death in 1876, his, to all appearance, uneventful life. Hard work he had by day, but evening brought his favourite pursuit, "the prouder pleasures of the mind." The account of his life and works in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* mentions 1869, 1876 and 1878 in different passages as the date of his death. But I am assured that Mr. John Reade's statement that it was 1876 is to be relied on.

The reputation of Heavysse as a poet rests on the drama "Saul," "Jephthah's Daughter," and a few sonnets. He wrote some other pieces, "Jezebel," "Count Filippo," "The Owl," and "The Dark Huntsman;" but those already mentioned are his best. "Saul" shows at once his greatness and his limitations; the beauty of his imaginative thought, often expressed in haunting lines, on the one hand, his prolixity, anachronisms, and want of dramatic form on the other. Bayard Taylor says of it: "It cannot be measured by dramatic laws. It is an epic in dialogue, and its chief charm lies in the march of the story and the detailed individual monologues, rather than in contrast of characters or exciting situations. The breath of a lofty purpose has been breathed upon every page. The language is fresh, racy, and vigorous, and utterly free from the impress of modern masters; much of it might have been written by a contemporary of Shakespeare."

The story of "Saul," as told in the Bible, is that of a man whose magnificent physique, great stature, and striking

appearance made him a noticeable figure in a young nation which had to depend for its existence on the bravery of individuals who could lead its armies triumphantly against its numerous foes. "There was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he." For these qualities he was chosen the first king.

"Warriors and Chiefs! should the shaft or the sword
Pierce me in leading the hosts of the Lord,
Heed not the corse, though a king's, in your path:
Bury your steel in the bosoms of Gath."¹

Young, brave, handsome and enthusiastic, he led Israel to victory, and promised to fulfil the eager hopes of the people. In these earlier years he appeared destined to become one of the great rulers of his country. The world and its glories seemed to lie at his feet.

"Thou art grown to a monarch; a people is thine;
And all gifts that the world offers singly, on one head combine;
High ambition and deeds that surpass it, fame crowning them—all,
Brought to blaze on the head of one creature—King Saul."²

But a mental weakness was inherent in his constitution, and under repeated attacks of the malady, his mind and body failed. The reputation he had won, and the power he had wielded, were gradually lost and he was finally defeated and slain by the enemy on Mount Gilboa. A sad and tragic end to a career that opened with such brilliant promise for himself and his house, Saul and his sons dead and dishonoured on their last battlefield. "How are the mighty fallen and the weapons of war perished."

Samuel says that his ruin was the judgment of the Lord, because he offered sacrifice and did not exterminate every individual of the Amalekites. But the reasons already given seem to be sufficient to account for his failure. And so his dream of life vanished in night without one ray of light to illumine the darkness.

"A meteor
That crossed the welkin ere the break of day,
And then went out forever."

¹ Lord Byron.

² Robert Browning.

Four very interesting people occupy the stage during this period. Three of them are typical examples for all time; the devout Samuel, the fearless and fervent David and the loving Jonathan. These epithets attach themselves to them, but all sides of their varied characters are given in the Scriptures. Samuel, who listened to the inner voice in his youth and tried to follow its counsel through his life, erred when old, in promoting his unworthy sons, and in being unnecessarily cruel to the Amalekites. David often sinned grievously. Against Jonathan only the Chroniclers have nothing to record. An affectionate son, a brave soldier, with no feeling of jealousy for his rival, he stands out against the fierce background of his day, a man without reproach, and with a nature so loveable that his very name has become the synonym of pure unselfish friendship. Far different is Saul. The outward events of his life are dramatic enough, his meteoric rise, his victories, his illness, his death. But in studying his career we cannot fail to see that no great soul inhabited his splendid frame. His is not a weighty character. No forceful magnetic personality impressed his people. His successor David, might sink to lower depths, but he reached at times to heights unimagined by Saul. His remorse and penitence rise above his sins, and like a mist gathering over the earth, hide the frailties of humanity. The poetic temperament and deep religious feeling with which he was endowed by nature were combined with great practical capacity, and his life has enriched the domain of literature, and the world of action. Saul was not of this race of great men. His home was not on the mountain top, but on the lower levels of life, where he could be head and shoulders above the common crowd and attract its noisy admiration. Though in the youthful flush of feeling, when informed that he was chosen to be the first king, he is said to have experienced a change of heart, and even to have joined the company of the prophets, we hear no more of this after his accession to power. Saul belongs to the class of fighting rulers, and not to the race of thoughtful statesmen. One misses completely, in his case, the literary charm that en-

velops the nobler characters in the Bible. Interwoven as it is with the lives of Samuel, David and Jonathan, his life has always evoked great interest, and each generation, though dismayed at what seems to be the inevitable outcome, has watched with intense eagerness the lonely figure of Saul in his struggle against Fate, with all the chances against him.

In his drama *Heavysege* follows the Bible narrative closely, in describing the varied events in the life of Saul. With great imaginative power he introduces good and evil spirits with whom he peoples the air. These strive together for Saul's salvation, and Gloriel tells the good angels to guard Saul, and sets this task specially to Zoe, who says:

"I must attend him who to me is given
To guard from hell and to assist to heaven."

Here, however, the logic of the situation seems to fail. For after waiting the prescribed time, and Samuel not appearing, Saul decides to offer sacrifice himself, saying with truth, "It is the heart God looks at." Then Zoe helplessly cries out:

"He will not listen
Whilst I dissuade him from impiety,"

and finally takes leave of him with the words:

"On Saul himself resides the blame.
His fault was found in his own heart,
Faith lacking all his works fell short."

And Saul is left in the hands of the evil spirit Malzah, who is the most remarkable creation in the drama. To the author, he became the most real of all the characters. He is introduced as,

"The facetious spirit who with mirth
Infectious can at times provoke half hell
To snap their fingers at both it and heaven."

And a cheery spirit he is, light-hearted and full of humour, until he is sent on his distasteful mission of driving Saul into gloom and despondency. While he seems a spirit of the air

in very truth, still he is very human. He says to the companion spirit he loves,

“The scents of heaven yet hover round thy lips,
That are a garden of well watered sweets,
Which I must leave now for the arid desert
Of vexing Saul.”

And later,

“What hath Saul done to me that I should plague him?
It goes against my heart and conscience, thus
To rack his body and deprave his mind.
Nay, by the pith of goodness left in me,
It me unfiends to see and listen to him.”

But vex him he does according to the instructions he must follow, until Saul cries out: “The King’s most lawless subject is himself.” Hating what he has to do, Malzah still must obey his orders, and he does so to the end. After the last battle with the enemy he cries sadly:

“Here lies the man I could have wished for friend!
How shall I atone for injuring him of old.”

It will be seen from the speech of Zoe, already quoted, that Heavysege follows the Bible statement that Saul’s troubles arose from his lack of faith, in not fulfilling to the letter the command of Samuel, speaking for his Master, to destroy every individual among the Amalekites. But, that he sympathizes with Saul in his view of the unmercifulness of this order is evident.

SAUL

“Tis Heaven requires

This rigorous execution at my hand,
Or I could not have given such fell command.

ABNER:

“Oh, let us cover us with the cowl of night
When we perform it.”

Yet, though he feels the rule of the “eternal laws of iron,” he will still struggle on:

SAUL:

“Yea, Heaven is unjust too. Oh, peace, my tongue,
And yet I am indubitably changed.
I have no God-ward movings now; no God
Now, from his genial seat of life remote,
Sends down to me a ray. Yet I’ll endure.
Though now ’tis night, ’twill break again to day.”

And the idea of the total extermination of his enemies appals him:

SAUL: "I did not crave my making; did not solicit
To be a ruler — — — What have I done
Since then? What left undone? I've sacrificed;—
And had I not apology? I spared the King
Of Amalek."

ABNER: "He had made women childless, Samuel said,
And so his mother should that day be childless.

SAUL: "Have not we all who draw the sword so done?
Shall not Philistia's mothers curse again
Our arms that shall bereave them? Shall
Not Israel's nations do the like and howl
By hill and valley their young darlings slain?
Thrice helm thy head, for soon will at it beat
Such storm of curses, both from sires and mothers
As thou has never seen the counterfeit of,
Not even when darts came at thee thick as hail."

Saul's chief offence then in the opinion of those of his own day, consisted in what to most men of a kindly disposition seems the exercise of his one redeeming virtue, his clemency in sparing the king. Otherwise his works were strenuous enough to satisfy the most exacting. Cruelty in plenty there was, but it was warfare in the open, and certainly not so repelling as the treatment of Saul's seven descendants, and of Uriah, by his great successor. But Saul in the midst of this had glimpses of the truth that, if a mere man can be merciful, a God might be more so than his own handiwork.

SAUL: "Too late! Is there no pardon in the world?
Why I myself dispense forgiveness, even
To culprits who have forfeited their lives.
Is not thy God as merciful as his creatures?"

SAMUEL: "He mercy shews to thousands who do keep
His great commandments."

SAUL: "They who keep them need
No mercy."

Even those on whom the rich gift of faith is not bestowed, and who only see the carrying out of hard unchangeable laws

in the working of the universe, would yet fain hope that there does exist that love that passes understanding and tempers justice with mercy.

But in these ideas Saul would seem to have been in advance of his day, and like every man so situated he suffered for his opinion. The later and more evenly balanced view of the Apostle James, for which he has almost incurred the "odium theologicum," as to the relative value of faith and works, suggesting the inference that each has a value of its own, and that the presence of works, not necessarily complete, is a strong indication of the existence of faith, not necessarily perfect; this view would seem to differ from the strongly expressed belief of Samuel. Yet it may well be that his opinion about this was an error of judgment on his part. He was at this time an old man, and his late years were disgraced by the behaviour of his sons. On account of his age and the actions of his sons, he was asked by the people to retire in favour of a king. Very few are the men who can surrender power gracefully, even when the proper time is at hand. Samuel's enforced abdication and his being compelled to appoint Saul as his successor, and the early victories of the king, may have biased his mind and led him unconsciously to misinterpret the Divine will. Certainly, his action is at variance with his whole career. The motives that actuate men in moments of spiritual enthusiasm need to be very carefully looked into. They often are not what the actors imagine them to be. The conduct of Samuel is opposed to that idea of mercy which runs like a golden thread through the Old Testament, guiding to the fuller light of the New, always present though often unseen when hidden by the passions of men. And down the history of the ages this idea of mercifulness in the Ruler of the World has grown in intensity until it has become the chief characteristic, and covers with a mantle of charity, the efforts of man to keep the law, failures though they be at best. It might be considered that the arrival of Saul's evil spirit and the loss of his kingdom were severe punishments, considering that he obeyed

what he thought to be the commandment to so large an extent as he did.

In the present day one cannot believe that this difficulty about the Amalekites was the real cause of the troubles that befell Saul. It can only be the explanation given by his generation of the development of the mental weakness that was inherent in his nature, and which, as has been already suggested, incapacitated him from being a successful leader of men. We may charitably suppose that the reasons given only echo the ideas held in these early times about the government of the world;

“Nor is it possible to thought
A greater than itself to know.”

The modern theory of the gradual revelation of God from the dawn of history, each age being only able to appreciate his character as far as its mental capacity in spiritual matters permitted it, is a very instructive one. It enables us to understand how certain ideas and motives in different circumstances came to be attributed to the Deity. They were but the reflection of the opinions of the society of the day, about Jehovah, projected into the skies and coming back as the voice of God.

Far indeed were these ideas in the days of Saul from the belief of an earlier age, and it is refreshing as a breath of pure air to turn from them and read of the noble faith of Abraham in a just and merciful God. “Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?” asks Abraham in the memorable interview with a God so merciful as to promise to spare the whole city of Sodom for the sake of even ten righteous men, if this small number can be found. But the long years of the captivity had borne their fruit in the degeneration of body and spirit. The people, led by Moses out of Egypt, could not escape from the dark shadow cast by slavery and sacerdotalism into the pure light that shone on the path of their wandering founder.

"Such a veil
 "Hangs over mortal eyes, blind from the birth,
 "And dark in things divine."

Nor did Israel for very many generations regain the early purity of their faith.

Such is the character of Saul and such the times, and the problems incident to them, that had such a fascination for Heavysege, and he tells the story with a wealth of simile and inexhaustible fund of ideas that make it full of interest. Though the drama as a whole is too prolix and lacks dramatic power, it contains many passages of remarkable imagination and great poetic beauty.

No quotations can give any adequate idea of the poem, but the following passages, with those already given, show the imaginative quality of the work, and the beautiful similes that abound in it.

SAUL:

"Fail?

Let the morn fail the East; I'll not fail you;
 But swift and silent as the streaming wind,
 At dawning sweep on Ammon, as night's blast
 Sweeps down from Carmel on the dusky sea."

* * * *

SAUL:

"Oh Prince of Flatterers but Beggar of Doctors
 How poor thou art to him who truly needs.
 Ye are imposters,
 All said, ye are imposters; fleas; skin deep
 Is deep with you; you only prick the flesh
 When you should probe the overwhelmed heart,
 And lance the horny wounds of old despair.
 Away, Death is worth all the doctors."

* * * *

ABNER:

"Jehovah's ways are dark."

SAUL:

"If they be just I care not
 I can endure till death relieves me; ay,
 And not complain: but doubt enfeebles me,
 And my strong heart that gladdeth to endure
 Falters neath its misgivings, and vexed, beats
 Into the speed of fever, when it thinks
 That the Almighty greater is than good."

* * * *

SAUL: "To hunt and to be hunted make existence;
 For we are all or chasers or the chased;
 And some weak luckless wretches ever seem
 Flying before the hounds of circumstance
 Adown the windy gullies of this life,
 Till, toppling over death's uncertain verge,
 We see of them no more. I'm sad as evening.
 Surely this day is life's epitome!
 For life is merely a protracted chase,
 Yea life itself is only a long day,
 And death arrives like sundown."

The following speech of the romantic and affectionate Jonathan to his more than brother is a very beautiful passage with its reminiscence of Milton's well-known repetition:

"Thou art fairer than the kindling firmament,
 Art fairer than the young empurpling dawn.
 Thou with thy flinty pebble of the brook
 Hast from the Giant's mail struck out a flash,
 That plays on thee as doth the lightning on
 A marble idol, making it resplendent.
 We shall, I fear, an idol make of thee,
 I fear we shall be tempted thee to worship,
 Who hast already found a golden shrine
 And ruby temple in our hearts' affections.
 Oh do not wonder that I thus extol thee,
 Oh do not wonder that I deem thee fair.
 Fair late was Phosphor as I saw him shining
 Alone e'er daybreak o'er a verdant hill;
 And fair was Hesper as I lately saw her,
 At evening lone above the Dead Sea shore;
 But neither Phosphor as I lately saw him,
 E'er daybreak shining o'er a verdant hill,
 Nor Hesper as at eve I lately saw her,
 All lonely shining o'er the Dead Sea shore,
 Pleased me as thou dost now."

"Jephthah's Daughter" shows an advance in technical skill in the composition of the blank verse, and it has a smoother flow than that of "Saul." In the opening lines it makes a comparison between the tragedy of Agamemnon's daughter and Jephthah's.

“Two songs with but one burden twin-like tales,
 Sad tales! but this the sadder of the twain;
 This song, a wail more desolately wild;
 Nor with less ghastly grandeur opening,
 Amid the blaze and blazonry of war.”

After the meeting with his daughter Jephthah relates the circumstances connected with his vow. Then he appeals directly to God, and prays to be released from his vow, or that a substitute may be provided.

“He said and stood awaiting for the sign,
 And hears above the hoarse bough-bending wind,
 The hill-wolf howling on the neighbouring height,
 And bittern booming in the pool below.”

The cruel answer that he imagines he has received, the priests later confirm, and declare that the vow cannot be broken; hireling shepherds truly that will not protect the lambs of the flock.

In a stormy interview with his wife, Jephthah cries out:

“Not all thy sex’s choir of Babel tongues
 Could reach the top of this high-towering grief,
 Whose summit soars athwart the brazen heavens,
 And piercing to Jehovah’s sacred seat,
 Pleads with him, pleads, but pleads, alas! in vain.”

Then follows the lament of the daughter, who never more,

“May from my lattice see the brooding East
 Bearing the solemn dawn.
 Nor twilight dim,
 Sickening through shadows of mysterious eve,
 Die midst the starry watches of the night.”

There are many fine passages in this poem, but though it is in form superior to Saul, it cannot compare with that poem in sublimity of thought and in imaginative power. The subject of the one, the results that follow from a man not having the strength of mind to disregard a foolish vow, is local and not inevitable. That of the other, Saul beating in vain against the bars of his environment and

feeling the power of inexorable law is universal. The unavoidable tragedies of life are harrowing enough, but they occur in despite of man's efforts. The reader resents the tale of wilful and useless infliction of sorrow, and the low idea held by Jephthah of his God, and the repellent action of the priests.

While these two poems have great merit, and are full of grand and beautiful thoughts, and will always be held in high regard, it is not likely that they will ever be widely read. In the first place, and little is it to be wondered at, the great majority of people are not fond of tragedy. Alexander Smith in "Dreamthorpe," a delightful book of essays, describes the shelf in his library within easy reach where his favourite authors are placed. He is on easy terms with them and loves to read them often. But he will have none of the great tragedies there. They are in a place apart. The sadness inherent in life is a different matter. This is common, alas! to all mankind and it properly finds a place in the poems we make our intimate companions. Then in addition to the nature of the subjects of these dramas of Heavysesge, the lyrical passages, for which there were splendid opportunities in "Saul", such as his song about Canaan, and David's victory over Goliath, and his singing peace into the mind of the wearied king, are failures.

But, fortunately for Heavysesge's popularity, he has left some sonnets, which must, and most deservedly, find their way into all anthologies. And to these people more and more turn as a convenient way of keeping the poems they are fond of. When a fine poem once gets its place in an anthology its reputation is secure. Some of his sonnets show Heavysesge at his highest point, and combine all his best qualities, and the thought is condensed, a necessity in this form of poetry, but not sufficiently considered in his longer poems. They have great imagination, beautiful similes, an apt choice of words, and poetic power and musical rhythm. In structure they do not comply with the strict rules of sonnet composition, though some of them

approach closely to the Shakespearian form. But this is not after all the important matter. It is the beauty of idea that is essential. "Yes," said the artist, to the critic who wanted the painting improved, "but don't you see that I might make it so good that it would be good for nothing?" That is the true point of view. Technical skill, certainly, but it must not interfere with the spirit.

William Sharp, himself a true poet, yet when he writes about the sonnet, inclined like most artists to place too much importance on technique, in his "Americian Sonnets" speaks of Heavysege as "the poet who had the potentiality of becoming one of the greatest sonnet writers on either side of the Atlantic." Strong words, when he tells us elsewhere that Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, and Rossetti are the greatest of the English sonnet writers! And he praises highly the sonnets quoted below on "Annihilation," on "The Dead," and the "powerful Night" which contains the lovely quatrain in which the comparison is made of night to a nude Ethiop.

ANNIHILATION

"Up from the deep Annihilation came
 And shook the shore of nature with his frame;
 Vulcan nor Polyphemus of one eye,
 For size or strength could with the monster vie;
 Who, landed, round his sudden eyeballs rolled,
 While dripped the ooze from limbs of mighty mould.
 But who the bard that shall in song express
 (For he was clad) the more than Anarch's dress?
 All round about him hanging were decays,
 And ever-dropping remnants of the past;—
 But how shall I recite my great amaze
 As down the abyss I saw him coolly cast
 Slowly but constantly, some lofty name,
 Men thought secure in bright, eternal fame?"

THE DEAD

"How great unto the living seem the dead!
 How sacred, solemn; how heroic grown,
 How vast and vague, as they obscurely tread

The shadowy confines of the dim unknown!—
 For they have met the monster that we dread,
 Have learned the secret not to mortal shown.
 E'en as gigantic shadows on the wall
 The spirit of the daunted child amaze,
 So on us thoughts of the departed fall,
 And with phantasma fill our gloomy gaze,
 Awe and deep wonder lend the living lines,
 And hope and ecstasy the borrowed beams;
 While fitful fancy the full form divines,
 And all is what imagination dreams."

THE STARS

"The day was lingering in the pale North West,
 And night was hanging o'er my head,—
 Night where a myriad stars were spread,
 While down in the East, where the light was least,
 Seemed the home of the quiet dead.
 And, as I gazed on the field sublime,
 To watch the bright pulsating stars,
 Adown the deep where the Angels sleep,
 Came drawn the golden chime
 Of those great spheres that sound the years
 For the horologe of time.
 Millenniums numberless they told,
 Millenniums a millionfold
 From the ancient hour of prime."

NIGHT

"'Tis solemn darkness; the sublime of Shade;
 Night, by no stars nor rising moon relieved;
 The awful blank of nothingness arrayed,
 O'er which my eyeballs roll in vain, deceived.
 Upward, around and downward I explore,
 E'en to the frontiers of the ebon air;
 But cannot, though I strive, discover more
 Than what seems one huge cavern of despair.
 Oh, Night, art thou so grim, when, black and bare
 Of moonbeams, and no cloudlets to adorn,
 Like a nude Ethiop, 'twixt two houris fair,
 Thou stand'st between the evening and the morn?
 I took thee for an angel, but have wooed
 An evil spirit in mine ignorant mood."

The last of these is almost pure Shakespearian in form. The others are irregular in structure, especially the one on "The Stars." Yet this is one of the most beautiful in idea, with its insistence on the endless beginning of time. The words have the very sound of music in them, and there is a haunting charm about it all that will not away. The occasional change to the anapestic metre gives a feeling of downward movement and restfulness.

Taking everything into consideration, the sonnet "Night" is the most complete poem Heavysege wrote. The solemnity and awfulness of the darkness of night unlit by a single star have never been more splendidly set forth than in this condensed telling of its dread power.

While the drama of "Saul" remains from its importance his masterpiece, yet these sonnets and some of the others we have not space to quote are the very flower of Charles Heavysege's genius. There is condensed power and lyric beauty in them, and they have the charm of musical rhythm and rhyme that we miss in his longer poems. Yet they have also his lofty imaginative thought, and dignity of expression, and they will ensure forgetfulness for his name:

Poet! who passed thy years of ceaseless toil,
 Earning but scantily thy simple fare,
 Amid the world's rough work and sad turmoil,
 Its daily tasks and many an irksome care;
 Still hadst thou quiet evenings of delight
 With thy dear muse, reviving the dim years
 Of olden time, or peopling mystic night
 With angel forms and music of the spheres.
 Wrapped in the Hebrew lore, the gloomy maze
 Around the path of Israel's first king,
 'Tis thy desire to tread, and trace the ways
 Of fate, that to his hopeless footsteps cling.
 Dreamer! is there no clue to that dire fall?
 Darkness but deepens o'er the name of Saul!

E. B. GREENSHIELDS

CO-OPERATION IN HISTORICAL RESEARCH

ONE OF the really notable features of modern thought is the changed attitude toward history. It is no longer possible for the historian to build his structure with second-hand material, however effectively he may use that material, or however attractively he may remodel it. To gain a hearing from intelligent men he must build his work upon the sure foundation of original sources; and he must leave his foundation exposed so that all who go by may test the character of his material and the faithful use he has made of it. If he would have it recognized as literature he must also build artistically, with all the skill of a literary craftsman—but that is beside the present point.

To meet the needs of the modern historian it has become necessary to gather from far and near the primary documents that constitute his raw material. The tremendous importance of this task has been gradually dawning upon the governing bodies of civilized lands, with the result that rational archives have been established at public expense, to be the repositories of manuscript material of every description bearing upon the history of the country. The British Government inaugurated a movement of this kind some years ago, and has already made immense strides in the garnering and safeguarding of material pertaining to the history of the United Kingdom.

With that energy and generosity which characterizes activities for the general welfare of the United States, they also have made notable progress in the same direction. Efforts, more or less well-directed, have been made toward the same end in France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and other Continental countries. It remained, however, for the people of

Holland to set an example which all other countries might well follow. With native caution and thoroughness, never more happily directed, the Government of the Netherlands appointed a Commission of Advice to survey the whole field of historical material affecting their own country. The most expert intelligence available by the nation was first to consider with deliberate care the question what most needed to be done, and was then to devise a general and relatively permanent plan for doing it. With the admirably full and scholarly report of this Commission before them, the Government were in a position to establish a department of national archives, into which could be gathered, with the minimum expenditure of time and energy, the documentary sources of the history of the Netherlands. This economical and business-like policy stands in rather a striking contrast to the haphazard methods of other countries.

Canada's advent upon the scene of archival labour is comparatively recent—at least so far as really effective work is concerned. The first Archivist of the Dominion, the late Dr. Douglas Brymner, worked for years in an atmosphere which could scarcely be described as sympathetic. That he accomplished so much is due almost entirely to the unconquerable enthusiasm of the man. That he left so much to be done was in nowise any fault of his. With rare good fortune the Canadian Government were able to secure as his successor one who combines the scholarship and genius for research, the "nose" for hidden documents, of his predecessor, with uncommon executive ability and, what is peculiarly important to-day, a keen appreciation of the importance of making the manuscript riches of the Archives readily accessible by means of careful classification and exhaustive indexes, as well as the desire to meet in a generous spirit the needs of those investigators who, for one reason or another, are unable to visit the Archives personally. To these qualities the present Archivist adds another, of special interest to all who have at heart the furtherance of historical research, without needless waste of energy and resources, and that is a strong

desire to co-operate to the fullest possible extent in the gathering of historical material with all who are working along similar lines, whether they be individuals or societies, colleges, or state institutions.

The vital importance of this matter of co-operation cannot be seriously questioned. Everyone who has given the subject serious consideration must realize the vast amount of valuable effort that has been, and is still, wasted in Canada, the United States, and elsewhere, for want of a broad and intelligent system of co-operation. Time and money have been expended, over and over again, for the discovery and transcription of documents in some out-of-the-way European collection, when copies of these very documents were already deposited in a neighbouring library. The folly of this wasteful system, or lack of system, was recognized long ago in business relations, but whether from thoughtlessness or, to put it bluntly, a dog-in-the-manger policy, we have gone on year after year acquiring and carefully secreting copies of the same documents, while at the same time we were missing golden opportunities for securing, by co-operation, other documents of inestimable value, many of which in the interval have been lost beyond recall. We have to a very large extent snatched at the shadow, and missed the substance. To amend, as far as may be humanly possible, this wasteful practice, is surely an object of the very first importance. As an example of the useless overlapping of material, take the following statement from the Report concerning Canadian Archives for the year 1904: "One result of this investigation" (that is, of the available sources of manuscript material) "is that a whole series of State papers are found to have been transcribed for our archives from *copies* in Europe, while the *original* documents, in excellent preservation, were at the same time in Canada." When this could happen in the National Archives, it can scarcely be doubted that the same blind policy has filled the archives of universities and historical societies with equally expensive and unnecessary duplicates.

There is, of course, scarcely any limit to the field within which co-operation in historical research may be effectively carried on, but so far as Canada is concerned, it is not necessary to look for the present beyond the boundaries of the North American continent. A broad scheme of international co-operation should be our aim, one which would embrace every agency in Canada and the United States engaged in historical research, or the gathering of historical material. Before we can consistently ask our American friends to join us in such a project, however, it is necessary, or at any rate desirable, that we should put our own house in order. That in itself is a work of much more magnitude and importance than many will imagine. From individual students up to the Dominion Archives Department at Ottawa we can count a large number of agencies engaged in historical research. Without attempting to enumerate them all, mention may be made of the more or less fully-organized provincial archives in Ontario, Quebec, and Nova Scotia; of such historical societies as the Royal Society, the Quebec Literary and Historical Society, the Ontario Historical Society, Champlain Society, Nova Scotia Historical Society, New Brunswick Historical Society, Manitoba Historical and Scientific Society, Lundy's Lane Historical Society, and Niagara Historical Society; and of such universities and colleges as Laval, McGill, Toronto, and St. Mary's College, Montreal. To these may be added the Library of Parliament, practically all the Provincial Legislative Libraries, and several other libraries, notably the Toronto Public Library. Here are over a score of Canadian institutions (and the list is far from complete) engaged more or less in historical research, and possessing collections of original documents, or transcripts of original documents, bearing upon Canadian history. At the present time every one of these institutions with the exception of the Province of British Columbia, is working for itself, without any regard whatever to the fields covered by the rest. There exists nowhere among them, with the exception of the Province above mentioned, the remotest approach to intel-

ligent co-operation. So far as anyone is the wiser, each and every one of them might be employing copyists for the transcription of the self-same documents. None of them has any effective means of knowing what the rest are doing, or what documents they have already secured. There exists nowhere even an outline of the scope of the various existing collections. In the case of some of the most valuable of these collections, there is not even a complete calendar, catalogue, or index, in the institution itself, of its own documents. Each has, in fact, been digging holes at random in the great mine of Canadian historical material, without method, without system, constantly overlapping, time and again traversing the same ground, wasting at least half the aggregate resources of time, money, and energy in idle and unnecessary duplication. Is there a single legitimate reason why this wasteful policy should be continued? Is there anything to prevent the various Canadian institutions, federal, provincial and local, getting together and devising some scheme of intelligent and effective co-operation?

As an illustration of the effects of system as applied to a single institution, let me describe briefly what is being done to-day to render more accessible the already extensive collection of manuscripts in the Canadian Archives. The very limited appropriations available in Dr. Brymner's day compelled him to confine his efforts to the acquisition of material, leaving to a more favourable period the preparation of a key to the ever-increasing mass of manuscripts. During his lifetime, in fact, the absence of an index was not seriously felt. Anyone who had occasion to use the Archives at that time will remember not merely Dr. Brymner's rare courtesy and untiring helpfulness, but also his extraordinarily minute and exact knowledge of the documents under his charge. Without the assistance of anything approaching an index, he could at any moment lay his hands upon a particular paper, and at the same time refer one to anything else he had on the same subject. He was himself the index to the

Archives; but with his death, as in all such cases, the key was lost and confusion reigned supreme.

The first care of his successor was therefore to begin the preparation of a complete card index, not only to the papers then in the Archives, but also to the very extensive collections of documents which the Government had decided to transfer to his care from other departments of the public service. It is estimated that the manuscript material already in sight will need not less than fifteen million cards. At the present time a million and a half have been filed in the index room. The work is being pushed forward with all practicable speed, but it will be some years yet before the index can be brought up to date.

Another project which the present Archivist put on foot was the preparation of a Bibliography of Canadian history. In this he has had the valuable co-operation of Mr. Phileas Gagnon and other Canadian bibliographers. Several thousand titles have already been placed on cards, and the work is going rapidly forward. A third undertaking is the completion of a guide to historical material elsewhere in Canada. A number of experts have been in the field on this work for some time, and considerable progress has been made. The Maritime Provinces have been pretty well covered; also the parishes about the city of Quebec—a peculiarly rich field; the district around Toronto; and a beginning has been made in the West, that romantic home of the fur trade.

In place of the annual volumes of Calendars, the value of which was questionable, it has been decided to issue series of volumes similar to the collection of Constitutional Documents edited this year by Professor Shortt and Dr. Doughty; the whole eventually to form part of a comprehensive body of material for the History of Canada. The Constitutional Documents will be continued, the next volume probably bringing the work down to the Union. Other series that have already been decided on will be devoted to Provincial and International Boundary Questions, and the Development

of Trade in Canada. The first volume of the former will probably be a bibliography of the subject, which is already well in hand, something over a thousand titles having been collected. These volumes will appear from time to time as they are ready, averaging probably a volume a year. Edited in every case by recognized specialists in the field they cover, these series of documents will be of inestimable service to the Canadian historian.

To supplement the larger work, it has been decided to issue a periodical bulletin, to contain what may be described as incidental materials, journals, letters, and historical papers of local rather than general interest. These will be edited with notes and introductions, indexes, and possibly maps and other illustrative matter. Through such an elastic medium as this, it will become possible to satisfy, to some extent at least, the needs of local historical students in every quarter of the Dominion, and thus broaden continually the usefulness of the national Archives.

One other project that should be mentioned is the preparation and publication of a Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Archives. The need of such a catalogue has been widely felt, and its value and usefulness can scarcely be over-estimated.

At the same time, while in these and other directions every effort is being made to make the manuscript collections now in the Archives as accessible as possible to everyone interested, the other side of the work has not been lost sight of—that is, the gathering of new material. Within the last twelve months there have been added to the shelves between four and five thousand volumes of manuscript. Since the present Archivist took charge of the work in 1904, some fifteen thousand volumes have been added to the shelves. When it is remembered that from the organization of the Archives in 1873 to the year 1904, a period of thirty-one years, the total number of volumes of manuscript collected was 3,155, the activity of the last three years will be appreciated. In three years the results of the preceding thirty have been increased more

than six-fold; thanks very largely to the fact that the Dominion Government, awakened to the vital importance of the national Archives, has voted during the last three years comparatively generous appropriations for the work. Historical students undoubtedly owe a debt of gratitude to the Minister of Agriculture, the political head of the Archives, to whose sympathetic and intelligent interest in the work is due much of its present success.

The manuscript material collected within the last three years has been drawn from many wide-scattered sources in Europe and America, and in both public and private collections. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that what has been secured is but a drop in the bucket compared with that which remains to be gathered, of material essential to an even approximately complete understanding of the course of Canadian history. The extent of this material in public collections in England alone is enormous. Of these sources the Public Record Office naturally takes first place. There we have the Haldimand Papers, which have only been copied in part; the Bouquet Papers; the Colonial Office Records; and many other minor collections. Progress has been made in the transcription of all these, but there remains still a very great deal of copying to be done. Besides the Public Record Office, a large amount of Canadian material is to be found in the British Museum; in the Royal Institution; at Hudson's Bay House; in Lambeth Palace; and a certain number of documents are to be obtained at Woolwich Arsenal and other minor sources. Incidentally it may be mentioned that one of the great Manuscript Commissions in England has recently been examining a new series of manuscripts, and it has been decided to publish these documents next year. It is known that this collection includes a great deal of material bearing on the North American Colonies, not hitherto available.

