VOL. VI., No. 3. OCTOBER: 1907

THE UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE

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

OCTOBER 1907

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA

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

Editor: ANDREW MACPHAIL, 216 Peel Street, Manager: CHARLES A. ROSS, 472 St. Catherine St. West, 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.

Communications may be sent to the Editor, and subscriptions to the Manager. The subscription price is one dollar a year. Copies are on sale by the publishers, and at all book stores for twenty-five cents each.

THE HUDSON BAY ROUTE

THE congested state of the grain traffic in Western Canada during the autumns of the last half-dozen years has led to a general demand for more outlets for Canadian wheat. The building of the Canadian Northern Railway has not met the demand, and it is felt by many that the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific will not solve the difficulty. Consequently the West, from Edmonton to Winnipeg, is looking to the North for a new and nearer outlet to the Atlantic Ocean. The demand for a railway to the Hudson Bay is heard on every political platform of the three grain-growing Provinces, and the question came up for serious discussion at the last session of the Dominion Parliament. The Minister of the Interior, in the name of the Government, spoke in favour of the idea, but refrained from giving any definite plan, or promise of immediate action. During the debate which took place both in the Senate and in the House of Commons, the possibilities of such a road were dealt with and thoroughly discussed. It is these possibilities that I propose to examine in this paper.

The question is a complex one and for the purpose of clearness must be discussed under a series of topics, which, though widely different in themselves, all bear in a vital and unmistakeable manner on the problem. The time of the navigability of the water route to the proposed eastern terminus of the Hudson Bay Railway, including opinions on the ice-movements and the climatic conditions that prevail in the Hudson Bay and Strait, is of fundamental importance. The possible extent of the operations of the railway,—the question whether they will extend their influence to British Columbia, and even to Japan and China, or whether

they will be limited to a part of the great plains,—cannot be omitted. We must also look carefully at the question whether the road will be financially a success, if built at the present moment, or whether it would not be wiser to put off building till at least financial loss does not seem the inevitable result.

Around the question of the length of time that Hudson Strait and Hudson Bay are open for navigation has centred a great deal of discussion and enquiry. The most authentic and reliable sources of information are the reports submitted to the Dominion Government by the commanders of the expeditions sent to the Hudson Bay for the purpose of exploring that great inland sea. I shall quote from the reports of Lieut. Gordon who carried on expeditions in 1884-85-86; the report of an expedition under Commander W. Wakeham in 1897; and that of Mr. A. P. Low's expedition in 1903-4.

Lieut. Gordon made three trips, and submitted three reports to the Canadian Government, dealing at length with the whole question. His 1886 report is the most complete and ends with these words: "In concluding these notes on the ice, it may not be out of place to say that, whilst I am of the opinion that there will always be more or less fluctuation in the date of the opening of practical navigation for the purpose of commerce, the ship-owner who sends in a freight-carrying steamer before the 15th. of July will almost certainly be subjected to such delays as will add very seriously to the cost of the voyage; indeed, it is by no means unlikely that, given two similar steamships, one entering Hudson Strait on the 5th. of July and the other on the 15th., the second steamer might pass the first and get through with little delay.

"In regard to the closing of the season, so far as obstruction from ice is concerned, the end of October seems to be the time when the heavy old ice comes down in force, and although in 1886 this ice was driven eastwards by a heavy gale and the Strait remained open for some time longer, the

temperatures have in November fallen so low and the days have become so short that the risks of navigation are seriously augmented. In estimating the period of navigation of an ordinary year, I should say from the 15th. of July to the 15th. of October, with a possibility of navigation from the 1st. of July to the 1st. of November; but in the first half of July, and indeed occasionally in the latter half, there will always be delays, and later than the 15th. of October the risks of navigation are so increased that the question of insurance will in all probability settle the date." Lieut. Gordon thus definitely limits the period of safe navigation to three months.

Commander W. Wakeham's opinion, expressed in his report eleven years later, is equally definite. He says: "I now conclude this report by saying that I absolutely agree with Capt. Gordon in fixing the date for the opening of navigation in Hudson Strait for commercial purposes by suitable vessels at from the 1st. to the 10th. of July. . . . I consider that navigation should close from the 15th. to the 20th. of October. I would not dread the ice in October, though there is always the chance of the western end of the Strait being blocked by Fox Channel ice. . . . I have already described the climatic conditions met with in October; we were favoured with a mild and comparatively calm month, yet the risks of navigation were so great that I have no hesitation whatever in saying that, after the last date which I have given above, it would be folly to think of carrying on commercial traffic through the Strait. I would therefore fix the 20th. of October as the extreme limit of safe navigation in the Fall." In other words, Commander Wakeham confirms Lieut. Gordon, both as to the opening and closing dates of navigation.

The latest word on the subject is that of Mr. A. P. Low in his report on the 1903-4 expedition. The report appeared in book form, under the title of "The Cruise of the *Neptune*." Mr. Low's opinion on the navigation question is summed up in the following paragraph: "The period of safe navigation

for ordinary iron steamships through Hudson Strait and across Hudson Bay to the Port of Churchill, may be taken to extend from the 20th. of July to the 1st. of November. This period might be increased without much risk by a week in the beginning of the season and by perhaps two weeks at the close."

That is, Mr. Low states that navigation is possible for from three and a-half to four months of the year. He, however, does not accompany his opinion with sufficient data to warrant us in throwing aside the opinions of either Lieut. Gordon or Commander Wakeham; nor does he attempt to refute the three following arguments put forward by them to show that the period of navigation must end before the first of November: I. The extremely short day at that time of year; II. The Baffin Bay pack's descent across the eastern entrance to Hudson Strait; III. The increase in insurance rates due to these dangers.

Granted then that there are three and a-half months, to take a medium figure, of navigation from the Atlantic to Churchill, it must be noted that for only two months, September and October, is navigation open after the shipment of the year's crop begins.

The navigation question thus disposed of, we must next ascertain what part, if any, of a railway to Hudson Bay is already built, and what is the outlook for the completion of the road. A glance at the last map of Canada issued by the Department of the Interior shows that there is only one road which can be considered as leading to the Hudson Bay, that is the Canadian Northern Railway. If one leaves Winnipeg on the Prince Albert Branch of the Canadian Northern, the train after travelling 390 miles stops at the rather startling station known as Hudson Bay Junction. From there a branch line runs northward towards the Hudson Bay, a distance of 86 miles to the Pass on the Saskatchewan river. Thus there are already 476 miles of the Hudson Bay Railway built. Nor does the Canadian Northern confine its attentions to the south side of the Saskatchewan; they have

survey parties at work on the proposed route beyond the Saskatchewan, and the Canadian Geological Survey Report for 1906 tells us that, by the summer of that year, "seventy miles of the road beyond the crossing of the Saskatchewan had been definitely located."

The mere fact that the Dominion Government has members of the Geological Survey at work "along the proposed route of the Canadian Northern Railway" beyond the Saskatchewan, as they themselves tell us in their annual report, goes to show that the question of the completion of the railway is less in the future than the average citizen thinks. The Canadian Northern do not object to state that they hope to be at Churchill in three years. The pending question before the Railway Company must be that hinted at by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the last session of Parliament, when he said that the standing offer on the statute books of 12,800 acres of land per mile for a railway to Hudson Bay had not been accepted by any company. The Canadian Northern Railway realize that 12,800 acres of inferior land along the road between the Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay, together with the customary Dominion subsidy of $3,200 per mile, and 50 per cent. of the cost over $15,000 per mile, the total subsidy not to exceed $6,400 per mile, will not enable them to build the road.

Building in Keewatin, they will not have the Manitoba Government to guarantee their bonds to the extent of $8,000 per mile, with interest at four per cent. for thirty years, as has been customary for that Province to do in the past. The Canadian Government will doubtless be urged to take the place of Manitoba in that regard; but before it does so a much fuller report than has yet been given as to the probable financial success of the road is due to the Canadian people.

The probable cost of the remainder of the line from the Saskatchewan to Churchill is a matter of conjecture. This distance is about 475 miles, and we are told that the route presents no very great obstacles to the construction of the

railway. There are, however, one or two factors which will seriously augment the cost of a line that hopes to catch any large portion of the grain traffic. The terminal facilities will have to be very large. Those immense grain elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur will have to be duplicated at Churchill. The hundred miles of track that Winnipeg boasts must be in a measure reproduced there, if a sufficient amount of grain is to be handled in an all too short two months to make the road pay. Not only must the terminal facilities be great, but the amount of rolling stock needed for the rushing of millions of bushels of grain to the Bay before the close of navigation will be abnormally large.

But does the question of the financial success of the enterprise depend solely on the ability of the railway to handle a large part of the grain crop? For the present this question must be answered in the affirmative; the future depends on the ability of the country between the Pass and Churchill to support a railway during the winter months. Churchill is not situated like Montreal. When the season of navigation ends there, traffic will cease; whereas Montreal, instead of loading vessels with grain and produce, when navigation ends sends the produce on to Canada's winter ports, St. John and Halifax.

That the land in those northern regions is of the nature to support any large population is doubtful. The resources of this country are of two kinds, of the forest and of the field. Information regarding it is most meagre; the best is obtained from the Dominion Geological Reports, of which the 1906 report contains the latest information. The Survey had two parties working in that district, especially on the country along the line of the proposed railway. They divided the route between them, the first taking the part from the Pass to Split Lake, and the second that from Split Lake to Port Churchill. Of the forests south of Split Lake, the Report says: "Though a wooded country throughout, there are but limited areas where the forest growth is of a size to be commercially of much value. There are no hard

woods. . . . Black spruce is the most abundant coniferous tree and grows to a size sufficient, at least, for pulp wood. . . . Forest fires have been wide-spread and most destructive throughout the whole region, sparing only the very wet, muskeg areas, and a few tracts isolated by surrounding water or marsh. . . . In the valleys occasional white spruce and tamarack attain diameters as great as 18 inches. These are trees that have escaped when the surrounding forest was burned and are sufficient evidence that, but for the repeated fires, there would be large areas covered with good timber."

As regards the timber beyond Split Lake the Report says: "The forest growth is chiefly black spruce and white birch of from four to 14 inches in diameter. . . . As already stated the whole country has been over-run with fires. Bunches of spruce and tamarack that escaped the fires were frequently met close to the water's edge. . . . Wood is scarce at Churchill. The Hudson's Bay Company obtain their fuel supply from a ravine three miles distant . . . where black spruce averaging five inches in diameter is found."

The agricultural possibilities are much more indefinite than the timber, but a few examples have been noted, which I will quote from the Geological Report of 1906. At Norway House, a Hudson Bay Company trading-post near the head of Lake Winnipeg, "the chief factor of the district cultivates a large garden, where on June 10th. 1906, peas, beans, beets, and other vegetables were well started. Wheat has been successfully grown here as well as at Cross Lake further down the river, in lat. 54° 40′. There are many tracts of land along the Nelson River suitable for cultivation, though for long stretches the banks show only rounded surfaces of biotite, smooth and glaciated.

"On the shores of Footprint Lake in latitude 55° 45′, small fields of potatoes planted by the Indians were looking remarkably well, the vines being 11 inches in height and about ready to blossom when this locality was visited. The

country lying to the south of the Archæan area, between it and the Saskatchewan valley contains very few tracts of land suitable for settlement. Practically only the river valley, a few tracts adjoining some of the slopes flanking the limestone ridges, can be considered as affording land suitable for cultivation."

In connexion with the weather the Report says: "From the time records were begun on the 19th. of June until the night of Sept. 29th, when the thermometer fell to 26°, there was no frost that affected even tender vegetation. On the night of August 10th. the temperature fell to the freezing point but did not get low enough to do damage, at least in the valley of the Grass river, though some of the potato vines on the summit of the high ridge north of the Pass were slightly touched."

The natural conclusions to be drawn from the above quotations are, that the timber resources of the country between the Pass and Hudson Bay, owing to forest fires, are not of the importance that we have been accustomed to believe; and that, though it has been found that in the valleys and certain parts of the country potatoes and other vegetables will grow and ripen, the amount of such land is limited and the extent to which it can be utilized is as yet largely a matter of conjecture. On the whole, our conclusion as regards this country must be that it cannot at the present, nor will it for years to come, be able to support a railway by its own resources; but that such a railway must depend for its very existence on the amount of grain it can carry from the prairies to Churchill.

Let us turn then and consider the grain crop, its size, and when and from what parts most of it is shipped to the East. The crop has assumed such proportions that the present transportation facilities for handling it are sadly deficient. The western grain crop for 1906 was roughly 190,000,000 bushels, consisting of 89,000,000 bushels of wheat and 101,000,000 bushels of oats and other cereals. Of the wheat crop 18,000,000 bushels were needed for seeding and for

country mills; 1,000,000 bushels were shipped from Winnipeg by the Great Northern Railway in 1906, and 25,000,000 were shipped down the Great Lakes in that season. This leaves about 45,000,000 bushels to find its way out by the all-rail route or by the Lakes the next spring. The annual shipment of about 10,000,000 bushels of oats must also be taken into consideration.

The most of this grain is at present handled by the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railways. These two companies have extensive terminals on Lake Superior, but are still unable to give adequate transportation facilities. The question was thoroughly discussed at the last session of the Dominion Parliament, and the reason given for the congestion of traffic was that the railways were unable to obtain sufficient cars with which to handle the crop. All the car-shops in America are flooded with orders, and the Canadian railways claim that on their lines the state of affairs is not nearly as bad as on the American lines across the boundary. Besides the increasing of the number of cars there are two other facts which will soon greatly facilitate the shipment of the wheat in the fall of the year, the double-tracking of the Canadian Pacific from Winnipeg to Fort William, and the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The double-tracking of the Canadian Pacific line has been going on for several years; and, though it is not yet completed, sections of it are being used in the shipping of the present crop. The requisite part of the Grand Trunk Pacific is still in the course of construction. By the time the Hudson Bay Railway could be built and ready to handle grain, if started immediately, these three routes to the Lakes will be completed and fully equipped with cars and terminals. Not only will the competition be between a new (and hence, at first, inefficient) road and three old and well-equipped roads; but the question of the length of navigability of the two water routes will be of vital importance. I have already shown that a great body of wheat does not find its way east till the following spring. The Hudson Bay Railway cannot

ship any of this wheat to Europe till three months after navigation has opened on the Lakes, for it is only then that their route is open for navigation. In the fall there is a similar disadvantage: the Hudson Bay route closes at least a month before the last grain is shipped from Fort William. The shipper's risk in being able to get his grain to market is thus greatly increased, and he will therefore only ship if the Hudson Bay Railway can quote him a freight rate substantially lower than he can get in shipping by the Great Lakes.

A comparison of the existing rates with the probable rates on the Hudson Bay Railway, if carefully done, leads to definite conclusions. It is most difficult to say what freight rates are likely or ought to be. Those given below are either the actual rates at present in existence or approximations from them for distances for which as yet no rates have been prepared. That they should be absolutely exact is impossible; but they are as definite as can be under the circumstances. I have left out of account the fact that the Hudson Bay Railway would be lying practically idle eight months of the year, so that the rates given as likely to obtain over that line will be if anything too low.

Winnipeg is the most important shipping point for wheat in the West. It is the wheat centre for Manitoba, the greatest wheat-producing Province in Canada. Of the 89,000,000 bushels of wheat grown in the West in 1906 Manitoba produced 58,500,000 bushels. The importance then of the question, which of the two routes from Winnipeg to Liverpool is the cheaper, is apparent. Winnipeg is 4,317 statute miles from Liverpool *via* Churchill, and 4,628 miles from Liverpool *via* Montreal and the Straits of Belle Isle. That is, the proposed route is 311 miles shorter than the present one; but it is to be noted that wheat goes by the all-water and not the all-rail route, giving the present route an advantage of a land haul shorter by 525 miles.

Let us look at a comparison of the present wheat rates with the probable rates on the new route:

Winnipeg to Churchill, 951 miles, at.. 20 cents per cwt.

Churchill to Liverpool, 3,366 miles, at..	7	cents	per cwt.
Total, Winnipeg to Liverpool *via* Churchill	27	"	"
Winnipeg to Ft. William, 426 miles, at	10	"	"
Ft. William to Montreal, all-water, at	9.75	"	"
Montreal to Liverpool, 3,206 miles, at	6.25	"	"
Total Winnipeg to Liverpool *via* Montreal	26	"	"

These figures show that the Montreal route can more than hold its own in competing for the wheat crop that really counts, that is, the Manitoba crop.

The Saskatchewan crop for 1906 amounted to 29,000,000 bushels of wheat, the greater part being produced in the south-east corner of the Province, almost as near Winnipeg as Regina, and hence as well suited to come under the Winnipeg rates as under the Regina. But the Regina figures are of importance in showing what the Hudson Bay Railway can expect from that part of the country in future years:

Regina to Churchill, 962 miles, at.....	23	cents	per cwt.
Churchill to Liverpool, 3,366 miles, at .	7	"	"
Total Regina to Liverpool *via* Churchill	30	"	"
Regina to Ft. William, 785 miles, at ..	18	"	"
Ft. William to Montreal, all-water, at	9.75	"	"
Montreal to Liverpool, 3,206 miles, at	6.25	"	"
Total Regina to Liverpool *via* Montreal	34	"	"

This is an apparent advantage of four cents per cwt. in favour of the new route, but, as was said before, this does not take into account the exceptionally high cost of the proposed route and the non-use of the road during the winter months.

Winnipeg and Regina are the two wheat centres at present, but with the steady growth of population that characterizes the West it will not be long before Edmonton and Prince Albert will be assuming an importance that cannot be overlooked. The prospects for the success of the proposed route are much brighter there.

Prince Albert is 1,011 miles nearer Liverpool *via* Churchill

than *via* Montreal. The probable and present rates are:

Prince Albert to Churchill, 713 miles, at	18	cents	per cwt.
Churchill to Liverpool, 3,366 miles, at.	7	"	"
Total Prince Albert to Liverpool *via* Churchill.....	25	"	"
Prince Albert to Ft. William, 969 m., at	23	"	"
Ft. William to Montreal, all-water, at	9.75	"	"
Montreal to Liverpool, 3,206 miles, at	6.25	"	"
Total Prince Albert to Liverpool *via* Montreal	39	"	"

This yields a difference in favour of the Hudson Bay route of 14 cents on the hundred weight of wheat. Edmonton shows a like result:

Edmonton to Churchill, 1,125 miles, at	25	cents	per cwt.
Churchill to Liverpool, 3,366 miles, at	7	"	"
Total Edmonton to Liverpool *via* Churchill, at.....	32	"	"
Edmonton to Ft. William, 1,266 miles,	25	"	"
Ft. William to Montreal, all-water, at	9.75	"	"
Montreal to Liverpool, 3,206 miles, at	6.25	"	"
Total Edmonton to Liverpool *via* Montreal	41	"	"

This shows nine cents on the hundred pounds in favour of the proposed route. It is therefore plain that, while Winnipeg will not be materially benefited by the opening of the route to Hudson Bay, the saving in transportation for the products from the whole Saskatchewan valley will be great; but it must be borne in mind that at present these products are still of the future and that, till that country has developed to a greater extent than at present, the idea that a railway to Hudson Bay can prosper is an untenable one.

The hope of a shorter route from Europe to China and Japan has often been raised in connexion with the proposed opening of Hudson Bay to navigation. This is indeed a slim foundation on which to build such an enterprise. That Chinese and Japanese freight will be diverted from its regular course of transit for three months by an expected saving

is very much to be doubted. It is also a question of doubt whether the British Government will trust their mails, as has been proposed, to the whims and fancies of the Arctic ice. Even granted that the Hudson Bay route does capture the Chinese and Japanese trade for three months of the year, will it amount to a very great deal? The answer must be in the negative, especially when the influence of the completion of the Panama Canal on Oriental trade is taken into consideration. The conclusion is that the Hudson Bay Railway cannot safely count on any appreciable amount of trans-Pacific trade.

We are forced to the final conclusion that the much-talked-of Hudson Bay Railway, if immediately built, cannot hope to prove a financial success. Owing to the keen competition of the all-water route by the Great Lakes, it will not be able to handle the Manitoba grain or general produce. What traffic it might hope to obtain from the Saskatchewan valley is at present so small and the time of navigation so short that to make the road pay, if built immediately, seems impossible. I do not, however, think that that will always be the case. When Edmonton, Battleford, Saskatoon, and Prince Albert have become the centres of a large and prosperous population, when land has become so scarce as to force settlers to seek out homes to the North towards Hudson Bay, then will come the time when the Hudson Bay Railway will be necessary, and it will then be an assured financial success, although working against the difficulties of a very short season of navigation. In the meantime the greatest care is necessary on the part of the Western Povinces which are clamouring so loudly for a railway, and on the part of the Dominion Government, in whose hands rests the all-important question to the Canadian people of subsidizing the proposed Hudson Bay Railway.

R. W. Ellis

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE AND BRITISH UNION

PRINCIPAL PETERSON, writing in the April number of this Magazine on the then imminent Conference, ventured a provisional prophecy that "more will come out of the Conference of 1907 than the man-in-the-street is at present looking for." Certainly that man was not expecting a new, workable, efficient, sufficient constitution for co-operative union of the self-governing realms of King Edward. Yet that desideratum appears to have issued from the meeting.

Before examining the unique political structure, it may be profitable to quote a broad definition from the closing paragraph of the Principal's April article. He wrote: "Imperialists are those who wish to see this Empire hold together, and who desire to do all that may properly be done to strengthen the bonds that unite us." That is conciliatory, and something more. Coming from one who has prominently appeared in the school of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Milner, the definition, like many other recent utterances from that school, signifies a liberal modification of the attitude of its adherents. Doubtless they understood all along that men could sincerely wish to see this Empire hold together, and yet could oppose the application of such cement as they favoured. But, until lately, they seemed to be chary of recognizing as Imperialists any save Centralizationists and Preferentialists. The new inclusiveness is not here impertinently observed with recriminatory intention, but simply as one item denoting the good understanding which has been at last produced by some forty years of controversy on the question, "How may British freedom be extended and British union be preserved?" Great is free discussion. Another of its good fruits is the present disposition of some who have long been

peculiarly sticklers for "Canadianism." Since they find local Nationalism encouraged by a school that formerly appeared to imagine it inconsistent with a sound Imperialism, they incline to reflect anew on British union as security for local Nationalism. In short, controversy has done its proper work of reconciliation. We are all Nationalists and all Imperialists now, because of the general perception that both the good sentiments can be entertained with advantage to both the good causes. Lord Grey must be credited with having promoted this perception in Canadian minds. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's share in the effect can be cheerfully left by his friends to public judgement and the enduring verdict of history.

Look again at Principal Peterson's definition. Mr. Bourassa, after cautiously emphasizing the "properly," might fairly avow himself such an Imperialist, because British union implies generally available strength to guard securely the conceded local rights, liberties, or privileges of every people of the units of the Empire. This new Imperialism embraces devotees of Federation no less fondly than those who can but hopelessly wish Federation were practicable. It enfolds hospitably those Canadian souls that were never so dead as never to have said, "this is my own, my native land," and as hospitably it entertains those co ıprehensive spirits who immensely yearn with no patriotism less expansive than His Majesty's realms. In one Imperialist company it ranges anxious warriors who urge that all the actual and potential armaments of all the British countries should be controlled by the military genius of the Horse Guards, and those raging anti-militarists who would permit no man or dollar to be commandeered for the King, save by his elected Parliament in each self-governing unit. In short, the New Imperialism ignores differences of opinion as to methods by which the common purposes of British Union can be served. It excommunicates neither Decentralizationists nor Centralizationists. In so far as they alike wish to hold this Empire together, it regards their different camps as not hostile, but friendly. The test is no longer one of opinion concerning plans of salvation. The test is of works. Co-operation for

all such purposes of British Union as we can agree to co-operate for—that is the New Imperialism's ambition.

It was in this large spirit that the conferrees of 1907 worked in London. Hence they agreed wonderfully well. True, an impression considerably prevails that they differed, and therefore effected nothing concerning matters of more importance than they agreed about. One may fairly take leave to declare that impression erroneous, if he has carefully read the entire verbatim report of proceedings and speeches. The error was produced during sessions of the Conference, partly by the rancorous eagerness of opposing party presses in London, and partly by the general lack of impartial sense in United States cable correspondents. These Activities could make their Dailies more interesting by seizing on and accentuating disagreements between the conferrees. It may be useful, within the range of this Magazine, to write now on a method precisely contrary, to remark mainly the points of agreement. What was left undone by reason of differences of opinion may be done later by common consent, or may be forever burked as undesirable, or as inexpedient for lack of unanimity. What was done was all to the good, all co-operative achievement for British Union. To look at work actually performed is to strengthen belief that much more can and will be done in a similar way. If the Empire really drifted at any time, it got up steam last April and May.

The constitution of the Conference was its most important achievement, or, indeed, the only one which it had power to consummate alone, that is without implementary aid from the various Parliaments represented. If, as some of us believe, that constitution amounts to one for efficient co-operative British Union, then the first Conference resolution, which formulates the constitution, is one of the most memorable of political documents. It reads:

"That it will be to the advantage of the Empire if a Conference, to be called the Imperial Conference, is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's Government and His Governments of the self-governing Dominions beyond

the seas. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom will be *ex officio* President, and the Prime Ministers of the self-governing Dominions *ex officio* members of the Conference. The Secretary of State for the Colonies will be an *ex officio* member of the Conference, and will take the chair in the absence of the President. He will arrange for such Imperial Conferences after communication with the Prime Ministers of the respective Dominions.

"Such other Ministers as the respective Governments may appoint will also be members of the Conference—it being understood that, except by special permission of the Conference, each discussion will be conducted by not more than two representatives from each Government, and that each Government will have only one vote.

"That it is desirable to establish a system by which the several Governments represented shall be kept informed during the periods between the Conferences in regard to matters which have been or may be subjects for discussion, by means of a permanent secretarial staff, charged, under the direction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with the duty of obtaining information for the use of the Conference, of attending to its resolutions, and of conducting correspondence on matters relating to its affairs.

"That upon matters of importance requiring consultation between two or more Governments which cannot conveniently be postponed until the next Conference, or involving subjects of a minor character or such as call for detailed consideration, subsidiary Conferences should be held between representatives of the Governments concerned specially chosen for the purpose."

That resolution was passed unanimously. Why recall, as if they were important, those temporary differences which were revealed during the discussion which shaped the complete agreement? Rather might the conciliatory spirit of the New Imperialism require observation of the factors that were contributed to that constitution by diversely minded men, who share the credit alike since they ultimately created the whole by common consent.

All the Premiers agreed, from the moment of meeting, on "Imperial" as a word more accurately descriptive than "Colonial" of the assemblage which they designed to perpetuate. All agreed from the start that it should have no executive or legislative powers, but be purely consultative and advisory. Mr. Deakin of Australia, who had proposed "Council" instead of "Conference," readily accepted the latter word as most proper, after Sir Wilfrid Laurier had explained that "Council" is taken, in Canada, to denote a body having something of executive authority. Not in the Conference, but only in obstinately factious newspapers, was there any wrangling on behalf of "Council."

The *ex officio* Presidency of the Old Country Premier accords with a suggestion probably first made public by Lord Milner, even as Principal Peterson indicated in his April article. This feature was first propounded in Conference by Mr. Deakin, a New Imperialist who came from the old Chamberlain-Milner school. It may have remotely originated in a "Canada-first" mind, or in some other which was peculiarly eager to promote local Nationalism, since the avowed purpose of including the Old Country Premier in the Conference was to signalize the newly acknowledged equality of political status between the King's self-governing realms. It was merely decent to give the Presidency to the Premier of the ancient and principal power, by way of recognizing him and his country as first among equals. The provision that his colleague, the Colonial Secretary of State, shall act as his deputy in the chair, prevents the possibility of some injurious contest by vote in Conference for the honour of temporary chairmanship. The entire Presidency arrangement goes toward gratification of that sentiment in Canadians, Australians, etc., which Professor Leacock voiced so emphatically in these pages—that sentiment which causes men of the New Countries to abhor being termed "Colonials."

Imperial Federation was long attractive to patriotic youth in the outlying realms, partly because it propounded such an equality of political status between the Old and the New Countries as the Conference unanimously formulated

by its own organization. Not only so, but every Premier there avowed, at one time or another, a hearty fealty to the principle of equality. Sir Wilfrid Laurier particularly denoted it by declaring the Conference to be one "between Governments and Governments." The Old Country Premier, in his opening and welcoming address, said: "We found ourselves, gentlemen, upon Freedom and Independence—that is the essence of the British Imperial connection. Freedom of action on the part of the independent State, freedom in the relations with each other and with the Mother Country." Obviously the equality established in Conference can never be infringed upon by the principal partner without giving such umbrage to the other partners as would drive them out. Hence the Conference has placed each minor Country in a political position essentially superior to that which it could hold in any all-inclusive British Federated Legislature or Executive Council, since such a body would necessarily be constituted with much conformity to the principle of representation by population.

The "One country, one vote" proviso is at once a corollary to the proclaimed equality, and in the nature of a security that no Government or Country represented in Conference can be compromised by any majority vote which its Premier opposes. Had each Country more than one voting representative in Conference, its representation might be conceivably split, its voice confused, its opinion doubted, its people pressed into a political contest on some Imperial business started in Conference, and a weight of opinion from outside their domain thrust injuriously upon them in respect of some decision, perhaps of huge importance to their future, which decision they ought to be free to reach by sole consideration of their best interests, lest such decision might be not valuably, firmly and permanently declared.

That no one of the King's dominions should be impelled, through operation of the Conference, into any course which such single country might not truly desire to pursue, might seem sufficiently secured by the Conference being required to leave its recommendations to be implemented or ignored

by each Parliament separately. But it is none the less wise that each country be guarded against the danger of such internal dissensions as might come from casting a split vote in Conference. To the fullest degree the constitution conforms with that Voluntary Imperialism whereby the natural union of the realms has so happily continued as to inspire them to create means for regularizing co-operation.