Then there is the large, and peculiarly difficult, field of material in private collections. Something has been accomplished within the last year or two toward the examination

and transcription of material in these sources, but nothing more than the mere edges of the field have been explored, and its extent can only be conjectured at the present moment. What has already been brought to light, however, such as the Durham, Selkirk, and Bagot papers, is sufficient to show that this field of research promises a harvest of inestimable value, not only in its direct bearing upon the history of this continent, but also in the extraordinary side lights it throws upon official despatches. With these intimate documents before us, many official documents which have hitherto puzzled the historians, will be capable of startling new interpretations. Placing the official utterance of a statesman beside his confidential letter of the same date it will often be found that the former was nothing more than a blind, while the key to the situation lay in his private communication.

What has been said of public and private collections in the United Kingdom, applies with equal force to similar sources in France; and even if these broad fields had been explored, and their rich historical treasures gathered in, there would still remain extensive collections in Italy, Spain, and even in far-off Russia, from which we know not what invaluable documents bearing on the early history of the North American Colonies may yet be obtained.

The exploitation of these many rich sources of manuscript involves, of course, years of research, and large expenditures for transcription. Fortunately the Government had not rested content with the appointment of an Archivist, but has placed in his hands the means of carrying on the work. Nor has the interest of the Government rested there. By the appointment of a number of the most eminent Canadian scholars, to form an Historical Manuscripts Commission, it has materially strengthened the hands of the Dominion Archivist in every branch of his work.

Now, all this brings us back to the vital question of co-operation; what it involves, and how it is to be brought about. Looking at it from any possible point of view, there can hardly be two opinions as to the advantages of co-operation. The

very circumstances under which historical students labour, and the peculiar nature of their field, make co-operation imperative if they are to secure the maximum results from our always and everywhere limited appropriations. The field of North American archives presents problems peculiar to itself. In England, for instance, the field is not only compact but clearly defined. With us, it is complex and widely scattered. We may not say that this field belongs to Quebec and the other to Ontario; or even, this belongs to Canada and the other to the United States. Everywhere the fields overlap, local and national. Canada must have documents, essential to the history of the United States; manuscripts that are part and parcel of the historical material of the Maritime Provinces, are at the same time indispensable to the New England States; the documentary material of Ontario and Quebec overlaps at many points, and the neighbouring states of New York, Ohio and Michigan must give and take with both our provinces. Similar conditions apply throughout the west; Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta on one side of the boundary, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana on the other, are interested to a very large extent in the same documentary material. Perhaps the interlocking of historical interests is nowhere more noticeable than in the West, for the boundless western plains were the happy hunting-ground of all, French, British, American. All this cries loudly for co-operation.

Looking at it from any possible point of view, it must be admitted that our present methods are, to say the least, most unsystematic, haphazard in principle, and entailing endless and quite unnecessary duplication. Because the various bodies and individuals have not got together, their work lacks uniformity and precision, both in the gathering and editing of material. The present time seems peculiarly favourable for a change in the right direction. Never before has the value and importance of archives been so thoroughly appreciated by national and provincial governments and by the people at large. Never in the past has so much activity been shown,

on the part of organizations and individuals, in the research for historical material. By getting together, discussing ways and means, systematizing the work, giving all the benefit of the knowledge and experience of each, and co-operating in that spirit of broad and generous fellowship, which, after all, must be at the bottom of all such efforts if they are to be at all worth while, infinitely more will be achieved than is possible under existing methods.

Something has already been accomplished in this direction by the Dominion Archives, if not yet with other historical bodies, at least with individuals, and even this slight advance toward co-operation serves to illustrate the manifold advantages of the idea. In Egerton and Grant's "Canadian Constitutional History" and Lucas's "Canadian War of 1812" we may find examples of such co-operation. These and other scholars will make known the results of their investigation in European archives to the Dominion Archives, and the latter will in return place at their disposal the results of researches made by its own officers. This system will result in the acquisition by both parties to the agreement of double the material obtainable by individual effort, at no additional expenditure of time and money. It can readily be seen that such a system is capable of indefinite extension both among historical bodies and individuals, and it is equally clear that the further it is carried the greater will be the ultimate gains to all concerned.

These are but suggestions—experiments, if you like—of what may be accomplished, to the mutual advantage of all, by a frank recognition of the principle of co-operation, and a determination to work together, rather than in selfish isolation, in the noble task which all have so sincerely at heart. But, however we may individually recognize the principle of co-operation, it is obviously necessary, if we are to achieve any tangible results, that some one should take the initiative in such a movement. By whom could it more properly, or effectively, be set in motion than by the Public Records Commission?

LAWRENCE J. BURPEE

THE MANY MANSIONED HOUSE

There looms, upon the enormous round
Where nations come and nations go,
A many-mansioned house, whose bound
Ranges so wide that none may know
Its temperate lands of corn and vine,
Its solitudes of Arctic gloom,
Its wealth of forest, plain, and mine,
Its jungle world of tropic bloom.
Yet so its architects devise
That still its boundary walls extend,
And still its guardian forts arise,
And still its builders see no end
Of plan, or labour, or the call
By which the Master of their Fate
Urges to lay the advancing wall
Of Law beyond the farthest gate.

The mortar oft is red with blood
Of men within and men without,
For hate's incessant storm and flood
Rage round each uttermost redoubt,
And bullets sing, and shrieks are loud,
And bordering voices curse the hour
That sees the builders onward crowd,
True to the Master Mind, whose power
Impels them build by plumb and line
To give the blood-stained wall increase,
And forward push the huge design
Within whose mansions dwelleth peace.

The Master Mind is in no place,
It hath no settled rank nor name,
Its mood, as moulded by the race,
Shifts often, yet remains the same,

To meditate what millions think,
And shape the deed to fit their thought,
Now raising high who seemed to sink,
Now flinging down their choice as naught.
It lauds what sons obey its calls
When time has come for hands to smite,
And when the hour to cease befalls
It chastens them it did requite;
Yet still so chooses that the change
From war to peace and peace to war
Confirms the mansions in their range,
And builds the far-built wall more far.

Within the many mansions dwell
Nations diverse of tongue and blood,—
Races whose primal anthems tell
How Ganges grew a sacred flood,
Tribes long fore-fathered when the birds
Of Egypt saw Osiris pass,
They that were ancient when the herds
Of Abraham cropped Chaldean grass,
People whose shepherd-priesthoods saw
The might of Nineveh begin,
And folk whose slaves baked mud and straw
Mid Babylon's revelling fume of sin;
Blacks that have served in every age
Since first the yoke of Ham they wore,
Yellows who set the printed page
Ere Homer sang from shore to shore,
Swart Browns whose glittering kreeses held
In dread the far-isled Asian seas,
Fierce Reds who waged from primal eld
Their stealthy warfare of the trees;
Men of the jaguar-haunted swamp
Whose mountain masters dwelt in pride
Of golden-citied Aztec pomp
Ages ere Montezuma died;

Builders whose blood was in the hands
 That propped the circled Druid stones,
 And Odin-fathered men, whose bands
 Storming all winds, laid warrior bones
 Round all the Roman mid-world sea,
 And held the Cæsars' might in scorn,
 And kept the Viking liberty
 That fairer freedom might be born.

The wall defendeth all alike,
 The Master Mind on all ordains—:
*Within my bound no sword shall strike,
 Nor fetter bind, save law arraigns ;
 No prisoner here shall feel the rack,
 No infant be to slavery born,
 The wage shall labour's sweat not lack,
 Nor skill of just reward be shorn.
 The king and hind alike shall stand
 Within the peril of my law,
 And though it change at time's demand
 Shall every change be held in awe.
 Here every voice may freely speak
 Wisdom or folly as it choose,
 And though the strong must lead the weak,
 The weak may yet the strong refuse ;
 Thus shall no change be wrought before
 The wise who seek a better way
 Can win, to share their vision, more
 Than praise the wise who wish delay,—
 That so the Master Mind be strong
 Through every drift of time and change,
 To fashion either right or wrong
 At will, within the mansions' range.*

Of what is wrong and what is right
 The Master Mind doth ceaseless hear,
 Listens intent to counselling might,
 Pity or fury, hope, or fear,

Sways to the evil, yet repents,
 Sways to the good, yet half denies,
 Follows revenge, but quick relents,
 And makes its wondering foes allies;
 In memory sees its frenzied hours,
 And holds those fury-fits in scorn;
 In gentlest aspiration towers,
 Or grovels as of faith forlorn,
 Yet never, never loses quite
 The thought, the hope, the glory-dream,
 That beacon of supernal light,
 The shining, holy Grail-like beam,
 The Ideal—in which alone it dares
 Advance the circuit of the wall—
 The faith that yet shall happy shares
 Of circumstance be won for all,—
 This is the vision of its law,
 This is the Asgard of its dream—
 That what the world yet never saw
 Of justice shall arise supreme.

The Master Mind proclaims as free
 Alike, all creeds that men may name,
 All worships they devise to be
 Their help in hope, or ease in shame;
 In Buddha, Mahmoud, Moses, Christ,
 Outspokenly may any trust,
 Or he whom no belief enticed
 May hold the soul a dream of dust,
 Yet all alike be free to teach,
 And all alike be free to shun,
 Because the law of freeman's speech
 Impartial guardeth every one;
 If but all rites of blood be banned,
 Then may each life select its God,
 And every congregation stand
 Past dread of persecution's rod,—

Lo now! Is thus not Jesus set
 Transcendent o'er the broad domain—
 The gentle Christ whose anguished sweat
 Bled for a world-wide mercy's reign?

Yet in the many Mansions flaunt,
 As if they deem their place secure,
 Legion, whose Christ-defying vaunt
 How long, O Lord, dost Thou endure!
 Belshazzar's Feast is multiplied,
 Mammon holds fabulous parade,
 Thousands of Minotaurs divide
 The procurers' tribute of the maid,
 Circe enchants her votary swine,
 Moloch, though veiled his fire, consumes,
 And all the man-made Gods assign
 Their victims self-elected dooms.

In large, the suffering and the sin,
 (Full well the Master Mind doth know),
 From luxury and want begin,
 And through unequal portions flow.
 This ancient wrong doth worst defeat
 The immortal yearning of His plea
 To save the little, wandering feet,—
 "*Suffer the children come to me;*"

Wherefore, on streets that Mammon makes
 The Master Mind bends ruthless eye,
 Yet calm withholds the blow that breaks,
 And leaves that stroke to bye and bye,
 Since faithful memory, backward cast,
 Beholds how much hath freedom won,
 And lest a pomp-destroying blast
 Might shrivel many a guiltless one,
 And since it knows that freedom's plan
 To build secure alone is skilled,
 And that firm-grounded gain for man
 Is only by what man hath willed.—

Hence waits the Master Mind, in trust
That yet the hour shall Mammon rue,
Since, as the mansions grow, so must
Freedom upraise The Christ anew.

But whether He prevail at last,
Or whether all shall pass away,
Even as Rome's great Empire passed
When wrought the purpose of its day,
Still must the builders heed the call
By which the Master of all Fate
Ordains they lay the advancing wall
Of peace beyond the farthest gate.

And, oh! the Master Mind may well
In pride of gentleness rejoice
That in the Mansions none may quell
The lilt of any nation's voice;
But every race may sing their joy,
May hymn their pride, their glories boast
To listeners glad without alloy—
The primal, wall-extending host,
The founding, freedom-loving race
Whose generous-visioning mind doth see
No worth in holding foremost place,
Save in an Empire of the Free.

EDWARD W. THOMSON

THE SOUTH AFRICAN SITUATION

ALL BRITISH subjects, whether they be Conservatives or Socialists, whether they live at home or abroad, must be confused by the strange happenings in South Africa during the past few years. It is the present intention to review briefly some of the more important events in South African history which have occurred since the Majuba incident of 1881 as an essential towards understanding the present state of affairs.

The effect of Majuba was all powerful on both Briton and Boer, though in two entirely different ways. To the Briton it was an ever-present reminder that British prestige had been sullied by a handful of ill-equipped farmers, and that no adequate redress for the blow had ever been obtained; and it represented further an increasing race hatred which finally culminated in war.

To the Boer it was the name of all that meant victory; its anniversary he proudly proclaimed as a holiday, upon which the nation should indulge in pleasant recollections of an event which marked its triumph over a great nation; which stamped its burghers as men of soldierly prowess; and stood as a reminder to the rest of the world that the Boer was thenceforward a factor to be reckoned with.

In the days of the early eighties, however, the Transvaal had not attained that position of importance which, by virtue of its mineral resources, it was but a few years later to assume, and the personal contact between the Boers and British was at that time a very limited quantity. The unveiled contempt of the "rooinek" by the Boer was therefore known in actuality only by a few, and these were not persons of sufficient importance to rouse the feelings of the British nation.

And this is an important point, for however displeased the Englishman in England might feel in regard to Majuba, he could never enter into the reality of the position as it was known to the Englishman in South Africa. The sneer of the youthful Boer was a thing which had to be experienced to be properly appreciated. In fact, had it not been for the inflow of a large percentage of Britishers into the Transvaal, which began six years after the first war, induced by the gold fever, it is almost certain that there never would have been any second war.

The immediate effect of the development of the gold industry was to bring in a much needed revenue to the Boer treasury, and simultaneously, the Government was invested with the control of a huge industry and a large population, such as never had been contemplated by them in their wildest imaginings.

The dignity of office in Government, Civil Service, Railroads, Education, and the Law, became theirs; and a dormant pride rapidly awoke to a conspicuous autocratism. The Boers complacently accepted the situation, and created position after position to be filled by their own nominees as their country's wealth became more and more disclosed and developed by the industrious "Uitlander."

The evolution from a bankrupt and semi-civilized State to a condition of extraordinary affluence and civilization was effected too rapidly to be a solid accomplishment. In the handling of the newly acquired wealth came the inevitable dash of vulgarity, whilst the exercise of great power brought with it arrogance and intolerance. The mining industry was being developed and carried on by a cosmopolitan population in which Britishers predominated as the workers, and the Hebrew element as the financiers. The Boers themselves knew nothing of mining, but they evolved a very fair mining law, and administered it with indifferent honesty.

With the rapidly growing wealth of the mining industry, however, was engendered a spirit of greed on both sides; the Boer naturally wishing to retain a firm grip on the country

and its mineral wealth, whilst the foreigner was equally anxious for the same end.

Furthermore the foreign element felt insecure as to its standing under such a Government, and there was an underlying fear that some day the Boers would impose restrictions and taxes of such a nature as to make the position almost untenable for outsiders.

In view of the fact that the discovery and development of the industry had been brought about entirely by the efforts of the foreign population, it seemed unfair and unreasonable to ask it to submit to conditions of such uncertainty; and as the Boers were in any case bound to reap enormous wealth without taking any risks, it was only just that the other side should be granted some facilities in the matter of obtaining franchise rights that would ensure for them a voice in the future control of the country, and in particular of their industry.

The attainment of such a position was all the more necessary, as without it the finding of the huge sums of capital required for the more extensive and scientific development of the auriferous deposits would become difficult if not quite impossible. The capitalist naturally felt that a wealthy country in such inexperienced hands might be sadly mishandled; and feared at least, that the Government could not be relied upon to properly safeguard the interests of outsiders. Without some reasonable certainty, therefore, that with the lapse of time the actual workers in the mining industry would secure a voice in the control, the security for large capital outlay might be regarded as unsound.

The Government's part in the handling of the dynamite monopoly lent considerable colour to the assumption that it would exact everything possible from the industry; and increased the feeling of insecurity to a dangerous point. Nor were indications lacking, or even direct evidence to show that bribery and corruption were factors to be seriously considered. To all overtures in the direction of securing a reasonable franchise for the foreign element the Government

showed a stubborn and uncompromising attitude; and despite every endeavour on the part of the moderates on both sides, a breach of unpleasant proportions and widening tendency developed.

From 1882 to 1899 racial hatred flourished, and the Jameson Raid incident of 1896 merely served to accentuate the growth. The younger generation of Boers looked back to the history of Majuba, and gathered from it a feeling of confidence in their own ability to uphold their position by force of arms, and they unhesitatingly showed the greatest contempt for the person and power of Englishmen. This was bitterly galling to the younger British section, and aroused a feeling of hatred which could be satisfied with no compromise short of war.

The war which began in 1899 was brought about no less from this cause than from the feeling of insecurity in the Government. Britishers wanted the franchise, but they also in the bottom of their hearts were determined to obtain redress for the hateful Majuba incident: the younger Boers were equally determined and unquestionably anxious to repeat the Majuba incident on a colossal scale: the financiers were unanimous in the wish to obtain that security in their schemes which could only be realised by having a voice in the framing of the laws governing the mining industry; and if this could only be attained by deposing the Boers, then the Boers must go: the Boer leaders themselves believed that their only safety, their only hope of holding their country entirely to themselves lay in refusing the franchise; and President Krüger had made up his mind that this refusal must be maintained at any cost.

The proposals made by Lord Milner at Bloemfontein in 1899 represented a compromise that would in every way have satisfied both parties; that is, on the basis of giving both sides what they were really asking for. Under that franchise the ascendancy of the Boer party for many years was quite secure; whilst the possibility of the other party getting into power, even after 10 years, was very remote. The only hope

for the foreign element was, that such a compromise would bring with it some certainty of participation in the control of the mining industry. Perhaps President Krüger's reason for not accepting those proposals was, that he did not believe they represented anything final; but that no sooner would the agreement on those lines be arrived at than the other party would come forward with new alternative suggestions.

Whatever his private views on the point may have been, he apparently had his reasons for deciding that an uncompromising attitude was the only one for him to adopt, and shortly afterwards the strained relationship between the two parties drifted into the beginning of what subsequently proved to be a stubborn war.

At the outset, the announcement of war was greeted by the Uitlander section, including the cosmopolitan financier, with every expression of delight. They saw in it a speedy settlement of financial troubles; the doubts affecting solidity of title and government taxation of the industry were to be dissipated; and a scrip boom was to be the certain outcome of the happy little war, in which the truculent Boer was rapidly, but firmly, to be brought to his senses. To the Jingo and the hot-blooded youth, the war was to be the realization of their desire to wipe out at last the Majuba incident in a few decisive engagements, in which the Boers were to be overwhelmed and out-manceuvred by up-to-date armament and correct military methods.

And then began the war in 1899. The magnitude of that war, its dragged out length, its expense, and its terrible cost in lives, are all now matters of well known history. The "happy little war" proved to be a formidable task, and one that strained even the strong arm of Britain. Certainly the Majuba episode was wiped out, but many a more deplorable one had to be recorded before the final balance was struck, and there can be no doubt that the Boer for all time vindicated his claims to greatness on the battle field.

To what extent the Boer counted upon assistance in this struggle from outside sources is not known, but there is

no doubt that he had counted upon some assistance. There seems to be no doubt either that he believed in his ultimate ability to win the fight on his own ground. It was only at the last, when all hope of support had vanished, that, surrounded by burning farms; with his women and children huddled together in various protection camps, all over the country; with his ranks decimated, and his base destroyed; he finally gave up the position as hopeless and agreed to the terms of the Veeriniging peace.

In the meantime, the principal towns on the coast were crowded with refugees, all full of optimism. They implicitly believed that with the advent of peace, and under a new Government, would come a wonderful prosperity. The mining industry was to be rehabilitated on a new footing, where there would be no question in the mind of the investor as to the soundness of the security offered. With the annulment of all monopolies, a basis of economic operations would soon be reached which had been impossible under the old conditions.

The native labour question was to be readjusted and a new schedule of wages introduced, which alone would make an enormous reduction in operating costs. The whole country was preparing for a gigantic boom, not only in the Transvaal, but in all the colonies.

The importation of supplies for the troops had brought a great increase of trade to the merchants at the coast ports, and had created an artificial activity that was regarded, not merely as being permanent, but as only the beginning of the new era of prosperity. New buildings were springing up in every town, and the price of land reached fabulous figures. In Durban these features were particularly noticeable. Even the shrewdest merchants, and those of the oldest standing, believed in the expansion to come; and few people seemed to provide for the inevitable drop in trade that must accompany the withdrawal of the great army after the war. Nothing could check the enthusiasm, and for some months prior to the declaration of peace, there was a steady but very material

appreciation in the value of all classes of security, including land, buildings, and mining shares.

Finally peace was declared, and within a few days began a slump, a most unexpected slump, but a most unmistakable one. At first people were incredulous. It seemed absurd, after fighting for years to gain a certain position in the country, that having achieved the position aimed at, no matter how desperate the struggle had been, the result should be a slump.

Of course the fundamental factor in everybody's calculation was the mining industry. It was admitted that the welfare of the country and the community at large depended, firstly and lastly, on that. The engineer, the merchant, the farmer, and the tradesman, counted firmly on the industry to attract a big population, to create a big market, and a big demand for almost every variety of produce. And now that the objectionable Boer Government had been removed, and that all sorts of economic reforms in the administration of the country and the industry were so surely to come, there seemed no further obstacle to success.

Looking back upon the position it seems simple to realize that there was nothing to justify any such optimism as that indicated. With several hundred thousand soldiers being withdrawn from the country, the sudden drop in the importation of commissariat supplies was in itself bound to be a serious matter, whilst the utter disorganization of the mining industry would certainly occupy some considerable time before conditions could be again normal. Many of the mines were full of water, and the labour complement, in respect to both Europeans and natives, had to be reassembled. Even under the most favourable conditions, the rehabilitation of an industry of such magnitude was bound to be slow work; but in the gradual development immediately before the actual declaration of peace, it became quite clear that conditions were not to be particularly favourable, and that the task of reorganization was likely to prove much more laborious and expensive than had ever been anticipated. The

burning question for the industry became the native labour supply. The representatives of the big mining groups had collected at Cape Town during the war, and had amongst themselves formulated a new schedule for the payment of native labour. Under the Boer regime, a system of "touting" had been permitted, the effect of which was to gradually, but surely, increase the rate of pay for natives, and as the demands of the mines for more natives increased, the competition between the mines to secure a full working complement became expensively keen. The supply was far short of the demand, and the immediate result was an increase in prices. The professional tout became quite a power, and the mines began to feel acutely their dependence upon him, and the accompanying higher cost. The outlying mines suffered more heavily on this account, as the natives favoured the old-established central mines, and it was felt by the controllers that the existing system of distribution was unfair on this account; hence the formation of the Native Labour Association, through whose medium it was believed that a much larger supply could be obtained at a greatly reduced first cost, and at a lower working rate, whilst a fair distribution to each mine would also be secured. No difficulty was anticipated in achieving these objects, and in fact it was believed that the effect of the war on the natives would be to impoverish them to such a point, that they would gladly flock to the mines as soon as peace was declared and the industry re-started.

There is no doubt that a serious blunder was made in this diagnosis of the position. Quite contrary to these anticipations, the Kafir had made more money during the war than he did in ordinary times. He was employed by both sides in connexion with military operations and commissariat, and the demand for his services at the coast ports had increased to an extraordinary degree. When peace was declared, therefore, the Kafir was considering the prospect of a pleasant little holiday, to be paid for out of the proceeds of his profits during the war; and those who did desire to work

preferred to engage in the towns and the agricultural districts, rather than go to the mines.

It soon became evident that the first important expectation reckoned on as coming with a change of Government, was not to be realized, and the new native labour association, organized at great cost, with its recruiting agents and stations distributed all over the important labour areas, brought with it a dearth of labour never before experienced. The mines were all undermanned, and month after month saw no improvement in the condition; whilst the call for labour by the mines grew rapidly.

There can be no question that the Association did all in its power, even to the point of lavish expenditure, to secure labour, and although it was always a most unpopular institution with the native—because of its policy of equal distribution, which often prevented him from going to his own favoured mine—its signal failure to provide a full supply cannot be altogether attributed to that cause. Rather was it due to the extraordinary activity in other directions, such as railroad work, shipping, building, and domestic wants. Everybody was preparing for the great boom to come, and everybody required Kafir labour; and the increased domestic demand alone made a very considerable inroad on the available supplies. Of course these things might have been foreseen, and there is no doubt they should have been foreseen, but the fact remains that they were not, and the net result was disastrous to the mining industry, in the hampering of the rehabilitation process and the resultant curtailed operations.

All hopes of reducing operating costs in mining centred largely on cheaper unskilled labour, and this was to be accompanied by reductions in European wages and cost of material. The pronounced failure on the first point was not only a sad blow to the leaders of the industry, but it also had the effect of shutting out the possibility of reduction in the other directions. Such a failure, at such a time, by the administrators of the industry, who could no longer

point to the interference of an unsympathetic Government, went a long way towards destroying confidence in the foresight of the leaders, and no amount of argument can alter the fact that those responsible for the blunder in the new policy were not soundly acquainted with the general position; otherwise they would never have engaged in the enormous expenditure of such an undertaking.

With the shortage of labour, coupled with the heavy expense of reorganizing the mines, after their three years of inaction, and on top of this, increased cost of material and administration, the condition of the industry became desperate, and decidedly worse than it had been before the war. The big ideas of the controllers as to the development that would ensue, once peace had been declared, found realization far more readily in increased expenditure than in enhanced profit. Palatial offices were built, both in London and Johannesburg, and innumerable positions were created, carrying princely salaries, and every preparation was made for a milk and honey period when money was to flow in like water. The modest results obtained before the war were to be outdone to a point where comparison would become absurd. Everything was to be done on a colossal scale, and no doubts could be expressed or tolerated as to the ultimate success of all these ideas. This feeling was not peculiar to the mine-owner; it was shared by the merchant, the tradesman, the engineer, and the Government itself. Each section was feverishly anxious not to be too late to share in the great success, and the Government hastened to place wild orders for railroad engines and material; the mining engineers engaged unprecedented numbers of draughtsmen to prepare designs for all sorts of new equipment, and the merchant and the tradesman ordered in large stocks of material, and took new and much more commodious premises; the builder and contractor borrowed money to erect large blocks of buildings, to be let or sold at a phenomenal profit; the estate agent bought land at any price, and it rose to fabulous figures; the sharebroker dealt in extraordinary

amounts of scrip for himself and his clients; the claim-owner's price for mine ground went to thousands where before it had been hundreds; and so it ran through the whole country from the indigenous nigger to the Government itself. In fact the whole sub-continent was living in an atmosphere of recklessness and improvidence.

It seems paradoxical to continue by stating that the cause of all this extravagance lay in the prospective economies that were to come about by reason of the change of Government; but this is so; everything hinged on the mining industry; it was to be the mainspring of all prosperity. But unfortunately the mines had become no richer by the change of Government, and the whole case for the future economies lay in the optimistic assurance that with cheaper dynamite and a British Government the cost of operating the mines must be greatly reduced and the profits correspondingly increased. It seems incredible that the absurdity of this position should not have been more generally realized.

Once the impossibility of securing native labour for the mines became a settled conviction, the next step was the importation of the Chinese coolie. Unfortunately for the mining industry this question became one of acute political interest, and although permission to carry it out was attained after a hard fight, it was accompanied by so many restrictions and stipulations, that many hundreds of thousands of pounds were unnecessarily entailed as contingent expenditure.

The experiment of importing thousands of labourers, to be followed by all the difficulties of initiating them to their new work, was alone one of very considerable expense, but when in addition all sorts of uncalled for provisions as to the housing and accommodation of the labourers were insisted upon, the cost rose to a point which an already over-burdened industry could certainly not afford to pay. What had been good enough for the natives in the way of accommodation was condemned as inhuman for the coolie, and the industrial leaders had no alternative but to comply with the regulations at a ruinous cost. Many an Englishman from the East End

of London, or from the poor quarters of any of the great English cities, might well turn with longing eyes to the newly-built Chinese compounds, with their facilities for heating, cooking, bathing, and ventilation, and their arrangements for medical comforts.

The war ended in 1902, and at the end of 1905 the country had had three years to settle down to all the conditions obtained under the new regime. There had been ample time to turn to account the great benefits assumed to go with the change of Government, and to launch out along those avenues of prosperity which had formerly been closed by an antagonistic control. Dynamite was obtainable at a very reasonable price, and the unskilled labour force had been augmented by the introduction of a large number of coolies. These two items had in themselves been confidently estimated to increase materially the profits of the industry, and yet, strangely enough, the position in 1905 could not be considered a particularly satisfying one. The mines complained of high cost; the merchants were not making anything like the profits they should; the coast towns were admittedly in financial difficulties; the railway returns fell short of expectations; the cost of government seemed to be ever on the increase; and the investing public of Europe seemed to be extraordinarily shy in the matter of investing.

The position was perplexing. Could it be possible that those responsible had miscalculated the advantages of cheaper dynamite, and more unskilled labour, and a new Government?—That a fearful blunder had been made, and that three years of war, and the devastation of a country, and the expenditure of hundreds of millions sterling, and the sacrifice of many thousands of lives, had been for nothing?—Just wasted because of an error in someone's calculation?

Surely not. And yet if this were not so, where then lay the trouble? There must be some explanation; something must be wrong somewhere. The mining industry, the heart of the whole industrial life of the country, upon which everything hinged; what could be the matter with it? These were

the questions that arose acutely in 1905. And at the end of 1908 do we find matters improved or prospects any better, even though six years have elapsed since the declaration of peace?

If these questions were put to some intelligent person who knew the position in 1905, but knew nothing of the happenings of the past three years, it would be interesting to study the effect upon him when he was informed that in that short period the Transvaal had again passed under a Boer Government, and one that more strongly held the reins of Government than ever before; that the victory had been a bloodless one, and one obtained without payment of any kind; that the Chinese had been ordered to be returned; that a great number of them had already gone, and that their places were instantly being filled by natives; that the mining industry had depreciated in market value by a further amount of many millions, and had sunk to a most desperate condition; that the whole sub-continent was the seat of a universal financial depression, extending from the highest to the lowest, and that ruin had overtaken a large percentage of the population, and was staring in the face of many of the rest; and all this despite cheaper dynamite, and an enormously increased gold output. It sounds like burlesque, but it is tragedy. The ruin has spread through South African supporters in Europe, and the worst feature of the situation is that there seems to be no immediate prospect of relief.

The leaders of the industry are concentrating all their efforts on bringing about a new era of market activity. Every new point in favour of the industry is hurriedly pushed forward before the public as a further incentive to share-buying. A new rock-drill, a new grinding machine, increased duty per stamp, reduced cost of white labour, amalgamation of properties, each and all of these have been widely dilated upon in cabled messages to the newspapers; in optimistic speeches by the chairmen of companies at annual meetings; in private and in public; and always with the same object of making the shares in the various concerns more attractive,

more alluring to the public. There is no attempt to disguise the desire on the part of the owners to sell these good things to the public. Their generosity and good-will cannot be satisfied until the public has once more become a heavy participator.

But why this anxiety to sell? And why this dire depression if the public wont buy? And why this disastrous depreciation in the value of mining shares? Surely if the industry is actually realizing the large profits it is credited with in liquid money, it is well able, not only to maintain itself, but to provide for its own further development. This would appear to be only a reasonable assumption. In other words, if there is a fair proportion of the £27,400,000 made as revenue in 1907, available as liquid profits, after allowing for all charges, it should not be a grave matter to utilize some of it in new development. Any business to be regarded as flourishing should be able, if need be, to pay for its own expansion; otherwise it can hardly be called flourishing.

It is quite certain that many of the mines are making a good margin of profit per ton of ore treated, but it is equally certain that when this margin of profit is taken in conjunction with the lives and capitalization of the various companies,—even calculated on the present market price of the shares,—there are very few that show 10 per cent. per annum after providing for the redemption of the capital. The unfortunate public are mostly holders of these shares at very much higher prices than they stand at to-day, and in the computation of the value of their investment the capital redemption fund must be taken at a higher figure, whilst the profit margin becomes correspondingly less.

Despite the enormous output, therefore, the rate of interest received by the investor of a few years back, even in the good mines, is lamentably small, whilst in only a few exceptional cases would it be even adequate to-day; and this despite a great deal of speculative risk as to future returns. That is to say, there is no certainty that the best of the mines will be able to maintain their present standard of returns up

to the period of their exhaustion, and in fact it is quite certain that in many of them there will be a considerable falling off towards the end of their lives.

As to new producers, all of which will be found in the deeper level concerns, the indications so far available point to an inevitably greater capital outlay in the initial stages, whilst the values of the ore bodies are distinctly less. It is safe to say, in regard to them, that unless there is a very substantial decrease in the cost of operations, to be brought about by an amelioration of the general working conditions, few of them can hope to repay the capital outlay with any reasonable rate of interest.

The truth of the position is, that the value of the industry has been gravely over-estimated by everybody interested in it. The engineer and the financier have alike made the mistake, and through them the Government itself has been entirely misled as to its capabilities; and, labouring under this misapprehension, it has been saddled with an expenditure both administrative and governmental, designed for its estimated potentialities that are out of all proportion to its actual capabilities, and it has inevitably broken down under the burden.

The public and the world at large are awed by the immense output, but they cannot escape from the fact that heavy loss has followed almost every time that money has been put into the industry for investment purposes, and the public will not be easily drawn into further investment. Of course money has been made, and legitimately made, by those who were fortunate enough to interest themselves in the mines before the era of big groups and over-capitalization; but since the Chamber of Mines became a semi-political organization, and politics generally became interwoven with the spirit of the industry; and since wholesale scrip-making and big schemes became the only accepted policy for financing the mines, the public have only gone in to lose their money. Large sums of money have been made in reconstruction schemes by the financial houses, but neither the public, the

country, or the Government have benefited much by these. Certainly a proportion of the capital has been returned for the furtherance of other schemes, but a large proportion of it has gone for good.