The main difference of opinion in respect of Conference constitution was voiced in discussions preliminary to unanimous adoption of the paragraph relating to a permanent secretariat. Mr. Deakin wished that secretariat to be controlled by the Old Country Premier, not in his capacity of Prime Minister, but in his capacity as Conference President. Dr. Jamieson favoured this scheme, yet propounded an alternative, that the secretariat should be controlled by the Agents-general of the Dominions external to Great Britain, these gentlemen to be, it seemed, in continuous Conference, and to have, as he put it, "a free hand." In neither case would the secretariat, though it could not but be essentially in the nature of a political Department of State, be under any responsible Minister. This objection, promptly taken by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, was soon confessed to be sound by Messrs. Deakin and Jamieson. Nobody in the discussion chanced to specify that the Conference, which has no existence out of session, which collectively represents no country nor any political entity, which possesses neither legislative authority, nor executive power, nor machinery to enforce or regulate operation on any of its resolutions, nor one inch of standing ground from which to delegate functions, simply could not establish a permanent political secretariat even if its members unanimously wished to do so. Probably this, being implied in Sir Wilfrid's objection, would have been expressed in Conference had discussion on the Deakin-Jamieson projects become strenuous. That was prevented partly by the Old Country Premier's refusal to administer the secretariat in any capacity, and partly by Lord Elgin's undertaking to establish the requisite linking staff responsibly as a branch of his ministry. He fully adopted Mr. Deakin's suggestion that the new branch [the

beginning of whose organization has been announced at the time of this writing] should be devoted wholly to affairs of the self-governing Dominions. This has given rise to a recent wish in the New Countries that they may be permitted to bear due shares of the expense of what may be termed the Department of The Free Empire, though its cost must necessarily be directly borne by the one Government which stands responsible for its administration.

The Conference, when fully constituted, went on to concoct and record various unanimous resolutions, or recommendations to the separate Parliaments. Such resolutions as were not unanimous must be ineffective, and to record them seems inconsistent with the principle of the Conference. As Dr. Jamieson once observed, it must advise unanimously to advise usefully. To put Conference at all in the attitude of seeming to press on the Parliaments in general aught that is known to be obnoxious to some or any of them, would tend to disunion, tend to put any unwilling unit on its independence in resentment at a seeming attempt of the majority to exercise on it a sort of coercion. It is probable that this sense would have caused suppression of the majority's "preference" and "coasting" resolutions, had they been opposed by any unit less important than the Old Country, whose ministers appeared magnanimously willing to admit record of any amount of advice contrary to their own vote.

The unanimous resolutions are well known, and may be described, sufficiently for the present purpose, as recommendations in promotion of common action for defence, and for improvement of the commercial, professional, and social relations between countries of the British Union. It is because the leverage of the Conference on the separate Parliaments appears strong enough to cause them to implement those recommendations, that one may reasonably regard the Conference as an effective and therefore sufficient Senate for the Union.

This singular Senate is composed of premiers, men powerful because their parliaments are obviously at their backs. They ought to be able to "make good" each in his

own domain. The presumption that they will do so, because they so engage themselves in Conference, is the foundation of the Senate. In seeking to keep his engagements no premier is likely to be assailed by his regular Opposition, since both parties in each country wish well to British Union, and therefore desire to see the Conference system succeed. It must be plain to every reflective mind that the system will be judged, and perpetuated or abandoned, according to its success or its failure in getting actually done the things which its members unanimously vote for. If the parliaments take hold everything goes. If they, to use the expressive vernacular again, "throw down" the Conference, then this must disappear as useless. Because it embodies the utmost respect for local Nationalism with an apparently sincere desire for Union every notable political element in each parliament ought to be, and doubtless will be hearty and prompt in helping its premier to save his Conference pledges.

If this be done all round, the Conference cannot but acquire immensely influential prestige. It will then be more and more regarded, accepted and employed as the means of effective co-operation for common good purposes. Did it vanish in consequence of proved ineffectiveness, then the very idea of a central organization for Union would inevitably decay. That might imply ultimate break-up of the Empire. The Conference now appears contrived as by an inspiration from the Almighty to accord with every dear sentiment of the British peoples; its success will be indisputable testimony that their union accords with the impulse in seventy million hearts, and is therefore essentially indestructible. The situation puts on the separate parliaments the onus of proving whether Sir Joseph Ward, New Zealand, was right or wrong in Conference, when he said, "Governments come and Governments go; parties come and parties go; but our great Empire, we trust, will last forever."

All but one of the unanimous resolutions of the Conference may be regarded as sure to be carried out effectively. The excepted one requires very important co-operative action.

It is Number XX, on "Development of Communications within the Empire:"

"That in the opinion of this Conference the interests of the Empire demand that in so far as practicable its different portions should be connected by the best possible means of mail communication, travel, and transportation. That to this end it is advisable that Great Britain should be connected with Canada, and through Canada with Australia and New Zealand, by the best service available within reasonable cost. That for the purpose of carrying the above project into effect, such financial support as may be necessary should be contributed by Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand in equitable proportions."

This was adopted in lieu of the general mutual tariff preference favoured by the premiers of the New Countries, but to which the Old Country, dependent for her commercial existence on free food and free raw materials, could not consent. Partly because of the actual benefits to be justly expected of the All-Red-line, partly because the British Government regard it as a compensatory alternative to "preference," partly because the vessels of the suggested service would be potentially a valuable addition to the naval forces of the British Union, but more than all because the establishment of that service would implement the one Conference recommendation that was both important and novel, is early institution of the All-Red-line desirable in the highest degree. Desirable for political consequences. Desirable as signalizing the efficiency of the Conference. Were the fast steamers running *as a result of the Conference*, then its potency would be so estimated that its survival would be assured, and the whole world be valuably impressed by a sense that British political ingenuity has invented a workable institution for enabling any sort of vast co-operation by the Independencies.

In reasonable expectation of such huge, useful, political effects, Canada might, even if the All-Red-line were not certain to yield profits, direct and indirect, to her people, surely well undertake thatthe project shall not be balked by the impudent

indisposition of the Australian Parliament to " make good " for Mr. Deakin. Consider how extensively the Dominion profited through gaining prestige by favourably affecting the imagination of the whole British world in freely granting a tariff-preference to the Motherland. A similar stroke would doubtless be achieved did the Ottawa parliament resolve to supply the British Union steamer service with every necessary dollar which might not be furnished by other interested Dominions of the King.

Thus the Imperial Conference would be, thanks to Canada, so established as a producer of great effects, that the peoples of the Union would look to it confidently as a means for achieving every practical boon formerly imaginable as resultant from Federation, or from any other fancied Imperial organization that could not leave the units in their present happy position as untrammelled and equal members of the Voluntary Empire.

E. W. Thomson

THE PATIENCE OF ENGLAND

BRITISH diplomacy has two sides; the one which it presents to its enemies, and the one which it presents to its friends. That explains why the enemies of England think her diplomacy at one time astute unto perfidy and again complacent to the point of stupidity.

When Lord Salisbury declared with simple words and good-natured utterance that England had no intention of yielding up to a band of adventurers what she had sweat for in the Sudan, that was the infamy of Fashoda. When he warned Europe against the infection of a decaying nation, that was English brutality, keeping the peace whilst an upstart power severed a decaying limb from Spain. When he effected a working arrangement with Japan, England was guilty of the barbarity of pitting the black race against the white. Yet these charges are not made with entire sincereness. There is that mental reservation which comes from perplexity.

England to foreign minds is a paradox. They are never done wondering at her stubborn determination not to be forced into action. But their wonder is increased to amazement, when the right moment has come, and they see the promptitude with which she is aroused and the resolution with which she proceeds, entirely oblivious of the scruples which restrained her and the hesitancy with which she began.

It would be of great advantage to foreigners if they could obtain a formula by which they might discover the flashing point of English passion. They have seen it slumber during clamour, smoulder when it should have burst into flame; and again they have seen it flash as a reaction against some innocent and unpremeditated operation on the part of an irresponsible rival. With the utmost of placid amazement,

England read Mr. Cleveland's Venezuela message of December 17th., 1895, and broke into a fury of flying squadrons because the Emperor of Germany had sent a simple, well-meaning telegram to a friend. The English mind is not logical; it is sentimental, passionate, quixotic. No one can tell—least of all one of themselves—what kind of insult will arouse this strange race to action. If Palmerston, instead of Salisbury, had been at the head of affairs when Mr. Cleveland took that amazing hazard, there would surely have been trouble; whilst the earlier premier would probably have put a straw in his mouth when he read the German Kaiser's telegram and wondered what it was all about.

More perplexing still to foreigners, the passion for blood dies down when its object is accomplished as quickly as it arose. Englishmen who have been accustomed ever since Majuba to refer to Gladstone only as "that bad old man" forgot in an instant Colenso, Spion Kop, and Maggersfontein, and welcomed General Botha to their councils in the month of April last. Truly it is a strange paradox to foreigners—the whole race hurrying to South Africa over every sea for the head of Botha, and this same General Botha, three years later on March 23rd., declaring at the banquet given in Johannesburg to the New Transvaal Ministry of which he was the head: "We trust Britain, and we desire to deserve her trust in us."

The quality above all others which impresses the foreign mind when it reflects upon England is her infinite patience with her own. This was never better stated than in the London *Standard* of March 30th., 1907, in commenting upon an article in the UNIVERSITY MAGAZINE: "We of the Old Country, to put the matter quite plainly, have not the smallest desire to keep the distant shires of the Empire in leading strings; we do not wish to hinder—we would rather help—their advance to nationhood. But we will not attempt to force them to take their places as fully-grown members of the family until they demonstrate, of their own free will, their desire to do so. We wish to see an Imperial Witan created; we wish to see an Imperial Navy ride the seas; but, until the

Five Nations offer willingly, we will bear cheerfully the burden of their defence and the exacting task of endeavouring to adjust foreign relations with regard at once to the interests of the Imperial whole and the susceptibilities of its component parts."

A child does not appreciate the graces of his parents until he himself becomes a father. Then he sees a fresh embodiment of his own early selfishness, his truculency and ingratitude. He has a new perception of his parents' perplexities, of their tolerant forbearance, their indifferent fortitude, and unceasing self-control. Now that we in Canada have come to man's estate, it is proper that we should take an accounting for ourselves of what England has done for us; and, if the account be satisfactory, make open and grateful acknowledgment of it. England does not demand such a reckoning. We owe it to ourselves to present it.

We can form no estimate of the conduct of England in any particular situation or locality unless we take account of the events which were happening elsewhere at the same moment. History must be studied as a whole. A fisherman must not lay too much stress upon the complaint of the individual sprat, else his living would soon be at an end and the larger fish be left to prey unchecked upon the whole sprat race. When we survey the field of England's dealing with Canada this century past, we must remember that she has had preoccupations elsewhere. The Premier of Canada, speaking before the British Ambassador, complained that England had withdrawn her boundary line from the Ohio River in 1783. As well might he blame her for withdrawing her boundary from the New England coasts; as most persons, I imagine, are aware that her withdrawal from that part of the American Continent was not quite voluntary. The Premier would also do well to remember that France was at England's throat and that she had some considerable employment before she succeeded in rescuing Europe and chaining Napoleon to her African rock.

The Premier, in spite of his beneficent nature and political adroitness, has found his resources strained in keeping the

peace between Colonel Hughes and Mr. Bourassa, between the Orangemen of Ontario and the Ultramontanes of Quebec. He had the Manitoba school question to settle and found it troublesome enough, whilst England was establishing and preserving correct relations between Musselman, Hindoo, and Christian, to say nothing of Episcopalian and Non-Conformist. Canada is a great country; but the Premier must not blame England too severely because she did not abandon her dealings with the Turk, with the heathen gods of India, with the spirit of murder and pestilence which for centuries had stalked through the Upper Sudan, even though we admit that, whilst she was engaged in the dark places of the earth teaching the helpless to help themselves, the people of the United States were stealing our fish from the waters of Prince Edward Island.

It is not the present intention to write the history of England—domestic and foreign—alluring as that enterprise appears. I am merely calling attention to the fact that all these years England has had a history elsewhere than in Canada. The Premier is aware--and, if he is not fully informed upon the subject, his friend Mr. Botha will furnish him with particulars—that England was fighting for her life in South Africa, whilst the vultures hovered in the European sky. During those years of warfare, gold was discovered in the Upper Yukon. Small wonder that England appeared abstracted when she was asked to define the true borders of Alaska.

The key to this paradox, an England passionate yet self-controlled, obstinate yet good-natured, implacable yet forgiving, illogical and sentimental, lies in this that the English are not a nation but a mixed race, more mixed than the Iroquois Indians who, in proportion to their numbers, held wider dominion than England now controls.

A pure race has one tendency and its course may be determined. The English are a mixed breed and retain the confusing characteristics of the elements by which it has been enriched and refreshed. The enemy of to-day may be adopted into the family to-morrow, therefore an English

campaign is a mixture of war and benevolence. That is why England did so badly in South Africa. That is also why in the long run she did so well, as the issue has proved.

Words do not forever retain their original meaning. The term "English" once described those peoples who dwelt between the two Channels. It was merely geographical, and inaccurate even at the time when it was seized upon; for those peoples were already intermingled. An Englishman is only occasionally and fortuitously English. To set forth this matter fully would require an expanse of writing and a display of learning which would be intolerable, but an observant person who moves about the English counties may ascertain for himself the truth of this remark in the varied stocks of the race. He will find yet persisting the thick-set Saxon, heavy, round-headed with blue eyes and drooping moustaches, "a sort of terrestrial walrus who goes erect," a bull-dog amongst terriers. The type is reproduced again in the women, in their round faces, in the pure colour and brightness of their eyes, mothers of many men, the indomitable Saxon peasants who in the last resort always saved England. Side by side with this stiff and stubborn breed, conscious still of its superiority, may yet be seen men of other types, small, narrow-headed, brown-skinned, black-haired and black-eyed, the true Iberian; or the black Celt, small and swarthy, besides innumerable harkings back to Danes, Brythons, and Goidels. Lastly, there are Romans walking the streets of London, proud in face and gesture, as knowing that the legions had never wholly left Britain.

All these breeds and races are now English, though they are as dissimilar as are the French-Canadians of Quebec, the farmers of the Western plains, the stockmen of Australia, or the burghers of the veldt amongst themselves. Within the narrow borders of England these peoples dwelt together fortuitously, Community of interest developed a patriotism; community of sentiment developed affection; community of language obliterated all remembrance of old strifes in the glorifying in the common tongue of new victories.

We in Canada must take account of this brooding instinct

if we would understand England's dealing with and on behalf of us. One illustration will serve. In 1866, Canada was invaded by an armed force from the United States with all the circumstance of war. Regular troops marched forth to meet it. The Militia assembled. Battles were fought. Men were killed. The country was ravaged. The invaders were driven out and took refuge under the guns of an American man-of-war. Here, if ever, was a case for satisfaction or reprisal. Yet England made no demand for indemnity nor even asked for apology. She herself paid for the damage done to her colony. In this her patience and passionless wisdom were abundantly justified. She knew that the United States was in a sore temper from the Civil War; that it had an army of one million veterans ready for fresh adventure however mad; that a foreign war would once more unite North and South by the bond of a common danger, and that a war, whether successful or unsuccessful, would be a disaster to the race. This was the moment for reticence, for patience.

It would be the business of a great writer to set forth the course of British diplomacy in so far as it has affected Canada, and the product would be a valuable book. In the main, these measures were far-reaching, just, and wise, and were inspired only by the desire to do what was best not only for the interests of Canada but for the English race as a whole. The present article, however, may serve as an introduction to such a study.

The most important of these diplomatic arrangements were the Ashburton Treaty in 1842, the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 and its abrogation in 1866; the Oregon Treaty of 1846, and the Alaskan Award of 1901. A full examination of the after effects of these measures has not yet been made, but in the meantime one may hazard the statement that in no single instance was injustice done, nor were the interests of Canada jeopardized.

All intelligent persons are now agreed that no different conclusion could have been arrived at by Lord Ashburton in regard to the boundaries between Canada and Maine. The facts are all set forth in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for 1903 by W. F. Ganong. A mischievous legend

has grown up around this treaty, and to this day it is propagated in school-books, histories, and other romances. The explanation which obtains most favour in the United States, and arouses most glee, is that Daniel Webster and his colleagues falsified the maps and imposed upon the simple-minded Englishman. In view of all the facts, it would appear that this astute people must renounce the reputation for smartness which they have cherished for over half a century and content themselves with the simple virtue of honesty.

In treaty making the stupidity has been on the side of the United States even when their own peculiar province of trade was under discussion. "Canada is within our lines" was the declaration of that great strategist, General Sherman. In a military sense, that is a matter of surmise. In a commercial sense it was true at one time but it is true no longer. The abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866 at the instance of the United States marked off the dividing line. This treaty was negotiated by the Earl of Elgin, at that time governor-general of Canada, and was signed on June 5th., 1854. The arrangement lasted for twelve years and was of great advantage to both countries. In the last year of the operation of the treaty, the exports from Canada to the United States, amounted to fifty-four million dollars, but the balance of trade was in favour of the United States. For the years preceding the abrogation of the treaty, the average traffic between the countries was valued at seventy-five million dollars; for a similar period after that event, the trade fell to an average of fifty-seven million dollars. The aggregate foreign trade of Canada was, during the last year of the treaty, $160,409,455. The year following it declined to $139,202,615, but in the seventh year it had risen to $235,301,203. The balance of trade was against the United States; and the Port of Boston alone suffered to the extent of twenty-seven million dollars a year.

The repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866 brought temporary hardship in Canada by the derangement of trade; and there was a clamour that England had forsaken us. Indeed, under the stress of those "bad times" there was a loud

cry for annexation to the United States. But to the credit of Canada, her people sought new paths and in a few years they were competing with the United States in the foreign markets of the world. Goods which had previously been sold in New York and Boston were now sold in the Maritime Provinces, in Newfoundland, in the West Indies, in England. Canada learned the valuable lesson that she had lakes and seas and rivers of her own whereon she might freight her goods in ships built from her own forests. A new spirit, a new people, a new nation was born, independent of the United States and free to develop affiliations according to natural affinity. "We shall have no more pilgrimages to Washington. We are turning our hopes to the Old Motherland"; this was the Premier's declaration in the hearing of Mr. Bryce at Ottawa, a fair warning to all statesmen of pro-American proclivities.

Under the Treaty of Oregon, England yielded seven degress of latitude and obtained six. It is impossible, for the present, to enter into a discussion of all the factors in so complicated a problem but it is worth noting that all of Western Canada was saved at a time when its value was entirely unsuspected. The Oregon Treaty is also commonly believed to have favoured the United States unduly and it has long been regarded as testimony to the ineptitude of British diplomacy. The western boundary between Canada and the United States, which is now accepted under this treaty as the forty-ninth parallel of latitude, was long in dispute. England laid claim to all territory lying to the north of forty-two degrees. The United States protested that the true boundary was as high as 54° 40′: "fifty-four-forty or fight" was their cry. The territory in dispute extended north and south 1200 miles and included all which lies between Salt Lake and Edmonton, namely, the present States of Washington, Montana, the two Dakotas, Wyoming, Idaho and Oregon, besides the greater part of British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Nor should the alien breeds who now form a part of the race fail to remind themselves occasionally of what England did for them in the hour of their defeat. The French-Canadian, whilst he glories in his language, his religion, and his laws,

might with propriety abandon himself to an emotion of gratitude for those privileges. Again in 1837, when he might have been called upon to endure the just penalty for unsuccessful rebellion, it was far-away England which saved him from the vengeance of his neighbours.

On one occasion at least England saved us in Canada from ourselves. We plotted for "Responsible Government" and broke out into armed revolt in 1837. At length we got what we wanted, and real self-government was inaugurated under Lord Elgin upon the plan laid down by Lord Durham. In the first Parliament a bill was introduced by the "great ministry" of La Fontaine-Baldwin to "provide for the indemnification of parties in Lower Canada whose property was destroyed during the rebellion in the years 1837 and 1838." In face of an outburst of passion this Rebellion Losses Bill was passed by a large majority. The "Tories" urged Lord Elgin to withhold his sanction; but he insisted upon maintaining a strictly constitutional attitude, and his assent to the Bill in 1849 was a signal for these "patriots" to break out in wild revolt. A meeting called on the Champ de Mars ended in riot. An armed mob led by the late "Fred" Perry invaded the parliament buildings and gave them over to the flames. The governor-general was mobbed in the streets, and only military intervention saved the day. A deputation was sent to England from the Tory party to urge the disallowance of the bill by the interposition of the royal prerogative. Lord Grey defended colonial autonomy in the House of Peers against Lords Stanley, Brougham, and Lyndhurst, and against Mr. Gladstone in the Commons. The Imperial Government refused to interfere. The rebellion predicted by the "Tories" did not occur, and the right of the Canadian Parliament to legislate upon Canadian affairs was admitted for all time as the cardinal principle of colonial policy.

In this summary fashion our rights were thrust upon us. Lord Elgin wrote to his Home Government: "I considered that, by reserving the bill, I should only have cast on Her Majesty and Her Majesty's advisers a responsibility which ought, in the first instance at least, to rest upon my own

shoulders, and that I should awaken in the minds of the people doubts as to the sincerity with which it was intended that constitutional government should be carried on in Canada; doubts which in my firm conviction, if they were to obtain generally, would be fatal to the connection." Three years afterwards, when all agitation had subsided, Lord Elgin wrote to a friend: "I have been possessed with the idea that it is possible to maintain on this soil of North America and in the face of republican America, British connection and British institutions, if you give the latter freely and unsparingly." That is a discovery which we did not make for ourselves, and we would do well to recall this incident with shame as well as gratitude.

The hegemony of the race has always lain in London, and England has never rid herself of the old instinct that she is yet responsible for the people of the United States. The disagreement of 1776 was an affair on the surface. She still regards them as Englishmen occupying a congeries of states beyond the sea, just as Canadians occupy a federation of colonies. Protest as they like the people of the United States possess the same instinct. They cannot convince themselves that the break in the continuity of the racial life was anything more than imaginary. When they have daughters ready to propagate the type, it is at the Court of St. James they present them. There is no national life for Canada or for the United States apart or together. They and we and England can only attain fulfilment as three persons in one "New England."

When we in the outlying parts of the Empire, arrive at a full apprehension of what England has done for the world, for the race, and for us, then will come back the greatness of those Elizabethan days in which there was an unbounded passion for the Motherland, when her children venerated and glorified her, and all which was hers. And, if we say that England did all this—nourished and protected us as children, endowed us with freedom and a kingdom when we were competent for the charge—for her own pleasure and safety, then are we, in the portentous words of St Paul, " bastards and not sons."

ANDREW MACPHAIL

BRITISH DIPLOMACY AND CANADA

I. THE ASHBURTON TREATY: A DIPLOMATIC VICTORY OR DEFEAT

IN DISCUSSING the question whether the Ashburton Treaty was a diplomatic victory or defeat for Great Britain, it is necessary, first, to examine all the moving causes that led up to the Treaty of Versailles in 1783, and the wording of the treaty itself, with all the modifying circumstances connected with the final settlement, commonly known as the Ashburton Treaty.

In 1621, James I. granted to Sir William Alexander, later Lord Stirling, a charter under the great seal of the Lordship and Barony of Nova Scotia. This charter "gave, granted and conveyed" to him and to "his heirs and assigns" the whole of what is now Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Gaspe Peninsula, and that portion of Quebec lying southeastward of the city of the same name.

The western boundary of this lordship was defined, in part, as follows: "to the river generally known by the name of St. Croix and to the remotest springs or sources from the western side of the same, which empty into the first mentioned river [St. Croix], thence by an imaginary straight line which is conceived to extend through the land or run northward to the nearest bay, river, or stream emptying into the great river of Canada; and going from that eastward along the low shores of the same river of Canada."

This description defines the boundary as following the St. Croix to the source of its western branch, doubtless on the principle that possession of the mouth of a river carries with it possession of the country drained by that river, and a line running to the nearest tributary of the St. Lawrence which, as we now know, is in the southeastern portion of the present county of Beauce, in the Province of Quebec, about WNW.

of the source of the west branch of the St. Croix—which must not be confounded with the present boundary stream—the east branch or main stream.

The commissions of all Governors of Nova Scotia from 1719 to 1761 describe it simply as the "province of Nova Scotia or Accadie." In 1763, subsequent to the Proclamation erecting the province of Quebec, a commission was issued to Montague Wilmot, Governor of Nova Scotia, which defined the western and northern boundaries of that province as following the Croix and a "due north" line from its source to the southern boundary of Quebec, and thence following the said southern boundary to the "western extremity of the Bay des Chaleurs."

The later confusion is probably due to the insertion in this commission of the modifying or explanatory words, "or run northward," which were doubtless assumed by the draughtsman of Governor Wilmot's commission to signify that the line had an approximately north and south direction.

The claim to part of the territory included in the charter, viz., the extension of Nova Scotia to the south bank of the St. Lawrence—which included territory which was admittedly part of Nouvelle France—was recognized as untenable, and in the Proclamation of 1763 and in subsequent commissions to General Murray, Sir Guy Carleton, etc., the southern boundary of Quebec is defined, in part, as following from the 45th parallel "along the highest lands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the said river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Sea; and also along the North Coast of the Baye des Chaleurs and the coast of the gulph of St. Lawrence to cape Rosieres."

The Quebec Act, 1774, defined the southern boundary of Quebec in more specified terms: "by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the high lands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence from those which fall into the sea, to a point in forty-five degrees of northern latitude."

In 1782, Strachey, one of the British negotiators of the Treaty of Paris, was instructed to claim the Penobscot and

its tributaries, as the boundary line between Nova Scotia and Maine, on the ground of jurisdiction in the area between the Penobscot and St. Croix. This territory was known as Sagadahoc, and was formerly claimed by the authorities of Nouvelle France. In 1664 Charles II. granted to his brother, the Duke of York, Sagadahoc, which is described as "all that part of the maine [Maine] land of New England beginning at St. Croix next adjoyning to New Scotland."

The United States negotiators first proposed the St. John as the boundary, but finally agreed to accept the line between "Nova Scotia" and Massachusetts Bay. The portion of the boundary, later in dispute, was defined as follows: "From the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, viz., that angle which is formed by a line drawn due north from the source of the Saint Croix River to the Highlands, along the said Highlands which divide those rivers that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean, to the northwesternmost head of the Connecticut River; thence down along the middle of that river, to the forty-fifth degree of north latitude; from thence by a line due west on said latitude, until it strikes the river Iroquois or Cataraquy."

The preamble of the Treaty reads as follows: "And, that all disputes which might arise in the future on the subject of the boundaries of the said United States may be prevented, it is hereby agreed and declared that the following are and shall be their boundaries."

Instead of "preventing" disputes, these boundaries gave rise to disputes which, on several occasions, brought the two countries to the brink of war, and were only ended by the Ashburton Treaty.

The first dispute arose respecting the identity of the river St. Croix, the United States claiming that the stream now known as the Magaguadavic was meant, and Great Britain contending for the stream then locally known as the Schoodic and now known as the St. Croix. In 1798, the Commissioners appointed under the Jay Treaty decided in

favour of the British contention for the Schoodic, but adopted the east branch—the main stream—to its source.

The adoption of the eastern branch has been criticised on the ground that the western boundary of the Lordship of Nova Scotia followed the St. Croix to the headquarters of the western branch; but, on the other hand, the Treaty of Paris defines the boundary as following it from its mouth "to its source." As the "source" of a stream is the most distant spring, measured by the meanderings of the stream, it is evident that this decision was in accordance with the intent of the Treaty, that the boundary should follow the line between Nova Scotia and Massachusetts Bay as it was at the date of the Treaty.

The Treaty of 1783 practically defined the northwest angle of Nova Scotia as the point at which a due north line from the source of the St. Croix intersects the highlands that divide the waters that fall into the Atlantic ocean from those which fall into the river St. Lawrence. In 1802, on the assumption that the word "highlands" meant a range of mountains or hills, and as explorations had shown that in the country south of the St. Lawrence the mountains were either wanting or did not form connected ranges, negotiations were initiated by the United States. The United States suggested the appointment of a Commission authorized to substitute for the "highlands" line an arbitrary line joining the heads of the rivers. The Hawkesbury-King convention, 1803, provided for this Commission but was not ratified by the United States.

The Treaty of Ghent, 1814, provided for the appointment of a Commission to ascertain and determine the "northwest angle of Nova Scotia" and the northwesternmost head of the Connecticut river, and to survey the line between the source of the St. Croix and the St. Lawrence. The surveys made for the Commission showed, I: That a due north line from the St. Croix crossed the headwaters of the Restigouche before it intersected the sources of the streams that fall into the river St. Lawrence. II: That there were not any mountains in the height-of-land where thus intersected.

III: That the northern boundary of the State of New York, as determined by Valentine and Collins, was, in the vicinity of Rouse's Point, three-fourths of a mile north of the 45th parallel. About a half-mile south of the surveyed line the United States had constructed a fort at a cost of $1,000,000 which, with another fort then under construction, was therefore theoretically in British territory.

In 1822, the Commissioners, having failed to come to an agreement, filed their respective opinions. The British Commissioner stated in his opinion that:

I. The northwest angle of Nova Scotia was at or near Mars hill, about 40 miles from the source of the St. Croix.

II. The northwesternmost head of the St. Croix river was the head of Indian stream.

III. The line of the 45th parallel should be adhered to.

The United States Commissioner stated his opinion that:

I. The northwest angle of Nova Scotia was about 144 miles due north of the source of the St. Croix.

II. The northwesternmost head of the Connecticut was the present Hall stream.

III. He did not think it necessary to report on the 45th parallel line.

Disputes arose respecting granting land and cutting timber in the disputed territory, and in 1827 a Convention was concluded, providing for submission to a friendly sovereign or state as arbitrator. In 1831, the arbitrator, the King of the Netherlands, rendered an award which in brief awarded to Great Britain 4,100 square miles—approximately one-third of the contested territory. The award was based on the ground that while the word "highlands" meant land dividing the heads of rivers, whether mountainous or not, the limits defined by the Treaty were not the ancient limits of the provinces, and it was necessary therefore to resort to a line of convenience. The contentions of Great Britain for the eastern stream as the Connecticut river and for the 45th parallel were sustained, except that the United States should be left in possession of the fortifications of Rouse's Point.

The United States protested against the award, and for eleven years, 1831-1842, negotiations were carried on by the two Governments. Some propositions made by the United States were more favourable than the terms of the Ashburton Treaty, but it is by no means certain that the United States Senate would have ratified them. In 1838-39, the so-called "Restook war" broke out. Arrests were made by the authorities of New Brunswick and of Maine; the President was authorized to call out the militia, and $10,000,000 was appropriated for military defense. In short, the two countries were on the verge of war when the British Government sent out Lord Ashburton with full powers to negotiate a Treaty to settle the question. This Treaty, known as the "Ashburton," was signed in 1842. Of the territory in dispute, Great Britain received 5,000 square miles—900 more than awarded by the King of the Netherlands—and the United States 7,000. The small triangular area, 40 sq. miles, at the head of the Connecticut river and the narrow boundary strip between the 45th parallel and the "Valentine and Collins" line were awarded to the United States.