And now we are told, in more than one chairman's speech, that unless the public come forward with further contributions, the development of the deeper level mines will have to be suspended; and in earnest of this statement a number of the non-producing mines have been shut down. The probability of the public coming forward to find money for the exploitation of these ventures is generally thought to be extremely remote, so that at its present production the industry may be regarded as having very nearly reached high water mark in output, and the returns from such deep-level companies as do come into action will be required as an offset to the tailing off of some of the older outcrops.

To summarize the position as outlined up to this point, we have:—1. The position under the Boer control. 2. A war engendered, partly by racial hatred, and partly to gain control of the Transvaal and its mining industry. 3. The advent of a British control after the war, and the reorganization of the mining industry. 4. Immediate political and labour strife, followed by the introduction of the Chinese. 5. The control of the Transvaal handed back to the Boers, the repatriation of the Chinese, and the industry in a stagnant condition. And now the world is wondering what is to happen next in this kaleidoscopic history.

In the mind of the writer it is not quite so difficult to forecast some of the more important phases with tolerable certainty. Nobody could be blamed for having failed to foresee that the Transvaal would be given back to the Boers for nothing by the very people who so nearly over-reached themselves in taking it in the first place. There is no conceivable line of logical deduction which could have led one to such a result. But having realized that astonishing fact, and being quite convinced of its hard actuality, it is not difficult to go further in assuming that the Boer will take the

fullest advantage of this philanthropy. It is quite certain that he has not yet properly recovered from the shock of surprise which seized him at the first blush of this new and totally unexpected change in his fortunes, but there is no evidence discernible that he has forgotten to grasp with both hands all the power that the change has brought with it. On the contrary, the most cursory inspection of the record of the past twelve months shows that the Boer is not only fully alive to the magnitude of his opportunity, but is taking every possible precaution to ensure the turning of the tide to good and, what is more important, permanent account for himself.

Whatever opinion may be held about what the British Government has done, there need be no doubts as to what the Boer will do. He will profit himself to the last letter of his opportunity, and he will have neither compunction nor scruple in utilizing every means in his power to secure to himself those advantages in perpetuity.

And thus far he cannot complain of the assistance given him. The very people upon whom he is imposing have received and lionized his representative in London and even amongst the chosen men of all the other colonies, have singled him out for special distinction and ovation. And after presenting him with the spoils of the war, for which the British taxpayer paid hundreds of millions, it has been suggested that a further loan of several millions be made him in order that he may consolidate his position.

In all this, the Boer is not in any way to be blamed. It would be suicidal folly on his part not to accept and take advantage of what he is offered, and if after all the Boer gets his beloved Transvaal back for his own, he only gets what he had before, and what he regards as his rights; and were it not for the mining industry, it is quite certain that nobody would care to dispute that right.

In truth it may be said without fear of contradiction that the percentage of Britishers who care for the Transvaal as a country to live in, and make a home in, is a remarkably small one. The Uitlander has been a constantly changing, unsettled

community, and the aspiration of at least nine-tenths of it has been to accumulate riches quickly, and then leave the country for good. There never has been any appreciable leaning towards permanent settlement or the building up of a real home. Beyond its gold mines and its climate, the Transvaal has nothing to offer the man who longs for "home" as it is known in England and her other colonies. Its isolation and sparsity of vegetation; its monotonous stretches of ugly rugged kopjes; its bad roads and interminable distances; its pests and scourges in stock-breeding and farming; its altitude and rarity of atmosphere; its awful dust-storms, and finally its uncongenial whole make it altogether a place which could only appeal to some class of humanity that had been bred in its midst.

There was a time when it was popularly believed that the Transvaal would attract thousands of British settlers, and that gradually the races would commingle and grow into a vast thriving community such as the Canadians or Australians. The belief was based on the assumption that the development and expansion of the gold industry would provide employment for a large population of Europeans and natives, and that consequently there must be a big demand for supplies. It was further assumed that by the time the mineral wealth had been exhausted, its agricultural resources would have been developed to a point where it could compete in the world's markets for the supply of produce. There was nothing unreasonable in these anticipations, provided that the mining industry did expand, and that the agricultural successes were realizable.

Unfortunately neither of these factors has come up to expectation. The persistent droop in the development of the deep level section of the mines in the past few years has curtailed the market requirement for all kinds of imports and produce, and a local demand is essential to the immediate successful exploitation of agricultural works. Under such conditions, there is little hope of profit to the existing farming community, and no inducement to offer to possible new-

comers. And this condition of things is unfortunately true of all the other industries in the country. The financial depreciation of the mining industry may be safely taken as illustrative of the condition of the general commercial position.

These then are the fruits of a disastrous war, and the securities which Great Britain holds against the expenditure of colossal sums of money and the sacrifice of many lives; and this is the goal which racial hatred, financial unscrupulousness, and wretched miscalculation have led us; truly a ghastly reckoning for the consideration of those responsible; those party politicians, so ready at any moment to sacrifice their country and their principles and their common sense to the furtherance of their own petty achievements; those financiers and industrial administrators who by unscrupulousness and greed have jeopardized the success of a magnificent industry.

There naturally have been, and there still are amongst both the political and financial leaders, men of honest purpose and whole-hearted energy; men who battle strenuously against the fatuous policy of the political and financial wrecker; men of high position and honestly earned wealth, who have not been afraid to spend their lives and money grappling with a proper study of the conditions on the spot; but these are in the minority, and their efforts have hardly checked the rush of the opposing forces. I have no intention of making an attack on everybody concerned, and I would fain pay this tribute to that small minority referred to; but taken as a whole, and judged by results as reflected in the general condition of the country, there must be cause for a strong indictment. It cannot be gainsaid that the industry is an extraordinarily valuable one, with the greatest inherent possibilities even now, and it is only the incubus of an environment of artificial and uncongenial conditions that has brought it to its present pass. These conditions are not ineradicable; but it takes time and patience and a large quantity of both to weed out the bad from the good, and in the process somebody must suffer.

The industry is still the key to the position; the major

portion of the gold-bearing ore is still intact, though the value per ton is less—and it should be still possible to reduce the controlling conditions to a level that would permit of profit being made on a much lower grade per ton than that obtained to-day. And although something in this direction has been accomplished during the past twelve months, there yet remains a great deal to be done. It will be hard finally to give up those great ideas of big capitalization and market booms that have been so characteristic of the operations of the past, and many of those who are wedded to those associations will have to drop out of the developments of the future. But given legitimate control and honest operation, and freedom from the political millstone, there is still plenty of vitality in the industry itself to enable it to emerge successfully from its present difficulties.

The trouble about the future is that this recrudescence, when it does come, will not be so much for the benefit of the Britisher as for the Boer. It is under the guidance and control of the Boer that these difficulties are to be righted, and it is to him eventually that the chief benefits must go.

If, under the present system of control, the working costs of the mining industry could be reduced by 40 per cent. there would still be great chances of a British population for the Transvaal; but, whilst the sympathies of the writer are entirely with those genuine workers who are endeavouring to bring this condition about, his fears are that such a reduction is in the circumstances out of the question, and in any case that the progress of the movement is too slow to save the situation.

The nonsense one has heard of the disappearance of race hatred must be forgotten. The Boer has no love for the Britisher, and in his scheme of the future the Britisher has no place. On the contrary he wants the country for himself. He wants the available native supply to himself. He has gladly lent a hand to the repatriation of the Chinese coolie, and has collected the required natives to replace the coolie from those other industries that have been closed or curtailed by the general depression, and he will eventually bring

the native back to that position which he occupied in the early days, and where he ought to be.

This is the crux of the whole question of the future economy in the industry. There are of course other important points too. For instance, the Boer will require no group system, no palatial head offices in London, no army of highly paid officials, and all of these facts will have a great bearing on the question. But the fact of paramount importance is the cheap unskilled labour supply, and under British administration, with its red tape, and its politics, and its interference, there appears to be no possibility of ever having that factor.

We have already seen the appointment of a Boer nominee as Government Mining Engineer, and in many other instances in the Civil Service Britishers have been removed, to be replaced by Boer partisans, and these changes represent the beginning of the movement which is to oust the Britisher from the country.

It is the fervent hope of the present writer that he may be wrong in these contentions, and that an enlightened Government will find some means of checking the tide that is advancing the position of the Boer; but he has the conviction that unless something drastic is done, and done soon, in this direction, all the glorious hopes of a United *British* South Africa must die, and with it all expectation of compensation for the expenditure and sacrifice of life in the past.

For whilst the British population, tired and ruined, is gradually leaving the Transvaal, the Boer is daily growing stronger, and presently will be thriving and multiplying, and his grip on the country and its industries will gradually strengthen to the exclusion of the Uitlander. It is the Boer who best understands the handling of the native question; it is the Boer who is content to call the Transvaal his home; and it is the skill of the Boer that will successfully engage those economic conditions that are essential to the real success of the gold industry.

H. S. DENNY

BRITISH DIPLOMACY AND CANADA

III. OREGON AND SAN JUAN BOUNDARIES

ON June 15th, 1846, Richard Pakenham and James Buchanan concluded at Washington, on behalf of Great Britain and the United States, respectively, a treaty providing for the adjustment of differences "respecting the sovereignty and government of the territory on the northwest coast of America, lying to the westward of the Rocky or Stony Mountains." This treaty, commonly known as the Oregon Treaty, concluded a dispute that had brought two nations to the verge of war and adopted the 49th parallel as the boundary between the summit of the Rockies and the sea.

During the first half of the 19th century the name Oregon Territory was applied to the area lying to the west of the Rockies and between the parallels of 42° and 54° 40' on the south and north, respectively. It included an area of about 400,000 square miles, drained by the Columbia, Fraser, Skeena and other rivers and fronted on the Pacific from Russian America, now Alaska, on the north, to the Spanish territory of California on the south.

In discussing this question it is convenient to deal with it under several heads: Discoveries and Explorations in the disputed territory; Diplomatic history; and Discussion of contending claims.

DISCOVERIES AND EXPLORATIONS. In 1578, Drake (Br.) landed and took formal possession of "New Albion" at Drake Bay, near the site of the present city of San Francisco.

In 1603, Vizcaino (Sp.) entered San Francisco Bay and also explored the coast as far as lat. 42° N.

In 1741, the Bering and Chirikof (Russ.) expedition

explored the coast from the Aleutian Islands southward, to lat. 55° N.

In 1774, Perez (Sp.) reached 54° N., and in 1775 Heceta (Sp.) discovered the Columbia River, which he named Rio de San Roque.

In 1775, Bodega y Cuadra and Maurelle (Sp.) took formal possession near lat. 57° N. and explored the coast to lat. 58° N., thus overlapping the discoveries of Bering and Chirikof.

In 1776, Cook (Br.) was instructed to proceed "to the coast of New Albion" in lat. 45°, thence northward to lat. 65° N., where he was to begin his search for "a northeast or northwest passage from the Pacific Ocean into the Atlantic or the North Sea." He was also to take possession of "such countries as he might discover." The portion of America that he was instructed to examine had, as stated above, already been discovered by Spanish navigators, but, as the accounts of these expeditions had been suppressed by the Government of Spain, the British Government had no information respecting it except the imperfect accounts of Russian voyages. Cook sighted land near 44° N. and explored the coast and outer fringe of islands to Icy Cape in lat. 70° 29', where his progress was arrested by ice. His explorations were much more minute, more accurate and more detailed than any of those who had preceded him, and dispelled many erroneous ideas respecting the navigability of this portion of the ocean.

The results of Cook's voyage were published in 1784, and, as a result, associations of British and Russian merchants were formed to prosecute the fur trade on the northwest coast of America. In 1788, Meares, a half-pay lieutenant in the British navy, but trading under Portuguese colours, established a settlement at Nootka Sound. In the following year, a Spanish officer took possession of the buildings and lands and seized his two vessels. Great Britain immediately demanded reparation which Spain conceded by the Convention of the Escorial, commonly called the Nootka Convention. In the same year, Meares re-discovered the mouth of the

Columbia, but thinking it only an inlet, named it Deception Bay, and a cape at the entrance, Cape Disappointment.

In 1790, Vancouver was commissioned by the Government of Great Britain to determine the indemnity due under the Nootka Convention, to British claimants, and to make a detailed survey of the coasts of the mainland from lat. 38° N., northward. He carried out his instructions, examining every port and inlet between California and the peninsula of Alaska, with such thoroughness that no other survey of many of the fiords of British Columbia has been made since.

In 1792, Gray, the master of a United States trading vessel, entered the Deception Bay of Meares and discovered that it was the mouth of a large river which he named after his vessel, the Columbia. In the same year, Broughton, Vancouver's lieutenant, explored it for one hundred miles, eighty-five miles above Gray's "farthest."

In 1793, Mackenzie (Br.) travelling via the Peace and Tacouche Tesse (Fraser) rivers, reached the Pacific in lat. $52\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ N. "from Canada, by land."

In 1800, McGillivray (Br.) crossed the Rockies by the Athabaska pass and discovered the Blaeberry branch of the Columbia.

In 1805, Lewis and Clarke (U.S.) explored the headwaters of the Clarke branch of the Columbia and the lower portion of the main river.

In 1808, Simon Fraser (Br.) surveyed the river that bears his name, from Mackenzie's "farthest" to the mouth.

In 1809, Thompson (Br.) explored the Kootenay and Clarke branches of the Columbia and established posts on these rivers. In 1811, he completed his survey of the Columbia river from its source to its mouth.

In 1811, the Pacific Fur Co. of New York established a fur-trading post, Astoria, at the mouth of the Columbia, and two years later, fearing capture by a British cruiser, sold the "establishments, furs, and stock-in-hand" to the North West Co. The North West Co. had, in 1809-11, established posts on the upper portion of the river, and the purchase of

Astoria gave it a monopoly of the fur-trade of the region. In 1821, it was merged in the Hudson's Bay Co., and, up to the date of the influx of settlers from the United States, practically all the white people in the territory were connected with the company.

DIPLOMATIC HISTORY. The Nootka Convention, 1790, was a binding recognition by Spain, of the rights of Great Britain on the Pacific. It provided for (a) The restoration of all property seized by the Spaniards at Nootka and the payment of an indemnity for these seizures. (b) It recognized the right of British subjects to make settlements on the Pacific coast of North America, to fish, and to trade with the natives except within ten leagues of the coast occupied by Spain. (c) For mutual liberty to trade and make settlements on the coast north of the portion occupied by Spain (about lat. 42°). This was a formal recognition of the principle of "effective occupation," Spain conceding that, as she had not effectively occupied any part of the coast north of lat. 42° N., this area was open to settlement by either, and that discovery alone could not confer an exclusive title as against effective occupation. Though Spain had, under the treaty, an equal right to settle and trade, it is evident that, if either nation acquired a decided predominancy in any particular area, it would acquire the best of all titles—that of possession. This convention was, practically, an abandonment by Spain of her original claim, by virtue of the discovery of America and the bull of Pope Alexander VI., to the portion of the western hemisphere west of the Tordesillas "line of partition" and a concession that, even admitting priority of discovery, the right of prior occupation could not be regarded as subsisting forever to the exclusion of all other nations; also that the claims of states occupying contiguous territories are always to be taken into consideration.

In 1819, by the treaty of Florida Blanca, the King of Spain ceded "to the said United States, all his rights, claims, and pretensions, to any territories" north of the 42nd parallel.

At this stage it is necessary to take up the thread of the diplomatic negotiations respecting the boundary between Canada and the United States, from the Lake of the Woods westward. The negotiators of the Treaty of Paris, 1783, had before them Mitchell's map of North America, published in 1755, and grossly erroneous in its delineation of the topography of the country northwest of Lake Superior. On it, the Lake of the Woods was shown as discharging its waters by way of the Long River—and its expansion, Long Lake—into Lake Superior, instead of northward to Hudson Bay, by the Winnipeg and Nelson rivers. As they had agreed on the principle of following the St. Lawrence system to the head of Lake Superior, and, as this stream appeared to be much the largest river falling into the western portion of Lake Superior, the boundary was carried up it, instead of up the St. Louis which falls in at the present city of Duluth. The map was also in error inasmuch as it showed the source of the Mississippi west of Lake of the Woods instead of due south as we now know it to be.

The negotiators evidently agreed on a boundary which followed the present boundary to the northwest angle of the Lake of the Woods, thence to the source of the Mississippi, and thence down that river to lat. 31° N.: therefore, the boundary should have followed a right line from the "northwest angle" to the source of the Mississippi whether that line ran due west or due south. Prior to the Treaty of 1818—except in so far as the British Commissioners in 1806, and subsequently, may have impugned the claim by offering to accept the 49th parallel as the boundary—Great Britain had an unassailable claim to the whole of the Red River valley.

The Treaty of Utrecht, 1713, provided for the appointment of commissaries to determine "the limits which are to be fixed between the said Bay of Hudson and the places appertaining to the French." The British Commissaries demanded a line from Davis Bay, on the Atlantic coast, southwestward through the middle of Lake Mistassini to the 49th parallel and thence due west along the parallel. Contemporary

British geographers assumed that this line would be adopted, and indicated it on their maps, with a note that it was the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay Co.'s territories, though the papers in the Public Records offices in London and Paris prove conclusively that the Commissaries did not come to any agreement. The result of the indication of this erroneous boundary on the maps was a general belief that this line had actually been agreed upon.

Art. IV. of the Jay Treaty, 1794, provided for a joint survey of the Mississippi from one degree of latitude below the Falls of St. Anthony to its source, and that if the survey showed that the due west line from the Lake of the Woods would not intersect the Mississippi, the "two parties will thereupon proceed, by amicable negotiation, to regulate the boundary line in that quarter. . . . according to justice and mutual convenience and in conformity with the intent of the said Treaty."

Nothing was done with reference to the survey, and, in 1803, the Hawkesbury-King convention provided that the boundary should follow the shortest line between the "north-west angle" and the source of the Mississippi. This convention was not confirmed by the United States Senate as, only twelve days before it was signed, the Louisiana treaty with France conveyed to the United States the territory between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains. The attitude of the United States immediately changed, and the Senate refused to ratify it unless the article respecting the boundaries was struck out. Great Britain refused to accept the amendment, but, in 1806, the British Commissioners—doubtless acting under the erroneous belief respecting the Treaty of Utrecht—proposed the 49th parallel as the boundary between the Lake of the Woods and the Rocky Mountains. The United States Commissioners accepted this proposal, and it was embodied in the treaty as an additional article. This treaty, however, for an extrinsic reason, was not submitted to the United States Senate.

During the negotiations for the Treaty of Ghent, 1814,

the British plenipotentiaries again proposed the 49th parallel to the Rockies, but, as the proposal was coupled with a stipulation for free access to, and navigation of the Mississippi, the United States plenipotentiaries refused to incorporate these articles in the treaty.

In 1818, a convention respecting fisheries, boundary, etc., was concluded. East of the Rockies, it defined the boundary in accordance with the proposals of Great Britain in 1806 and in 1814. West of the Rockies, the United States proposed the 49th parallel as the boundary, but the British plenipotentiaries asserted that their rights, based principally on discovery, gave them a good title to an extensive area south of lat. 49°, but that they might accept the 49th parallel to the Columbia and thence down the Columbia to the mouth, as a fair settlement. Eventually, an article was agreed upon which provided that the disputed territory should be free and open for ten years, to the subjects of both nations, without prejudice to the claims of either nation.

In 1821, the Emperor of Russia issued an ukase excluding foreigners from trading or navigating within 100 miles of the coast of North America between lat. 51° N. and Bering Strait. Great Britain and the United States protested against this assertion of sovereignty by Russia, and, in 1824, by treaty with the United States, and, in 1825, by treaty with Great Britain, Russia renounced all claims to territory south of lat. 54° 40'—the southern limit of Bering's discoveries.

In 1826, negotiations between the United States and Great Britain were resumed. The United States negotiator contended for the 49th parallel to the Pacific, as a basis, having in view the possible exchange of the portion of Vancouver Island, south of lat. 49°, "for the whole or part of the upper branches of the Columbia River north of that parallel." Great Britain adhered to the 49th parallel and Columbia River line, but was willing to concede a detached area of about 6,000 square miles in the northwestern portion of the present State of Washington. The British proposals were rejected by Mr. Gallatin, though, at this date, the Hud-

son's Bay Co. controlled the whole territory; the Americans had no settlements of any kind and their government exercised no jurisdiction whatsoever west of the Rocky Mountains.

As an agreement could not be arrived at, the plenipotentiaries concluded, in 1827, a convention extending the joint occupation indefinitely but terminable by either party on twelve months' notice.

The British Commissioners annexed to the Protocol of December 16th, 1826, a statement of the British claim:—

“Over a large portion of that territory, namely, from the 42nd degree to the 49th degree of north latitude, the United States claim full and exclusive sovereignty.

“Great Britain claims no exclusive sovereignty over any portion of that territory. Her present claim, not in respect to any part but to the whole, is limited to a right of joint occupancy, in common with other states, leaving the right of exclusive dominion in abeyance. In other words, the pretensions of the United States tend to the ejection of all other nations, and, among the rest, of Great Britain, from all right of settlement in the district claimed by the United States.

“The pretensions of Great Britain, on the contrary, tend to the mere maintenance of her own rights, in resistance to the exclusive character of the pretensions of the United States. . . . Great Britain, on her part, offers to make the river [Columbia] the boundary. . . . To carry into effect this proposal, on our part, Great Britain would have to give up posts and settlements south of the Columbia. On the part of the United States, there could be no reciprocal withdrawing from actual occupation, as there is not, and never has been, a single American citizen settled north of the Columbia.

“The United States decline to accede to this proposal.

Such being the result of the recent negotiation, it only remains for Great Britain to maintain and uphold the qualified rights which she now possesses over the whole of the territory in question. These rights are recorded in the convention of Nootka. They embrace the right to navigate the waters

of those countries, the right to settle in and over any part of them, and the right freely to trade with the inhabitants and occupiers of the same."

In 1823, a select committee of Congress, appointed to enquire into the expediency of occupying the mouth of the Columbia, requested General Jesup to communicate his opinions. Though such action would have been a violation of the Treaty of 1818, General Jesup recommended the construction of forts at the mouth of the Columbia and at other points in the territory, to "protect" citizens of the United States during the time of joint occupancy and to enable the United States to "remove" the British subjects on the expiration of the term.

In 1828, a bill was reported in Congress, providing for the establishment of forts and garrisons "in any proper places between the parallels of 42° and 54° 40', and to extend the jurisdiction of the United States over the territory as regards the citizens of the Union."

In 1837, societies for emigration to Oregon were formed in various parts of the States. In 1843, the Linn bill was introduced into the United States Senate, providing for the erection of forts, for free grants of lands to settlers and for the extension of the jurisdiction of the United States to the disputed territory. In the British House of Commons, Lord Palmerston, leader of the Opposition, pronounced that the passage of the bill would be a declaration of war, but, after passing the Senate, the House of Representatives allowed the session to expire without further action.

Up to 1841, practically the whole population of the territory was British, but in 1842, the stream of immigration from the United States, that eventually decided the ownership of the area south of the 49th parallel, commenced—in 1842, 100; in 1843, 1000; in 1844, 1400; in 1845, 3000, and in 1846, 1500 to 1700, making a population of about 7500, of whom only 400 were British subjects. The immigration of 1843 was due to the confidence that the Linn bill would become law.

In 1843 a Provisional Government was formed, and with such a strongly pro-American population, its attitude was decidedly hostile to the Hudson's Bay Co.

In 1844, Great Britain proposed arbitration, and also in March, 1845, in the hope that the new (Polk) administration might reverse Tyler's decision. Both offers were declined by the United States. In October, as Pakenham had refused the proposal to adopt the 49th parallel, Polk declared in his inaugural message for "the whole of Oregon" to 54° 40'. In Jan., 1846, when the British Government was making extensive preparations for war, an intimation was given that the United States "would not reject an offer to settle upon the line of 49 degrees," and, in April, a formal proposal of this line was made by Great Britain. Before signing the treaty, Polk referred it to the Senate, which advised acceptance.

The gravamen of the treaty was as follows:—(a) The boundary followed the 49th parallel from the Rockies to the middle of the Strait of Georgia, and thence southward and westward through mid-channel between Vancouver Island and the mainland.

(b) Free navigation of the Columbia by the Hudson's Bay Co., "on the same footing as citizens of the United States."

(c) That the possessory rights of the Hudson's Bay Co. and of British subjects should be respected.

(d) The right of expropriation by the United States of the properties of the Hudson's Bay and Puget's Sound companies; the property to be transferred "at a proper valuation, to be agreed upon between the parties."

DISCUSSION OF CONTENDING CLAIMS.—The claims of Great Britain were based on:—

(1) Discovery by Drake, Cook, Vancouver, Thompson, Mackenzie, Fraser and others. (2) The Convention of the Escorial, commonly called the Nootka Sound Convention. (3) Occupation by the North West Co. and by their successors, the Hudson's Bay Co.

The claims of the United States were based on:

(1) As the successors in title of France, the United States having, in 1803, acquired by purchase the Louisiana territory. (2) On the "discovery" of the mouth of the Columbia by Capt. Gray in 1792, and on the explorations of Lewis and Clarke, in 1805-06, of the lower portion of the river and of some of its branches. (3) As the successors in title to Spain, that power having, in 1819, by the treaty of Florida, ceded all her claims to territory north of lat. 42° N. (4) Occupation by the Pacific Fur Co. of Astoria, 1811-1813, and its restoration by Great Britain, in 1818.

RESPECTING THE CLAIMS OF GREAT BRITAIN.—(a) So far as first discovery was concerned, Spain could claim priority; but mere discovery, unattended by permanent occupation and settlement, constitutes the lowest degree of title. In any event, the conflicting claims of Great Britain and Spain were adjusted by the Nootka Convention. (b) The Nootka Convention conceded the right of British subjects to settle and trade in the territory north of California, and was renewed and confirmed by the treaty of Madrid, 1814. Greenhow concedes that, "If the Nootka Convention were, as asserted by the (United States) Secretary of State, a definitive settlement of general principles of national law respecting navigation and fishery in the seas, and trade and settlement on the coasts, here mentioned, it would be difficult to resist the pretensions of the British plenipotentiaries with regard to the territories west of the Rocky Mountains as set forth in the statement presented by them to Mr. Gallatin in 1826." (c) In 1809-11 the North West Co. established posts on the upper portion of the Columbia, and, in the latter year, acquired by purchase, the Pacific Fur Co.'s post, Astoria. From the latter date till about 1841, the North West Co.—and its successors, the Hudson's Bay Co.—monopolized the whole trade of the region, maintaining posts on the Columbia and on its tributary streams, southward as well as northward of the main river.

RESPECTING THE UNITED STATES.—(a) The claims of

the United States as the successor in title to France and to Spain and in her own proper right are obviously incompatible. If the territory formed part of Louisiana, it could not be Spanish nor United States; on the other hand, if it were Spanish, it could not be French nor United States territory. This claim, instead of strengthening their case, nullified it. (b) As the successor in title to France under the Louisiana cession of 1803. The grant of Louisiana to De Crozat describes the province as "the country drained by the waters entering directly or indirectly into the Mississippi." As the whole of the Oregon territory drained into the Pacific, it could not have formed part of Louisiana. (c) By discovery by Gray and by Lewis and Clarke. To contend that the United States claim was strengthened by Gray's discovery that the supposed inlet of Meares was not a bay but was the embouchure of a large river, is futile. In addition, it was only the re-discovery of the Rio San Roque of Heceta. So far as strengthening the case of the United States is concerned, the explorations of Lewis and Clarke were a negligible quantity, at most. Their route followed the upper waters of a branch of the Columbia and the lower portion—below lat. 46°—of the main river only, whereas in 1807-09 Thompson, the geographer of the North West Co., explored and established posts on the Clarke and Kootenay from source to mouth. In addition, it is a somewhat novel theory and one not likely to receive general acceptance, that the re-discovery and partial exploration of a river emptying into the ocean on a coast that had previously been surveyed by formally commissioned vessels of other nations, carried a title to the area drained by the re-discovered river. Finally, any title to the Columbia that the United States acquired by discovery was in derogation of the title of Spain, and the discovery and settlement by Great Britain of the Fraser and upper Columbia rivers was equally fatal to any claims that the United States could make to these regions. (d) As the successor to Spain, the United States had some substantial basis for a claim—and the only basis—though after the abandonment of Nootka

by the Spaniards in 1795, no settlement was made by them north of San Francisco Bay. Here, too, there was a fairly well defined ground for an equitable settlement, inasmuch as the respective rights of Great Britain and Spain had been determined by the Nootka Sound Convention. (e) The post of the Pacific Fur Co., Astoria, was sold to the North West Co., not "taken from the other (United States) during the war." In 1815, the United States made a demand for the restoration of Fort George (Astoria) on the plea that it was covered by the first article of the Treaty of Ghent. The British Government at first demurred, but, later, that not even the shadow of a reflection might be cast upon its good faith, agreed to restore it. The British Minister at Washington, in accordance with his instructions, informed the Secretary of State that Great Britain did not admit the validity of the title of the United States, and asserted that the American settlement was considered as an encroachment on British territory. A protested concession of this nature could not add any material strength to the claim of the United States.

Summing up: The title of the United States was practically the title that she possessed as the successor of Spain, and, with the rights of Spain, she also succeeded to the obligations that Spain had incurred as one of the signatories of the Nootka Sound Convention. In addition, the title of Spain had been impugned by both Great Britain and the United States. On the whole, up to 1841, the title of the United States was much inferior to the title of Great Britain, and the repeated offers of the latter to concede the territory south and east of the Columbia, with its settlements and trading posts, was a liberal, even a generous one. The influx of settlers from the United States in 1841 and succeeding years, however, completely changed the relative status of the two nations and rendered advisable a settlement on the basis of a boundary that would give Great Britain a territory that was not likely to be invaded in the near future by immigrants from the United States. It must have been evident to the British Government that, with a

Provisional Government strongly pro-United States, it was only a question of time when action that would precipitate a conflict, would be taken; that government of the country by Great Britain would soon be impossible owing to the overwhelming predominancy of Americans; that there was the additional probability that they would invade what is now the Province of British Columbia, and we now know that if the joint occupancy had continued till the Fraser River gold "rush" of 1857-58, the whole territory might have been lost to the British Crown.

In the opinion of the writer, the settlement, under the then existing conditions, was a fair and reasonable one. It concluded differences that had, on several occasions, brought the two countries to the verge of war, but, of course, was not satisfactory to the extremists of either party in Oregon. It was not satisfactory to the pro-American party, inasmuch as they were not conceded the right to seize without compensation, the property of the Hudson's Bay and Puget's Sound companies; it was not satisfactory to the Hudson's Bay Co., inasmuch as they foresaw that, with an antagonistic territorial government and populace, the monopoly of the trade would soon pass from them. The attitude of Great Britain throughout was a dignified one, conceding that the United States had certain rights and prepared to offer a boundary that was equitable and even generous; willing to make concessions such as ports on Puget Sound and free access thereto, but, until overwhelmed by the immigration from the United States, standing by the Columbia River as an irreducible minimum. It must be borne in mind also, that, in this matter, the Government of Great Britain was, in great part, merely supporting the Hudson's Bay Co., and the action of McLaughlin, the virtual Governor of the great North West, in joining the Provisional Government, fatally compromised the Company. If the Hudson's Bay Co. was content to accept the existing government—so strongly pro-United States that annexation to, or absorption by, that country was only a question of time—is it surprising that British diplomats con-

cluded a Treaty that apparently conserved the interests of the Company so far as they themselves, apparently, desired them conserved?

Hardly was the ink on the Oregon Treaty dry, before differences arose respecting the identity of the "channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island." The British Government claimed the eastern channel, Rosario Strait, and the United States contended for the western channel, Canal de Haro.

In 1856, commissioners were appointed by Great Britain and the United States, with instructions to make surveys and mark the boundary as settled by the Oregon Treaty. They held six meetings but failed to arrive at an agreement, the British Commissioner contending that the wording of the treaty provided that (1) the channel should separate the mainland from Vancouver Island, (2) the boundary should go through it in a "southerly" direction, and (3) it should be navigable. He contended that while the Canal de Haro was navigable, all three requirements were satisfied by Rosario Strait only, and that the latter had been used by the Hudson's Bay Co. since 1825.

The United States Commissioner argued that the Canal de Haro was the widest and deepest channel; that it was the one usually shown on the maps in 1846, and that, as it washed the shore of Vancouver Island, it was the channel that "separated it" from the mainland. Contemporary correspondence and statements of an inconclusive nature were cited to prove the current understanding respecting the meaning of the doubtful clause.

In rebuttal, the British Commissioner quoted certain United States maps in support of his contention. The United States Commissioner, in reply, impugned the accuracy of one map and the official character of another and quoted a British map in support of his view.

The British Commissioner then offered, without prejudice, a compromise line which would give San Juan Island to Great Britain, and the other islands, Orcas, Lopez, etc.,

to the United States. Though this offer would have conceded two-thirds of the area, the United States Commissioner refused to entertain it.

In 1859, an officer of the Hudson's Bay Co. on San Juan Island threatened to arrest and take to Victoria for trial, a settler charged with shooting one of the company's pigs. United States troops were landed on the island; a redoubt was constructed, and, but for the forbearance of Admiral Baynes, war would have been precipitated by General Harney and some of his "fire-eating" officers. General Scott, however, concluded an arrangement for the joint military occupation of the island.

In 1869 a convention was concluded providing for arbitration by the President of Switzerland, but the Senate failed to take any action. In 1871, an attempt was made to settle the question by the Joint High Commission, but without success, the American Commissioners declining the British offer of the compromise line. By Arts. XXXIV to XLII of the Treaty of Washington, the respective claims were submitted to the "arbitration and award of His Majesty the Emperor of Germany." In 1872, the arbitrator rendered an award in favour of the United States contention for Haro Strait.

The arguments and the evidence adduced by the contending parties show that:—The evidence adduced by both sides was of an inconclusive nature and, in general, consisted of *ex parte* interpretations of discussions and correspondence; the Oregon Treaty was concluded hastily, both nations fearing that actions of its subjects would precipitate a conflict; and there is no reason to believe that the negotiators intended the boundary to be drawn elsewhere than as stated in the treaty, viz., "the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island."

An examination of the chart shows that the mid-channel line follows approximately the compromise line offered by the British Commissioners, except that it is slightly more favourable as regards some of the small islands.

In the portion of the territory that fell to the United States in 1846, the Hudson's Bay Co. had thirteen establishments, and the Puget's Sound Agricultural Co.—an accessory organization—two. After the passage of the act establishing the territory of Oregon the companies found their position increasingly precarious. Harassed by peculiar constructions of the revenue laws; their cattle shot by travellers, as game; the lands surrounding the H. B. Co.'s forts, and the Puget's Sound Co.'s farms covered by American squatters on the ground that their possessory rights would expire with their charter; the right to navigate the Columbia rendered valueless by the interpretation that the words "on the same footing as citizens of the United States" permitted the levying of customs dues on merchandise imported for trade—the companies finally offered to dispose of their interests to the United States.

In 1863, a treaty for the final settlement of their claims was signed at Washington, and, in 1871, the Commission appointed under the treaty awarded the Hudson's Bay Co. \$450,000.00 and the Puget's Sound Agricultural Co. \$200,000 "as the adequate money consideration for the transfer to the United States of America" of all their possessory rights and claims.

JAMES WHITE.

TARIFFS, BOUNTIES, AND THE FARMER

“WE denounce the principle of Protection as radically unsound and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labours.” So ran one of the statements in the Liberal Platform adopted at the Ottawa Convention in 1893; and Sir Richard Cartwright re-affirmed the position thus taken when he asserted in 1894, “Our policy is death to Protection.”

In September, 1905, at the banquet given in Quebec during the annual convention of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the leader of the Liberal Government, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, uttered these words: “It is your mission, it is my mission also, that our tariff shall make it possible that every shoe worn in these provinces shall be a Canadian shoe, that every yard of cloth shall be made in Canada, and so on.” Such a statement of ultra-protectionism from the wearer of the Cobden Medal might either be attributed to the conviviality of the occasion, or be viewed as a playful touch of sarcasm, were it not for the important fact that the tariff policy of the Laurier Administration has been identical with that of its Conservative predecessors. In point of fact, while the Conservatives reduced the rate on total imports, dutiable and free, from 20.5 per cent. to 17.13 per cent. between 1889 and 1896, the Liberals only reduced the rate from 17.13 per cent. to 16.33 per cent. in the ten years 1896-1906.

In these ten years two revisions of the tariff have taken place, neither of them in any material way altering the old “National Policy.” The general rate has remained much the same, and the same inequalities, running all the way from 0 to 50 per cent., are apparent. After the first revision

the rate on dutiable imports during the three years 1903-1906 was 27.5 per cent., and the average rate on articles used chiefly by farmers was about 30 per cent. The second revision of November, 1906, left the duties on household necessities and clothing about the same as before, if anything slightly higher, but made a reduction of some 3 per cent. on agricultural implements. It is quite true that, under the Laurier Administration, there has been a small decrease in the general rate; but there has been a countervailing expansion and extension of the Bounty System, the enacting of an anti-dumping clause, and so forth; so that, taking everything into consideration, it is fair to say that the Liberal Government has fully and frankly repudiated the tariff principles it advocated while in opposition prior to 1896, and upon which, among other things, it appealed to the country.

One looks, naturally, for some explanation of this change of front. Four, and, I think, only four, possibilities suggest themselves.

1. The present Government was insincere in its declarations of 1893.

2. It underwent genuine conversion to Protection upon its accession to power.

3. It submitted to a strong popular feeling in favour of Protection, discovered after 1896.

4. It played into the hands of the corporations and "manufacturing interests," in return for large contributions to campaign, or other funds; deliberately choosing to stand in with a well-organized minority rather than to serve the people as a whole.

Now, respecting the sincerity of the Liberal Party's declarations of 1893, or the genuineness of its leaders' conversion to Protection, one can have no positive knowledge; nor can one do more than make some shrewd guesses, with the help of the Civil Service Commission's Report, as to how far certain interests have been corruptly granted special favours. It is, however, quite possible to determine ap-

proximately the general feeling in the country, and to examine the whole system of tariffs and bounties on its own merits.

Though possible to determine popular opinion *approximately*, it is not easy to gauge it with accuracy. Most people have no opinions that they could assign reasons for; and many who do think for themselves never give publicity to their views. Then, too, the masses are in the main unorganized, and thus find it difficult to give expression to those views which may exist. Moreover, the voting at election time gives little indication of what the voter thinks about any particular question. It is one of the most unfortunate features of our present system of Government by Party that a number of distinct issues are blended in each campaign. Two bills of fare, as it were, are presented for the elector's consideration, in each of which he finds something to his taste, and a good deal that he dislikes. He is not permitted to discriminate: he must take one or other of the political *menus*, or none at all. Recognizing this fact, and also making due allowance for traditional party affiliations and the personal characters of the candidates in any constituency, it will be readily seen that the popular vote, under present conditions, is no sufficient indication of popular opinion. And, when we come to consider the tariff, the question is still further complicated by the fact that, since 1896, both parties have occupied practically the same position. Therefore, one can attach no significance to the party vote in respect to this question. Were it possible to disentangle the issues and submit them separately, something might be learned as to the state of public opinion; but, since this has not yet been made possible, we have to depend upon other methods of ascertaining the point of view of the masses.

When any public question, upon which concerted action is possible, sufficiently and similarly interests a number of people, these usually form an organization to clarify, disseminate, and enforce their views; and when no organization exists, we are justified in concluding that public opinion is too indecisive, vague, or heterogeneous for spontaneous

organization. It is, then, to independent popular organizations that we must look for the expression of independent popular opinion. In Canada the agricultural class constitutes the majority of our people; the urban artisan, factory-hand and labourer form another fairly large and distinct portion; and we have in addition a relatively small number of professional men, teachers, students, and so forth. The two numerically greatest classes have independent organizations—various farmers' associations and various trades unions. These organizations have expressed their views regarding tariffs and bounties, and it has yet to be shown why these expressions should not be taken as being representative of average popular opinion. Awaiting proof to the contrary, I assume that these opinions are sufficiently representative, and herewith quote in brief:—

“ We therefore ask, in the coming revision of the tariff, that the protective principle be wholly eliminated; that the principle of tariff for revenue only, and that revenue based on an honest and economical expenditure of the public funds, be adopted; and, as proof of our sincerity, we will, if this position is adopted by the Government, gladly assent to the entire abolition of the whole list of duties on agricultural imports.”

Such is the concluding paragraph of the memorial presented to the Government in November, 1906, by the Dominion Grange, the Farmers' Association of Ontario, and the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association. It speaks for itself, but does not stand alone. The position there taken was maintained by argument and evidence wherever general farmers gave testimony before the Tariff Commission in its peregrinations of 1905–1906. It was affirmed by resolutions prior to 1906, and has been re-affirmed by resolutions passed during the year 1907.

Scarcely less emphatic was the position taken by representatives of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, claiming to speak for 200,000 organized workmen, before the Tariff Commission in November, 1905. Space forbids quoting

at length, but the following extract from one of the resolutions passed by the Congress will give the point of view of organized labour: "That, while free trade in labour is held by employers to be necessary for the promotion of their interests, we hold that free trade in the products of labour is equally logical and necessary for our well-being."

The influence of these views has been considerable, for, if one can judge from a number of significant events and utterances in 1904 and 1905, the Government contemplated large concessions to ultra-protectionists in the then coming tariff revision. Of this threatened movement Mr. Edward Porritt says: "The scheme which Mr. Fielding had so carefully elaborated in 1904, the scheme which had raised such exhilarating expectations among the protected manufacturers and the ultra-protectionist politicians at Ottawa, was quietly abandoned by the Government some time between the session of the Tariff Commission at Toronto on November 14th, 1905, and the introduction of the new tariff on November 29th, 1906 . . . It was killed by the steadfast and well organized opposition of the Dominion Grange, the Ontario Farmers' Association, and the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association."

If, then, it has been shown that Canadian popular opinion is strongly anti-protectionist, there remains the still further very important question to consider, namely: Is this opinion right or wrong, justifiable or unjustifiable? Popular opinion is often notoriously foolish and baseless, and no one should assume that a certain view is right because it is wide-spread. Particularly is this the case in somewhat complicated economic questions concerning which, unfortunately, the average man has made little serious study, and about which he has been sadly misled by demagogues. It is, therefore, advisable to examine the Tariff and Bounty questions on their own merits.

The word "Tariff," it seems, is derived from "Tarifa," the name of a place near Gibraltar. This spot was formerly infested with pirates who were in the habit of exacting toll

from passing ships by relieving them of part of their cargoes. The methods of these marauders, it seems, have been very suggestive to authorities and governments in need of funds, for the tariff system has been largely defended as a means of providing a revenue; and, when tax-payers are disposed to be refractory, this special method avoids the unpleasantness of the heated protests which often attend direct collections. The chief advantage, I take it, of a "tariff for revenue" lies in this very fact that unwilling tax-payers are forced to disgorge in every purchase of imported goods; and, in a non-democratic community, this is no small consideration. In the past taxation has usually been regarded by the contributors thereto as a disagreeable burden, imposed by "the powers that be," and exacted under heavy penalties; and, in a country such as Russia, this view is still prevalent, and in no small degree justifiable. But, if we consider the case of our Canadian municipalities, taxation must be viewed in a new light. Here it is the individual contribution to the social fund, used for the maintenance of roads and bridges, schools, lighting, water, and transportation services, and other activities which must necessarily be conducted in a co-operative way. There should be no opposition to taxation of this kind, and, among intelligent citizens, there is none. Consequently, when taxation is viewed in its relation to democratic institutions, one encounters no such difficulties in collecting as are met with under a system of government in which the people do not have a voice. Indirect taxes in general, then, and a tariff for revenue in particular, imply more or less of an antagonism between Government and People; and so soon as community or identity of interest becomes recognized, are unnecessary. No one suggests changing our direct municipal tax into an indirect one, for the simple reason that people are generally willing to contribute their share, and take an intelligent interest in the expenditure thereof. Yet provincial and federal politicians are wont to frighten the masses by the very mention of "direct taxation." There is no just ground for this apprehension which is a relic of

past ages; rather are there abundant and weighty reasons why direct taxation should prevail in our larger political organizations just as it does in our smaller ones. There is no question in my mind that a direct tax on real estate is infinitely preferable to the indirect tariff tax, providing other methods of securing funds, such as the management of state forests, exploitation of Crown lands, royalties on minerals, etc., be not adequate for the purpose. A number of reasons which go to sustain this view may be given.

1. The army of collectors, spies and customs officials could be dispensed with, and the Federal or Provincial taxes collected in connexion with our municipal system. A great saving could be effected in this way, and many people thus freed for intrinsically productive enterprises.

2. Revenue from a tariff tax is supplied in proportion to what a man uses, not in proportion to his property. Such incidence of taxation is out of harmony with that underlying our municipal system, and, if retained, surely ought to be justified.

3. A serious objection to the tariff tax lies in the fact that the tax-payer as a rule does not know how much he is paying. He is thus apt to suffer from extortion at the hands of unscrupulous authorities, and also gives little attention to methods of expending funds to which he is scarcely conscious of contributing.

4. The tariff tax is unusually difficult to collect along international boundaries: witness the prevalence of smuggling along the Western frontier and along the St. Lawrence River. One must not overlook, too, the disrespect for the law developed by these continual and open violations of it.

5. For every dollar which is paid by the consumer in duties on imported goods, and which finds its way into the public treasury, there are usually several dollars which the consumer must pay in enhanced prices on domestic commodities, and which find their way into the pockets of the protected parties; for, *wherever actual competition is possible*, the domestic producer can overcharge the consumer to the

extent of the duty. We shall see later how this discriminates against the Canadian farmer.

These objections to an indirect tariff tax are sustained by the practice in Switzerland, where, perhaps, democracy has developed more completely than elsewhere. There, during the last half century, indirect taxes have been largely replaced by direct taxes on real estate, incomes, and inheritances. But, however this may be, Canada has adopted the tariff for Federal revenue purposes, and it will be some time before a change can be effected. The people generally will have to disabuse their minds of absurd objections to direct taxation and obtain a point of view more consonant with democratic institutions. Until then a tariff for revenue may be a "necessary evil."

Tariffs for "protecting home industry," or, in short, "Protection," may be considered from various points of view, which for present purposes may be classed under two headings, (1) Economic Theory and (2) Practical application to Canadian life.

First, however, before abandoning the revenue point of view, one should note that tariffs cannot be used primarily for both purposes, protection and taxation. Protection is successful in so far as it prevents importation and secures the home market for the home manufacturer; while the revenue from customs duties is jointly proportional to the rate of duty and the quantity of goods imported. If the rates are so high as to be prohibitive, importation ceases and the revenue disappears. Thus it is that Protection in the highest degree is incompatible with revenue production; and in practice there is a compromise between the demands of the public treasury and the demands of the protected interests.

Now to consider the Theory of Protection: Protectionists are fond of viewing their doctrine wholly in its relation to producers of commodities; and they do not seem to remember that the financial interests of producer and consumer are antagonistic. It is obvious that an overcharge by the producer must be paid by the consumer, and that any such

transaction is essentially unjust. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not socially beneficial: on the contrary it is usually baneful.

Exchange arose, of course, in the first place, by reason of division of labour, differentiation of industrial functions, and diversity of natural opportunities. We Canadians can grow wheat, but we cannot grow bananas; consequently we exchange wheat for bananas with our Southern neighbours. Moreover, here one man makes clothing while another grows food, and it is found mutually advantageous to exchange one commodity for another. Recognizing the general social advantage arising from these exchanges, man has made every effort to overcome natural barriers, to improve means of communication, and to facilitate transportation; and it strikes the ordinary intelligence as rather absurd to subsidise steamship lines across the Atlantic and make every effort to reduce ocean freight rates while an import tax greater than all natural obstacles is levied for the express purpose of keeping out the commodities which our other policies make easy of access. The protected interests may be able to explain this apparent inconsistency, or tell us why trade between Ontario and Quebec should be more profitable than trade between Ontario and Michigan. They may be able to explain why it would not be as profitable to protect the city of Hamilton against Toronto's competition as against Buffalo's, or how the game of robbing Peter to pay Paul is going to make us a great nation. Failing these explanations would they not be disposed to welcome a blockading fleet as a more consistent and effective means of securing the home market than a tariff?

We have been told also that we are being "deluged with cheap goods." This is surely a very satisfactory condition from the ordinary business standpoint of the man who likes "to get the worth of his money." Perhaps, indeed, those who look with alarm on this inundation of good things do themselves like to buy their raw material where they can do so most cheaply. In fact it is rumoured that the very people who dislike so much to see American tools, machines, and

vehicles on the Canadian market, do actually wish to be "deluged" with cheap coal from the mines of Pennsylvania and cheap labour from Europe. It does not need extraordinary mental acumen to realize that the farmer likes to be "deluged" with cheap agricultural implements just as much as the manufacturer likes to be "deluged" with cheap coal; that, in fact, we *desire* cheap foreign goods even more than the producers of these commodities desire that we shall have them. The natural way to avoid the deluge is to decline to buy; and the Canadian manufacturers have it in their power to so combine superior quality with moderate price that Canadian consumers will not want to buy abroad, because they can get better satisfaction at home. In "Past and Present," Carlyle tells the story of a London hatter who built a seven foot hat and had it hauled about the streets as an advertisement; and he remarks that the hatter would have been better employed had he expended his ingenuity in improving the quality or reducing the cost of his hats. The efforts which the Canadian manufacturers make to avoid competition might be more profitably spent in successfully meeting competition. They would thus dam the foreign flood, and also gain strength, courage, and resourcefulness in the process.

Protectionist doctrines find some support in the *Balance of Trade* theory. According to this view a nation is commercially prosperous if its exports, measured in money, exceed its imports. This notion, of course, finds its origin in the consideration of a man who sells his wares and pockets the money, and in this condition is said to be "rich." But he is only *potentially* rich, and does not realise his richness until he has paid out his money for commodities which he wisely consumes; until, in fact, he has imported as much as he has exported. Indeed there would be no incentive to export unless a man (or a community) anticipated greater advantage—which advantage finds approximate measurement in money—in future importations. So that, in fact, it is the importer who is "richer" than the exporter, not *vice versa*. Nations really practise barter, through the in-

tervention of money, and there must therefore be an approximate equivalence of exports and imports, provided the measurements are taken over a fairly long period of time. This statement, of course, relates only to typical commercial transactions, and does not take cognizance of international loans, interest payments, and so forth. Leaving these to be dealt with by themselves, let us take the case of a ship going from Canada to England with, say, wheat, butter, bacon, and cheese, and returning with a cargo of cutlery and clothing. *Essentially* there has been an exchange of one cargo for the other, and from our point of view the return cargo is worth more than the outgoing. Hence, as we measure our estimates of the values of things in money, it would not be strange if the incoming cargo had a higher money estimate placed upon it than was placed upon the outgoing cargo. What, then, becomes of the Balance of Trade theory in such a case? It is absurd, and its absurdity becomes still more apparent when we consider a yet untried method of protecting home industry, namely, that of dumping return cargoes into the sea or burning them up before they reach international boundaries. This would be an excellent way of securing the home market for the home manufacturer, and would make the greatest possible "favourable" balance of trade. Or, to avoid unnecessary effort, let return cargoes be merely sand-ballast and money; then, according to current doctrines, we should be in an exceedingly prosperous condition. Theoretical considerations are abundantly confirmed by facts. England, for example, has had for years an "unfavourable" balance of trade, and yet it does not appear that she is on the verge of bankruptcy. In fact the excess of imports over exports probably represents the tribute which she exacts from nations borrowing her capital. "Favourable" or "unfavourable" balances of trade mean nothing without further examination of conditions.

There is another method of curtailing importation which might commend itself to protectionists, namely, the levying of an export duty. Its immediate effect, in preventing the

producer from disposing of a surplus abroad, would, doubtless be somewhat disagreeable and wasteful; but it can be guaranteed to be an effectual remedy against the disloyalty of not patronizing home industry. Forbidden to sell anything abroad we should soon be unable to buy anything outside our own confines. Moreover, this scheme would greatly diminish transportation charges, and tend to cultivate a Chinese sense of national greatness and solidarity. For those who cry, "Canada for Canadians," it would seem to possess sufficient merit to warrant sympathetic study. Failing thus to find a satisfactory method of attaining the eminence of "splendid isolation," protectionists would do well to remember that the finished product of one manufacturer is the raw material of another, and that therefore they cannot *all* be protected.

The fact is that *equal* protection to *all* Canadian industries would be no protection at all. The manufacturer of agricultural implements has, let us say, 20 per cent. protection against his Yankee competitor. What does this advantage him if he has to pay 20 per cent. more for his labour and his raw material? He would not deny that his workmen are entitled to 20 per cent. protection in the labour market, especially as they have to pay 20 per cent. more for their food, assuming that the farmer is similarly protected. The thing works in a circle, and the addition of *equal* protective duties or bounties *equally* changes the positions of all the points in the circle. So devised the system is fair enough, but foolish; and its folly may be more easily seen if we imagine uniform bounties granted on all productive industry. The people then pay into the public treasury and forthwith draw from it in proportion to their contributions. There are at present bounties paid on iron smelted in Canada, further bounties on steel ingots made from this iron, still more on rods made from the ingots, and it is proposed to subsidise the building of steel ships. Then we shall have to subsidise the carrying of wheat in these ships, and after that the growing of the wheat, then again the manufacture of that wheat into the

flour and bread which go to feed the workmen in the steel mills. Such a scheme of all round subventions might be fair, but it would be foolish, and I do not believe that the most extreme protectionists would conscientiously recommend it.

The fact is that *in practice* it is impossible to protect everyone alike; and it is, therefore, the inevitable opportunity for unfair discrimination that gives protectionism its strength. It is the hope of getting something earned by another that propels the whole movement, however deeply concealed beneath manifold sophistries this hope may be. Mr. R. L. Borden talks of "adequate protection to all Canadian industries," and is apparently ignorant of the fact that no industry is clamoring for that kind of protection, because it would not do it any good if it did get it. In fact the whole situation shows nothing but a struggle for special privileges, though it is publicly represented as a patriotic movement. But patriotism does not flourish by parasitic methods, and quite otherwise shall Canada become a great nation.

Finally, let it be remembered that Free Trade has no special advocates because it confers no special favours; while Protection, waxing fat at the public expense, can afford, and does afford, to pay handsomely for skilled dialectic support.

But it is customary for protectionists to admit the possibility of Free Trade being the ideal policy, of its being "all right in theory." Still they maintain that under actual present conditions in Canada we must maintain a tariff wall for self-defence. In the words of one of Canada's large protectionist manufacturers: "With the theory of Free Trade in the abstract we have nothing to do. Whether or not it would be a good thing if universally adopted must be left to newspapers and debating societies to decide. Our duty is to face conditions as we find them, to make the most of our opportunities, to keep Canada for the Canadians, and to build up our country." But in point of fact England does not

raise a tariff wall against our products, and therefore in her case the plea of "self-defence" fails. Moreover, with reference to the United States, the propriety of the point of view of the above quotation is to be questioned. We must regard the "ought" as well as the "is," and try to make our facts square with right principles; for the present "ought" is the future or ultimate "is," and in the pursuit of the ideal, in politics as elsewhere, is to be found the key to success.

But suppose we do admit the propriety of the point of view, acknowledge that there is no abstract justice or right, and accept the implied challenge. We shall do no more than did the farmers who testified before the Tariff Commission in 1905. They did not argue from abstract theories, but from present facts and conditions. The farmer desires to "face conditions as he finds them, to make the most of his opportunities, and to build up his country;" and, if he differs from the manufacturer in his view of how this ought to be done, his opinions and reasons are surely entitled to consideration.

On November 13th, 1905, the Tariff Commission was met in Toronto by representatives of the Farmers' Association and Dominion Grange, who presented in substance the following argument:

1. The tariff cannot protect the general farmer because Canada has a large agricultural surplus to export; and, so long as this is so, just so long will protection to agriculture be impossible. In 1904 over 85 million dollars worth of certain agricultural products was exported, while only somewhat over two millions of the same was imported. These figures include imports and exports of hogs, cattle, sheep, butter, cheese, and grain, the main products of the general farmer, beside which others such as fruit, garden truck and the like, are very inconsiderable indeed.

2. The above contention is amply sustained by the fact that prices for agricultural products in the United States, practically our only competitor in that line, are generally higher than they are in Canada; a fact easily verified by

comparison of market prices, and implied in the fact that we import practically no agricultural products from the United States.

3. The benefit which the farmer is supposed to get from the creation or development of a "home market" is inappreciable. The increase of our agricultural exports from ten millions in 1879 to 120 millions in 1907, under a "protective" regime indicates how shallow is the pretence of a "home market." Moreover, it has yet to be proven that a home market would not have developed equally as well, if not better, under a different policy. Nobody denies the desirability of a home market, but the manufacturer should remember that, as the farmer benefits by nearness to a manufacturing centre, the manufacturer likewise benefits by *his* nearness to *his* customers. The question of proximity of producer and consumer, often used by protectionists to support their claims, has, in reality, nothing to do with tariffs or Protection. It is an economic condition which has exactly the same significance under Free Trade as under Protection, and affects one industry as much as another. But, even supposing Protection to bring producer and consumer nearer one another, the loss of national wealth caused by diverting labour from profitable into unprofitable channels is likely to more than neutralise any direct gain due to proximity.

4. The tariff, while it cannot give the Canadian farmer any protection, does enhance the prices he has to pay for clothing, tools, vehicles, agricultural implements, stoves, and so forth. This statement is proven by the claim of most Canadian manufacturers that they cannot compete without protection, *i.e.*, would have to reduce prices if left unprotected; and by the fact that we import from the United States and Great Britain large quantities of the above commodities *and pay the duty*.

5. Manufacturers are doing well. Their output increased from \$481,000,000 in 1901 to \$715,000,000 in 1905; and Professor Shortt says that Canadian manufacturers "have of late years increased in wealth more rapidly than any other

considerable element in the country. Why men so prosperous and so abundantly justified in their self-confident ability should, when tariff questions are being discussed, so unblushingly claim to be on the high road to ruin, and so ostentatiously parade their apprehension at the very mention of a foreign competitor, even when muzzled by a very substantial tariff backed by a highly efficient anti-dumping device, baffles all ordinary logic."

6. If any discrimination is allowable it should be in favour of the farmer, for, according to the 1901 census, there are 14,650 factories, employing 344,000 persons, with an investment of \$477,000,000, while there are 471,833 farms with an investment of \$1,787,000,000. Agriculture is still the great industry of Canada, and should suffer no unnecessary disabilities. But it does so suffer, and this discrimination against agriculture is responsible in a large measure for the drift of our young people cityward, for the unhealthy stimulus given to urban industries, for the scarcity of labour in the rural districts, and for the presence of a host of undesirable immigrants who will not work on the land if they can help it.

The above argument, varied by different speakers, and based, not on theory, but on actual conditions, was presented before the Tariff Commission by deputations of farmers at various places all over Canada where the Commission held sessions. The attitude of the average Canadian farmer may be aptly summarised in the concluding words of the President of the Farmers' Association at the Toronto Sitting of the Commission: "We wish the manufacturers God Speed in their race for prosperity, provided the prosperity secured is due to their own efforts; but we emphatically protest against any movement looking towards empowering them to take toll of our earnings by means of legislation."

There are some other arguments advanced by protectionists that require consideration. It is said that infant industries cannot compete against gigantic foreign rivals, and require to be "nursed." But this argument is largely

fallacious, because, where conditions are suitable, business foresight and enterprise will see ultimate success and invest sooner or later,—at all events soon enough. The readiness with which Canadian capitalists invest in unsubsidised enterprises elsewhere is calculated to make us suspect their motives when they plead infantile weakness in our midst. But let it be granted that infant industries require to be “nursed,” either by bounties or tariffs. The question remains to be asked: When did any “infant” ever attain maturity and voluntarily relinquish its hold on the bottle? We hear much of unfair foreign competition, but do not hear sufficiently of unfair domestic tyranny. Some years ago German refined sugar was sold to domestic consumers for over 6 cents a pound while the same article was laid on the London market at 4 cents a pound. This was the patriotism of tariff-protected and bounty-fed German sugar manufacturers; and of somewhat similar quality is the patriotism of the Canadian manufacturer who boasts of his love for the Mother Country and yet puts her wares under the disability of a long ocean voyage and thirty odd per cent. import duty, or who boasts of his love for his native land and yet charges his fellow-countrymen more than he does foreigners. The policy of feeding infant industries may possibly be defended in theory, but in practice it works out badly, and, in order to meet protectionists on ground of their own choosing, we will deal with some specific cases.

One might judge Hamilton, Ontario, a very unsuitable place for iron smelting. Nevertheless, we find there the Hamilton Steel and Iron Co., which has so prospered that its Capital Stock has been lately increased from \$1,500,000 to \$5,000,000 by a stroke of the pen. How comes this extraordinary prosperity, since ore and coal have to be hauled immense distances? The public records tell the tale. In 1906 the bounties alone, irrespective of tariff advantages, amounted to 14 per cent. on the capital stock. During the five years 1900-1904 bounties received by the four Ontario Iron works (Deseronto, Algoma, Midland, and Hamilton)

totalled \$1,347,139.31, while their whole wage bill only amounted to \$1,705,986. Manitoba farmers might almost engage in orange culture under such conditions.

Quite differently situated from the Hamilton Steel and Iron Co. is the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., of Sydney. Its plant is located almost on top of a coal bed. Limestone is equally near, while the most distant ore can be brought from the mines in 18 hours. Experts testify that the facilities for iron smelting are fully as good as those in Pittsburg. According to one authority the labour cost at Pittsburg is as follows:—

For producing pig iron.....	\$1 per ton.
To convert iron into steel.....	\$3 to \$3.50 per ton.
For rolling ingots into rails.....	\$2 per ton.

And yet the Dominion Government pays a bounty of \$2.10 per ton on pig iron, \$1.65 per ton on the manufacture of steel ingots, and gives a tariff protection of \$7.00 per ton on steel rails.

Here, then, are two of the infants we are rearing, and here are the rations they are getting. And yet Mr. Fielding has extended the period of bounty paying for another four years from January 1st, 1907, in spite of enormous counter petitions from farmers.

Moreover, Dr. Haanel's recent investigations into the electric smelting of iron show how great are the natural advantages of Canada for the profitable manufacture of iron and steel without subsidising. With abundance of water power amongst vast deposits of iron ore no special privileges are necessary. But the protected interests are not satisfied with even such wonderful prospects. They will run no risks. Their point of view is well stated by one of their number thus: "Capitalists as a class are conservative investors. They hesitate to put their money into problematical enterprises. They have a habit of insisting on proof that their enterprises are likely to thrive, and one feature of such proof must be the assurance of a profitable market for the goods they expect to produce. Now, the possible markets

are restricted to two—the home and the foreign. The latter is uncertain and the former can only be made certain by adopting measures of protection.” One could not wish for a more candid admission that the manufacturer wants a monopoly of the home market.

Canadian agriculture forms a strong contrast to these protected and bounty-fed industries, for, when it found the American market inaccessible through the adoption of the McKinley and Dingley tariffs, and agricultural exports to the United States dwindling from 18 millions in 1888 to 5 millions in 1894, it did not whine for public aid, but, in a spirit of sturdy self-reliance, turned its attention to other markets and to home economies, and is to-day, despite the set-back then received, more prosperous than before. The Canadian farmer has many risks to run. His business is problematical. He cannot guarantee a handsome dividend, and yet, with few exceptions, he is ashamed to seek public aid. He faces the world's competition and accepts the consequences, trusting that strength of arm and mind, skill and economy in management, and patient industry, will enable him to meet even the competition of cheap Oriental labour in the world's great markets. But the manufacturers will meet neither this competition nor that of the highly organized industries in the United States. Ostensibly they are tenderly solicitous as to how the standard of living among their employees will fall if such competition exists. But who is chiefly responsible for the presence in all our larger cities of great numbers of “foreign paupers” whose “cheap labour” is welcomed with joy? The “cheap labour,” against whose competition the manufacturer inveighs, is already here, and is being used to diminish the cost of production at the same time that continuous pressure is exerted to maintain high prices by means of protective tariffs. How is this “cheap labour” affecting the quality of our national life? Such a question the manufacturers would do well to answer. Meanwhile we are reminded of their pet phrase, “Canada for Canadians.”

"Protect Home Industry" is a good example of insincerity, and the sugar industry will afford abundant illustration. Between 1883 and 1902 the price of raw sugar in Java declined from \$4.28 to \$1.63 per 100 lbs, and the production increased three-fold. The income per acre at the latter price was about \$130. In Cuba, in the Philippines, and in Hawai, raw cane sugar can be produced for about \$1.50 per 100 pounds by modern improved methods. On the other hand refined beet sugar at \$4.00 per 100 pounds averaged \$75 per acre in the United States during the years 1891-1904. The production of sugar per acre in Java and Hawai is more than double the production in the main beet growing countries of Europe. In view of these facts, or ignorant of them, some seven years ago a successful attempt was made by certain capitalists to establish the sugar-beet industry in Ontario. A bounty on home-made sugar was provided for, machinery used in the industry was put on the free list, the Ontario Department of Agriculture was used to "educate" the farmers, and four beet sugar factories were built in 1902. Today there remain two of these factories struggling to make ends meet with refined sugar selling at \$5.00 or more per 100 pounds. At the time of writing granulated sugar is selling by retail for nearly \$6.00 per 100 pounds. Yet, not even with bounties, free machinery, municipal bonuses, and a high protective tariff have the Ontario beet sugar factories been able to stand alone. Moreover, not only are the Canadian people taxed heavily for all the sugar they use, but the industry of canning fruit for export has been prevented from developing. With cheaper sugar great quantities of fruit which now goes to waste could be put up in an imperishable form, and a very useful and highly profitable industry established in our fruit growing centres.

Look where one will, the policy of Protection, whether by tariffs or bounties, is economically and commercially disastrous. It is fallacious and impossible in theory, unfair and mischievous in practice. But if it were not so; if the policy could be rationally defended on economic grounds,

and shown in practice to conduce to industrial development, there are potent objections to it from moral and political points of view. No people can become truly great if they are an assemblage of warring classes, each struggling for special privileges. Such a condition is essentially wrong, and therefore practically foolish.

Moreover, protection aggravates international antipathies. It is frankly confessed to be commercial warfare, and "in war everything is fair." Then, too, the commercial isolation which protectionists desire is accompanied by intellectual and moral isolation, invariably baneful in its effects on character. We have had a good example lately in the attempt of the Canadian Post Office Department to "protect our people against the contaminating influences of United States literature." One now begins to realize that the paternal solicitude of the Government was not directed so much to the Canadian reader as to the protected manufacturer whose business was endangered by the persuasive advertisements in American magazines. Protection against *ideas* from abroad is characteristic of Russian censorship.