In arriving at an impartial view of the settlement it is necessary to review the grounds on which the opposing claims were based, bearing in mind the principles of International law in so far as they affect these claims. A nation may claim territory on various grounds. It may claim by virtue of possession, whether that possession be exercised by acts of jurisdiction or by legislation affecting the area, if this legislation has not been protested by the opposing nation. That this is the strongest claim a nation can have, is admirably set forth in a despatch of Lord Salisbury's, May 18th, 1896. He says: "Whatever the primary origin of his rights, the national owner, like the individual owner, relies usually on effective control by himself or through his predecessor in title for a sufficient length of time. But in the case of a nation, what is a sufficient length of time, and in what does effective control consist? In the case of a private individual, the interval adequate to make a valid title is defined by positive law. There is no enactment or usage or accepted doctrine

which lays down the length of time required for international prescription; and no full definition of the degree of control which will confer territorial property on a nation has been attempted. It certainly does not depend solely on occupation or the exercise of any clearly defined acts. All the great nations in both hemispheres claim, and are prepared to defend, their right to vast tracts of territory which they have in no sense occupied, and often have not fully explored. The modern doctrine of "Hinterland," with its inevitable contradictions, indicates the unformed and unstable condition of international law as applied to territorial claims resting on constructive occupation or control."

Since the above was written, the Venezuela arbitration has practically enunciated the principle that adverse possession for thirty years constitutes a good title.

Arguing on this basis, Great Britain could claim the territory in the vicinity of the Madawaska settlement, which included a comparatively small area south of the St. John, but did not extend up the latter beyond the St. Francis, if so far. The Madawaska seigniory was granted in 1683, and jurisdiction had been exercised there by the French and, subsequent to the cession of Canada, by the British. In addition the highway from New Brunswick to Quebec followed the St. John and Temiscouata rivers. The United States could claim, by possession, the country to the south of the Madawaska settlement and the narrow boundary strip north of the 45th parallel. Elsewhere the country was a wilderness.

A nation may claim by virtue of a treaty either with the contesting nation or with its predecessor in title. As regards the wording of the Treaty of Paris, on which both nations relied, there can be no doubt that the United States contention for a due north line was correct so far as the southern watershed of the Restigouche, but not to the headwaters of the Metis branch of the St. Lawrence; thence westward along the Restigouche watershed, to the St. Lawrence, and thence westward along the height-of-land between the St. Lawrence and St. John.

In discussing national territorial rights under a treaty,

it is necessary to enquire, "What was the intent of the negotiators of the Treaty?" This question must be decided on all the evidence available, oral and written, both as evidenced in their official correspondence and in their private correspondence and in all their acts before, during, and subsequent to the negotiations.

Summing up all the evidence available, there is little doubt that, I: The negotiators were indifferent respecting the "hinterland," and were principally concerned respecting the area in the immediate vicinity of the Atlantic, of the St. Lawrence, and of the Great Lakes. II: They intended the boundary line to follow the eastern and northern limits of the thirteen states. III: Where the boundaries of the states had not been defined, they adopted natural boundaries, such as rivers and lakes.

From the above it is evident that Great Britain got all that she could claim by virtue of possession, and more; that she obtained more than she could claim under the Treaty of Paris, with the exception of some forty square miles at the headwaters of the Connecticut, which was amply compensated for by the difference—nearly 1,000 square miles—between the area on the upper St. John awarded by the King of the Netherlands and that obtained by the Ashburton Treaty. It ended a controversy that had created much bad feeling between the two nations, and on numerous occasions had brought them to the verge of war. Finally, it is worthy of note that, in 1848, six years later, the Quebec-New Brunswick Boundary Commissioners reported that, west of the due north line from the St. Croix, was a tract "which, according to the strict legal rights of the two provinces, belongs to neither," as, in 1763, it "formed part of the ancient territory of Sagadahock." The area in question was the area awarded to Great Britain by the Ashburton Treaty.

X.X.X

THE BUSINESS OF LEGISLATION

THE salary of twenty-five hundred dollars a year, which is now paid to a member of the Parliament of Canada is still called a sessional indemnity, a name indicating a compromise between the English and the American idea of the treatment of a legislator. We hesitate to describe the member of Parliament as a paid servant of the State, just as the reduced lady dislikes to admit that she keeps boarders, but will acknowledge the presence of a few guests who contribute toward the expense of the household.

The increase from fifteen hundred dollars to twenty-five hundred dollars was received with some disfavour which was not wholly due to the fact that the legislators made the increase without consulting the people. There is still some prejudice against paying for legislation; and between it and administration a distinction is drawn in the popular mind. The civil-servant, from the minister down, seems to be doing such work as is paid for in shops and offices. The member of Parliament seems to be making speeches, giving opinions and advice, scolding, defending, arguing, quarrelling—things which the ordinary man outside of Parliament will do for nothing. The notion of regular payment for such actions is accepted with reluctance.

Accepted, however, it must be; the system of payment for legislative work has come to stay. The payment may be disguised under the name of sessional indemnity, but two thousand-five-hundred dollars a year is an income on which a man may live; and, except in a few large cities, it would be considered as a liberal income. Those who have objected must accept the situation and make the best of it. And the only way to make the best of it is to say to the member of Parliament: "You are a paid servant of the State, just as a

civil-servant is, and we expect you to attend as closely to your duties as a deputy-minister or a chief clerk."

If this standard is insisted upon, the benefit of the increased indemnity may outweigh the evil. The sentimental haze which now surrounds the position of a member of Parliament will tend to disappear, and to give place to a calm and scientific view of the business of legislation. The common-sense of the people will revolt against the notion of paying a man two thousand-five-hundred dollars a year for voting one way or the other, for cheering one speaker and howling at another, for being a good fellow or for looking wise. To put it frankly he will be required to earn his money.

Something may be done in this way toward solving the problem of political independence. Our system of responsible government is worked by two political parties, and it is customary to say that it cannot be worked otherwise. Whether or not that judgement be accepted as final, it will be generally agreed that a greater measure of independence is desirable. Instead of saying that there should be as much independence as the party system allows, let us say that there should be as much partyism as is compatible with independence. A system that checks freedom of thought, suppresses truth, dwarfs the intellect, and weakens the will surely must be evil and ought not to stand. Advocates of partyism say that it does not work these evils; at least that it does not necessarily work these evils. The best way to test the question is to exercise independence to the full, and let partyism take its chances.

How is the question of independence related to the question of payment of members? In this way: the tendency will be to compel the member to take his duties more seriously; and independence that is worth anything is the outcome of seriousness, of earnestness. At present a very common accusation against the independent member is that he is actuated by vanity and selfishness. If that accusation is just, the remedy is not less independence but more. Where all are men of strong convictions and devoted to their duty, no one can come to

the front except by sheer merit and excellence. The mere expression of an independent view will not startle the country, and there will be less temptation than there is now to sensationalism. The plain, blunt man, who says "that is wrong, and I will follow neither Government nor party in supporting it," will be heard more often, and his words will be as effective as those of the most finished orator.

It may be supposed that the plain, blunt man sometimes says these things in caucus. But that avails very little. If he is not suppressed with scorn, it is supposed that he ought to be satisfied with delivering his soul in presence of his friends, and that he must accept the ruling of the majority and support it before the House and the country. There must be at least an appearance of unity in the ranks of the party, as there must be in a ministry. However they may differ in their hearts, they must all say the same thing. This is, of course, a direct invitation to the majority to disregard the protest. It deprives the protesting member of the support of the country, of such a part of the community as he could otherwise convince, and debars him from appealing to that element. It deprives the country of the educative value of the protest. If the real deliberation on the merits of a question goes on in caucus instead of in Parliament, the people are cheated out of that which is their right. They have a right to know not only the decision but the grounds of the decision.

It is not only the right but the duty of the people under our system to understand the grounds of all political action. Otherwise it was foolish to give them votes, and it would be doubly foolish to compel them to vote. There is no merit in merely making a cross on a piece of paper and dropping it into a box. Not by the "will of the people" but by the reason, judgement, and conscience of the people should the people be governed. Compulsory voting provides merely for the recording of the will, and leaves untouched the real problem of recording the voice of reason and conscience. Its result may be nothing more than an addition to the bulk of the paper in the ballot box; a ballot may mean nothing more than a

mark made opposite the name of a man whom the voter does not in the real sense know, and in favour of a cause which the voter does not understand.

One obstacle to intelligent voting, the nominating convention managed by intrigue, is outside the scope of this article. The other lies in the secret parliamentary caucus and in the neglect of representatives to keep their constituents informed of what goes on in Parliament, of the nature of the measures there proposed and enacted or rejected, and of those administrative acts which come before Parliament for judgement. Such explanations, it is true, are made after a fashion, but they are too often deferred to an election campaign, when, the judgement is biased by violent partisan feeling and by the heat of political conflict. The late Hon. David Mills kept up the excellent custom of addressing his constituents regularly, once a year, on the business of the session and the public questions before the country. With a strong sense of the obligations of members of Parliament this practice should become more common.

The view here maintained is not that so energetically combatted by Burke in his speech to the electors of Bristol, namely that the member of Parliament is bound to account to his constituents as a delegate acting under instructions, "mandates which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for, though contrary to his clearest conviction, judgement, and conscience." He is not to render that sort of obedience to his constituents, any more than to a Government or a caucus, But he is bound to unfold to his constituents the workings of his mind, and explain how he arrived at the conclusions which are shown on the records of his votes in the House. If he cannot or will not do that, he cannot expect that they, with smaller opportunities of learning public business, will vote intelligently in parliamentary elections; and if they do not vote intelligently they had better not vote at all. This is the fatal defect in the scheme of compulsory voting. It enforces only a mechanical act; it is like trying to promote religion by forcing the man to his knees,

instead of by appealing to his conscience. It is an effort to gather the fruit without planting the tree.

The hope I have tried to express is that, if the member of Parliament is clearly recognised as a paid servant of the State, there will grow up a clearer and more scientific view of his duties. If that hope be fulfilled, independence will be regarded as something more than a cataclysm, an outbreak against authority. It will be systematic, habitual, and to the extent of the member's ability, creative and original. The member will have a clearer view of his duties as a legislator, and there will be a more systematic division of labour in Parliament, according to taste and capacity.

The work of the member of Parliament, who attends faithfully to sessional duties, is as laborious as that of any clerk in the civil service, and, notwithstanding sensational episodes, just about as humdrum. A committee meeting of two hours in the morning, a sitting of the House from three to six, and another from eight to midnight, make up a fairly good day's work. If a member of Parliament were conscientious enough to read and master every bill in his desk, and follow the discussion carefully, he would perform a body of work that might be compared with that of a hard student in a year at the University.

The picture of a member of Parliament as an industrious apprentice in legislation may provoke a smile. It is true that he may neglect his duties if he please, and still draw his pay, if he observe certain conditions as to bodily presence in the House, for a certain portion of each day. But the fact is that to work hard at Ottawa is the only tolerable way of passing the time. At Ottawa the life of the toad beneath the harrow is preferable to that of the butterfly upon the road. The spectacle of a member of Parliament endeavouring to lead a life of Parisian gaiety at Ottawa is one to create thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears. Removed from his family, his home, his library, his garden, his farm, all the social pleasures, activities and little habits that make up the life of man, he is a mournful exhibition of homesickness and ennui, and his attempts to

amuse himself are pathetic in the extreme, almost tragic. These laborious efforts at idleness and frivolity at Ottawa have been the grounds of much scandalous talk. I shall not attempt here to sift the truth from the falsehood in this gossip which, to my personal knowledge, has been circulating in regard to public men for nearly a quarter of a century. All I desire to point out is that, whether true or false, it is the result of idleness, of ennui, and of a false notion that the conditions of life at Ottawa lend themselves to gaiety. The member of Parliament will be apt to find it a dull place unless he takes a keen interest in his parliamentary work.

Hard work is the only refuge. One of the members of Parliament who seemed really to enjoy himself at Ottawa was he to whom reference has already been made, the late David Mills. Mr. Mills was an eager student of constitutional questions, spent much of his leisure time in the library; and, when he spoke he threw the light of history and philosophy upon the discussion. It would hardly be reasonable to demand that all members of Parliament should follow that example. Parliament, if it is to be representative, must be composed of all sorts and conditions of men, and the philosophic temperament is not common. But the example of Mr. Mills may be useful to this extent, to show that the means of contentment in Ottawa lie in making a study of some phase of the public business there transacted, and in acquiring a round of habits to take the place of those of the home.

It is probable that members of Parliament, in the main, are hard workers, and go through an amount of business that would surprise the general public. The scenes and sensations get into the papers, the hard, prosaic work attracts less attention. The people of Canada are not idlers, and it is not reasonable to suppose that they choose idlers to represent them. But a great deal could be done by systematizing and specializing work, and by thus employing the gifts of each, so as to afford a training for public service.

In this matter of training, it is often said that the English system possesses marked advantages over ours. In England

a young man of means and leisure will be destined to public service; his education will be directed to that end, and very early in life he will begin to gain experience in public affairs through some position subordinate to that of a Minister of State. Even the old rotten borough was defended as a means of enabling a young and unknown man to enter Parliament, and it is remembered that Gladstone found such an entrance to public life. We cannot reproduce the conditions of England here, but we may aim at achieving similar ends by means adapted to our own conditions. The sessional indemnity, now larger than the income of a young professional man, might be an inducement to enter public life at an early age, and to become, in the best sense a "professional politician." Of course, neither election nor re-election could be guaranteed, but the way is now made easier for young men and for men of small means. The House of Commons could be made to a certain extent a political university affording a political education for all, and for some a training for ministerial positions, One could be encouraged to make a special study of the tariff, another of transportation, a third of questions involving the relations of labour and capital.

It will be admitted that the debates of men engaged in such studies would possess an interest and an educative value far exceeding that of men whose parliamentary career lacked direction and definite aim. There would be a gain in independence—not the independence of revolt, though revolt is sometimes required; but the steady independence that comes from originality of thought and a firm grasp of facts, principles and public business. Through the reports of the debates, and through those frequent and regular addresses to the public which I have advocated, the benefit of this political University would flow out to the people; and there would be more intelligent voting at the polls as well as in Parliament.

All this may be regarded as a too rosy picture of the results of a measure which has been ascribed to naked avarice, and condemned as an unprincipled raid upon the public treasury. I do not pretend that the aims here set forth

were the aims of those who voted for the increase. The motives were probably mixed, as most human motives are. But they have builded better than they knew, and as we may regard the act as irrevocable, we may as well make the best of it. The best feature of the increased indemnity is that it has a tendency to emphasize the duty of the representative to the country, and to make him feel that he is a servant of the State. The experience derived from the working of the civil service is hopeful in this respect, that experience warrants the belief that, when a man is set to do a certain work for the State, allowing some scope for thought and originality, he will try hard to do it well. Put him at the head of a labour department, and he will strive with might and main to promote industrial peace and to better the condition of the worker. Put him at the head of an asylum for the deaf and dumb, and he will master the literature of the subject and become a father to his charges. Put him in the agricultural department, and in his dreams he will discover new kinds of wheat and make war on the insect pest. The mass of administrative work in this country is well done; our great scandals have nearly all been connected, not with administration, but with elections.

This is the grand hope for governing and legislative bodies; that it is natural for men to like work, when it is not mere drudgery and routine, and to like to work well. "Business," says Bagehot, "is really more agreeable than pleasure. It interests the whole mind, the aggregate nature of man, more continuously and more deeply." More than that, it is not taking too bright a view of human nature to say that the normal man takes special pleasure in working for his country and for his fellow men. What is evil in our politics is due not so much to the innate depravity of human nature as to misleading traditions and conventions; to exaggerated partyism; to a strange admixture of false sentiment and cheap cynicism. What is wanted is the destruction of these and the setting up of standards that are true and simple, and allow free play to conscience, to reason, and to public spirit. I am convinced that to these normal human nature would respond, and that

it would be a relief and a pleasure to the ordinary member of Parliament to have his work simplified and systematized, and to be allowed to transact public business as he practises his profession or manages his farm. The increase in the sessional indemnity is the incident which has started this train of thought, but I do not put it forward as the chief motive of the reform. What is desired is that we should get rid of hazy, sentimental and cynical ideas of the business of legislation, and try to place it upon a footing of scientific exactness as well as of honesty and patriotism

JOHN LEWIS

THE BIBLIOPHILE

Dear, faithful friends, not long together may we bide—
I to my rest—ye, by strange hands all scattered wide
I know not where,—
Carried afar upon that same relentless tide
Of Time and Chance, that erst-while bore ye to my side
From here or there.