Further, if we grant that Protection will, as its advocates say, fill Canada with tall chimneys, we must be prepared for those evils which have usually accompanied the rapid development of the factory system, chief among which are child-labour, physical deterioration, and the diminishing of individual initiative and resource. The factory boy or girl is usually no match for the children of the farms, for his work deadens and crushes him. We have but to go to the cotton mills in the Southern States, or to the manufacturing cities of England to see the price paid for "manufacturing supremacy." He who would transform Canada into a "busy workshop" should be circumspect.

A protective tariff, also breeds political corruption; for, where the protected interests are looking for legislative favours, they will be "in politics" with a vengeance. We have had a sufficient number of cases exposed to make us believe that the ominous growth of campaign funds is due

to the contributions of corporations seeking special favours from legislatures; that these funds are but a tithe of the money really extracted from the people by unfair legislation; and that they are used, through the medium of "the machine," in bribing the more ignorant amongst the electorate to submit quietly to continued exactions. Protection threatens the creation—nay, has already created—an aristocracy of wealth. No development could be more ominous and sinister.

In conclusion, while tariffs and bounties may be occasionally necessary for political reasons, as settled commercial policies they stand discredited. Tariffs for revenue are unfair, wasteful, and out of harmony with democratic institutions; while tariffs and bounties for protective purposes are fallacious and impossible in theory, and pernicious in practice.

W. C. GOOD

MANUFACTURES AND SHIPPING

IT SHOULD be the aim of every part of a great country to promote measures for the general advantage in preference to those of purely local interest. But as the general advantage can only be determined by judiciously weighing the interests of all the parts, it is legitimate enough for every city and for every province to urge its special claims, provided it be done in a temperate manner, and without a desire to secure more than is just, when all the circumstances have been examined. And when it is found that certain special interests are persistently brought under the notice of Parliament primarily with the view to secure the objects of the promoters who incidentally try to convince Parliament and the public that these special interests are identical with the interests of the people at large, it becomes necessary for other branches of public industry to take pains to enlighten public opinion upon the real merits of the case.

From their own point of view the manufacturers of Canada are within their right to point out the great advantage to a nation of diversity of employment, to show the number of persons to whom profitable employment may be given in their establishments, and to endeavour to convince the people's representatives that it is for the public advantage that such industries should be encouraged and maintained, even although this may impose some charge upon the general revenues. It requires great judgement to weigh the relative importance of the different claims that are made in this manner, and it is unreasonable to deny that certain benefits may accrue from the encouragement given to such industries. The only proper basis for coming to a decision upon such a question is to bring the arguments on every side to the test of properly selected statistics, and this is the business of the political economist.

It is therefore highly important that the ultimate decision of these questions should not reside with those who have a direct personal interest in the controversy. If Parliament should be composed of manufacturers and their partizans in a larger proportion than the interested manufactures bear to the other industries of the country, the decision is likely to be influenced by special rather than by general considerations. Or to put it more plainly, if the tariff is arranged by men having a large special interest in a high rate of duty, the effect upon the general public is less likely to be impartially weighed than if the evidence on both sides is put before a jury, say, of political economists.

Much criticism is indulged in by the public of lawyers as members of Parliament, some of which is quite well founded, because lawyers in general make their greatest profits out of championing special interests, and it is notorious that in nearly all ages lawyers, with few exceptions, (although these exceptions are the most brilliant examples of popular statesmanship), have been on the side of the maintenance of special interests which they call vested rights, in opposition to the demands of the simple general taxpayer. But still the lawyer has at least this advantage: that he has nothing immediately and personally at stake, and that his training enables him to perceive the fallacy of an unsound argument and the proper weight to attach to sound principles of legislation; and therefore he is a less dangerous instrument for handling the affairs of the public at large than the man who has a direct pecuniary interest adverse to that of the general public.

It results from the general conditions of our political system that it is not always the real majority that rules; it is very frequently a well organized minority that succeeds in persuading others that they properly represent the real interests of the majority of the people. If then we find in the community two great and important classes, one only of which is thoroughly organized, and every member of which has a large pecuniary interest at stake, such a class is likely to be more effective in its influence on public affairs than a much

larger class less effectively organized. This is one reason why the manufacturers in modern industrial communities have succeeded in moulding the policy of the Government in a direction deemed by them beneficial to their special interests in a degree greater than their numbers seem to warrant. The influence of this class is equally great in Canada and in Britain.

In Canada it is the interest of the manufacturer, or he believes it to be his interest, that the Canadian market should be exclusively reserved to him, and that he should be protected from the competition of all outside countries for the disposal of any article that can be produced or manufactured in the country. The most effective method of thus reserving the Canadian market to himself is evidently the imposition of customs duties large enough to exclude outside competition. If he could be trusted not to take unfair advantage of the market thus reserved to him, and if, having secured a monopoly of the home market, he would be most careful to supply the Canadian people with goods at the lowest price at which they could be purchased in the best outside market, such a policy might be defended, with respect to those articles, at least, for which this country affords equally favourable conditions for manufacture as are possessed by other countries. For articles not naturally adapted to the country, it is, of course, in all cases absurd and unreasonable to encourage their manufacture in the country at a perpetual loss.

But even in regard to articles for which this country may be supposed to possess equal facilities with other countries, the public is not protected in the manner described. In former times, when it was considered that competition was the life of trade, the rivalry of different home producers might very well have kept down the price to the home consumer. But from the inception of the idea of trusts and combinations among capitalists, to regulate the price they choose to assume it to be necessary to maintain, in order to give what they consider a reasonable profit, the public is deprived of the benefit of competition, and the selling price is fixed, not at the lowest price at which the goods can be purchased outside,

but at that price augmented by the customs duty. In other words, if the selling price in England or Germany is two dollars and the Customs duty is 25 per cent., the fixed price by the Canadian manufacturers, by an understanding among themselves, is not \$2.00 as it should be, but \$2.49 or \$2.45, that is to say, just a shade below the outside price *plus* the duty. Freight, insurance and other charges are left aside for the present. In this way the consumer of such goods is obliged to pay the amount fixed by the tariff, not only upon the imported article, in which case the duty is paid directly into the national treasury, but also upon the same article manufactured at home, in which the duty does not go into the national treasury, but goes to swell the profits of those controlling the home manufacture, who may or may not be residents of Canada. Paying on the home-made article a price that includes the rate of duty, the consumer is obliged to pay a still higher rate of duty upon other imported goods, or to fill the national exchequer by some other tax.

The answer of the manufacturer to this contention is that the people benefit by supporting the home industry, by the additional population to which employment is given, and by keeping the money at home. As to that portion of the advantage which results from additional employment being given to a certain number of our people at home, this, fortunately, can be investigated, as we have the means of ascertaining what is the number of hands employed, and what is the amount of wages paid to them. The returns on this subject are, of course, very imperfect, but they are at least based upon information supplied by the manufacturers themselves, and therefore are not likely to make out a case unfavourable to their own pretensions.

In England, again, the manufacturer is also a most powerful element in his influence on the tariff policy of the country. There, however, the manufacturer was brought to realize, at the time of the Corn Law Agitation, that he was largely interested in free trade, that freer trade would give him a great advantage over his foreign competitors in supplying

the markets of the world; and while I am not concerned to investigate whether the prediction of Mr. Cobden, that free trade would be adopted by every country, has been realized or not, I feel convinced that the English manufacturer is perfectly right in believing that a system of absolute free trade gives him a great advantage in supplying all outside markets over his foreign competitors. It is disputable whether he is not being gained upon by German and American competitors. He is certainly in some branches of trade; but the elastic conditions in a system of free trade, which enable him to devote himself to what is most profitable, prevent outside competition from having any really serious effect upon the growth and prosperity of the manufacturing industries of the United Kingdom in the grand aggregate. Even if the increase of his trade is less rapid in proportion than the trade of the German Empire or of the United States, this is partly, and may be entirely, because the latter are younger countries industrially, and because the boy grows faster than the man. The fact remains that in general the English manufacturer believes it to be his interest to maintain a system of free trade, and his influence is exerted upon the Government in this direction.

Against the manufacturer, however, there is, both in the United Kingdom and in Canada, another industry which might be benefited by a change in tariff conditions. I think it can be demonstrated that in Canada the farmer would be benefited by freer trade. It would be to his interest to buy what he requires at the lowest possible price at which the articles can be obtained, regardless of whether they are produced in the United Kingdom or in the Dominion. The agriculturist of the United Kingdom, on the other hand, would, I think, be benefited by a duty upon foreign wheat and other corn products, and upon animals and their produce. At present he is subject to somewhat unfair competition from outside. He has to pay heavy rental taxes from which his competitors, say in the United States, are exempt; and he pays interest on a heavier national debt. If conditions were

equalized, by forcing the foreign wheat producer to pay an import duty into the British treasury, this would be simply an offset to the income tax and other changes that have to be paid by the British agriculturalist. And here I refer to the agricultural class at large, and especially the land-owner and the farmer who has sufficient income to be subject to the income tax. The agricultural labourer does not pay an income tax, but the rate of his wages may be less than it might have been, if his employers were relieved from such a tax, or could obtain a price for their goods sufficient to offset the income tax that they thus have to pay.

In other words, if there were an import duty upon agricultural produce, the amount of money available for the remuneration of the agricultural classes would be greater. And the soundness of a policy that might produce such an effect may be reasonably contended for, to some extent at least, by reason of the undoubted fact that the agricultural labourer is at present paid less wages than any other class in the country. If the effect of a slight advance in the value of agricultural produce were to raise the rate of wages of the agricultural labourer to the level of those engaged in the textile, iron and steel, and other industries of the United Kingdom, it would be at least a recommendation thus far of such a policy.

The agricultural industry, however, both here and in the United Kingdom is apparently unable to organize for its own particular advantage, in the same way as the manufacturing industry; and therefore there is a lack of combination of force among the agriculturists in both countries, which makes them, even although they may be more numerous, less effective in their influence on the tariff policy of the country, than their manufacturing competitors.

But there is another branch of industry that must be considered in its relation to manufacturers, and in which, both in England and in Canada, the special interest is identical with the general, and is most unquestionably bound up with a policy of free or freer trade. This is the shipping industry.

The free trade policy of the mother country in all its branches has been most beneficial to British shipping. I refer not only to the reduction or abolition of customs duties, but to the repeal of navigation laws which imposed a series of restrictions upon the operations of shipping and commerce. I shall not refer to the shipping of the United Kingdom beyond saying that, while any departure from the free trade policy of the Home Government might affect British shipping, I do not think this necessarily implies that a preference in favour of the colonies would have a prejudicial effect, because shipping certainly would not be diminished by bringing produce from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the East and West Indies, instead of from the United States, Russia, Argentine, and other foreign countries. The shipping, indeed, might be even benefited by such a transfer of the custom of the United Kingdom. The subsidy paid the Cunard Line to New York constitutes a discrimination against colonial trade.

It would be otherwise, to a slight extent, as regards any addition that might be made to the output of the agriculturist, or other producer, in the United Kingdom, replacing imports. To compensate for this, the colonies which would also benefit should see to it that a fair return in their growing markets will inure to their customers in the United Kingdom.

But I desire to point out what an important industry the shipping of Canada is, and might be, and what a large share the City of Montreal has in this branch of industry. It has long appeared to me most extraordinary how seriously, since the time of Sir Hugh Allan, Hon. John Young, and Mr. Andrew Robertson, Montreal has neglected its special interests as the head of ocean navigation. While as a manufacturing centre she possesses certain advantages, and suffers from certain disadvantages, compared with other places in Canada; in respect to shipping her situation is unique, and I believe I do not go too far in asserting that the predominating interest in the City of Montreal is the development of her harbour and of her sea-borne commerce. Whatever is required for

the supply of the wants of the people of the whole of Canada, that cannot be produced in Canada, or on the North American continent, must be brought through the port of Montreal for the supply of the vast districts extending from Montreal itself to the Rocky Mountains, while she has her share of the supply of such articles even to the Maritime Provinces and to British Columbia. But while her interest in such trade is unique and predominant, her interest is at the same time absolutely identical with the interests of every other seaport in Canada, whether Halifax, St. John, Sidney, or Quebec on the Atlantic Ocean; or Victoria, Vancouver, New Westminster, and Prince Rupert on the Pacific Ocean. While her interest is thus special, it is at the same time not in the slightest degree exclusive, but is absolutely identical with the general welfare of all her competitors in this branch of trade. And not only so, but in so far as a large import trade would benefit the consumer in the whole of the Dominion, the interest of Montreal and of all these other seaports is also identical with the interests of the people of Canada at large.

Let us therefore compare, so far as we may, the shipping interests of the City of Montreal with her manufacturing interests. The capital invested in manufactures in Montreal and suburbs, according to the latest returns, was some \$112,500,000 in 1905. Dividing this in the proportion given for the whole province in the census between fixed capital, including lands, buildings, and machinery 53.6 per cent., and floating or working capital 46.4 per cent., gives us \$60,315,000 as fixed capital invested in manufactures in Montreal.

A year ago I ventured to estimate the manufactures that might be affected by British competition, and those that apparently would not be appreciably so affected, on the basis of the countries from which articles similar to those produced are imported, according to the trade tables, and found that 75 per cent. would not be appreciably affected, and 25 per cent. might be exposed to the competition of British-made goods.

I have verified these results carefully since, and have also recently made an examination on this point of the manu-

factures of Montreal, the results of which are shown in the following table:

MONTREAL MANUFACTURES 1901.

Divided among those exposed to over-sea British competition and those not.

m = \$000	Totals.	Competitive with		Non
		over-sea British		
		per cent.	per cent.	
Establishments.	991		198	793
Capital.	68,900m	29	19,981m	48,919m
Capital, fixed.	32,383m		9,383m	23,000m
Capital, working.	36,517m		10,598m	25,919m
Materials.	45,368m	24.4	11,069m	34,300m
Products.	84,589m	29.6	25,039m	59,550m
Salaried hands.	4,572	
Salaries.	4,357m	
Wage earners.	47,756	
Wages.	15,747m	
Hands, total.	52,328	28.8	15,070	37,258
Salaries and Wages	20,105m	26.4	5,307m	14,798m

I find that Montreal would apparently be affected, possibly to a slightly larger extent than the whole country, the percentage ranging between 24 and 29 per cent. in respect of raw materials, capital, number of hands, wages and salaries, and products. In no case, however, does it seem to reach 30 per cent. In the one class is included boots and shoes, lumber products, butter and cheese; brick, tile, and pottery; carriages and waggons, tobacco, and generally those things in which the trade and navigation tables show that the import from Great Britain is small relatively to the import from the United States. They represent something over 70 per cent. of the manufacturing industries of Montreal.

In the other class are put cottons, men's and women's clothing; hats, caps, and furs; rubber clothing, refined sugar, and generally those things in which there is an appreciable import from British countries; and these, as regards Montreal, represent something under 30 per cent. of the manufacturing industries. Dividing the fixed capital from the total capital

as regards these, it would appear to amount to some \$18,000,000 in 1905.

Comparing these figures with the capital engaged in shipping, only, however, to the extent to which that shipping is employed in carrying freight, and without special regard to passenger traffic, it would appear that the fixed, which in another sense is the floating, capital necessary to supply the tonnage required for the sea-going shipping of our port amounts to probably \$19,000,000 or more, arrived at in this way:

The registered tonnage from over the seas in 1906 was 1,180,000 tons, and having ascertained at the Port Warden's office that the average number of trips made by each vessel in 1907 was 3.2, this would give 431,000 tons for over-sea shipping. The tonnage of the shipping between Montreal and the Maritime Provinces is 592,000 tons, and taking the average number of trips as 6.2, this gives a tonnage of 95,000 engaged in this traffic. The two together amount to 526,000 tons, and multiplying this by £7 10s., the price per ton for building freight ships, would give a capital invested in sea-going vessels, including both over-sea and Maritime Province shipping, of \$19,199,000, of which \$15,700,000 over-sea, and \$3,500,000 in Maritime Province Trade.

We find, further, that there were entered in the port 12,559 inland vessels, with a tonnage of 3,095,000. Here the difficulty of estimating is even greater, because these figures include market boats, which may be entered once a day, and also vessels trading as far as the head of Lake Superior, which will take almost as long as over-sea vessels.

These figures, again, do not include vessels which discharge in the canal, unless they happen to pass through the port also. From the Lachine Canal office, we find that these, in 1907, numbered 3,532 vessels, with a registered tonnage of 703,000 tons. Part of this is included in the harbour returns, and part of it is not; but I have not been able to ascertain what the proportions are. It is certain, however, that a large aggregate tonnage is engaged in this traffic. The only other source of information I have on this point is vol. III. of the

Census of 1881, page 9, where it appears that in that year there were 115,500 tons of vessels owned in Montreal and Hochelaga. These figures, however, may have diminished since 1880, as there has been a large shrinkage in the total amount of shipping between 1880 and 1905. The above tonnage would represent at the rate mentioned, \$4,216,000. In 1905 there were over 112,000 tons of Lake and Upper St. Lawrence boats represented in the Dominion Marine Association.

Taking the value of Montreal's inland shipping at between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000, it is safe to estimate that there is a capital invested in ships carrying freight in and out of the port of Montreal to the extent of \$23,000,000. In a discussion before the Political Economy Club of Montreal, Mr. W. I. Gear stated that this is an under-estimate, and that there is not less than \$40,000,000 invested in the shipping of Montreal. If we add to this the bonded indebtedness shown in the Harbour Commissioner's report, as the outlay on our harbour, which was \$8,812,000 up to the end of 1906, and also the cost of the ship channel below the harbour down to June 1905, amounting to \$8,400,000, these two items amount to \$17,217,000, to be added to the \$23,000,000 in shipping, making \$40,000,000, apart from any special value that may belong to passenger vessels such as the *Victorian*, 10,000 tons, which itself represents from £20 to £30 a ton, a cost of \$1,000,000 to \$1,700,000; the *Empresses*, 14,000 tons, represent from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 each. The *Lake Manitoba* is valued at \$750,000.

The serious injury that has been done to shipping, not in Montreal alone, but in Canada at large, appears from the great shrinkage in the value of shipping registered in the country since the adoption of a protective policy in 1879. The department of Marine publishes a table showing the amount of this shipping from 1874 to 1905. It shows a gradual increase from 219,000 tons in 1874 to 248,000 tons in 1878, when the maximum was reached. In 1905 this had decreased to 141,000 tons, instead of increasing as it should have had

the advance continued in proportion to population, to 320,000 tons; estimating this loss at £7 10s., or \$36.50 per ton, it represents a loss to the country of \$6,500,000.

Turning now to hands employed, these also can be more easily ascertained for manufacturing than for shipping. The hands engaged in 1905 both on salary and on wages in Montreal and its suburbs were about 56,000, of which 30 per cent. is 16,800 hands. Assuming that each of these represented the same number of persons dependent upon him as the number in all occupations bears to the total population (2.8), this would indicate 47,040 persons in Montreal and its suburbs dependent upon these engaged in industries that might be affected by over-sea competition, out of a population, as given in Lovell's directory for this year, of 434,000 persons.

Against these the following is the information we have as to the persons interested in trade and transportation. The shipping returns mention the number in the crews of the shipping of the port as follows:—For sea-going vessels, including those trading with the Maritime Provinces, the Harbour Commissioner's report gives the crews as numbering 42,927. Separating the over-sea from the Maritime Province vessels, the crews of the former are 30,027, which may be divided by 3.2, the average number of trips, making 9,380 men. The crews in the Maritime Province vessels will thus number 12,900. Dividing this by 6.2, the number of trips, gives 2,080 men. These two classes amount to 11,460 men. There still remain the 2,557 vessels engaged in inland navigation, whose crews are said to number 67,347. If, which is a pure guess, these vessels make ten trips each, this would give 6,734 men, which added to those in the sea-going vessels, makes a total of 18,194. There are still the crews of the vessels discharging in the canal, and the stevedores, longshoremen, and other persons employed in the harbour. These latter are mentioned, in the GAZETTE report of the export trade for 1907, as numbering 142,303 during the 181 working days of the season of navigation, being an average of 786 each day. I will not attempt to make an estimate of the aggregate number

of those employed, although these figures suggest a considerable number.

Taking, however, the proportion engaged in trade and transportation on the basis of the last census which gave returns of occupations, namely, the census of 1891, this, applied to the present population of Montreal, gives the number of 91,140 out of 434,000, the present population of Montreal, as dependent on those engaged in trade and transportation. This would appear to be the number of persons directly interested in freer conditions in the trade of the port as opposed to the 47,000 persons apparently dependent upon those engaged in industries that may be exposed to competition from over-seas, making 387,000 directly and indirectly interested in freer trade in our port.

Turning now to the relative importance of manufactures and shipping as regards their product, or the quantity of goods handled. We are informed by the census return of 1906 that the product of the factories in Montreal and vicinity amounted to \$123,000,000.

Dividing these between those likely to be affected by British or over-sea competition, and those not likely to be so affected, the former may be taken as 30 per cent. or \$37,000,000, and the latter as 70 per cent. or \$85,000,000.

The only revenue derived from these goods is the duties paid on such part of the raw materials as are subject to duty. The materials used according to the census of 1901 were valued at \$45,368,000. They are not given in the return for 1905. Increasing this by 40 per cent. makes \$63,000,000 in 1905. Then allowing for materials entered duty free, estimated at \$20,000,000, and assuming that half of the remaining raw materials are not imported, but produced in the country, and that the remaining half \$21,500,000, pay duties at the average rate, 27 per cent. on dutiable imports, this represents a revenue of \$5,800,000, probably an overestimate.

On the other hand, the imports into Montreal for 1906 were of the value of \$95,531,000, including \$13,275,000 paid directly into the treasury. Adding to these imports the ex-

ports from Montreal, we reach a total of \$177,120,000, which fairly represents the value of the commerce of the City of Montreal with other countries. This includes shipments to the United States. The sea-borne commerce by the St. Lawrence River was \$151,571,000 (i 227). This evidently includes Quebec, and the other river ports. The total of these latter may be obtained from the table on page (i 21) where the exports and imports from other ports on the St. Lawrence are shown to amount to \$15,718,000, leaving for Montreal alone \$135,853,000, of which

Imports from sea.....	\$ 32,148,000
Exports for sea.....	81,590,000
Transhipments at Montreal.....	22,114,000

This excludes, however, trade with the Maritime Provinces, whose bulk we know approximately from the tonnage given above, namely, 592,000 tons, but the value of which is not given. If the value is proportionate to the value of imports from sea, it will amount to \$19,031,000, by the following equation:—

Over-sea tonnage 1,380: 592: 32,148: 19,031. This may be an overestimate for the arrivals alone from the lower ports, or for the shipments alone to the lower ports, possibly even an overestimate for the two combined. Coal, which is the chief item of receipts, amounted in 1906 to about 1,300,000 tons, which at \$3.50 a ton gives a little over \$4,500,000. I do not know either the quantity or the value of any of the rest of this trade.

If this full amount is added to Montreal's share of the St. Lawrence trade as given above, we obtain the amount of \$154,884,000 as the value of the shipping of the port of Montreal in 1906. It will be observed that the imports from sea amount to only \$32,148,000 against exports to the value of \$81,590,000. The great loss to our harbour resulting from insufficient cargoes inwards further appears from the tables of shipping every year. Taking the returns of 1906, pages

412 and 422, we find that the registered tonnage of the vessels inwards and outwards was about 1,300,000 tons.

Vessels are able to carry, and do generally carry, a greater weight in tons than their registered tonnage, sometimes more than double, as shown by a tonnage of 592,000 from the Maritime Provinces bringing 1,500,000 tons of coal alone, besides all the rest of their cargoes. But regular vessels can never obtain full cargoes on every voyage. It appears, however, that outward vessels carried cargoes to an amount slightly over their registered tonnage, or, including vessels in ballast, practically equal to their registered tonnage, namely, 1,337,000 tons weight of freight.

The inward vessels, however, brought only 517,728 tons of freight, being only 40 per cent. of their registered tonnage, although as above mentioned, they would have been able to carry freight greatly in excess thereof. It is this wasteful system under which vessels have to come with very small cargoes inwards, in order to take the cargoes outwards, that constitutes one of the very serious disadvantages under which our seaports suffer at the present time, a disadvantage which might be considerably relieved if more encouragement was given to import trade.

It is frequently urged upon the Government that Montreal should be made a free port, and this might be a sound policy if applied not only to Montreal but to every other seaport in Canada. It would mean the transference from harbour dues to Custom duties of the revenue collected in the port, and it would have the advantage of simplifying the collection of the revenue, and indeed one of the merits that is claimed for the single tax, possibly the only merit it has. But it would have the disadvantage that the Government would be called upon to spend money on all the seaports, a great deal of which could hardly be justified by commercial necessity.

It is manifest, however, that if this should be done, some means must be taken to increase largely the revenues to be collected in the various national seaports, and it is equally

obvious that this can be done only by greatly increasing the amount of the imports themselves.

At present there is a heavy discrimination against imports by sea, as compared with imports overland. The rate of duty levied upon imports from Great Britain in 1907, (ii 363) was 18.3 per cent.; the rate from the whole Empire 17.9 per cent.; the rate from foreign countries other than the United States 28.6 per cent., and the rate from the United States 12.23 per cent.

This is sought to be explained, though it cannot be justified, by the fact that raw materials and necessaries of life are largely imported from the United States, while spirits and wines and manufactured articles come from Europe, and from other countries over the seas.

For a tariff conceived for the purpose of giving protection to manufactures, and for forcing consumers of what are supposed to be harmful luxuries to pay more than their proper share of the taxes, this explanation may have some weight; but in a tariff framed, as I respectfully submit it should be framed, for revenue purposes mainly, these arguments are without proper justification.

First, let us take the free list. I cannot admit that coal is any more a necessity of life than clothing or blankets, yet anthracite coal is on the free list, while ready-made clothing is subject to 35 per cent. under the general and intermediate tariff, and only 5 per cent. less, that is 30 under the preferential tariff. The rates upon blankets and flannels are $22\frac{1}{2}$ and 35, and it is reasonably certain that the consumer has to pay at least the lowest of these rates upon the same articles manufactured in the country.

On the assumption that we have to pay upon the clothing manufactured in the country, according to the census return of 1906, 30 per cent., not on \$32,534,000, which is probably the selling price including a percentage added equal to the lowest rate of duty, but on \$25,000,000, which, if increased by that rate, would make the \$32,534,000, this gives an amount of \$7,500,000 lost to the consumer. In the same way

22½ per cent., not on \$5,764,000 woollen goods, but on \$4,700,000 is \$1,057,500; these two items making together \$8,557,500, not a dollar of which reaches the national treasury.

Raw sugar, again, is charged a duty of from 22 to 29 per cent., yielding in 1906 \$8,000,000 of revenue, while raw cotton is on the free list. Refined sugar pays a duty of from 26½ to 37½ per cent. under the preferential and general tariffs respectively. Sugar is just as much a necessary of life as cotton. One is imported from over the seas, and chiefly from British countries; the other by land, and chiefly from the United States.

Cotton is, of course, the raw material of one of our manufacturing industries, upon which the general rate of duty under the three tariffs, (article 537) is 25, 30 and 35 per cent. If the cottons manufactured in the country are sold at a price equal to the lowest of these rates, this means an excessive price paid by consumers of 25 per cent. on \$11,380,000 of the \$14,223,000, amounting to \$2,845,000, not a farthing of which reaches the national treasury, an annual loss to the consumer on clothing, woollens and cotton of \$11,402,500. The total wages and salaries paid in these three industries in 1905 was \$14,920,107.

A duty of 5 per cent. on the raw cotton imported in 1906 would have yielded \$412,000 on \$8,240,000 in value imported free of duty. The consumer might be benefited either by levying this duty on the raw cotton, and leaving the duty on the manufactured as it is, or by reducing the duty on the imported manufactured cotton. A 5 per cent. reduction on \$6,456,500 manufactured cotton imported from British countries would relieve the tax-payer to the amount of \$322,875, and incidentally would force a reduction in price on \$11,380,000 out of \$14,223,000 manufactured in the country, amounting to \$569,000.

A reduction in the duty on British cotton from 25 to 15 per cent., without imposing a duty on the raw cotton, would benefit the consumer to the extent of \$1,138,000 on the

cotton manufactured in the country, and \$645,650 on the cotton now imported from British countries, making together \$1,783,000.

As to the taxation of spirits and wines, while these may be a proper subject for taxation on various grounds, there is no justification, from a revenue point of view, for the enormous difference between the excise and the custom duties. The rate of duty on imported foreign wines averages 46 per cent., while there is no excise duty whatever levied on Canadian wines. If wines are taxed for the purpose of diminishing the consumption of intoxicating drinks, the duty should be levied upon intoxicating wines wherever they are produced. And if it is desired to give an incentive to the production of wines that are not intoxicating, let the exemption from duty upon Canadian and other wines be confined to those wines that contain little or no alcohol.

The rate upon imported spirits is \$2.40 per imperial proof gallon, while the excise duty upon spirits manufactured and consumed in Canada is only \$1.90, and no duty is collected upon spirits manufactured here and intended for export.

The rate upon imported spirits gives 229 per cent., namely in 1906 (i 137), \$4,800,000 collected on 1,994,000 gallons, of the value of \$2,192,000; while the excise duty collected in 1906 was \$6,737,000 on 3,789,000 proof gallons, which would have yielded \$8,560,000 at the customs rate; a loss to the revenue, and a discrimination against the sea-ports, of \$1,773,000. This is not all gain to the distiller, as he is obliged to keep the spirits in bond for two years, at a probable cost of over 10 per cent. But if this is enforced in the interest of the consumer, it should apply to imported spirits as well. In any case 15 per cent. over excise rates would cover this in competition with oversea British producers.

Of spirits, the import from within the British Empire was about \$1,000,000, and from foreign countries other than the United States about another million. From the United States only \$58,000.

As to wines, the import from within the British Empire in 1906 was \$47,800, from foreign countries other than the United States \$625,000, from the United States \$27,500.

If the excise and customs duties on spirits and wines were more nearly equalised, the revenue on imports from over the sea would be greatly increased, and the total consumption would not necessarily be increased at all.

To sum up my conclusions, I contend that the average rate on all imports from every part of the British Empire should be reduced to 15 per cent. If the duty must be maintained at a higher rate on some articles, it should be reduced or abolished altogether upon other articles imported from British countries, so that the average rate would not exceed the average rate from any other country. Moreover, the customs duties from British countries should not so greatly exceed the excise duties on the same things produced in the country, and I would recommend the difference between the two being reduced to 15 per cent.

The consequence of such a change in our fiscal policy would be to increase enormously both the quantity and the value of the imports by sea, and also to increase greatly the revenues to be derived from such imports, not only without increasing the burdens upon the people at large, but actually lightening these burdens.

There is no justification for protective duties on imports from British countries. There may be a justification for higher duties on imports from foreign countries, for the reason that our chief foreign customer excludes us from her markets by almost prohibitive duties; possibly also from the simple fact that these owe no allegiance to our Sovereign or our Empire.

ARCHIBALD MCGOUN.

QUEBEC

1608-1908

Of old, like Helen, guerdon of the strong,
Like Helen fair, like Helen light of word,—
“The spoils unto the conquerors belong.
Who winneth me must woo me by the sword.”

Grown old, like Helen, once the jealous prize
That strong men battled for in savage hate,
Can she look forth with unregretful eyes,
Where sleep Montcalm and Wolfe beside her gate?

JOHN McCRAE

A STUDY IN IMPERIALISM

THE QUESTION of the hour, Imperial Unity, might well recall the fact that the fusion of races divided by forces of nature, creeds, traditions, and ideals has been more than once successfully accomplished. This is a problem especially familiar to the Canadian mind, for the two races that provide the governing dualism of this country give a concrete example which is every day more encouraging of greater things. The facts here set down, in whose despite England became one, to this day give illustrations of great price for the straiter embracing of an empire. The example of the slow welding together of the English people, even within the bounds of England, may well give pause to those who try to anticipate the fruits of time, and to reap the harvest yet being sown. For to this day it is scarcely realized that the union of the English cannot be put in Henry the Second's time, nor even in Tudor times: the Reform bill of 1832 is probably the first action bringing with it the sympathies of the country as a whole.

The very facts of geography made England a disunited country: the Thames and the Severn, the fens and the forests cut into the national life, and every successive invasion only widened the gulf. The Roman roads did not bridge that gulf. It is in the South and the East that the Romans left their hypocausts and stucco paintings; it was thence that their corn-ships sailed for the Rhine, and it was there that they drank the waters at Bath. No Roman country house has been found north of Aldborough. The Wall, a military factor, dominated their settlement of the North, and between the North and the shining South lay the woods and clay lands of the Midlands on which Roman civilization got no hold.

The Anglo-Saxon invasion of England only emphasized these distinctions, for the brunt fell on the fertile East and South. There for all practical purposes things Celtic and

Roman were wiped out, and the driving of the Celts into the West and North added a racial to existing geographical dividing lines. The conquerors themselves contributed to this result. The Saxons took the South, the Angles the East and the Midlands; Angles, Jutes, and Norwegians overran the North. Cumberland and Westmoreland swarm with Norwegian names. There were Celts at Leeds; Frisians around Dumfries; Scots on Strathclyde; and Picts beyond; and so a many-coloured mosaic of races was imprinted on the country from Aberdeen to the Humber, a fact that goes partly to explain the eventual predominance of the comparatively coherent South.

Nor are we yet done with even the rudimentary divisions. Procopius in his account of Britain symbolises for us an undoubted truth in these words: "The island is divided into two parts by a wall built by the men of old. On the eastern side of that wall all is fresh and fair, neither heat nor cold excessive; fruits, harvests, men abound, and a fertile soil is blessed with abundance of water. But on the western side it is altogether different, so that no man can live there even for half an hour. There numberless vipers, serpents, and other venomous beasts swarm, and so pestilent is the air that the moment a man crosses the wall he dies." This was a fear of the great West that the English race of later days was gloriously to overcome, but the almost physical horror of savage races, which complicates the coloured question now, comes out strongly in the story of the Mercian Saint Guthlac, the founder of Croyland abbey, who was tempted by demons with great heads and horse's teeth, speaking the Briton tongue. Christianity, preaching peace and good-will only embittered the feud. It is true that in the infant days of the Church England was spared the struggle of two creeds, but none the less there were two missionary movements each trying to capture her for its own. Augustine, by banning the Welsh church, added the third great solvent, religion, to the other two, geography and race. Separatism was not only made a question of principle but canonized.

If we turn to the East, similar forces postponed for centuries the making of England. Three parts of Essex lay in dim forest. The districts cleared were in the diocese of London, and practically an annex of the city. North of Essex, the great fens cut off East Anglia from the current of national life: it was in the Ely fens that the defenders of lost causes, like Hereward the Wake, found a last refuge. But the greatest influence in the attitude of the Middle East was the coming of the Danes, a race of qualities strikingly suggestive of the Boers, who are happily, like the Danes, to find their place in an imperial England. The apex of Danish control was the Wash, the outlying points Lincoln, Derby, Nottingham, Leicester, and East Anglia, and so into the middle South they drove a wedge, something of the rigour of the north. In truth the control of the Midlands was the crux of the whole situation. Northumbria on the north (and in it Manchester is included by the Chronicle) and Wessex on the south fought for centuries to win the Midlands,—a struggle reproduced, as we shall see, at every stage of national history.

Mercia, "the march-land," lay in between as the gage of battle: Dorchester in Oxfordshire was for a time the ecclesiastical capital, and the Thames was in fact the Mercian southern frontier. When the Danes secured Watling street as their frontier, Southern Mercia partook of all the characteristics of a border country: the new country capitals, Hertford for instance, were fortress towns, and the numerous laws on cattle-stealing recall the raiders of the Afghan frontiers. Only very slowly and only after overcoming the Celts of Devon and Somerset and the Danes on the East did the House of Wessex pass the Thames and absorb Middle England: the evidence of the ninth century puts plainly before us the permanent dividing lines in English history.

When the Northumbrians did homage to Egbert of Wessex, it was to Dore in northern Derbyshire they came: the frontier in fact may be said to fluctuate from the Trent to the Humber. Listen to King Alfred bewailing the lack

of godly learning: "so great was the decay of learning among Englishmen that there were very few on this side Humber; and I ween not many north of it who could understand the ritual or translate a letter from Latin into English; no, I cannot remember one such south of the Thames, since I came to the Throne." Here it is clear that the Thames was the Wessex first line of defence, the Humber the barrier of the real north country. Shakespeare, on the other hand, makes the three conspirators, Mortimer, Glendower, and Harry Percy, fix the division of the spoils at the Trent; a hundred years later Defoe says that to cross the Trent is to enter a foreign country. The Peak district therefore may be taken as the debateable land.

Is it imagination only, or have nature and religion conspired to keep us apart? We saw the alliance at work in the West; in the North Celtic Christianity descended from Ireland, and its outpost monasteries, its mystic gropings, its appeal to the individual soul corresponded to the nature and the environment of its converts. Certainly there is not more difference between the religion of Ontario and the religion of Quebec than there was between the sacerdotal Theodore of Tarsus at Canterbury, and Aidan, or Columba, who lived for the poor and prayed among the sea-gulls.

It is in these great alliances, themselves liable to disruption, of the South and East against the North and West that half the history of England lies embedded:

"Send danger from the East unto the West,
So honour cross it from the North to South,
And let them grapple."

More rarely minute divisions come out. Abbot Samson of St. Edmunds, we remember, preached to the people "in the language of Norfolk," and Cornwall rejected the Church litany at the Reformation because English was a strange tongue to them. But, generally speaking, a line drawn between Manchester and London would represent the division of sympathy and ideals. As time goes on, however, racial and

linguistic characteristics lose their strength, or rather they harden along social and economic lines. Domesday book gives us the Humber valley burnt into black ruin by the Conqueror, but the vale of Severn all aglow with vineyards: the fact, (so startling in the light of modern conditions) is here envisaged that till the sixteenth century the struggle raged between the South, a land flowing with milk and honey, and the lean kine and sterile pastures of the North. Norwich and her Flemish craftsmen, the traders of Bristol and the Cinque ports, the seamen of forgotten little fishing villages like Topsham, were all famous when Liverpool, Leeds, or Manchester were unthought of.

The ratio of wealth has changed to an astounding degree, for in 1531 the Northern Convocation paid £18,840 to the king as against £100,000 from the Southern Province. The South again was the seat of government. Winchester, Oxford, London were the capitals of civilization and the political life of England. The North and the West were essentially the feudal country: the "Aquilonares" or north-country lords refused to fight for John's territory in France, which would eventually benefit the traders of London and the Cinque ports: the prince-bishops of Durham kept their palatine jurisdiction till comparatively modern times: the Lords Marcher only lost their power under the Tudor millstones. The South, once more, was the land of progress: the Peasants' Revolt started in the fishing villages of the Thames estuary; the Kentishmen of Jack Cade inaugurated the popular protest against the inefficient Lancastrians; Norfolk led the democratic outburst against the landlords who exploited the crown of Edward VI.; the Lollards nourished the pure Bible in the Chiltern Hills and the seaports of the South; the "lovely company" of Ironsides came from the Eastern Association. The Wars of the Roses point the same moral: the Yorkists who put forward strong government, naval supremacy, and commercial progress as the leading points in their policy, drew their real strength from London and the Eastern counties; the bitterness of feeling against

Margaret of Anjou was enhanced when she brought the burning, plundering levies of the Border into the South.

It may be asserted, however, that these are only instances of personal or territorial politics; the answer is that the struggle went on in every department of English life. The Universities, it is well known, divided their students into northern and southern nations: it is not so well known that to this day the electors to the Mastership of a certain Oxford college take an oath to be influenced neither by hatred nor by fear "nor by love of country" (*nec amore patriæ*). Half the laws in the municipalities were directed against "outlanders" or "foreigners;" the borough charters grouped themselves round London and York as their models. Roper puts a delightful story in the mouth of Sir Thomas More that throws a world of light on the question. The northern merchant put on his trial at Saint Bartholomew's fair makes desperate effort to get a jury empanelled of his own countrymen, and secures all but one; an absolute deadlock follows, owing to the convictions of this "honest man of another quarter." Parliamentary history, of course, teems with instances; putting aside the purely local character of early legislation, the meeting place of Parliament is a distinct move in the political game: Edward I. had to call parliament in two divisions, one at Shrewsbury and one at Westminster, before he completed his unifying work.

Yet the ancient political antagonists would have died a natural death the sooner, had not the Reformation again thrown the gage of religion between them, and this time with a more dissolvent force. There had been difference of ritual; there had been blows in Convocation between York and Canterbury, but now for the first time in Imperial history a genuine battle of creeds flamed out in the Pilgrimage of Grace which, concentrating as it did all the old divisions with the added venom of the new, is possibly the crowning proof of this argument. The yeomen of the North, those "habitants" of older England, who held by the old Church, the old lords, and the old ways, rose in protest against a govern-

ment dictated by an aggressive Protestant minority, led by a new nobility sprung from monastic spoilings, and financed by the commercial classes of the South-East. Their leaders,—for eight hundred clergy fought with them: their banner, which bore the sacred wounds and the chalice, the plough, and the horn: their aspiration,—for they demanded a parliament at Nottingham or York, the restoration of the monasteries (of which Yorkshire alone had lost fifty-three), and the restoration of “gentle blood” to the royal council: their solidarity,—for their catch-word was “if any rise, all rise:” their limitations,—for the Derbyshire men stood by the crown: the final issue, in the erection of martial law over all north of the Humber under the Council of the North,—the whole movement sums up the past disintegration of England.

There are good reasons for stating that this was the expiring effort of the old antagonism. It is true that in the Civil War the North and West were, roughly speaking, Royalist, the South and East Puritan, but three qualifications which go far to nullify the concession, must be made. The upheaval in the landed system following the Wars of the Roses and the Reformation set a tide of migration flowing that broke in upon the old provincialism: of the two leading families of Essex, for instance, in the seventeenth century, the Petres had come from Devonshire, the Richs from Yorkshire. Moreover, economic grouping superseded all the others: Manchester, in the heart of loyal Lancashire and the loyal Stanley country, stood by the Parliament, as did the clothing towns, Leeds and Bradford in royalist Yorkshire. The proposed redistribution of seats in the Instrument of Government, giving members to Manchester and Birmingham, is retrospective so far as it signifies the collapse of the northern solidarity, prospective so far as it anticipates the future reversal of proportionate strength. And lastly, while throughout the Middle Ages it was but one country from the Forth to the Humber, the policy of the Tudors, Calvinism, the attraction and repulsion towards union, the army of Leslie, the rout of Prestonpans, put the dividing line at the

Cheviot Hills. Politically speaking, the South had at last worn down and absorbed the North. But already in the womb of the North were the conquerors of the South: by the discovery of iron and coal, by the industrial revolution, by free trade, the North became manufacturing, progressive, and democratic; the South became what the North had been, the home of lost causes. In the course of the scuffle of ten centuries Hamlet and Laertes have changed rapiers.

In one of his "rural rides" in the valley of the Wiltshire Avon, Cobbett counted thirty-one churches in as many miles; the fact recalls a time when culture, learning, wealth, and civilization were almost a Southern monopoly. We can follow the old rivals into the new world. "The settlement of New England," says Mr. J. A. Doyle, "did but follow that law by which in almost every important movement the eastern half of this island asserted its lasting supremacy," and it is not altogether fanciful to note that the Devon men made Virginia a country of landed gentry, while the exiles of Lincoln and Essex made New England a land of small holders: in following the dictates of geography they were listening also to the call of the blood within them.

Finally, it is a fine symbol of the reconciliation of the old rivals that Caxton's English, which we all write to-day, is the dialect of the old Middle English: in this respect, at least, Mercia, so long the gage of battle, has furnished the flag of truce. If these considerations, brought out of old treasure houses, have any vital lesson for the new problems, surely it is that Empire is not a thing to be hastily constructed, but the offspring of time, which Aristotle tells us is the maker of all states: if union is the monument of the builders of England the figure sitting on it is patience. Once in England, "shire would not help other," yet now a common nationality has come in the fulness of time, for the Anglo-Saxon race is as a stone cast on the face of the waters, and though the circles spread so slowly, expansion is for that the surer.

KEITH G. FEILING

ALICE IN WONDERLAND

EXACTLY forty-three years ago, a little book was published in London, called "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland," which almost at once became a nursery classic. The copy used in the preparation of this article bears a recent date. It is the property of a young lady whom I know very well, and whom, as she kindly allowed me to make the freest use of her treasure and has assisted me in other ways, it is simply my duty to thank publicly. The state of this precious document is, I regret to say, far from satisfactory. It seems to have been very intently, if not judiciously studied, if the usual inferences may be drawn from the loosened covers, the dog's-ears, and the thumb-marks along the margins. Several pages are altogether missing, and I should have been at a serious loss in consequence, had it not been for my young friend who was able, from her intimate knowledge of the text, to fill up the gaps in the narrative by oral recitation. From this mutilated copy, I have gleaned the following interesting facts regarding the popularity of this important work. Although appearing in an expensive form, no fewer than 83,000 copies had been sold by 1891. Of a cheaper "people's edition," 24,000 copies were insufficient to supply the demand within four years of the first issue; and the sale still goes on. More recently it has been published in a still cheaper form for six-pence, not to mention the pirated editions. By this date, nearly half a million copies of the book must be in circulation; and it is safe to say that at least five times that number of children have been made happy by its perusal. Nor is the boon confined to English children. Little Germans may read "Alice's Abenteuer im Wunderland," French children, "Aventures d'Alice au Pays des Merveilles," and little Italians, "Le Avventure d'Alice nel Paese delle Meraviglie." In a word, its reputation is European.

Nor is it a favourite in the nursery alone; it has penetrated into almost every department of English thought. The periodical press of the last twenty years teems with allusions to this curious production. A quotation from it is almost as readily understood as a tag from "Hamlet," and the little heroine herself has joined that undying band of shadows which live only in books and are yet so much more real to us than nine-tenths of the men and women we pass every day upon the street. The *Saturday Review* is not too cynical, the *Times* too serious, the *Quarterly* too starch, or the *Nation* too morose to point some of their best sentences with allusions to the sayings or doings of Alice, a child. She has invaded the class-room of the college; and the ordinary course in metaphysics is rather incomplete without her. The prim text-book even admits her within its bounds and is brighter for her presence.

The only instance of any objection being raised comes from a famous city in the West. There, some very wise parent found fault with what may be called the *un-natural* history of the book; and protested against the famous statement about the little crocodile improving his shining tail, as calculated to mislead the infant mind.

The question naturally arises: What is the cause of this wide-spread popularity? What is there in the little book to make it a favourite not only with children everywhere, but with learned professors, busy journalists, politicians, men of the world? The book consists of less than two hundred loosely printed pages, and nearly fifty pictures encroach seriously upon the letter-press. Anyone can run through it in an hour. Clearly then it is not imposing size and solidity which have made it famous. Still less is its theme of a kind to attract general attention. What is it about? To do more than allude to the main outlines of such a classic tale is surely unnecessary, in any English-speaking community. Everyone knows how Alice sat beside her sister on that memorable summer's afternoon when the White Rabbit ran by, looking at his watch; and how she followed him down the rabbit-hole, falling and falling.

until she landed at last safely in the land of wonders. Everyone knows what happened when Alice drank from the little bottle which had a "mixed flavour of cherry-tart, custard, pine-apple, roast turkey, toffee, and hot buttered toast;" and when she and the mouse met in the Pool of Tears; and when the draggled animals organized the Caucus Race. It is almost proof of an imperfect education to be ignorant of how the Rabbit sent in a little Bill, how the sententious and short-tempered Caterpillar ordered Alice about and gave her good advice, or how the Duchess and the Cook with the *penchant* for pepper in the soup treated the baby that Alice rescued. A critic is of course a privileged person, but there are limits to the liberties he may take with his public, and to assume that to readers of the UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE, the mad tea-party, the Queen's croquet-ground, the mock-turtle's story, the lobster quadrille, the trial of the Knave of Hearts are names and nothing more, is like insinuating ignorance of the multiplication-table.

Why the book finds favour with the little ones is no mystery. They have all Alice's preference for a book with pictures and conversation, and here they find both in plenty. The story is a real story. There are no digressions, no repelling paragraphs of solid information, no morals except the delightful aphorisms of the Duchess. Something is continually happening, and that something is always marvellous. Children are the fairest and frankest critics in the world. They have no preconceived notions, no theories of art, no clique politics to hamper their judgements. Of the jargon of criticism they know not a word; but they have by nature a firm grip of the maxim that there is only one style of writing which is inadmissible,—the tiresome. One infallible rule they apply to their books, "Are they interesting?" No other considerations have the slightest weight with them, not the author's zeal, not his knowledge, not his reputation, not tenderness for his feelings, as when little Anne Thackeray asked her father why he did not write stories like "David Copperfield." To have won their suffrages by a brand-new fairy-tale is an achieve-

ment of which any man might be proud. Most nursery legends are seemingly as old as the race and made according to a few well-worn patterns. It is only at the rarest intervals that any addition is made to the small stock of world-wide fable.

The charm which "Alice" possesses for children of a larger growth is more manifold, but still easy to trace out. There are, happily, many who never quite lose the heart of the child in the grown man and woman, who never grow old, whose souls remain fresh and unhardened after half a century of rough contact with this work-a-day world. They understand the story of the French King who was discovered by the dignified foreign ambassador, playing horse on all fours with some riotous young princelings. Far from being confused, or offering apology, he merely asked the stranger if he were a father, and on learning that he was said, "In that case, we'll have another turn round the room." Over a child's story-book, they can dream themselves back again into their childhood, as Chamisso says, and be all the better for it. Again, Alice's adventures reveal a quite unusual aptitude for being read a second time, and a third and so indefinitely. This is not the result of chance. This artlessly artful narrative is the outcome of much thought and labour on the part of the writer; but, as Thoreau says of Carlyle, the filings, and sweepings, and tools are hidden far away in the workshop and the finished, polished product is all we are permitted to see. Considered merely as a piece of clear, straightforward, idiomatic English this little book is not unworthy to rank with such masterpieces as "Robinson Crusoe" and "The Pilgrim's Progress." The story runs on so smoothly, the marvels dawn upon us so clearly and succeed one another so swiftly, the interest is so absorbing, that it is only by a strong effort that we can wrench our attention away from the illusion to consider the means by which the illusion is produced. Such books are not made every day. As Sheridan said, "Easy reading is extremely hard writing," only he employed a more energetic adverb than is agreeable to ears polite. It is therefore not surprising to learn that the present story represents

what German critics call an "Uebersetzung," or working-over of previous material, and that the book begun in 1862 was not really finished until three years later.

Apart from its fascination as a story and the artistic pleasure arising from the contemplation of skilful workmanship, there are other reasons why grown-up readers find their account in a child's story-book. For one thing, it possesses humour. I do not mean to say that young readers are entirely unaware of its presence in the book. On the contrary, though I speak under correction, as one who is no psychologist, I hold that one of the first faculties the infant mind develops is a sense of humour. Practical jokes, even at their own expense, will make babies laugh long before they can walk or talk; and they soon discover the inexhaustible fun of existence in such a topsy-turvy world as this. At the same time, in their love of the wonderful, young readers hurry over places where the more mature love to dwell. For instance there was once a kind of book for young persons, now happily extinct, which adopted an insufferably patronizing air. Every normal child must have resented it strongly. The condescending tone of these sermonettes is caught in such a passage as this: Alice hesitates about following the plain direction, "Drink Me!" on the label of a wonderful bottle. "No, I'll look first," she said, "and see whether it is marked, 'poison' or not; for she had read several nice little histories about children who had got burnt, and eaten up by wild beasts, and many other unpleasant things, all because they *would* not remember the simple rules their friends had taught them: such as, that a red-hot poker will burn you if you hold it too long; and that if you cut your finger *very* deeply with a knife, it usually bleeds; and she had never forgotten that if you drink much from a bottle marked 'poison,' it is almost certain to disagree with you sooner or later."

More obvious is the caricature, when the game is goody-goody little verses, under the tyranny of which so many generations of children groaned in vain. We do not teach our children the "little busy bee" now-a-days. By slow degrees, we

have come to see that suggestion of beauty, that charm of word-music is not thrown away on the young growing mind; and that the best is not too good for the children. A comparison of such a collection as Mrs. Wood's "A Child's First Book of Verse," with any of the old anthologies "For Infant Minds," shows the difference between ancient and modern points of view. Dr. Watts, had never been parodied before; but who will deny that he deserved to be? Alice after having suffered many rapid and surprising changes in size is striving to establish to herself her own identity. All her intellectual tests break down. In vain she tries to remember lessons in geography and arithmetic. In vain she attempts to repeat "the little busy bee." The words will not come right.

"How doth the little crocodile
 Improve his shining tail,
 And pour the waters of the Nile
 On every golden scale!

How cheerfully he seems to grin!
 How neatly spreads his claws,
 And welcomes little fishes in,
 With gently smiling jaws!"

Equally delicious is the parody of Southey's "Father William." Every one knows the improving colloquy between the young man with the enquiring mind and the eccentric sage. It is hard to say which are most absurd, the questions of the young yokel, or the old gentleman's replies.

"You are old, Father William," the young man said,
 And your hair has become very white;
 And yet you incessantly stand on your head—
 Do you think at your age it is right?"

"In my youth," Father William replied to his son,
 "I feared it might injure the brain;
 But, now that I'm perfectly sure that I've none,
 Why I do it again and again:"

And so the improving conversation goes on from the question

of the back somersault in at the door and the demolition of the goose "with the bones and the beak," to the climax:

"You are old," said the youth, "one would hardly suppose
That your eye was as steady as ever;
Yet you balanced an eel on the end of your nose—
What made you so awfully clever?"

It is only the other day that *Punch* had a set of verses on the Emperor of Germany in the same strain, beginning, "You are young, Kaiser William." It would not be Wonderland, if matters took their natural course; and poor Alice's attempt to recite "The Voice of the Sluggard," is as unfortunate as her former efforts.

"Tis the voice of the lobster, I heard him declare
You have baked me too brown, I must sugar my hair,
As a duck with his eyelids, so he with his nose,
Trims his belt and his buttons and turns out his toes."

Her audience is anxious for an explanation. "But about his toes?" the Mock-Turtle persisted, "How could he turn them out with his nose, you know?"

"Its the first position in dancing," Alice said; but was dreadfully puzzled by it all and longed to change the subject."

I notice that in later editions this immortal stanza is continued, and even a second added; most unwisely, I should say,—nothing can surpass the exquisite topsy-turviness of the first quatrain. There is just a sufficient show of meaning to lure the mind on, in the hope of finding more. The end of the pleasant teasing is bafflement and agreeable provoking excitement.

There are other points less obvious than these, which the younger generation of readers or listeners is almost sure to miss; but which catch the attention of their elders. It is hardly to be expected that children should see the fun of the mouse's expedient for drying the bedraggled animals which have just escaped the pool of tears. This is to read aloud the driest thing it knows, namely a passage from a certain famous historian, which our author wickedly quotes *verbatim*. Children

will not perceive the satiric intention in the turn given to stock English phrases which have been worn threadbare in every-day use. From human lips, they are simply commonplace; but coming from the curious denizens of Wonderland, they sound irresistibly droll. Such is the remark of the Lory, who clinches an argument with, "I am older than you and ought to know better;" and then positively refuses to tell its age. Such are the set speeches of the Dodo, who is the representative English committee-man. The extract from Hallam fails to dry the mouse's audience. "In that case," said the Dodo solemnly, rising to its feet, "I move the meeting adjourn, for the immediate adoption of more energetic remedies." "Speak English!" said the Eaglet. "I don't know the meaning of half those long words, and what's more I don't believe you do either." The jeer startles the Dodo out of his pomposity into something like a natural and direct manner of speaking. "What I was going to say," said the Dodo in an offended tone, "was that the best thing to get us dry would be a caucus-race."

Admirable too, is the Dodo's way of meeting the chief difficulty arising from this novel contest. All have won, so all must have prizes, and he solemnly bestows Alice's own thimble upon her, as her prize, with the usual formula, "We beg your acceptance of this elegant thimble." It is not only in Wonderland, I believe, that the recipients of testimonials and addresses and such things are victimized. Nor is the brief dialogue between the old crab and her daughter repeated infrequently by those who ought to know better. The mouse leaves the company in a huff, and the Mamma Crab points the moral:

"Ah, my dear. Let this be a lesson to you never to lose *your* temper!"

"Hold your tongue, Ma!" said the young crab a little snappishly. "You're enough to try the patience of an oyster!"

Again, the excuses made by the magpie and the canary, for leaving, after Alice's unfortunate allusion to her cat Dinah's fondness for birds, are the conventional society excuses, and, like the other citations, of the nature of a formula. The satire

is so light and impersonal that the correction is made without offence.

The satiric intention is plainly to be seen in the summary of the arguments brought forward by the King, the Queen, and the Executioner regarding the Cheshire Cat. This remarkable animal had a trick of grinning persistently; and, stranger still, a habit of vanishing gradually, and appearing in the same manner. The manifestations began with the tail and ended with the grin, or contrariwise. The grin might be visible for some time after the cat had disappeared. Once the King of Hearts wished to have the Cat removed, and his royal consort met the difficulty, as was her custom, by ordering its immediate execution. But this was easier said than done.

“The Executioner’s argument was, that you couldn’t cut off a head, unless there was a body to cut it off from; that he had never done such a thing before, and wasn’t going to begin at his time of life.

“The King’s argument was, that anything that had a head could be beheaded, and that you weren’t to talk nonsense.

“The Queen’s argument was, that if something wasn’t done about it in less than no time, she’d have everybody executed all round.” Here the philosopher glances at many arguments just as sapient.

Forty-three years is really a very respectable span of life for a book. It has outlasted a whole generation of mankind, and seen many revolutions in the world of thought and outward human activity. Three more decades of such swift and sweeping changes, and the book will need foot-notes and explanations. Who knows but some day a Doctor of Philosophy may edit it with various prolegomena and complete *apparatus criticus*, or some Oxford man get his research degree by a thesis on it. Even now some of the allusions need clearing up; for example, those relating to the game of croquet.

The description of the game as played in Wonderland is hardly exaggerated: “The players all played at once without waiting for turns, quarrelling all the while, and fighting for the

hedgehogs; and in a very short time the Queen was in a furious passion and went stamping about and shouting "Off with his head!" or "Off with her head!" about once a minute."

There is another English institution of greater antiquity and much more venerable than croquet, our invaluable system of Trial by Jury. Every now and then, there is an agitation to abolish it, and every satirist has his fling at it. The climax of Alice's adventures is the trial of the Knave of Hearts upon the historic charge of stealing the tarts; the judge and jury have the trial to themselves; and their ways are peculiar.

"The twelve jurors were all writing busily on slates. "What are they all doing?" Alice whispered to the Gryphon." "They can't have anything to put down yet, before the trial's begun." "They're putting down their names," the Gryphon whispered in reply, "for fear they should forget them before the end of the trial."

The average jurymen has not a very good name for intelligence and often has to meet the charge of muddling evidence. There could be no more lively way of exhibiting this failing than the Wonderland jury's mode of dealing with important testimony:

"The first witness was the Hatter. He came in with a tea-cup in one hand and a piece of bread-and-butter in the other. "I beg pardon your Majesty," he began, "for bringing these in; but I hadn't quite finished my tea, when I was sent for." "You ought to have finished," said the King. "When did you begin?" The Hatter looked at the March Hare, who had followed him into the court, arm-in-arm with the Dormouse. "Fourteenth of March, I think it was," he said. "Fifteenth," said the March Hare. "Sixteenth," said the Dormouse. "Write that down," the King said to the jury, and the jury eagerly wrote down all three dates, and then added them up and reduced the answer to pounds, shillings and pence."

This is of course but a concrete way of representing the confusion in the mind of the average citizen in the jury-box. A child can grasp the fact, when put in this way. It would be

pleasant to dwell on the other humours of the trial, but it is better to send the curious to the book itself. The Judge's inclination for Jedwood justice, verdict first, trial afterward, his futile facetiousness, his brilliant interpretation of documentary evidence, the suppression of the guinea-pigs, the contumacy of the Cook, who refused to testify, are too good to be spoiled by compression and must be read in the original. But one part seems to have been written in anticipation of the Dreyfus trial and the part played in it by the famous *bordereau*.

"There's more evidence to come yet, please your Majesty" said the White Rabbit, jumping up in a great hurry: "this paper has just been picked up."

"What's in it?" said the Queen.

"I haven't opened it yet," said the White Rabbit, "but it seems to be a letter, written by the prisoner to—to somebody."

"It must have been that," said the King, "unless it was written to nobody, which isn't usual, you know."

"Who is it directed to?" said one of the jurymen.

"It isn't directed at all," said the White Rabbit; "In fact there's nothing written on the outside." He unfolded the letter as he spoke, and added—"It isn't a letter after all; it's a set of verses."

"Are they in the prisoner's handwriting?" asked one of the jurymen.

"No, they're not," said the White Rabbit, "and that's the queerest thing about it. (The jury all looked puzzled.)"

"He must have imitated somebody else's hand," said the King. (The jury all brightened up again.)

"Please your Majesty," said the Knave, "I didn't write it, and they can't prove that I did: there's no name signed at the end."

"If you didn't sign it," said the King, "that only makes the matter worse. You *must* have meant mischief, or you'd have signed your name like an honest man."

All these flashes of fun do not by themselves make up the book. Apart from veiled and gentle satire, there is another humorous element which can be enjoyed by young and old alike,—I am speaking of English stock. This is the incongruous in words, the absurd, or nonsense. This is language where faint, illusory mirages of meaning vanish, language which triumphantly resists all efforts at logical analysis and sometimes even parsing. For three centuries it has formed part of our intellectual bill-of-fare. Shakespeare, who is such a thoroughly national poet, is very fond of this device. Witness Bottom's "Raging rocks," and above all Ancient Pistol's nice derangement of epitaphs, as in the famous skit on Marlowe. "What? Have we Hiren here?" Ancient Pistol is surely the true great-great-great-grandfather of Mrs. Malaprop, whose views on female education are so well known.

As good an instance as any is Touchstone's mystification of the country boy, Corin.

Corin. And how like you this shepherd's life, Master Touchstone?

Touch. Truly, shepherd, in respect to itself, it is a good life, but in respect that it is a shepherd's life, it is naught. In respect it is solitary, I like it very well; but in respect that it is private, it is a very vile life. Now in respect that it is in the fields, it pleaseth me well; but in respect it is not of the Court, it is tedious. As it is a spare life look you, it fits my humour well; but, as there is no more plenty in it, it goes against my stomach."

The Duchess runs Touchstone close when she gives Alice this piece of excellent advice.

"Be what you seem to be,— or if you'd like it put more simply: Never imagine yourself not to be otherwise than what it might appear to others that what you were or might have been was not otherwise than what you had been would have appeared to them to be otherwise."

Most of us will share Alice's bewilderment over this oracular saying, and agree that it would be much easier to follow if it were written down; and rejoice that the Duchess

did not carry out her threat, "That's nothing to what I could say if I chose."

There is wisdom as well as wit in this nursery classic. Indeed it was a professor of metaphysics who described it as "a wise little book." The Duchess, as we know, is fond of finding morals in everything; sometimes she evolves mere incongruities, but sometimes she hits the mark with a maxim of universal importance. By the simple misplacement of a letter or two, she lifts the familiar old adage which recommends economy in small things into another and equally important sphere. The nation of shopkeepers expressed the result of long experience and observation in this tenet of proverbial philosophy, "Take care of the pence, and the pounds will take care of themselves." At a single stroke, the Duchess transformed the musty proverb and widened its application a thousandfold. "Take care of the *sense* and the sounds will take care of themselves." If only public speakers, reciters, orators, political debaters, lecturers, preachers, and professors would attend to this fundamental precept, what verbiage should we not be spared.

In truth, underneath all this surface sparkle of wit, fun, grotesque, and incongruity flows a deep serene current of true wisdom. Without the second, the first is impossible. "It takes a wise man to play the fool."

From still another point of view, this child's story-book has what may be called, without exaggeration, a scientific importance. A German psychologist might call it "Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des Träumens," or a contribution to our knowledge of the phenomena of dreaming. Perhaps the most widely observed and most puzzling of all mental phenomena are the phenomena of dreaming. All peoples have noted and all literatures recorded them. Except in rare instances they are the most difficult to record or to fix. "As a dream when one awaketh," says the text, in order to compare two of the most fleeting and evanescent of things. "I have had a most rare vision," says Bottom the weaver. "I have had a dream—past the wit of man to say what dream it was. . . Methought I was—there is no man can tell what methought I

was,—but man is but a patched fool if he will offer to say what methought I had." Dreams are vivid enough; but how hard to recall these strange freaks of sub-consciousness, when our senses are completely alert. The main outlines we may retrace; but the details, the attending circumstances, the atmosphere of reality in which the marvels took place, escape us altogether. How can we make words give back impressions so vivid, so confused, so seeming real at the time, so unreal afterwards? Yet this most difficult literary feat is accomplished by this child's story-book. The child does not perceive this, is not in fact meant to perceive this; but even a hasty analysis will make the author's intention clear.

In the first place, the border line between consciousness and unconsciousness is very faint and hard to define. The process of transition from the one state to the other is gradual. In the book, the illusion is produced by the closest mimicry of reality. A tired little girl, on a hot summer's afternoon, is resting on a bank beside her sister, when she sees a white rabbit run by. The scene is in England where the "bunnies" range freely through the fields. There is nothing more common than the sight. Alice is still awake; but when she sees the creature take his watch out of his waistcoat pocket, the line between asleep and awake has been crossed. The dreaming has begun, but it is only in the last chapter when her sister speaks to Alice that we are actually told that this is a dream, "a most rare vision." True to experience also is the sensation of falling which so soon follows: this is produced, observers say, by the stretching of the foot an inch or two. In dreams we always fall slowly, and feel that we can control the motion. In falling down the rabbit-hole, Alice has time to take jam-pots out of cupboards, to replace them in other cupboards farther down, and even to curtsy as she descends. Admirably accurate also is the short cross-current of thought, where the remembrance of Dinah her cat, diverts the progress of the dream.

Once fairly afoot in Wonderland, marvels thicken. A whole pack of cards take part in the story. Gryphons and Mock-turtles dance the lobster quadrille. Croquet is played

with live flamingoes for mallets, and live hedgehogs for balls. In the mind of Alice, two feelings alternate: calm acceptance of the marvellous as perfectly natural, and the faint protest of reason against the strange happenings, or perhaps I should say, the attempt to rationalize them. Sudden appearances, unexplained vanishings, events however strange do not surprise us in the world of dreams, but generally the mind makes an effort to relate them to ordinary experience. When the White Rabbit mistakes Alice for the house-maid, and sends her off for his gloves, she obeys, but is not surprised. Only by degrees does the oddity of the situation dawn upon her.