My friends through all my quiet, men said, aimless life—
And yet we loved it well—far from the toiling strife
Whose echoes fell
On heedless ears. Missing the joy of child or wife,
I missed somewhat the pain with which our earth is rife,—
And so farewell.

M. ALGON KIRBY

THE AMERICAN NEWSPAPER

FOR present purposes we shall employ the now classic definition, that America means the United States, and excludes Canada, Newfoundland, and the British Arctic Isles. We shall also adopt the sound method of good magazine writing and get under weigh as soon as possible. Therefore we may say in sufficiently general terms that there is no evil without its remedy. Eventually, upon some terms or other and in roundabout way, a stick will be found to beat the dog and compel him to fulfil his mission in life by biting the pig.

Before the present day of mechanical efficiency the printed word had great virtue. In the printing of it lay a presumption of its truth. But in time the important discovery was made that paper prepared from wood-pulp would receive from a rotary press a false impression as readily as a true. From this it was an easy step to the conclusion—an entirely unjustifiable one—that everything which is printed in a newspaper is necessarily false; and so the dog is beaten.

Upon this a convention has been established by which a public man or a prisoner at the bar, commonly called the defendant, may "give out" a statement to a newspaper, and if it is disliked by the public he feels free to deny his part in the publication. Taught by experience the public is ready to accept his denial as being the truth. This is a modification of the old *ballon d'essai*. "Truly," as Swift observed, "when I consider that natural disposition in many men to lie, and in multitudes to believe, I have been perplexed what to do with that maxim, so frequent in everybody's mouth, that truth will at last prevail." Certainly, truth has not yet begun to

prevail in that sphere of human activity which has to do with the production of newspapers.

The editor of "the magazine section" of one of the most widely circulated newspapers in the United States boasted of the literary excellence of the advertisements which he printed, and confessed that it was his ambition to bring the text up to that high standard. In that simple statement lies the explanation of the present condition of American newspaper writing. This astute editor was right. The best literature in the United States to-day is found in the advertisements. Indeed they are now known technically as "literature." This paradox will bear some explanation.

The test of good writing is fitness of words with ideas. It is not simplicity, or clearness, or beauty, or strength. It is efficiency. A legal document is written in good style if it defines the maker's intention so clearly that it may be understood for all time by any judge or jury who may be called to pass upon it. A diplomatic message is well written if it is obscure,—that is if it was the writer's intention to cause delay whilst the obscurity was being cleared up by subsequent communications. Now, the object of the advertisement writer is not to tell the truth but to tell something which looks like the truth. His function is precisely that of the novelist—to create an illusion. But his task is infinitely harder. The novelist is not likely to get himself into gaol on account of the improbability of his story: the man who writes advertisements is. Indeed many of them happily are now in that situation. To avoid this contingency they must keep an eye on the public prosecutor, the district-attorney, and the postmaster-general. "Cures for consumption" now appear as "consumption cures"; "warranted harmless" is now "pleasant to take," and "soothes the most fretful child" reads "opium and chloral." It is under difficulty that great work is accomplished; and if authors were also amenable to the courtesy of the police magistrate their writings would be better and less voluminous. One romancer offered for sale the seeds of Jonah's gourd, and when the purchaser complained that they were sterile he

was met with the explanation that the plant had in reality grown, but, true to its nature, it perished in the night. A novelist with such ingenuity would go far.

The writer of advertisements, under penalty of the law, is obliged to deal in tergiversation, evasion, and subterfuge, when he must. He resorts to hyperbole and over-statement when he may. The owner of a newspaper by reading his advertising pages and consulting his accounts quickly discovers that this kind of writing pays. This is the kind of literature which he thinks admirable; and, consciously or unconsciously he adopts that style. He forgets that it is an occasional function of literature to tell the truth. The principal reading in the United States is advertisements, and the public ear has become so bedevilled that it can only hear a shriek: the still small voice of literature goes unheeded. The average man reads that a preparation in a bottle is a "queen," a "king," or an "empress," of table waters; that a railway train is a "cannon-ball," a "meteor" or a "wolverine;" that a steamship is a "greyhound," a "flyer," or a "racer," that a boot is a "Napoleon," and a type-writer a "monarch."

When a man gets it into his head that he is travelling on a cannon-ball or a greyhound it is insignificant to him that the conveyance rarely arrives at its destination at its appointed time. He forgets to remark that the "library car" is two rows of chairs and a collection of magazines; that the "sea-bath" is a hole in the floor with some dirty water and a black handful of salt out of a bottle; that the "drawing-room" is a den and the "berth" a grave. Under such circumstances he is content to read the advertisements of the scenery through which he passes instead of looking at it; and he is willing to believe what he is told, that Sandusky Bay is "the finest marine view in the world," and that Duluth is "the zenith city of the unsalted seas." The thing which is false has come to be the thing which is true, and if a writer would be read, he must supply the "hot stuff" to which the public taste is accustomed. The newspapers must speak the language which is generally understood. There are, of course, advertisements

which are mere statements of fact, like a publisher's announcement; but, if we can believe what we are told, that is not a form of literary excellence which is very profitable. Accordingly his books become "fascinating, attention-compelling, soul-stirring. They rivet the mind, charm the eye, and move the heart."

There is a tradition in England that a dealer who advertises is not reliable. Old-fashioned persons cannot understand why a tradesman should pay money to induce purchasers to come to his shop to buy goods which are the best of their kind. Self-interest alone, they think, will compel customers to go to him. A man who advertises is, according to their way of thinking, either foolish or dishonest. The best physicians and solicitors do not advertise their services. Indeed a professional man who advertises is one to keep clear of. Why then, they ask, should an advertising tradesman be patronized. They recall the fate of the Persian devotee who required a lamb for sacrifice and was induced to accept a dog which he was assured was equally good.

No mention has yet been made of those advertisements which are obviously false. They have to do, for the most part, with the cure of incurable diseases. This is known as the great "American fraud." One of themselves has said it. The average newspaper is little more than an advertising circular of patent medicines. By actual measurement of its columns one leading journal abandons 20 per cent of its total space to this form of literature. In one issue of fifty-six columns there were eleven and one third columns of medical advertisements; in one of ninety-six columns there were fourteen; in another of one hundred and sixty columns there were thirty-two columns of this pernicious stuff. It is not necessary here to dwell upon the preposterous nature of the claims which are so publicly made, nor to insist upon the falseness of them; they carry no weight in normal minds, but the minds of persons to whom they are addressed are not even in a condition of normal ignorance. The newspapers take advantage of the psychological condition of the real or imaginary suf-

ferer; they hold out one last hope to those whom the profession in all honesty has abandoned to die, and make high promises to those who have preferred to suffer in secret rather than resort to the ordinary methods of cure. One who publishes these untruths is, in the Scriptural phrase, like him who letteth out water; he cannot foresee the evil consequences of his act, nor does he care what heart will be made faint, when the last hope is dispelled, which was falsely raised.

It has long since become impossible to allow any but a very few newspapers in the hands of children; it is now almost impossible for a man to read his paper at the breakfast-table, filled as that paper is with loathsome details of catarrhs, and coughs, and running sores. It is not enough to say that a man is not compelled to read this tissue of untruth; he cannot avoid it. If he be ill, and has exhausted all legitimate means of cure, he is apt to abandon the old physicians for the new quacks, to his own hurt. If the progress of medicine were correctly indicated by the newspapers this would be a truly marvellous age. The blind have been made to see, the deaf to hear, the lame to walk. If only these miracle-workers could be made to cast out the evil spirit of untruth from their own hearts—that would be a marvellous feat. A person suffering from a "tired feeling" is stimulated with a tonic wine containing alcohol and cocaine; another has his catarrh dried up by morphin; constipation is cured with senna under the guise of some fanciful syrup; and children are soothed into a lethal slumber by a preparation of opium. It is no wonder, then, that the victims are ready to adduce sworn testimony that they cannot get along without their favourite medicine. Any drunkard or morphinomaniac will attest to as much. It is no small matter for a newspaper to break down the boundary between truth and falsehood, and when one has read the affidavits in support of statements that cannot be true, he is inclined to doubt the dictum of the late Sir Francis Johnston, that a statement is not necessarily false because it is sworn to.

It is a singular fact that the makers of American news-

papers have not yet discovered that people do not read them: they only buy them. In a western town of not more than 230,000 inhabitants the Sunday edition of one of the newspapers regularly contains from 128 to 140 pages, and that is the proof that it is not read. Another curious feature is the kind of news which they think interesting. In June last there was a wreck on the Southern Pacific Railway whereby forty persons were killed. In the account of the disaster which appeared that morning the feature which received most prominence was that a "rich and beautiful young woman" rode to the scene of the accident on the brake-beam of the relief train. She had been ejected from the train as a wayward busy-body, but "American womanhood was not to be denied in its passion to minister to the wounded and the dying." There is no account of what the rich and beautiful woman accomplished in the end; because, of course, the whole incident was imaginary.

Nothing is more admirable than the treatment which the American woman receives at the hands of the American editor. If she is rich and without occupation and takes it into her head to make occasional visits to the sick poor she is "an angel of the hospitals." She is always the "angel of the home," and the idea is sedulously fostered that the American man is as good as he is because this angel loves him so much. The domestic life of the late President was praised without stint, because "the people of the country saw in the White House a family life in accord with the highest American ideals of purity and chivalrous devotion." Yet in the same number of the periodical which pronounced this eulogy upon the widow of William McKinley, at the time of her death, Judge E. Ray Stevens of Wisconsin produced some evidence of the practice of these people which is harshly discordant with those ideals of purity and chivalrous devotion which they are alleged to reverence. Judge Stevens points out that in two States alone during twenty years there were over thirty thousand divorce cases and, during a similar period in the whole country, the future care of 267,739 children was decided

by the courts. So long as the American woman is taught by the periodicals especially devised for her enlightenment that an endurance of the ordinary inconveniences of the married state is an insult to her "womanhood" she will avail herself of this ready weapon. Freedom of divorce she is taught will result in "an enhanced purity, a sublime sacredness, a more beautiful embodiment of the trinity of the father, the mother, the child."

The news which is printed as coming by cable from Europe is more curious still, both in respect of its amount and its quality. Papers in comparatively unimportant places habitually print cablegrams which must have cost several hundred dollars in tolls. These are all exclusive despatches; they are not shared in common with other journals, and many of them come by leased wires. There is scarcely a city in Europe in which these apparently localized papers do not keep a regular correspondent, but these employees do not appear to serve their papers very well. European events in the judgement of these writers owe their importance to the connexion more or less remote which some American visitor may have with them. The arrest of a midnight reveller in Paris is elevated into international importance if he happen to be a relative by marriage of one of those beautiful and wealthy American "married girls" who are so prevalent in foreign capitals. Not all the dispatches however deal with such trivial events as the omission to invite a visiting, or resident, American to a private dinner at which kings are the guests. One paper at least, in every town, will print each morning a dispatch which could be written only by Prince Bismarck or Lord Salisbury if these diplomatists were yet alive. One correspondent who had great vogue some months ago always began his story with the formula: "Every chancellery in Europe is agog over the intelligence which I sent you yesterday by exclusive cable, and which was promptly repeated to London, Paris, and Berlin." Such catch-words as "every chancellery in Europe" are the ear marks of a correspondent who is technically known as a faker.

The industry and financial resource of the American newspaper is amazing. In comparatively small cities, each one of half-a-dozen newspapers employs upon its staff trained jurists who are competent to pronounce judgement upon a criminal case however obscure; theologians who are qualified to adjudge the subtlest variations in dogma; psychologists, keen enough to ascribe the proper motive in every public act. The confidence with which the newspapers are treated by statesmen is no less amazing. When the President has a diplomatic message to present he "gives it out" to a newspaper before the accredited ambassador of the country for which it is intended is aware that the subject is even under advisement. If the subject under discussion in the Cabinet has something to do with industrial or financial legislation some member is always found to disclose the nature of the deliberations with an alacrity which, in other communities, would be considered treacherous.

So long as it is understood generally that the American newspapers are not especially concerned with the truth no great harm is done. But simple-minded foreigners have not made that discovery. They think that the papers reflect public opinion while in reality there is no public opinion because the public declines to form an opinion from information which is probably false. The Japanese with all their astuteness believed that the American people were influenced by what they read about the barring of Oriental children from the schools of San Francisco. The controversy turned upon the statement that the Japanese scholars were adult young men. The manufacture of this legend is worth tracing by the following seven quotations: "President Altmann of the Board of Education said, 'We do not care to have our little children mixing with adult Japanese.'"—*San Francisco Chronicle*, December 7th, 1906. "Senator Perkins declared that there were not forty Japanese children of school age in San Francisco."—*San Francisco Examiner*, December 7th. "Representative Hayes: 'Most of the Japanese pupils are youths from fifteen to twenty-five.'"—*San Francisco Chronicle*,

December 4th. "It is deemed inexpedient that adults should associate with little children in the intimate relations of school life."—*San Francisco Call*, December 4th. "Ninety-five per cent. of the Japanese pupils are over sixteen."—*News Letter*, December 8th. "Alfred Roncovieri, Superintendent of schools, declared that 'these so-called Japanese children are ninety-five per cent. of them young men.'"—*San Francisco Examiner*, December 5th. "Practically without exception they are full-grown men between the ages of twenty and twenty-five."—*New York Sun*, December 13th. Here are seven newspapers in absolute agreement upon a question of fact. The truth is that there were exactly six Japanese pupils in the primary schools who were over fifteen years of age.*

And yet the American press stands second in the world for truthfulness. It is excelled only by the press of England. When one reads the newspapers of other European countries he wonders how it is that Russia is to be saved by a like freedom in the propagation of falsehood. Nobody but a fool will suppose that these remarks apply alike to all American newspapers, or that it is always possible for any newspaper to print only the truth. The most truthful man in the world is mislead at times, but that does not abolish the wide gulf which separates liars from men who speak the truth.

The newspapers declare war. They make peace. They pull one down and set another up. Fifty years ago Mr. Godkin was boasting in the *Daily News* that he had contributed his "little mite towards inducing the English people to plunge into a bloody war on behalf of the Sultan;" and complaining that his efforts were not adequately appreciated by Omer Pacha. The American newspapers, I believe, have not yet agreed amongst themselves which one of them caused the Spanish War or the Peace of Portsmouth.

The administration of Justice has abdicated its functions. When a crime is committed the newspapers send out their corps of detectives. They discover who the criminal is and denounce him to the authorities. If the authorities are not convinced they are denounced in turn for their slowness and

*George Kennan, *The Outlook*, June 1st, 1907.

stupidity. When a railway accident occurs first aid to the injured is always afforded by physicians who come to the scene in an automobile which is owned by a newspaper, and in the next edition there will be a full and technical account of the accident; how it occurred, the causes, proximate and remote, which led to its occurrence, and the means which should be adopted to avoid such accidents in future.