“How queer it seems” Alice said to herself, “to be going messages for a rabbit! I suppose Dinah’ll be sending me on messages next!” And she began fancying the sort of thing that would happen: “Miss Alice! come here directly and get ready for your walk!” “Coming in a minute nurse! but I’ve got to watch this mouse-hole till Dinah comes back and see that the mouse does not get out! only I don’t think,” Alice went on, “that they’d let Dinah stop in the house, if it began ordering people about like that.”

Another phenomenon of dream life, which is most vividly portrayed, is the inexplicable way images present themselves, and then fade into nothingness. Alice is going to play croquet; she finds a live flamingo in her hands; a little later, the game is over and no more mention is made of it. Neither its coming nor its going is explained. Nor is there felt to be any need of explanation. Everything happens in accordance with a new set of laws, which govern this strange mental state in which the absurd is accepted as the real. The most famous instance is the Cheshire Cat, whose grin appeared long before the rest of the animal, and remained when all else of it had vanished. And our author follows his own maxim, “Adventures first; explanations take such a dreadful time.” Another well known sensation of dreaming is the wilful opposition, the malicious contrariety of things. For instance, you dream that you are going on a journey; you get to the station, or the steamer and find that your luggage has not come; or you get into the wrong

train, or you haven't money enough to buy your ticket. So Alice is ordered about by the animals, made to repeat lessons and verses, snubbed by the caterpillar, bored by the Duchess. Allied to this, or another phase of it, is what may be called, reaching out after the unattainable. You wish to go somewhere, or to do something, and find yourself perpetually balked and disappointed. Alice sees through the little door, the beautiful garden, with its fountains and flowers; but she is too large to squeeze through; and, when she is small enough, the key that will admit her is on the glass table out of her reach. It is a pleasure to the reader, when after many mischances, she at last finds her way into that Enchanted Ground.

Interesting too, and true to fact, is the concrete way in which the return to consciousness is pictured. There is first the return of courage, and then, of reason half alert and working drowsily. Poor Alice has been tremendously bullied and made to feel literally very small; but at last she feels herself regaining her natural size. Then the formalities of the courtroom, the fury of the Queen have no terrors for her.

"Hold your tongue!" said the Queen turning purple.

"I won't," said Alice.

"Off with her head!" the Queen shouted at the top of her voice. Nobody moved.

"Who cares for you," said Alice (for she had grown to her full size by this time). "You're nothing but a pack of cards."

At this, the whole pack rose up into the air, and came flying down upon her; she gave a little scream, half of fright and half of anger, and tried to beat them off, and found herself lying on the bank, with her head in the lap of her sister, who was gently brushing away some dead leaves that had fluttered down from the trees upon her face. This is as faithfully observed as it is admirably worded. Every one knows how a noise or slight accident has the power to suggest, in some cases, an entire dream. Here the falling of the leaves on the child's face suggests the assault of the cards; and the trifling fright and effort to defend herself effectually arouse her.

Of course to describe the fairy-tale as a scientific treatise would be to do it an injury; but that the fairy-tale has this solid frame-work of sound observation it is impossible to deny. What has been said will go far to account for "Alice's" great and ever-increasing popularity. There is a very great difference between careful and flimsy work; and in order to value the "Alice" books rightly, it is only necessary to examine any one of the hundred melancholy imitations of them; for there is a definite type or fashion of child's-story brought into existence by their originality and freshness. Photographers have so perfected their art that the different motions of a bird on the wing, of a horse in full gallop, of a bullet from the muzzle of a rifle are caught and fixed to the most minute detail. Our author has triumphed over difficulties almost as great. He has made words, simple words that children understand and delight in, do the work of the sensitive plates. They have caught and they hold in cold print those fleeting impressions of an experience which, though universal, is the hardest to make comprehensible. The process of dreaming is as it were, arrested at various stages, and we have to examine each of them as clearly as we care to.

Apt as the mere words are, and cunningly as they are joined together, they would miss something of their effect without the pictures. As Alice thought, "What is the use of a book without pictures and conversations?" Indeed it is almost impossible to imagine "Alice" without the illustrations. Pictures are not always an aid to the understanding of books; very often, they only spoil one's ideas; the illustrated books which are unqualified successes are rare. But in this case, the talent of the artist has been so happily inspired by the talent of the writer, that each heightens the effect produced by the other.

The artist is the second, not the first, but he has entered so thoroughly into the spirit of the text, that his interpretation is well-nigh perfect. Without him, we should never have realized to the full, the delightful fatuity of the King of Hearts, or the ferocity of his terrible Consort, with the *penchant* for beheading all who offended her, or the fussiness of "Brer Rabbit," or

the immense dignity of the caterpillar. His skilful pencil has created a whole gallery of portraits. There is the March Hare with the wisp of hay about his ears, and the Hatter with the advertising ticket on his "topper:" "This style 10/6:" the wild light in their eyes tells the tale of their insanity. In striking contrast to their eccentric demeanour is the reposeful manner of the Dormouse, whose ideal of life has been so admirably summed up as "nuts ready cracked, and between nuts, sleep." Here are many ingenious turns in the plates. The most original conception of all, is the melancholy Mock-Turtle who was once a real turtle. For this the artist found no hint in the text; so he grafted the head, tail and hindlegs of a calf on the carapace and fore-flippers of a tortoise; and a more woe-begone beast it would be hard to find in fact or fable. I have always wanted to know Ruskin's opinion of the Gryphon, having in mind his famous criticism of the Lombardic and Renaissance griffins in "Modern Painters." Are the lion and eagle natures perfectly fused in it? Would the motion of this creature's wings give it the ear-ache? In my humble judgement, it seems a most satisfactory result of the constructive imagination. As he lies asleep, in the way of Alice and the Duchess, he looks like a coiled steel spring. When his hand is perfectly free, our artist is perhaps even more amusing. The humours of the trial scene are almost wholly original and admirable, the finest perhaps being the portraits of the counsel, an eagle, a crow, and a parrot, all in barrister's robes and wigs. In the second part of the trial, where the King-judge is explaining so lucidly to the jury, the verses imputed to the Knave, all the lawyers are sound asleep. Most of all are we grateful for the pictures of Alice. She is not a perfect heroine. She has her little tempers, is not exactly philosophical in distress; nor is she altogether free from certain affectations, and a desire to show off. But this is the worst that can be said of her. She is a capital representative of the finest race of children in the world, a substantial, graceful, well-groomed, innocent, fresh-faced, little English lass, and "sweet as English air could make her." There is a certain national primness in all her attitudes,

suggestive of nursery governesses and extremely well-regulated families. She is a little gentlewoman, never forgetting her manners. The finest grotesque to my mind is the picture in which she appears with the baby in her arms, that turned, dream-fashion, into a pig. The contrast between the sweet, shy, wondering face of the lovely child and the smug vulgarity of the little porker is simply delightful. It is Titania, queen of the fairies, caressing Nick Bottom the weaver, over again. Memorable also, is Alice's comment on the transformation. "If it had grown up," she said to herself, "it would have been a dreadfully ugly child; but it makes rather a handsome pig, I think." And she began to think over other children she knew, who might do very well as pigs."

And who is the artist? Some young lady, with a talent for draughtsmanship? Some student in the Academy schools? Not at all. The illustrator of this child's story-book is the veteran artist, Sir John Tenniel, who for forty years has probably done as much as any one man to form English opinion on political and social questions. For forty years his cartoons have had the place of honour in *Punch*. They have been collected in two volumes, and constitute a pictorial history of the period. They have noticeably increased, not fallen off in power, and some of them, such as "General Février turned Traitor," on the death of Czar Nicholas, and "Dropping the Pilot" on the dismissal of Bismarck, are of European interest and importance. His portrait shows a worn, hard face rather stern, like that of a general, who had seen many campaigns. It seems like condescension for an artist of this importance to make pictures for children; but Tenniel did not think it beneath him. The opinion of Mr. Pennell, who is well qualified to judge, is that from the artist's point of view, Tenniel's "Alice" drawings are his very best work.

Of a more important personage still, that is to say the author himself, I have, as the scientific gentleman said at the christening, no facts to communicate; or at least, very few. Everyone knows that he was a mathematical don of the most aristocratic college in Oxford; and that Lewis Carroll is merely

a pen-name, well exchanged for his real patronymic, Charles Lutwidge Dodgson. In private life, he was pleasant and unassuming. An old bachelor, he was a most devoted friend of children, delighting to entertain them in his rooms, getting up plays for them to act, and keeping elaborate mechanical toys for their amusement. He seems to have been a recluse, representing the most conservative, not to say, reactionary type of Oxford scholar. He avoided notoriety, did not write for the magazines, was never interviewed. Nine men out of ten, on making such a hit as "Alice," would be tempted to rush at once into the market, with hasty replicas of his first success. But "Lewis Carroll" did no such thing; he waited, and in thirty years, wrote just two other books. It is surprising how little is known about him. A biography has been published since his death, but the further facts contained are astonishingly few and unimportant. But little more is needed to make him known to us. The man who created "Alice" and told the tale of her adventures is a brother to all the world. We know him as well as if we had lived under the same roof with him. To me, the most striking fact is his devotion to mathematics, "the hard-grained muses of the cube and square." In fact, I am almost tempted to open a digression after the manner of Swift, on the ways and traits of mathematicians. I have known one or two of first-rate ability and I have heard traditions of the demigods of the science. The popular notion of the mathematician is a Mr. Dry-as-dust, constructed out of conic sections and talking in algebraic formulas. My observation runs averse to all this. The most salient feature in their characters is mirthfulness, not to say frivolity. We had—alas! we have no longer—in one Canadian college a fine example of mathematical mirthfulness. He was no more famous for his ability as a teacher than for his genial wit, his good sayings, sometimes rather caustic, to say nothing of his skill in chess, in whist, with the flute and with the fishing-rod. No more convincing instance could be found of the exhilarating influence of life-long mathematical study. It is enough to make us forswear every other pursuit and branch of learning. Lewis

Carroll had this gift of humour of a very rare and delicate kind, and a polished Oxonian wit, like Melissa's "hitting all . . . with shafts of gentle satire, kin to charity!" His book is sufficient proof of this; and there are confirmatory tales like those of the French king already cited.

The real man, the essence of his character comes out in an after-note, the appendix called "The Easter Greeting," first printed in 1876. Few noted it, or perceived its significance. Here, speaking in his own person, our author lays bare his own motives, and reveals unsuspected riches of character. Its tenor may be known from this extract: "And if I have written anything to add to those stores of innocent and healthy amusement that are laid up in books for the children I love so well, it is surely something I may hope to look back upon without shame and sorrow (as how much of life must then be recalled!) when my turn comes to walk through the valley of shadows."

Not then as a mere *jeu d'esprit* of a busy thinker, not merely as a diversion of the nursery, are we to regard this tale of Wonderland! To the author, the book is a serious effort, an achievement; and we may well adopt his point of view, for the significance of it lies deep. It is, in fact, one symptom of a great change which has taken place about us silently, almost without our knowledge, a change in our attitude to the child. The child's book of the early Victorian type was severely improving. It still retained the impress of Sandford and Merton. Its aim was to improve the child's mind by informing him of certain facts, or his morals by preaching at him. Whatever jam there might be was rather poor and acid, and never really disguised the taste of the pills. The books most in favour were, frankly, twaddle, like the inexpressible "Beechnut" and "Rollo" types, or cheerful little tales of very good little boys and girls, who were so very, very good, that they died very young to the mingled distress and edification of parents and friends. The old notion was, apparently, that anything was good enough for children. Though wit, grace, humour, harmony, beauty might be good for grown people, the proper elements for the tender, sensitive intelligence in process

of growth, was dulness. Cheap books, in every sense, ill-written, worse printed, with a few coarse wood-cuts filled the nursery shelf. The change the last fifty years has seen in the reading matter for children amounts to a revolution. Consider for a moment, the portent of our foremost English critic, Andrew Lang, editing, with the help of many scholars, a series of fairy-tales for children; of Tennyson writing verses for them; of the most skilful artists in the land making pictures for them. Think of the magazines for their exclusive benefit; of the annual output of books made especially for the little ones, and it begins to dawn upon us that this is the children's age. These things would have been regarded as absurd a century ago, when children were regarded, more or less, as a necessary nuisance. We see now that the true absurdity lies in failing to study, understand, and rightly educate the child. The rise, growth, and application of the kindergarten system has had a most beneficial effect on the science of education and on philosophy. This new attitude towards childhood is one of the most important ideas the nineteenth century acquired and handed on.

We talk gloomily of coming evils, loss of faith, the madness, misery, and sin of the masses, the weakness of governments everywhere, the greed and insolent power of capital; and there is evil enough at our very doors to make the most selfish and comfortable and unthinking of us ill at ease at times. But we must not lose sight of the great and subtle forces working silently about us for good. A living book is a great power. Ruskin says that the imagination in its play is either mournful or mischievous; and that it is a most difficult thing to invent a fairy-tale which is neither the one or the other. But this, "Lewis Carroll" has done. His book has influenced and will influence hundreds and thousands of children; and that influence can only be for good. We know its own attitude towards the work of his hand. Tiny and humble as the book may seem, almost unimportant, it manifests the spirit of a very wise Teacher, who spoke many weighty words, but kept his tenderest for the little children.

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN.

AN OLD WOMAN

ROSEANNE MARTIN, like Elia's old friend, now with God, was a wonderful example of longevity. Her seventy years, when I remember her first, were a spectacle of how long a human being could live, as viewed by the abbreviated creatures over whom she had elder authority. But she kept about until she was ninety-two, and all the while between seventy and ninety was a symbol of old age to those whom she had nursed when they were babies. If she were here to-day, she could teach young people items in the account of man's age which we run up so quickly on our fingers to twenty-five and then take to re-counting more or less doubtfully.

There is an Eastern saying which Mrs. Martin would have scorned, or rather disregarded, because it says nothing of a definite character. Yet now that the time has come to pay a poor tribute to her memory, the meaning of the Oriental sage blows itself with little puffs from the wind of memory down on the page which I am writing. So on a Canadian seashore, where the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence whisper on the beaches of the Maritime Provinces, a little ridge of golden sand will form any summer day on the pages of an open book which you may have read some length of time in company with wind and weather: "Many grains of incense on the same altar," the saying runs; "one drops sooner, another later. . . it makes no difference." If there is anything cheerful, and sturdily independent of their fate, in the falling of these grains of frankincense on the unseen altar, then that was how Roseanne was touched by the dissolving flame and changed into a tiny part of the disappearing cloud of incense.

Roseanne Martin was born a Pretzel. Her father was one of the Pennsylvania Dutch who came to Canada with the

same migration which brought the United Empire loyalists. Neither woods, nor Indians, nor lack of bread, nor strenuous labour could daunt the men who undertook that journey. Roseanne's soul must have been shaped on the road from Pennsylvania. After I had sense enough to recognize what a temper of endurance the old lady had, I used to set myself foolish questions as to whether it was the soul of Roseanne that lifted Roseanne's body over the trying obstacles which life and relatives placed about her feet, or whether a superb constitution defied soul and relatives alike. Mrs. Martin herself never wasted time in debating anything.

But the Pretzel who was a Canadian pioneer dulled his axe against the tall shaft of some few score trees, and then took farewell of Roseanne and all the rest of them. The Pretzels were a large family. I neglected, however, to find out the cause of Mr. Pretzel's comparatively early death. Thus, even at ninety-two, it is proved that many interesting questions are left unanswered entirely through the dilatory habits of the up and coming generation. Roseanne did not exactly dwell on the fact that her mother was a widow, but the widowhood was a basic part of her stories to the household juniors. Not that Mrs. Martin ever did relate stories. The practice would have been against her utilitarian habits. She let fall brief facts of pioneer life. What had impressed her, she took care should impress us. Roseanne as a child must have been a hard-worked little creature. But the dearest picture I have of her is standing at the edge of the untouched woods, clad in her little homespun dress dyed brown with butternut, not daring to breathe the scented air, whilst a bear devoured the sweet, red raspberries meant for the Pretzel preserving kettle.

I know that Mrs. Pretzel, Roseanne's mother, was a widow because she was under the guardianship of a saintly but eccentric character who left a fund for distributing Bibles to the school children of the city where Roseanne dwelt in later life. As long as he lived he kept the distribution in his own hands. Polly's children—Polly was the name of

Mrs. Martin's mother who had been brought up in the household of the saintly character—were given Bibles as soon as they were ten years old. The fact of Bibles being given to children was a primal circumstance of life when we were junior to Mrs. Martin's eldership. We did not know how we were going to get them since the saintly character had long been gathered to his fathers. But the childish mind hoped against hope. The Bibles had to come from somewhere according to the deathless principles which were implanted in Roseanne's youth in the wonderfully fertile soil of early Ontario.

The man who gave away Bibles used to visit the Pretzel farm once or twice a year. At the gate he would charge one of the boys to look after his horse. Then he would walk around all the fields, to see if the fences were well mended. If any of the rails were broken down, he would say to the boys; "Now, you mend that right away, for if you don't the cows will get into the orchard and do lots of harm." After this inspection he would consent to arrive at the house and would say to Roseanne's mother; "Well, Polly, I have looked at the farm, and the boys are doing well, but mind that they keep up the fences because if they don't then the cows will get into the orchard and do lots of harm."

These words must have been spoken by the saintly character more than eighty years ago. But there they are exactly as he said them. For Mrs. Martin repeated his conversation with the authenticity of an actual ear-witness.

In Roseanne's youth, food was baked in an oven, outside the house, and to heat the oven they burned wood from the farm which would be worth hundreds and hundreds of dollars to-day. It was all, Mrs. Martin said, curly maple, or beech, or elm. Apparently they knew how valuable the wood was. But they could not help themselves. They had to burn their potential riches. As Roseanne remembered it, the maples harvested on the Pretzel farm were either "curly" or "bird's eye." These two words were among the most extraordinary and mysterious known

in the age of long pinafores. Since then I have learned with a feeling of verbal poverty that they mean the same thing.

It is little to tell of the days when Roseanne was young, this burning of wood. But like most people who have lived through great vicissitudes, who have been stretched upon the rack of the world, she had nothing to say of the great events of her life. Silence had fallen upon her lips. She was a diligent sempstress and contriver of garments out of odd pieces. A stocking ready on her needles was kept against an emergency of idleness. But labour just to be busy had no charms for Mrs. Martin. When her will was set in a direction favourable for relaxation, she would bake, and give away with discrimination ginger snaps, which brought tears of gingery pain to the eyes of trusting, greedy, innocent youth. The tears were always a great surprise to Mrs. Martin who had baked the ginger snaps in good faith as a high treat. "The ginger is too hot for the little young thing," was her dictum. "Never mind, when you are a few years older you will like them." She pointed to the older recipients, crunching boldly, blithely and with untearful eyes. Pennsylvania Dutch, perhaps, are indurated to ginger. But that is long ago!

There must have been a Martin. But we never knew him, never heard where he came from, nor where he had gone. Roseanne was left with two children. In all the years of her companionship with us she did not mention her husband's name. Yet after we grew old enough she used to speak of other tragedies. One of the two children when a woman might have been named Goneril or Regan. The other got a queer husband who expected her to keep house on nothing. Such an expectation on the part of mankind is more common in some circles than is generally believed.

Although Mrs. Martin never spoke of her own husband, it must be conceded that between the years of eighty and ninety she could address a limited audience on the habits of husbands in general with an incisive eloquence which indicated a lively and penetrative mind. But when she got as far as the late eighties, she gave up blaming human nature

at all, and at ninety-two passed away as gently as any "Christmas child." Yet I remember an earlier period when Mrs. Martin's temper was a thing to fear. It never actually fell on anything belonging to my mother. My mother was Mrs. Martin's idea of an Angel, with far more sense and kindness of a practical nature than any angel ever had. But in spite of her admiration for the angelical qualities, Mrs. Martin's temper was of the character of a volcano. When an eruption was on children laid willing legs to the ascent of the stairs which led to the quiet country where the Angel lived.

Mrs. Martin's actual old age must have begun when she was about eighty-five. After that when little absences threatened between Roseanne and any of her friends, she would remark cheerfully, yet with the glint of a tear in the corner of one eye, that she was likely not to see you again. Roseanne kept the evenest balance between going and staying which could be maintained by the mind of a mortal. None of your saintly, weeping aspirations to be done with life for Mrs. Martin! Yet, on the other hand, she did not commit herself to any desire for prolonged existence. She made little jokes and enjoyed them up to the edge of beyond. At ninety she travelled down town on the arm of a granddaughter and bought a new "front" of smooth brown hair, the old one scarcely coming up to her idea of what a last appearance ought to be on this or any stage. While she did not exactly hide behind the door and spring out upon the family a new Roseanne in a new wig, she did so just as nearly as was consistent with a subsequent denial of having known that anyone was there.

If Roseanne had a genius, it was for home-made medicines. The criterion of amateur medicine is taste. In remedial brews Mrs. Martin consulted her own taste entirely. The pharmacopoeia of pioneer Canada, judging by Roseanne's draughts, would constitute a fascinating study in early and evil medicines. She used to take to her ultimate day a mixture of brandy, saltpetre, and pepper, but latterly complained of its want of taste. A person in any company where she was, who mentioned

heedlessly a sore throat or pain in the chest was borne down upon by Roseanne. She was gifted, too, in explaining what went on inside the mortal frame. A proper young lady, whose digestion had deserted her but who believed in mentioning the physical ally only with vague allusiveness, was advised by Roseanne to drink copiously of the juice of wild cherries, as bitter as possible. "Your stomach," Mrs. Martin declared, "has gone all smooth. Drink wild cherry juice and it will crinkle it up again as it ought to be."

Mrs. Martin, while denying the possession of an education, could write her name, and did so with neatness up to the end, although her hands were crippled with rheumatism. But before she began the signature she always used to say that she could not write, leaving a youthful audience to infer that she never had been taught. She said nothing of school. But she was one of the most intelligent women who have yet spent their days in Canada. No modern invention was passed over unnoticed by Roseanne. If one of her better-informed friends did not come to see her soon after any striking modern advance was recorded in the newspapers, she would send for the most convenient person and have that invention, or discovery, or treasure trove of intelligence explained at length. It was useless to pretend that the contrivance could not be elucidated. It had to be. She was a keen student of human nature, and knew every interesting biography in her neighborhood. Most of the important people in Mrs. Martin's city would have been surprised, and should have been gratified, if they had known how intimately Roseanne was acquainted with their past and present history. The chances were that she could tell them a thing or two about their fathers and mothers, of their grandfathers and grandmothers, of which they themselves were ignorant. Naturally as she grew older she loved to talk of how life used to be lived when she was young, but never to the exclusion of hearing about contemporary science, politics, discovery, and life in general. She knew something of Canadian partyism and had her own opinion of public men. Roseanne kept such a mind as this, and did it on a dollar and a half a week, with a store of well-woven

garments which she had laid by, principally made up of friendly exchanges with the Angel. Historical fact compels the statement that when Mrs. Martin was eighty-five a small legacy fell in on the death of her long invisible husband. She regarded the windfall as a humorous circumstance, although providential in its event like the falling of manna ; and the humorous impression was distinctly what she gave privately to one or two older friends of perpetual fealty.

There is not a family so poor in the world, I suppose, but has an old woman in its connexion who bears some faint resemblance to Roseanne. Oh, to strike once the rock of human nature and let streams of hidden tenderness and loyalty flow out ! " Old woman " is easily said, but it is long in the living. What sacred words they are, these two, placed side by side—old woman—with an encircling halo shining brighter than gold. Say them kindly in a whisper, and think of the old women you have known. God help us, the words have been used as a term of reproach. But if you have known anyone wiser than your old friend, I have known no one wiser than Roseanne. It was her old womanhood that was so wise. She had learned to be silent on the great shatterings of life, to be gay in her old age, and to have a sweet temper. Dear faded old faces, dear wrinkled hands worn with labour and folded in the patient folding of old age, does the sun shine on more humbly accepted humanity than yours? There are no such smiles as the smiles of old women who have been mothers of children and have learned the impatience and folly of youth. Not a heart in the world but can weep in the memory of some old woman of its own. Dost thou despise thy old woman, Oh foolish heart? No, thou canst not, for her old hand was always ready to smooth every sorrow of thine away. Such was Roseanne. But it was love and not sentimental praises, that she asked not but coveted. We exchanged not once a religious observation until the last morning, although I knew her as a consistent Methodist. Then I said, " The Lord is my shepherd," in a foolishly wavering voice ; and she answered by a barely audible, but indescribably cordial affirmation,

not an articulate word but more eloquent, and as faint as a steady pulse of the heart. Even while speaking I knew with an inward smile that if Roseanne had been in my place and I in hers her voice would not have wavered.

Mrs. Martin was not explicit in terms of affection. But she dearly loved Canada. I think she would have liked to feel that her ninety years had gone into the warp and woof of life in the country where she had known a woman's ecstasies and tragedies. She conceded to a man who dealt rightly by his family a paramount interest in the conduct of his own house. He was a lawful potentate. But so was Roseanne. In her ungarrulous way she made it plain that she liked to hear of young women doing well in employments. House-keepers, teachers, stenographers, bookkeepers, saleswomen had the one quality that Roseanne exacted of a woman. If she worked with her hands or her mind she was dear to Roseanne. Young people had liberty to play. But a full-grown woman Roseanne would accept as an equal only on condition that she knew what it was to be weary after a day's work. An idle woman was her abhorrence. Roseanne's ninety years' old prayer for Canadian women was that they should work and bear responsibility. It was the one spoken conviction she bequeathed.

Dear, fine, silent, humorous Roseanne! Not brilliant but permanent, not demonstrative but unailing: she was of the pioneer character. Two centuries from now some other old Canadian woman will sit rocking with careful hand a baby's cradle. In her heart will beat an echo of the indomitable Roseanne. When the nursling, a Canadian girl two hundred years away from us, is old enough to run, her feet will tread more firm and light because Roseanne's feet travelled a journey of ninety-two years from an old Ontario farm. To have lived at the source of a nation is to set flowing an immortal river. But then Roseanne was not famous. She was an old woman, like the old woman who sits warm at your fire. Heaven make room for every life-worn, beautiful old woman—and for us all.

MARJORY MACMURCHY.

THE EVOLUTION OF RELIGION

THE STUDY of the evolution of religion may almost be said to be the study of the development of the human mind. If religion be defined as the belief in and fear of unseen spirits who have power to help or harm mankind, it may be said to be the most characteristic feature of man. No tribe of savages, however degraded, is without it; and it is inseparably bound up with the highest and holiest hopes of the most advanced portions of our race. No question could therefore be of more interest than the problem of the general growth and modification of religious feeling and belief. But at the outset of our enquiry we are met with a host of difficulties. How is such a history to be elucidated? What data do we possess? Of the history of some of the later dominant religions such as Christianity, Mahometanism, and Buddhism, which owe their initial impetus to the compelling force of a great personality, we know a good deal. But the origin of such faiths as Brahminism and the ancient religions of Rome and Egypt is lost in the mists of an immemorial antiquity; and yet it is on the soil of such beliefs that the later religions took root and grew.

The only way out of these difficulties is the comparative method. Fortunately for our enquiry there still exist on the earth fast diminishing tribes of savages who have remained at a level of culture comparable with that shown by the oldest tools found in the river gravels. These gravels accumulated around the melting edges of the great ice sheet which once covered Northern Europe and America. While the great river of human progress carried other peoples onwards on its bosom, these tribes have remained in stagnant back-waters. If their knowledge of the arts has remained stationary, it is a fair inference that their beliefs have remained at a primitive level also. This argument of course has been fiercely combat-

ed by those who assert that mankind were originally in full possession of a knowledge of the true God which they lost through their own wickedness; and that, whereas one chosen race was selected as the vehicle of a special revelation, all the rest were allowed to wallow in ignorance and sin.

Such a theory raises enormous moral difficulties and is moreover at total variance with the facts. When the so-called heathen religions are studied, so far from our detecting any traces of an originally pure religion in them we discover unmistakable signs that their original kernel resembled the beliefs of the lower savages. In fact, as nations have advanced in civilization so their religious beliefs have improved; for it remains eternally true that righteousness exalteth a nation. To this conclusion that distinguished scholar Sir William Ramsay has taken exception. In a recent book he has stated that experience bears out the view of Paul, that mankind left to itself retrogrades and does not evolve [into higher morality. There is truth and untruth in this. In a mild climate with abundance of food man's mental advance stops, but man is not left to himself. Small portions of the race are subjected to a fierce struggle for existence and so taught eternal truth by bitter experience, and these highly developed tribes subjugate the more slothful tribes, and so spread this knowledge. Nay, it seems that from the reaction between the two the leading thinkers are born. Therefore on the two-fold ground of the resemblance of their tools to those of the oldest fossil men and the resemblance of their beliefs to the oldest strata of the historical religions, we may turn with confidence to the savages as giving us the best clue to what the beliefs of primitive man were like. In such an enquiry stress is of course to be laid on those elements which are common to savage beliefs all over the world; recognising that each tribe has some peculiarity of its own, which may have been specially evolved and never have formed part of the basis on which the beliefs of the higher races were founded.

When, therefore, these early beliefs are subjected to scrutiny, two elements are found common to them all: con-

sciousness of the reality of the self or soul, and fear. The first is the distinctively human element; the second is shared by the lower animals. All wild animals, except perhaps the largest and fiercest carnivora, live in an atmosphere of fear. They live, move, and have their being in a world of enemies. We are not to picture to ourselves this fear as a constant obsession, such as in certain cases torments the lives of nervous individuals amongst civilised peoples. Rather we are to picture it to ourselves as an emotion which is in complete abeyance during periods of sensuous enjoyment, but which is called into an overmastering activity by slight stimuli. But there is this difference between the fear of animals and of men. Animals have an instinctive dread of all unusual phenomena; but if the phenomenon recurs sufficiently often without evil consequences the dread disappears. Thus the war-horse is trained for battle by being forced in spite of its terror to gallop up to the muzzles of the rifles of a squad of infantry firing with blank cartridge. The emotion of fear therefore in the first instance comes instinctively without any definite image being formed of the thing feared. But in the case of man the object of fear is always conceived as an agency similar to man's own will. It is an evil spirit, and the belief in an evil spirit, which is oftenest the etherealized image of a beast of prey, is perhaps the earliest form of religion.

This brings us to the other element in early belief—the distinctively human self-consciousness. This is shown first in the conviction that the human spirit, that is the human will, survives the death of the body and can enter into other objects; and in the explanation which the savage makes to himself of all the activity found in nature, whether in animate or inanimate objects: all this activity he supposes to be due to the agency of wills similar to his own. Thus, all animals are thought to have souls like those of man, and there are similar souls in the winds, in the rivers and fountains, in the growing trees and herbs of the field, and in the heavenly bodies. Most of these spirits are either hostile

to, or indifferent to, the needs of man, and yet if man is to survive he must somehow conciliate or evade them. How is this to be done? It is necessary to remind oneself that at no part of his history has man been a solitary animal. He has always been gregarious, and to this fact he has owed his success in the struggle for existence. The clan or tribe is however of no use without a leader; the chief is an absolutely essential institution, and so is the feeling of loyalty which makes his power effective. When the chief dies, according to primitive belief, his soul lives on and becomes the protecting deity of the tribe. In dreams he reappears to those who obeyed and followed him, and dream experiences are not sharply separated from real experiences at this stage of culture. But when he does not appear in dreams where is he? Primitive man answered at once—incarnate in some animal which then becomes the sacred animal or totem of the tribe. The appropriation of a certain animal, by no means always one that is hunted for food, as a habitation for the spirit of the chief is a phenomenon not easy to explain. It was first discovered among the savages of this continent; but similar beliefs were found in the natives of Central Australia. Over the method by which the totem grew up, violent disputes have arisen. In the lower strata of savage life the relations of the sexes are so irregular that paternity is always a matter of doubt; and indeed, in some cases, incredible as the statement may appear, there is no knowledge that this relation has anything to do with conception. A babe, it is supposed, is conceived by the spirit of an ancestor entering into the womb of a woman. Under these circumstances it is inevitable that descent should be reckoned in the female line. Many writers suppose that the human clan was originally endogamous; that is to say that all the males in it paired with all the females, and that the children born of these unions were the children of the tribe. Later, it is supposed that the young braves acquired the habit of stealing women from other clans, whom they regarded as their special property. The superior vigour of the offspring arising from these unions

led to this method of propagation obtaining the victory over the older method, and so marriage was evolved. It is exceedingly curious to find that when peaceable barter had succeeded to violent robbery as a means of obtaining women, the ceremony of capture should be kept up, as it still is, amongst the American Indians. Amongst some Indian tribes the would-be bridegroom, having previously paid the parents, pursues the bride who at any rate pretends to try to escape him. The older relations between the sexes, however, still persisted. Love feasts were held at stated intervals, when unrestricted promiscuity prevailed. Such orgies are practically universal amongst savages. In connexion with the cult of certain divinities they prevailed in the Greek, Babylonian, and other Oriental religions.

Mr. Andrew Lang has surmised that when marriage was first introduced, before the exclusive rights of the husband were at all generally recognized, the children of the stolen woman would be called by the name by which her tribe was known. He thinks that this name was always one bestowed by other tribes as a nickname. The tribe was to itself—"the people": outsiders were alluded to as Mice, Kangaroos, Rabbits, etc., and hence inside the tribe there were gradually to be found communities of the children of the Mouse, of the Kangaroo, and of the Rabbit. These children regarded the *name* of their mother as the mysterious bond of union between them, and they believed that the soul of their mother's ancestor resided in the animal indicated by the name. Such is Mr. Lang's explanation of the secret of the totem. It may be so, but it is difficult to believe that the matter is so simple as that. But whatever may be the explanation, the fact is undoubted that primitive tribes were divided into clans bearing the names of animals, and that in all cases these clans worshipped a divine ancestor supposed to be incarnate in the animal. Thus the ancient Egyptian aristocracy worshipped Horus the hawk-god, who is represented as a man with a hawk's head. The name Italy is said to be connected with *Vitalus*—"a cow"—and signified the land of the cow people.