They have also taken over municipal government. In a city of three hundred thousand inhabitants the local bacteriologists discovered that the water supply was impure, because a thousand cases of typhoid fever had occurred. Upon the instant a newspaper rose to its destiny and telegraphed to the President and to the Mayor of New York for the names of the two most eminent engineers in the country. Before there was time for a reply these two "scientists" were constituted a "commission" to report upon the water supply and indicate the measures which should be taken for its improvement. The report of this "commission" has not yet been made public.

They have constituted themselves the arbiters of morals. To the nobler catalogue of virtues which Saint Paul signified to the Philippians, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, pure, lovely, of good report, they have added: whatsoever things are American. To be "American" is to fulfil the whole law. To say that a thing is "un-American" is ultimate. It is as if one were to say that a cook is dirty.

The discipline which the newspapers exercise over public men is perfect. A statesman is asked by telegraph if he disapproves of the "atrocities" in the Congo, or in a local mine where the owners are trying to protect their property; a minister is requested to give an opinion upon the merits of some crusade in which the newspaper is at the moment engaged. If either declines to answer these messages which are repeated every hour, he is aroused from his bed at midnight to reply to the pointed enquiry: "Do you refuse?" Few men are so recalcitrant as to misapprehend the subtlety of that simple question.

There is another cause which is bound up with the newspaper in working for the degeneration of American writing. It is the glorification of the "business man." To this personage is due the prevalence of the stenographer, the typist, the caligraphist, the clavigraphist or whatever these young ladies now choose to call themselves. It comes about in this way: In times gone by a man who had been a plate-layer and rose by sheer force of merit to a road-master's dignity, was prevented from recording his ideas by the mechanical difficulty which he experienced in setting them down on paper. He would employ a secretary whose education was not wholly obtained on the track and in the camp, and it was his business to convey his master's directions in well-considered words. These letters were models of expression and served as standards to the persons to whom they were addressed. But in these days an ill-educated "business man" employs an equally ill-educated "business-woman," unless it be in the important matter of hair-dressing, to "take his dictation." Consequently his letters are long, garrulous, confused, redundant, incomplete, beginning with the fixed formula: "In reply to yours would say same has been received and contents duly noted," and flaunting with impunity every vice of writing for which countless generations of school boys have been systematically whipped. These letters from men so eminent become in time the popular standards for expression.

The average man picks up his newspaper with the desire to be informed, not to excite himself. When a war is in progress, he would gladly learn of the events and the sequence of them. He is served instead with ungrammatical bombast about the shrieking and whizzing of the shells, the drumming of the Maxims, and the leaden hail and rain which the Mausers vomit forth. Instead of a well-ordered account of a battle, such as Mr. Russel, or Mr. Godkin, or Mr. Burleigh, or Mr. Williams used to give us fifty years ago, we get an account of the "impressions" which are conveyed to a mind in a condition of hysteria. Mr. Kipling does this kind of thing naturally because he retains his senses. The average correspondents

in their efforts to rival the performance of that great writer only succeed in throwing themselves into a fit. They leap upon the altar. They cry aloud. They cut themselves after their manner with knives, but there is none to answer nor any to regard.

There are signs that the people are tired of the farce, and that soon the lights will be out and the audience gone home. All art passes through this stage. In the early days of the vaudeville a negro and a flap-stick were considered sufficient for an evening's entertainment. Towards the finish of the programme one got tired. But the average newspaper writer is the last man in the world to discern the hopeful end. The reporter of the baseball game continues his buffoonery every morning, repeating his jargon which was already tiresome when Kelly slid and Casey went to the bat. The sporting editor yet "breezes" his horses, "works" them "on the flat," or "lifts" them "over the timber." His pugilists are as of old time "gluttons for punishment," and their "blows will not be denied." All sensible persons must yearn for the time when the "yellow metal" will have disappeared, when the "fiery element" will be quenched, and the "palatial hostelries" closed, when the "speckled beauties" will have vanished with the other members of the "finny tribe," and the "kings" of cotton, lumber, and wheat, will have gone with the "merchant-princes" to their own place.

ARCHIBALD MACLISE

THE BRIDEGROOM OF CANA

"There was a marriage in Cana of Galilee . . . And both Jesus was called, and His disciples, to the marriage."

Veil thine eyes, O belovéd, my spouse,
Turn them away,
Lest in their light my life withdrawn
Dies as a star, as a star in the day,
As a dream in the dawn.

Slenderly hang the olive leaves,
Sighing apart.
The rose and silver doves in the eaves
With a murmur of music bind our house.
Honey and wine in thy words are stored,
Thy lips are bright as the edge of a sword
That hath found my heart,—
That hath found my heart.

Sweet, I have waked from a dream of thee,—
And of Him,
He who came when the songs were done.
From the net of thy smiles my heart went free
And the golden lure of thy love grew dim.
I turned to them asking, " Who is He,
Royal and sad, who comes to the feast,
And sits Him down in the place of the least?"
And they said, " He is Jesus, the carpenter's son."

Hear how my harp on a single string
Murmurs of love.
Down in the field the thrushes sing,
And the lark is lost in the light above,
Lost in the infinite glowing whole,
As I in thy soul,—
As I in thy soul.

Love, I am fain for thy glowing grace
As the pool for the star, as the rain for the rill.
Turn to me, trust to me, mirror me,
As the star in the pool, as the cloud in the sea!
Love, I looked awhile in His face,
And was still.

The shaft of the dawn strikes clear and sharp;
Hush, my harp.
Hush, my harp, for the day is begun,
And the lifting, shimmering flight of the swallow
Breaks in a curve on the brink of morn,
Over the sycamores, over the corn.
Cling to me, cleave to me, prison me,
As the mote in the flame, as the shell in the sea;
For the winds of the dawn say "Follow, follow
Jesus Bar-Joseph, the carpenter's son."

MARJORIE L. C. PICKTHALL

HENRIK IBSEN

ABOUT the year 1720 a Danish skipper named Peter Ibsen came from Moen to Bergen, where he settled down and married the daughter of a German citizen. He was the great-great-grandfather of the poet and dramatist, Henrik Ibsen.

The great-grandfather bore the name of Henrik Petersen Ibsen and was also a ship master. In the following generations of the Ibsen family there was mingled with the stock of the Danish seamen, German, Scotch and once again German blood. The only immediate Norwegian element is represented by Ibsen's mother, Maria Cornelia Altenburg, daughter of a wealthy merchant of Skien who had begun life also as a ship master. We are told that Norse admixture might perhaps be found if the genealogy were traced back on the mother's side, but it is interesting to note that Norse blood has played no direct part in the formation of Henrik Ibsen's temperament, which has never been regarded by the best native biographers as peculiarly Norse. It is well to bear the facts regarding ancestry in mind in connection with Ibsen's cosmopolitanism, idealism and asceticism. His asceticism and idealism, which rendered his outlook on the world sombre and his demands on his fellowmen rigid and uncompromising, had, doubtless, their sources in Scotch and German ancestral influences; while the German influence is most probably also seen in Ibsen's tendency towards speculation, in his liking for pure abstractions, and his capacity for the systematic development of his ideas.

Henrik Ibsen resembled his mother in possessing a reserved disposition which made it difficult to open himself to others. His father was both austere and vivacious; his character cheerful, his keen wit ever ready for combat.

While he was popular he was also feared, for he knew how to say bitter and unsparing things about people who had awakened his dislike. His son showed similar qualities in "Love's Comedy" and "The League of Youth."

Henrik Ibsen was the eldest child, and was born at Skien in March, 1828. Skien was then a simple lumber village—not very different now,—and had barely three thousand inhabitants, now increased to eleven thousand, and the terminus of the Telemark Steamer, one of the most frequented inland routes in Norway. Small as the town was, its life, we are told, was remarkable and its commercial activity considerable. It had for long the credit of being a very religious community, where sectarian movements found a grateful field of activity. Before Ibsen's time it had been a nursery of Pietism, whence, connected later with the name of Lammers, the movement had spread and had made a stir in the religious consciousness of the whole land. Ibsen himself was brought into intimate relation with many of its representatives, and recollections of this period of spiritual unrest provided some of the material for his great work "Brand."

Knud Ibsen, the father, had an extensive and varied business which prospered until Henrik was eight years old, when he was obliged to make over all his property to his creditors. There was an end to the life of comfort, and the family was obliged to repair to a neglected farm on the outskirts of the town. Their life here was marked by an economy and retirement which contrasted sharply with its previous luxury; and they dropped out of the circle to which they previously belonged. The boy Henrik was the one who appeared to feel it most keenly. He has told enough to give us an idea of what sort of impressions his youth received. The sad and serious preponderated. At an early age attention was drawn to his unnatural reserve. He did not play like other children; he preferred to read or to occupy himself with the magic arts. He also busied himself with drawing and painting. The only outdoor occupation

he cared for was building. He wished to become an artist; but, of course, under the pressing economical conditions which were his lot, there could be no question of choosing a profession or cultivating a talent. It was necessary for him to select that occupation which could be had for least expense and gave the most speedy promise of support. So, at the age of sixteen he was sent to an apothecary at Grimstad to serve an apprenticeship as a pharmacist. He returned to his native town only for a few brief visits.

Ibsen's home seems to have had almost no attraction for him. He appears to have experienced no strong family affections. Life in Skien had aroused in him a strong feeling of repugnance for all those conventional instruments of coercion and repression which society brings to bear upon those who either by their own doing or by the force of circumstances come into conflict with the general order of things. Although not devoid of youth's capacity for rising above adverse conditions through the influence of ideas, yet the early taste of poverty left its mark on his individuality. To Ibsen, solitary and combative, it acted as a kind of challenge; it helped to develop still further a natural reserve and make him more serious and taciturn. It bred the germs of revolt and rendered him self-reliant.

Grimstad was still worse than Skien. In Ibsen's time it had only 800 inhabitants; and in this "crow's corner" he was obliged to remain over five years, during which life for him became more and more life in the world of thought. In such a town, where there is only one club, one apothecary, and one inn, every one knows his neighbour's affairs both outside and inside; nothing of one's private affairs can be concealed. In such a place whatever is uncustomary is unnatural; personal peculiarities are regarded as faults; any unusual display of energy or ability is interpreted as an eccentricity, and an eccentricity amounts to a moral defect.

From a sketch given by Ibsen himself we learn what his life was in this little community. The five years spent there were years of mental growth and unrest. He soon

found himself in antagonism with his surroundings. Naturally modest and shy, he hesitated to thrust himself forward, but once derision was aroused he did not shrink from fight. "Truth compels me to say," he observed humourously at a much later date, "that my actions were not such as were calculated to arouse any great hope that society as a result of my efforts would be a gainer in civic virtue." Stinging epigrams and caricature sketches repelled those who deserved better of him and whose friendship he even prized. Altogether out of sympathy with his environment he was swayed by ambitious ideas, and formed bold plans for the future. He was not content to remain a pharmacist; he intended to become a student and pursue medicine. During this period his poetic talent first showed signs of vitality. This was in the years 1848 and 1849, years of political upheaval throughout Europe. While he was preparing for his examen artium he studied Sallust's "Cataline" and Cicero's "Orations against Cataline," with the result that he produced a drama on the same subject which was published in the year 1850. It was composed at night, after long and exhausting days in the apothecary's shop, to which fact the author afterwards humorously attributed the circumstance that nearly all the action of the piece takes place after dark. Unlike the Cataline of Sallust and Cicero, both of whom, though in varying degrees, represent him as an unprincipled adventurer, pursuing the gratifications of his own passions and using the most desperate means since he cannot attain his purpose by lawful ones, Ibsen's Cataline is an indignant idealist who sees the rottenness of the time, but is himself too much a child of the corrupt age to successfully play the role of a reformer. It has been well remarked that "Ibsen's Cataline speaks like a Cato." Ibsen's own revolutionary enthusiasm rings through all Cataline's protest against injustice and the oppression of the individual by society. Very early, even if dimly, as his biographer, Jaeger, points out, there dawned on Ibsen's mind a view that runs through a series of the works of his maturest years:

society is rather a hindrance than an aid to the development of the extraordinary individual; its conventions are instruments of coercion, they compress individuality into conformity with the existing standard.

Ibsen's first work, "Catalina," is not an unremarkable production for a youth of twenty-one unacquainted with Shakespeare and Schiller and knowing only the dramas of Oehlenschlaeger, but it afforded no indication of what its author was later to achieve. It had an unfavourable fate. Rejected both by theatre and publishers at Christiania on account of its unpolished verses and obvious immaturities, it was eventually printed at the expense of an enthusiastic and self-denying friend. Not more than thirty copies were sold. The only profit the author had from it was a supper for himself and his friends, whose purses one evening were empty, when a huckster on the streets of Christiania discovered that the book was well fitted for wrapping paper.

"Catalina" had already appeared when Ibsen went to Christiania in March, 1850, in order to immatriculate at the University. He failed in two subjects, one of which was Greek. Permission was given to renew the examination, but was never made use of; for along with some students, amongst whom may be mentioned Vinje and Bothen-Hansen, in whose house he made the acquaintance of his distinguished countryman and later friend, Bjoernstjerne-Bjoernson, he was quickly drawn into the sphere of political and dramatic activity. Six months after his arrival his second play was produced, a single-act drama, "The Warrior's Tomb." It was well received by the critics, was accepted by the Christiania Theatre and performed three times. With its performance Ibsen gave up his studies at the University and settled down as a man of letters.

In 1851 he was appointed theatre poet of the Bergen State, and in the following year was granted a small stipend and three months' leave of absence, so that he might make himself practically acquainted with the details of stage management abroad; which he did in such centres as Copen-

hagen and Dresden. The stipend was conditional on his assuming after his return the stage managership for a period of five years. These years were fruitful. They saw the production of "St. John's Night" performed once on the stage but never printed; the important dramas based on Norwegian history, "The Banquet at Solhaug," perhaps his most cheerful work and an immediate theatrical success, "Lady Inger of Oestraat" and "Olaf Liljekrans," and then "The Vikings at Helgeland," in which the turn from romanticism is first marked. That Ibsen at an early period of his life came into close relations with the stage is undoubtedly an extremely important fact in his development; for without such practical experience he could scarcely have gained that technical mastery of dramatic composition which all must surely admire in his works whatever other view they may hold as to their subject matter and trend. As soon as his Bergen engagement was over a new position was awaiting him, the Directorship of the Norwegian Theatre in Christiana, where for seven years he struggled further to win a secure position among the dramatists. Thus for over ten years he was connected with the Norwegian Stage, during which time there were numerous productions of the works of Shakespeare, Schiller, Holberg, Oehlenschlaeger, Heiberg, Bjoernson's youthful works and the works of contemporary French dramatic literature, especially those of Scribe, whose technique was probably not without its influence. In "Lady Inger of Oestraat," in spite of one or two improbabilities through which the audience is kept in the dark, we already see the expert manager whose study of foreign plays and whose daily experience tell him what is effective on the stage.