The mythical leaders of the Saxons who invaded Kent, Hengist and Horsa, "Stallion and Mare," are nothing but the totems of these piratical clans.

Pausing for a moment to reflect on what we have learned as to primitive religion, we have seen that it contained the germs of the ideas of God, of the Devil, and of Immortality. God is represented by the protecting spirit of a dead chief incarnate in an animal. The devil is a hostile spirit incarnate in a beast of prey, and the world is full of devils, whilst to each clan there is at first only one God, its totem. Religion therefore grew out of the *fear* which man shares with the animals, coupled with the consciousness of his own soul, which seems to me to be something peculiar to man coming in at one definite point in evolution and marking the line of division between man and beasts. This consciousness implies reflexion, a separation of the ego from its environment; and indeed, as Mr. Lang has said, primitive religious stories are really primitive scientific theories, that is, attempts on the part of early man to explain to himself the dreadful Nature by which he was surrounded. We who belong to the great community of civilized nations by whom Nature has been subjugated, have no conception of the terrors which assailed our ancestors, when with inefficient tools and poor clothing or none, they wandered through the primeval forest and sought refuge by night in caverns.

I have said that the great problem confronting early man was how the legion of devils animating Nature was to be controlled. Now the chief, in order to exercise his function, had to secure obedience; and every member of the tribe, no doubt, experienced the force of his overpowering will, as expressed in the word of command. If the chief could so bind the spirits of his followers, must he not, it was thought, be also able to control the other spirits as well? Hence arose the idea of magic or medicine and the belief in the chief as a magician. Natives in Central Africa firmly believe that their medicine-men can make the rain fall. The principal instrument by which the members of the tribe were made to obey was the

word of command, and so the curious idea grew up that power over anything was secured if once the correct name to use was known. This is the origin of the spell.

But the tribe could in many cases be got to act together by an imitation or suggestion of the action it was desired that they should engage in, and this is the origin of magic ritual. Hence the belief also in the efficacy of such means of destroying hated rivals as making waxen images of them, and then sticking pins in these and melting them slowly before a fire. The person represented was believed to fall into a decline and waste away as the image melted. The marvel of marvels is that such beliefs have been so astonishingly persistent. Once one's attention is directed to the matter one sees that the innocent superstitions of childhood have their roots in an immemorial past.

So far man had progressed whilst still in the hunting stage, a stage in which he has passed the greatest portion of his sojourn upon this earth. The oldest implements may date from 200,000 to 300,000 years old, but the first traces of domestic animals and of cultivated plants do not go back more than from 20,000 to 30,000 years. It is believed that the arts of keeping animals and of cultivating plants were first introduced by women, and it appears as if this led to a great improvement in woman's position. She became in this way the owner of real estate. Formerly the woman was carried off by her husband ; now, however, the husband in many cases came to live with his wife in her father's tribe, amongst whom he was regarded as merely a guest. So only can we explain to ourselves that many civilized nations appear to have passed through a matriarchal stage when the divinities are conceived of as feminine.

Man, we know, is by no means the only being who keeps domestic animals. The ants do the same. One species of ant has imprisoned as excessively useful domestic servants another species of ant. It is believed that this extraordinary arrangement arose in this way. Ants are essentially foraging animals who wander about gathering up everything that

looks edible and carrying it back to the nest. Amongst such finds are in many cases the pupæ of other ants. Now, if in some cases these pupæ were left undevoured and hatched out and commenced their instinctive activities of tending the home larvæ, an advantage would accrue to the colony, and the habit of not devouring such pupæ would grow. Now, in a similar way, we may believe that primitive hunters sometimes brought home to their wives the young of the animal they hunted, by whom they were reared in the first instance as pets. When game became scarce, and when the usefulness of these pets as a supplemental source of food supply was demonstrated, the primitive practice of hunting would be entirely superseded by the pastoral life. So too it is thought that the cultivation of plants was initiated by the women who buried seeds in the ground near the camp. When therefore we probe into the earliest religious ideas of several of the civilized nations, we find that the tutelary deity was conceived of under the form of the beneficent Earth-Mother, Ishtar in Babylonia, Isis in Egypt, and Aphrodite in Greece, who bore in her womb all the kindly fruits of the earth. It may be surmised that in the Earth-Mother we see the dim recollection of some skilful tribal mother whose spirit was still thought of as inhabiting the ground on which so much of her efforts had been spent when alive. When, however, agriculture and the keeping of cattle had made such strides that the energies of men were withdrawn from hunting and given to them, the male deities reappeared and the Earth-Mother receded although still worshipped. At first she had had such an expansion of her functions that she was conceived of as incarnate not only in the ground but in the sun whose beams promoted growth, nay even in the clouds and rain.

No doubt in the early villages of the Euphrates Valley she was worshipped, in one under one aspect and in another under another aspect of her character. When the villages were co-ordinated into kingdoms these aspects were separated as distinct male-gods. Thus Marduk became the God of

Light and Spring in Babylonia, and Apollo performed a similar function in Greece. By this time, too, marriage was better organized, and the necessary function of the male better understood, and so we find that kinship was reckoned through the male. To the Earth-Mother becomes added a divine lover or husband,—the Adonis of the Greeks, and Tammuz of the Semites, and the Osiris of the Egyptians. Since the Earth-Mother yields her fruit only at certain seasons, the legend arose that she was fruitful only so long as she consorted with her lover, and when the barren time approached—the dry season in sub-tropical regions and winter in colder ones—it was believed that her lover was slain. When the spring returned he was regarded as having risen again from the dead. Hence there were two great festivals in this religion, that in spring to rejoice in the resurrection of the divine lover, and that in the autumn to mourn his death. The spring festival was the occasion for promiscuous intercourse, which was believed to have a magic effect in bringing about the union of the Earth-Mother with her consort and so promoting fertility. In the graphic pages of Parkman a somewhat similar belief is related of the American Indians. A scene is described in which orgies of this kind were enacted in order to cure the illness of a diseased Indian.

But another and more shocking magic ceremony was also enacted. It was discovered that if a representative of Adonis were put to death in the autumn and buried in the field, the fertility of the Earth-Mother in the coming season was greatly increased; so the custom of sacrificing human beings grew up. We can now understand something of the horror with which those preachers of righteousness, the prophets of Israel, regarded the abominations with which they were surrounded. When the wicked king, Manasseh, made his children pass through the fire to Moloch (an epithet of the divine lover), or when Ezekiel beheld women weeping for Tammuz, *i.e.* Adonis, we know exactly with what kind of a belief the prophets were struggling. The custom of killing a man, dividing his body into pieces and burying a fragment

in each field prevailed till the fourteenth or fifteenth century in Brittany !

The system of beliefs which I have outlined seems to have prevailed all through the ancient Melanochroic peoples who inhabited the countries bordering on the Mediterranean basin and the Western coast of Europe. When these peoples were invaded and subjugated by the fair-haired children of the North, other gods were added to the Pantheon. The yellow-haired gods of Olympus were brought down by the invaders. Zeus the Heaven-Father, Mars the god of war, and Apollo the god of light were among the number, and the earlier gods were worshipped alongside them in subordinate positions.

This rapid sketch may serve to bring home the heterogeneous character of the ancient Pantheon. The gods increased in number with each invasion; and with each new federation separate aspects of the same divinity became separate divinities. Gods, originally feminine, became male, whilst their ancient female character remained as goddesses regarded as their consorts.

As human intelligence increased, great thinkers came to light, chiefly amongst Mediterranean peoples, and to these the cumbrous Pantheons seemed absolutely incredible. Of these the earliest of whom we have any record is Moses, who may be regarded as the founder of the Jehovah religion. The so-called books of Moses were not written till many centuries after his death and were collections of legends which had gathered round his name, but all except the most extreme critics grant that there is a considerable thread of historic truth in them. It appears eminently credible that Moses should have been the leader of a number of the tribes of enslaved Arabs who escaped from Egypt into the desert of Sinai. The story that Moses sojourned amongst the Kenites of the Sinai peninsula is also inherently probable, for the Kenites were a closely allied tribe. The tale that Jehovah there revealed Himself to Moses may be interpreted as meaning that he there learned the Jehovah religion. What

this religion in its earliest form was like it is difficult to say : Jehovah himself was an altered form of the single tribal god, and is supposed by some to have been viewed as the god of war and of the tempest. He was, however, distinguished by his attribute of the love of justice and righteousness. Moses undertook on behalf of Jehovah that he would save the people if they put their trust in him. When the Egyptians pursued and outflanked them, Moses ventured to make a dash across the marshy ground at the head of the Red Sea, and the pursuing Egyptians were mired in the mud and drowned by the returning waters. This victory, attributed to Jehovah, clinched the faith of the Israelites in Him, and the connexion between God and people was always represented under the form of a covenant or bargain, not as a natural and inevitable one such as the relationship of Asshur to the Assyrians.

When, however, the Israelites had finally gained possession of the land of Canaan there arose a strong tendency to identify the national god Jehovah with the Earth-spirit or Baal whom they found the inhabitants adoring in every spring of water, for in the early days of agriculture the only plots cultivated were those in the vicinity of perennial springs. The festivals celebrated in honour of Baal were continued in honour of Jehovah, and the licentious rites of the one worship transferred to the other. But there was always a party in Israel who clung to the old simple form of desert religion, and when misfortunes befell the degenerate and effeminate sons of the conquerors of Canaan, this party always interpreted them as judgements of Jehovah and strove to use them as occasions to reform worship. The leaders of this party were the prophets. When, with the rise of the great Assyrian and Babylonian empires, the impending doom of the Israelites drew nearer, the outlook of the prophets widened and they rose to the conception of Jehovah as the one universal God of whom all the peoples of the earth were the children, and they identified him with the ethical principle which they found in their own hearts. In some respects the conceptions of Jeremiah and the second Isaiah have never been

surpassed ; with the exception of the teaching of Christ, they represent the zenith of religious thought.

About the time when the later prophets were uttering their burning words, there arose the great reformer Zarathushtra or Zoroaster in Persia. He too simplified the old Persian religion, recognizing out of its Pantheon only the God Ahura-Mazda, the principle of light, truth, and goodness, to whom was opposed Ahriman the spirit of darkness and evil, who continually strove to thwart Ahura-Mazda, by whom he would eventually be overthrown. The symbol of Ahura-Mazda was the purifying flame. It will be observed that the religion of Persia in purest form was *dualism*. Zoroaster did not dare to say with the prophet, "I am the Lord Jehovah, and beside me there is none else; I make good and create evil." When the Jews returned from the Babylonian captivity they carried back with them not only the idea of Ahriman as Satan, the opponent of God, but also of heaven and hell. In their earlier literature the life beyond the grave is regarded as an uninteresting and colourless existence among the shades : the fellowship with Jehovah and his rewards and punishments were looked for in the life that now is.

The leading minds in Greece had long been in revolt against the cumbrous and contradictory set of myths which constituted the official religion. "If the horses had gods," said one of the earlier philosophers, "they would conceive them under the form of horses." Indeed, it might seem as if the whole aim of the Iliad, so far as it deals with theology, were to turn the Olympian gods into ridicule. As we approach the zenith of Athenian culture, the revolt against the received theology grew louder. Socrates was put to death for his opposition to official religion. So far as we can gather from the parody of his views given us in the comedies of Aristophanes, Socrates had grasped the idea that the affairs of the world are ruled by everlasting law, not according to the caprices of spirits like men. This law he called "*αναγκη*"—necessity. Socrates was followed by his favourite pupil Plato, who taught like his master the reign of law and also

the eternal survival of the soul. He taught further that the present world is only the shadow of the eternal world of Ideas amongst which the souls of the righteous for ever dwell. Plato's conception of the world as the embodiment of the Divine Idea exercised an enormous influence on the educated portion of the ancient world. His philosophy became really a religion, and it was taken over by the Church and embodied in Christian theology. The gospel usually attributed to John is full of its influence, and the "Logos" or Divine Word by whom the worlds were made is the direct offspring of the Divine Idea. It is highly interesting to compare the attitudes of the three great tragic poets of Greece in theological matters. Æschylus felt that the religion must be reformed, but he would not break with the past. So he exalted the Zeus, the Heaven Father, to the position of sole God, and treated the other denizens of Olympus as his manifestations. Sophocles handled the ancient stories more from the ethical point of view. Euripides revolted against the whole Pantheon, exposed the stories of the cruelty, revenge, and lust of the Gods to horror and loathing, and made his appeal to the tenderness and sympathy of the human heart. Mrs. Browning speaks of him as, "Euripides, the human, with his droppings of warm tears." His soul revolted from the constant butchery of intertribal disputes, justified by appeals to the Gods; and he had a far-off glimpse of humanity organized under the beneficent rule of law and wisdom.

Euripides flourished about 400 B.C. One to two hundred years earlier, when the second Isaiah was uttering those noble words, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people," there arose in India the great thinker and reformer, Gautama Buddha to whom we owe the Buddhistic faith. As this faith is the only one besides Christianity which in our day has compelled the adherence of men of education, it behoves us to look at it a little closely. Like that of Euripides, the heart of Buddha was moved by tenderness and compassion for the woes of those he saw around him, especially for that woe which he

regarded as worst of all—the gnawing of unsatisfied desire. After long wanderings and musings there was granted to him a revelation of the Light, and he devoted his whole after-life to spreading this revelation amongst his followers. This revelation he grasped under the idea of the law governing human life, therein showing his deep conviction, shared by all religious reformers, that this universe is not governed by capricious wills which can be cajoled, but by eternal law.

According to Buddha all human misery proceeds from desire, and the way to peace is the extinction of desire. So long as desire persists death only means the beginning of another life; but by the persistent and resolute mortifying of the flesh the soul at length attains the cessation of desire, Nirvana, in which it is steeped in a white peace difficult if not impossible to distinguish from non-existence or annihilation. Every indulgence in passion either of anger or lust is a retardation of the soul on its way to its final goal, and so in less degree are the tender social ties of the family. Before Nirvana is obtained all these must be left behind. On the other hand, all almsgiving and help to the needy enables the soul to acquire merit, and so shortens the path. No one has reached the last stage of the journey towards Nirvana till he is ready to pass his life as a mendicant monk, free from all earthly ties, and so most people must die and go through another life before they approach Nirvana. But all human beings will eventually reach it; there are in the Buddhistic religion no eternally damned—only those who take longer to reach the goal than others. Again, since every man must enter the way that leads to peace of his own initiative, and since this way means the inward bent of the mind, not outward observance, all persecution is forbidden, nay even the speaking evil of false creeds. Such evil speaking only hurts the speaker, and the creeds that are not in accordance with “the way” will show themselves to be false by their utter inability to give peace.

There are no stains of blood on Buddhism, no holocausts either on this or on the further side of the grave. The con-

duct it enjoins is closely similar to that enjoined by Christianity. The chief defect of Buddhism seems to be this: that it regards the whole course which the evolution of man has pursued as a huge mistake, and its aim is to undo this mistake. For evolution has led to the massing of men into larger and larger societies, and the binding of them together by intricate ties, so that they shall depend on one another. Buddhism however looks forward to a time when the race shall again be severed into individuals, each in his blissful calm, indifferent to all the rest. Surely there must be purpose in the trend of things, surely men must be intended to be connected together, when all the noblest traits of character are developed by this connexion.

I may pass lightly over the teachings of Confucius, the prophet of China, because they do not constitute a religion. They enjoin conduct similar to that taught by Buddha, but they teach nothing of a life beyond the grave or of gods of any kind. He is a teacher of morality merely.

About five hundred years after the times of Confucius and Buddha, Jesus, the founder of the Christian religion, was born in Palestine. In dealing with his word and works two things must be kept separate ; first, what there is reason to believe he taught while alive, and second, what was taught about him after he was dead. I shall now endeavour to give a tentative answer to the questions—In what sense can educated men of the twentieth century still regard Jesus as divine; and how much of Christianity can be said to have weathered the storms of two thousand years ?

To begin, we must briefly review the later history of the Jehovah religion. Beginning as the cult of a tribal god, it extended its outlook ; and, as we have seen, the greater prophets regarded Jehovah as the maker of heaven and earth, all nations as his children, but the nation of Israel as his specially favoured child, with whom he was wroth on account of its disobedience. When the nation was finally carried into captivity the hope never died that Jehovah would re-establish his people under a specially devout king, his

representative. The re-established kingdom is the germ of the idea of the kingdom of God. The kingdom under whom the restoration should take place is the beginning of the idea of the Messiah.

We may notice that the modern idea of democracy was unthinkable to Orientals. What they craved was not liberty in the modern sense, but a wise and just ruler. But not even the most fanatical Jew could imagine that the small band who, by the gracious permission of Cyrus, returned to Palestine, represented the restored kingdom, and apparently no one mistook Zerubbabel for the Messiah. The appearance of the Messiah was pushed farther forward into the future, and his expected coming was surrounded by portents of various kinds, such as his descent in fire from heaven. The Messiah was expected to promote the faithful among Israel to lordship over all the nations of the earth; and in some forms of the theory he was represented as sweeping the Gentiles, that is the other nations, to everlasting destruction.

Now, there can be no reasonable doubt that Jesus regarded himself as the Messenger of God. Possibly he considered himself as the Messiah in the later portion of his career. Whether he did so in the earlier portion is open to question. The Messiah was generally regarded as a conquering monarch, but there existed of course that wonderful passage in the second Isaiah, in which is depicted the suffering servant of Jehovah who was bruised for the iniquities of the people. This passage is now usually interpreted by scholars as referring to the faithful remnant of the people of Israel who still clung to Jehovah, though they shared in the awful misfortunes which had fallen on the nation owing to the infidelity of the majority. It is, however, quite conceivable that amongst the obscure, pious people in Galilee and Judea, the reasonable idea prevailed that what was true of the faithful remnant in Israel was pre-eminently true of their leader, the Messiah, and that he, like them, must suffer on account of the sins of the people. According to two of the greatest authorities, Harnack and Wernle, this is the view which Jesus adopted:

When he realized that he was the special messenger of God and spoke God's will, he drew the conclusion that he must be the Messiah. He saw that he would be crushed by the opposition of the official party, and that, therefore, his manifestation as conquering Messiah must come after his death.

This view has, however, not been universally endorsed by scholars. The reason for the uncertainty is that the documents which record the teaching of Jesus have undergone a great deal of editing at the hands of the Christians. These documents resolve themselves in the last analysis into two: the gospel of St. Mark, and a lost document "the sayings of Jesus," generally denominated Q. by scholars. Q. has been, however, embodied in both Matthew and Luke, which were compilations made at the end of the first century. Q. contains a passage which represents Jesus teaching that the coming of the Son of Man would be "as the thief in the night," which certainly seems to embody the view that the Son of Man would miraculously appear. This sudden appearance from Heaven, termed the Parousia, was strongly believed in by the first generation of Christians, and the expectation of it so possessed their minds that they in some cases ceased to attend to their earthly avocations.

The fourth gospel is now regarded as a theological treatise emanating from an educated Christian living at the end of the first century. Although possibly it embodies one or two genuine traditions such as the appearance of Jesus after his resurrection to the disciples in Galilee, its aim is not to write history.

In the gospel of St. Mark, however, there occur parables in which the appearance of the Kingdom of Heaven is represented as a gradual growth, as for instance the parable of the leaven, and the parable of the grain of corn, which springeth and groweth up, the sower knows not how. These parables suggest that Jesus, like other great religious reformers, spiritualized the conceptions of God which he found current around him, and said practically this:—"The Kingdom of God is not a material kingdom, it is an empire

over mind and heart, and like leaven it permeates mankind slowly, and the true Messiah is he who establishes this kingdom; it shall last for ever, as I and all who follow Me shall live eternally with God." It is certainly very difficult to understand how any man could at the same time hold this view, and yet believe in the sudden and miraculous establishment of that kingdom by a supernatural Messiah. In the same gospel from which these profound evolutionary parables are taken, there occurs a passage (Mark xiii) in which the coming of the Son of Man with supernatural portents is described. Now it is found that this passage bears the closest resemblance to a Jewish description of the Son of Man, current in the first century. It seems reasonable to regard the whole passage as a later interpolation. The profoundly spiritual view of Jesus ran so counter to the prejudices of his followers that they confessed they did not understand him, and we may therefore attribute to them and not to him these passages bearing on the appearance of the Son of Man from heaven.

The question of miracles is, of course, a perennial difficulty. Q. contains an account of only the healing of the centurion's servant and of the dumb man possessed of a devil. That the performance of some of the miracles was not regarded as a peculiar power of Jesus, is shown by his retort to the suggestion, that he acted by power of Beelzebub, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils by whom do your sons cast them out?" Casting out devils was, therefore, a well-known therapeutic practice, and we may suspect that there underlay it some species of beneficial suggestion. As to the other miracles for which St. Mark is the authority, we must remember that they were recorded by ignorant and credulous people in a time when scientific criticism was not yet born, and it is hopeless to expect to get at the facts which underlay them. All we can say is that if twentieth-century people had been spectators of them, they would have given a very different account from that found in the gospel. Summing up, we may perhaps assert this: that Jesus believed he was the special messenger sent from God to reveal

His will ; that the Kingdom of God consisted in obedience to that will as taught by Jesus, and that all who obeyed it would enjoy everlasting life in union with God.

Comparing this gospel with that of Buddha, we see at once that Jesus taught that the final destination of mankind was to form a divine society of mutual service, whilst Buddha taught that mankind would be resolved into its primal units. There can be no question that the ideal of Jesus seems to be the goal towards which human evolution is tending—indeed, if we grant the immortality of the soul the only goal that is thinkable. It is endorsed by the latest form of idealistic philosophy, and in its essence is practically taken for granted by all serious thinkers to-day. Buddha said, "Die that you may have peace," Jesus "Die that you may live:" in a word self-realization or self-satisfaction which we all long for is not found in sensuous gratification but in the service of others.

But Jesus "was taken and with wicked hands was crucified and slain," and his followers, overwhelmed by a disaster which seemed to end all their hopes, scattered and fled to their various homes, and Christianity seemed to be extinguished. Nevertheless, a short time afterwards these very disciples re-assembled in Jerusalem and founded the Christian Church. What had happened in the interval was the "Resurrection of the Lord." This is the one miracle for which the evidence seems to approach Hume's criterion of a genuine one, "That a miracle should only be believed on evidence the falsity of which would be a greater miracle than the miracle it substantiates."

The Resurrection of the Church requires some stupendous cause to account for it. Can we gain any nearer idea of what that cause was? Q. contains no account of it whatever. The ancient document was not a life of Jesus, but a collection of his sayings. We are therefore thrown back on St. Mark, whose account has been subjected to an analysis by Prof. Lake, of Leyden, one of the few Englishmen who have been promoted to a continental Professor's chair. Prof. Lake

shows that, as is universally admitted, the last 16 verses of St. Mark are an addendum by a different hand, in order to replace the genuine ending which was lost, whether accidentally or purposely it is difficult to say. The genuine gospel ends with the account of the visit of the women to the sepulchre, and their fright at being accosted by a young man who told them that Jesus was not where they sought him. In the embellished accounts of St. Matthew and St. Luke the young man has become an angel and is doubled. Antiquarian research has confirmed St. Mark's account of the tomb, a cave, as opposed to St. Luke's, a mausoleum. It is therefore surmised by Prof. Lake that the appearances of Christ took place in Galilee, not in Jerusalem at all, since the young man is represented as telling the women that in Galilee "Ye shall see him as he said unto you"; and it was these appearances which convinced the disciples that Jesus had conquered death and induced them to return to Jerusalem. Here they met the women who now were inclined to put a supernatural explanation on what was a natural occurrence, viz., the courtesy of a young man who, guessing their errand, explained that they were coming to the wrong grave. They met also the disciples, to whom Christ had also appeared—at Emmaus. Since in all probability the disciples had fled before Jesus was dead—and had not, therefore, seen where he was laid, and since the women had made a mistake, the tomb was never revisited, and the legend of the empty tomb grew out of the incapacity of the ordinary Jew to conceive of a continued life apart from a revived body. Since they had seen Jesus in Galilee, it seemed to them that the tomb must be empty. What gave rise to the appearances is a point as to which opinions will differ. That the disciples evolved them out of their own depressed imaginations, seems to me difficult to conceive of. When it is remembered that some accounts of the appearances of the dead are not to be explained away, it is probably near the truth to assume that the appearances of Jesus were a supreme manifestation of the phenomenon

owing to his overmastering love for his disciples and wish to encourage and console them.

With the belief in the continued life of Jesus Christianity was fairly started on its way. It was at first a Jewish sect; was not Jesus by birth a Jew? and did he not conform to the Temple services? Its adherents were at first ignorant men who did not realise what was involved in accepting all the traditional law of the Scribes as the word of God. But a few years later there was attracted to their ranks a young Hellenistic Jew, to whom as one born out of due time there was vouchsafed an appearance of the risen Jesus. This man Paul was not only the first who grasped the conception that Christ's teaching was for the world, not for the Jews only, but he was the first also to construct a definite body of Christian theology. Paul seems to have known the teaching of Christ only by hearsay, and his whole religious life seems to have centred round that wonderful experience of his on the road to Damascus. Intuitively he saw that the gospel must be for all men, and his theology is an attempt to justify this view to himself in spite of his previous training. His Rabbinical masters had taught him the verbal accuracy of all the Old Testament; his Christian colleagues were willing to admit outsiders to the faith only on condition of their keeping the commandments of Moses. Paul felt that this was impossible, but how could the law be got rid of, if it was given by God? This, indeed, was his life-long intellectual struggle. He got round the difficulty by several subsidiary hypotheses.

First, he assumed that the death of Christ was an expiatory sacrifice to God for sin which rendered superfluous all other sacrifices. Secondly, he allegorized the passages in the Old Testament, promising future glory to Israel by assuming that the true Israel consisted of believers and had no relation to the fleshly Israel. In Paul's writings we find the Rabbinistical explanation of the origin of evil based on the story of the Garden of Eden, which has been taken for the corner stone of orthodox theology. Paul's theory made the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles a possibility, but

it overlaid the simple gospel of Christ with an amount of metaphysical matter which has led to the total divergence between theology and science in our own day. It is an epigram, which contains a certain amount of truth, that Paul "spoiled Christianity and rendered it possible."

The theology of St. Paul at first rent Christianity in two. Those who had actually known Jesus found it impossible to agree with Paul, and it is generally conceded that we owe the gospels to the efforts of the party who opposed Paul. They desired to show what Jesus was really like. Paul, on the other hand, said that it was only the risen Christ, the Spirit of righteousness that mattered, and "that though we had known Christ after the flesh, henceforth know we him no more." There was right on both sides, for it must be admitted that something of the Jewish and temporal must adhere to the human life of Christ, but that if Paul's view had prevailed Christianity would have become an esoteric philosophical doctrine without power to move the world.

We have left brief space to glance at the further development of Christianity. After the death of the first generation it rapidly deteriorated. The attempt of Greek philosophy to explain the assumed identity of Jesus with the Creator of the Universe, was denounced as Gnostic heresy, combated and overcome. At the same time that intellect was repelled, superstition was rapidly absorbed. The cult of the Earth-Mother and the sacrificial meals in which the slain Adonis was absorbed by his worshippers, were taken into Christianity as the worship of the Virgin and the doctrine of the Mass.

The evolution in this direction in the Eastern end of the Mediterranean led finally to the orthodox Greek church. On this division of Christianity Harnack's judgement may be quoted: "The Greek Church is the natural development of the Greek Nature religion. To save mankind from a religion like this Jesus let himself be nailed on the cross, and now in his name it is set up." Catholicism is an offshoot from Greek Christianity before it had sunk to final corruption. Like the Greek Church the Catholic also has absorbed superstition ;

but there has always throbbled through it an unextinguished core of original Christianity, a belief that externals are secondary and that matters of primary account are self-sacrifice and service. It is to this element is due the circumstance that whilst Greek Christianity for the last thousand years has remained stationary, Catholicism has given rise to Protestantism and is to-day big with the conception of Modernism.

The profoundly interesting question which remains is : How far can Christianity be regarded as valid for the man of the 20th century considering our changed outlook on Nature and life ? Christianity is, of course, totally devoid of meaning if man's existence terminates with death. Christ did not say "Die that another may live," but "die that you may live." Now the ideal which the natural sciences are constantly approaching is the explanation of the whole universe, as a mass of atoms controlled by definite laws, *mirrored in an observing consciousness*.

In this last clause the whole case of materialism is given away, for no materialist has explained how, if the observer himself be merely matter, knowledge of any sort is possible. If, however, there is more than matter in one observer, there is so presumably in all, and the whole argument against a future life collapses, for science only deals with matter. If we grant then the reality of the soul and its persistence, the truth of spiritual teaching can only be gauged by the harmony and happiness it brings into life. If a thing is intellectually true because it satisfies our reasoning faculty, so it may be said to be spiritually true if it satisfies our soul. Whether, therefore, Jesus Christ is a revealer of Spiritual Truth, in other words a teacher from God, is to be settled only by the experience of each man for himself, and no acceptance of the fact on external authority can produce any real effect on the man.

But, as I have said on another occasion, and as I repeat now, if we are to keep our Christianity we must leave the theology of Paul. In this reflection no disparagement is

cast on Paul who, considering his origin, did a marvellous work. But Paul took as basal axioms (1) the story that mankind originated from a single pair who sinned and whose sin brought the whole human race under legal condemnation, (2) the story that the whole of the ceremonial Jewish law was delivered by God to Moses at Sinai. The first assumption is totally at variance with modern science, biology and anthropology, and antiquarian research has shown that the Eden story is an old Semitic myth which originated probably in the Euphrates valley. The second assumption is shown to be baseless by the whole of modern criticism of the Old Testament. The "Laws of Moses" would no doubt have astonished that leader of men could he have learnt what was taught under that name. The Laws were a collection of customs which required centuries of growth, and some of them were based on old superstitions of nature worship.

In this matter I do not think that the public have been quite fairly dealt with by liberal theologians. No doubt, these theologians have their difficulties and excuses for the course they pursue. They have to minister to a generation which is passing away as well as to the younger one, and they frequently assure their hearers that the higher criticism has made no difference in the faith once delivered to the saints. If by this is meant orthodox theology, it must be frankly conceded that criticism has upset its entire basis, and it is the sub-conscious perception of this fact by the laity which accounts for the diminished interest in church services and in missions, which the clergy lament without realizing its cause.

To the modern mind Paul's dilemma no longer exists. The law was not given to Moses, nor was there a covenant made with Abraham; indeed, some critics have maintained that Abraham is an altered form of a totemistic animal. The sacrifices were not ordained by God; they are primitive observances which arose from the desire of primitive man to share the life of his tribal god by devouring the animal in which the god dwelt, and the shedding of the blood was the

giving of the portion of the sacrifice to the God ; when it dried up, it was believed that the God had drunk it.

God did indeed reveal Himself to the children of Israel as the Lord who loved righteousness and hated iniquity. Jeremiah expressly declares that when God brought the children of Israel out of Egypt he gave them no commandments with reference to sacrifice ; and Micah says, " What doth God require of thee but to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with thy God." The ethical principle as the dominant rule in the Universe, was what the great prophets grasped—and it was that which Jesus himself taught.

But the supporters of traditional theology reply that the sense of sin and the feeling of the need for salvation is inherent in man, and that to these needs orthodox Christianity ministers, while the proclamation of God's will that we should be perfect leaves us helpless.

There is indeed considerable force in these contentions ; under traditional phrases orthodox teaching deals with facts that must be faced. The feeling of unrest and want of satisfaction in the heart of man is the most profoundly interesting thing about him, the best witness to his immortality. It is the contest between two natures : the old animal one bent on self-assertion and sensuous enjoyment, and the new spiritual one, longing for communion with the Soul of the Universe and feeling that the way to it is obedience and service. To suppose that God is wroth with us for possessing an animal nature is, as Sir Oliver Lodge says, " comic," for did He himself not create that nature? The possibility of being helped in our struggle for the supremacy of the new nature by communion with the Spirit which shone through Jesus, is a fact of religious experience too widely attested to be seriously doubted ; but that this Spirit hath not left himself without a witness in any nation, and that under whatever name He may be called He helps men upwards, is a fact just as well attested but too often overlooked by traditional theology.

The question as to how far Jesus is divine is just the question as to how much of the Eternal Law he revealed. The great defect of traditional theology is that, on its own showing, it has palpably failed. Impressive figures of the number of nominal Christians in the world are often brought forward, but the fact is generally kept in the background that only a few of these Christians take their religion seriously and can in the evangelical sense be regarded as "true Christians." It follows then that according to traditional belief God constructed a plan of salvation through which for the last two thousand years only a minute fraction of the human race has attained eternal felicity. Even if, as believers in the Millenium maintain, Christianity will eventually conquer the whole earth, yet the generation then living will constitute but a small portion of the whole race of men who during the last 300,000 years have lived, suffered, and died. In this respect Christianity may well give heed to Buddhism, and as that faith teaches that all men will eventually find peace, so the enlightened Christian of the twentieth century may well hope that, although in some way wicked men shall be punished in order that they may learn that the law of the universe is righteousness; yet, "though a long compass round be fetched," they, too, will eventually find their place in the Kingdom of God.

"And not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete."

E. W. MACBRIDE