The "Vikings at Helgeland," 1858, marks an important step in Ibsen's literary career. It was recognized immediately by a very few discerning spirits as indicating a break with the dramatic tradition which had been handed down from Oehlenschlaeger. Ibsen gathered his impressions from reading a series of Sagas, which he worked up into an organic

whole, without making literal use of them. To the generation which viewed ancient Norway with Oehlenschlaeger's eyes the piece seemed crude; the author had used the material in too objective a manner to please the romantic tendency then prevailing on the Norwegian stage. "A Norwegian stage," wrote Heiberg, the Danish dramatist and critic, "will hardly be created in the laboratory where these experiments are performed." As a result of this and similar censure from high quarters, the play was rejected by the Royal Theatres of both Copenhagen and Christiania, where the battle for a national theatre was being hotly waged. At the Theatre in Christiania, the Danish accent still prevailed; its personnel and its management were in Danish hands. So much were Danish artists admired that every attempt to create a Norwegian dramatic art was looked upon by the older generation with contempt and scorn. Those who were opposed to this tendency and contended that Norway's stage must be Norwegian if it were really to influence the people, had in the year 1852 established a dramatic school for the purpose of educating Norwegian actors. The school became a theatre, The Norwegian Theatre, and between it and the Royal Theatre there was hot rivalry, in which the press and public took sides. Ibsen, as director of this new theatre, occupied a prominent part in the struggle into which, along with Bjoernson, he threw himself with much energy. Impartial and critical as Ibsen was by nature, he could not be hostile to Danish actors as such, whose talent and excellent training he thoroughly appreciated. They were welcome where they could be employed to develop a National Theatre. He had no sympathy with those local actors who desired to exclude Danish artists merely in order to avoid competition.

Although the years spent in Christiania were not so fruitful as those in Bergen, yet they saw two very important works finished: "Love's Comedy" and "The Pretenders." "Love's Comedy," the subject of which was doubtless suggested by an earlier Norwegian work of Fru Collett's, and

which was completed in 1862, is a vigorous piece of contemporary satire. It treats of love, the clergy and religion, with what at the time was unparalleled audacity. It is free in its satire, but perhaps painful to the ordinary view in its outcome. Whatever originality it possesses is to be traced to the ideally impressed nature of its author. In the light of the ideal, love is weighed and found wanting in the imperfect forms in which it appears in actual life. Ibsen was by no means blind to the satisfaction and beauty of family life; but his logical mind allowed of no compromise. Just as with religion, so with love, when its essence becomes dissolved into official forms and legal ties, it loses its vivifying force. The men and women of the time are too insignificant to be capable of true love, and yet they go about fancying they are capable of it. This is the tragi-comedy of the situation. Poetically considered, the piece does not strike one as being of a very high order. Although the thoughts are brilliantly rhymed and the verses turned with admirable skill, judging from the German edition by Morgenstern and the English translation by Professor Herford, yet it creates the impression of an intellectual farce. There is too much display of petty anger against human nature simply because the latter falls below the requirements of an abstract theory. Notwithstanding many epigrammatic thrusts of wit, its brilliant style and its overflowing mirth, the ideas it expresses seem sterile.

After considering the subject for several years, the "Pretenders" was finally begun in the summer of 1863, was completed in six weeks and published early in 1864. Here for the first time Ibsen discloses himself in his true vein. If the previous dramas assured him a prominent place amongst the writers of his country, this work assures him a prominent place amongst the world's leading dramatists. The effect of this drama is all the more surprising when it is considered how limited the political struggle is which is described in the piece, and how often a similar theme has been worked out before. Perhaps it is owing to the fact that the "Pre-

tenders," Haakon and Skule, are of equal rank, are equipped with very similar qualities, and that the contrast between them is largely if not wholly a human one. Both have great influence over their fellow-countrymen. Both are passionate and daring; both are cool and even harsh to their nearest kin. Haakon actually feels that he requires Skule's "strong arm and clear head." But Skule never knows when to seize the opportunity; while Haakon has unshaken confidence in his own "star." Both Haakon and Skule are almost eclipsed in interest by the figure of Bishop Nicholas, their common adversary, a human monster and giant of wickedness, in comparison with whom Iago shrinks into an ordinary stage-devil, a satanic spirit yearning to rise higher than its powers permit, and whose great energies are wasted in sheer impotent coveting and craving. He is admirably characterized by himself in a few wonderfully simple and vigorous lines. Again, in Shakespeare there is nothing more admirable than the wooing of Margaret by Haakon after he has become king. Writing, in 1867, his first impression of Ibsen, George Brandes, who considered that the "Pretenders" was, without doubt, the work in which the author had up till then displayed his dramatic talent at its fullest and highest, has adduced the following exchange of speech between King Skule and the poet Jatgeir in order to illustrate Ibsen's relation to the former.

King Skule: What gift do I need to become a king?
Jatgeir: Not that of doubt, else would you not question so.
King Skule: What gift do I need?
Jatgeir: Lord, you are a king!
King Skule: Have you at all times full faith that you are a poet?

What a painful confession, says Brandes, lies in these last words. Long before "The Pretenders" was written, Ibsen had felt the worm of doubt gnawing at his heart. To what an extent he was tortured by it, is to be seen from a collection of poems published in the year 1859. But when "The Pretenders" was finished this stage of spiritual conflict had

passed. Like the poet in "Love's Comedy," Ibsen needed a struggle with adversity in order to gain the heights. His was one of those natures which are not subdued but, on the contrary, stirred to more vigorous efforts through opposing conditions.

Materially things had not been going well with Ibsen. Coming from Bergen with debts, he had lived constantly in debt in Christiania, where the struggle for existence, in the narrowest sense of the phrase, had been carried on. Christiania, moreover, did not offer conditions suitable to his free development; the place was too limited. "Love's Comedy" had raised a fierce storm of indignation amongst the respectable; it was declared to be not only immoral but unpoetical. One of the leading criticisms designated it as "a pitiful product of literary trifling." On the appearance of "The Vikings" he was described as "a dramatic author who is a complete nonentity;" he was charged with boundless vanity and even dishonesty. In his capacity as theatrical director Ibsen was also subjected to much annoyance. Actresses who considered themselves slighted, attacked him in the newspapers: added to which, the theatre was not proving a financial success; and finally, at the end of 1862, became bankrupt. Ibsen was now left in the lurch. He was obliged to borrow heavily from some friends without any prospect of ever being able to repay. As a writer he felt there was no future for him at home. He must get away from the hampering conditions of life at Christiania. The national atmosphere was stifling: mere "Stubenluft." When he made an application for a travelling stipend, one of the professors at the University declared that "the person who had written 'Love's Comedy' deserved a stick rather than a stipend." Ibsen felt it to be a matter of life and death. Supported by Bjoernson, who had already received the "poet's salary," Ibsen went curiously enough to the Head of the Ecclesiastical Department and explained to him the situation. The entire sum asked for was granted, and never was a better investment made by the Norwegian Government. But it

was not until two years later that he received the full "poet's salary." In April, 1864, Ibsen left Christiania and began his *Wanderjahre* through Italy and Germany. Only twice in twenty-seven years did he pay a brief visit to his native land, until in 1891 he returned to settle down and spend the rest of his life in the Norwegian capital, where he died a year ago. His seventieth birthday was made the occasion of a national celebration. After receiving but scant appreciation at the hands of his countrymen when he was young, he was in later years idolized by them as one of their chief possessions of world-wide celebrity.

The first work which Ibsen wrote from abroad, "Brand," 1866—written at Rome—is a controversial one; by some it has been considered his greatest achievement and even worthy to be placed alongside of Goethe's "Faust," a view which in the opinion of the present writer shows a thoroughly undiscerning comparison. "Brand" was Ibsen's first decisive success in Scandinavia; and it laid the foundations of his European reputation. It is a sustained and merciless attack on officialdom with its cowardly materialism which holds that anything beyond the actual and perceptible is purely visionary and ought to be suppressed. The people of a country should all be of one mind like a regiment of soldiers. The ideal citizen is the average characterless man who tenaciously clings to such things as lie within his limited purview. Ibsen felt bitterly that this weak materialism was responsible for the hesitating stand taken by Norway and Sweden in the war between Denmark and Germany, and refers to it in the poem. But the attack originally made upon the Norwegian people and commenced as a satire of officialdom is finally developed into a polemical discussion of the State as an institution and of the Official Church as a part of the apparatus of Government. Brand himself, whose motto is "all or nothing," is a symbolical figure, the incarnation of enthusiasm and will power. He possesses all the qualities which are lacking in those against whom the satire is directed. Nobody is spared. The various representatives of religion and education all receive

sharp and well-merited thrusts. They are made to satirize themselves in ludicrously exaggerated conversations. Brand shows the clashing discrepancy between "things as they actually are and as they rightfully should be." Ibsen's nature, fundamentally gentle like Nietzsche's, here shows itself clothed in mail armour for the battle against popular stupidity and practical materialism. The closing scene of "Brand" will perhaps be disappointing to some to whom it may seem as if Ibsen had finally yielded to the spirit of compromise.

"Brand" was quickly followed by "Peer Gynt," perhaps Ibsen's finest poetical work, more poetic than controversial; and both are intimately related to one another. Peer Gynt's character is the antithesis of Brand's. "Brand" seems to me much less peculiarly national than has often been supposed. "Brand" concerns all nations, not merely Norway. "Peer Gynt," on the other hand, contains the image itself of the Norwegian character. Peer Gynt, himself, presents a typical figure embodying all the national faults. He is the personification of the incomplete, the characterless and egotistic. He is sketched in the following lines:

> "Go but about the land, and when
> You listen to all sorts of men,
> How each has learned you soon may see
> A little of everything to be."

It is not easy for foreigners to follow all the peculiar local touches and suggestions. Later on in the piece, Peer Gynt, having accumulated a fortune in America, appears as a successful humbug. There is a satire in the fourth act, which is too blockish and clumsy to be regarded as successful, on the way in which the silly and uncritical hail each new self-boaster as the ideal figure of the hour and the great man of the future. Peer Gynt is greeted in Arabia even as the divine Mahomet himself by a chorus of girls led by Anitra, a typical specimen of the hero-hunting woman. The weak point of the drama

is that we are not permitted to follow the transition from an earlier to a later stage of Peer Gynt's character, and thus cannot understand how ten years residence in America should have so completely transformed him.

It is an interesting fact which is psychologically quite intelligible that Ibsen felt himself more of a Norwegian when he got away from his native country. It was in Rome that his two most typically national poems, "Brand" and "Peer Gynt," were composed, as well as a modern satirical comedy, "The League of Youth," dealing with peculiar local conditions. The two first mentioned works established once for all Ibsen's position as a writer; together with "The League of Youth," they form what may be called his controversial period, and disclose his eminent qualities as a great modern satirist deliberately dissecting life with "a smile of sarcasm." The last mentioned work is very important in following Ibsen's development; in one sense it was epoch-making. It is a modern comedy and in prose. For the first time there is here reproduced in a masterly fashion the tone of modern conversation at which Ibsen had vainly aimed in "Love's Comedy." "Even the minor figures," says Jaeger, "have the stamp of a reality at that time without parallel in our literature." Here we see the first signs of that capacity for the development of dialogue which the author has displayed in unsurpassed measure in his later dramas. The dialogue is not written, it is rather spoken; even slip-shod modes of conversation are reproduced. Unfortunately its appearance led to a break with Bjoernson, who considered it indicated a surrender of Ibsen's former political views.[1] The work was misunderstood at the time by the public, who failed to grasp the "new manner" which Ibsen introduced and were unable to distinguish a remarkable imaginative work from a political pamphlet. On its first and even later performance at Christiania, there was a violent disturbance in the theatre. Fifteen years later, in 1884, when Ibsen was

[1] The period of estrangement between Bjoernson and Ibsen lasted until the year 1880. Their earlier friendship was then gradually resumed and became deepened. In 1892, Ibsen's only son married Bjoernson's daughter.

paying a visit to his former home, his presence in the theatre at a performance of "The League of Youth" was the occasion of vociferous applause from a crowded house.

After "The League of Youth," Ibsen tells us that he wanted to seek "relief and escape in remoteness of subject;" so he harked back to an old scheme for a play on Julian the Apostate, and produced at the end of four years the double five act drama "Emperor and Galilean." He has said that this is the first work which he produced under German influence and on German soil, and that it contains "that positive theory of life which the critics have demanded of me so long." We shall not stop to analyze it here. Four years later, that is eight years after "The League of Youth," there appeared "The Pillars of Society," the first of the so-called "social dramas," which created for Ibsen a world-wide reputation as one of the most advanced dramatists of recent times. Hereafter, a new play was produced with almost unswerving regularity every two years, about Christmas time; in 1879 "A Doll's House;" 1881, "Ghosts;" 1882, "An Enemy of the People," exceptional in succeeding the last after an interval of only one year; 1884, "The Wild Duck;" 1886, "Rosmersholm;" 1888, "The Lady from the Sea;" 1890, "Hedda Gabler;" 1892, "Master-builder Solness;" 1894, "Little Eyolf;" 1896, "John Gabriel Borckman," and then after three years, "When We Dead Awaken," entitled a "dramatic epilogue," which Ibsen determined should be the last. He was aware then that his powers were already on the decline; he could no longer weave the material together with the same smoothness as in "Ghosts" or "The Wild Duck." His capacity for criticism had always been keen, and he was quite as unsparing of himself as he was of others.

It has been pointed out by several interpreters of Ibsen that we can already see the germs of the later dramas in the "Comedy of Love." We know that the author tried to write it in prose, failed, and had to fall back upon verse. In "The League of Youth," however, the step was really taken which had only been attempted in "Love's Comedy." "In my new comedy," he wrote to Brandes, "you will find com-

monplace reality, no violent emotions, no deep feeling and, more particularly, no isolated thoughts." "It is," he adds, "written in prose which gives it a strong realistic colouring. I have paid particular attention to the form and among other things have accomplished the feat of doing without a single monologue, in fact, without a single 'aside.'" In "The Pillars of Society," there is a still further advance. Realism has established itself more firmly and the stage mechanism goes much more smoothly. In this drama Norwegian society is especially analyzed and the local social hypocrisy laid bare. Norway had for some time been cut off from intimate intercourse with the rest of Europe, and the great events connected with the development of political affairs in France had only been vaguely reported in the newspapers. It was felt that while there was danger abroad, there was security at home. The great societies of Europe were supposed to be falling into decay, but Norwegian society was still regarded as sound; and its moral superiority was one of the "special articles of Norwegian faith." But Ibsen by no means shared this optimism. In his opinion, there is nothing to show that smaller communities are more moral than larger ones; on the contrary, he believed that there was probably more thieving and lying in the former than in the latter. Consul Bernick, whose friends adorn their smallest actions with magnificent phrases, and who is at first so indignant with American ship-owners for sending unsafe vessels to sea, is finally driven, in order to save his own social position, to the very same kind of crime. As in all plays of this period, from 1873 to 1886, there is a probing of society and social convention ; and some lie is unveiled. The dramatist exposes his characters as they really are, not as they merely seem to society to be. The "Pillars of Society" are after all only the "Tools of Society." The Pillars of Respectability are propped up by lies. A happy marriage is simply life in a Doll's House, where one of the parties sinks her individuality in that of the other. In the respected family there is the voice of heredity muttering,

"Gjengangere."[1] In the later dramas, however, there is less about lies and deceit and more about the irony of individual existence.

It is a mistake to conceive Ibsen as a moral preacher like Leo Tolstoi. It is because people have not grasped the fact that he is rather an analyst and imaginative enquirer than a moralist, that his dramas have produced such fierce controversy. He has himself expressly told it that even "'Ghosts' preaches nothing at all." He has declared his chief aim as a dramatist to be to set the characters independently in action and stand aside reserving his judgement. Thus in the "Wild Duck," the saddest I think of his plays, he scarcely decides between the cynically good-natured physician, Dr. Relling, who holds that a certain amount of illusion is indispensable in order to render the average man happy, and Gregers Werle, the intrusive personage who, acting on the conviction that the truth should be told at all times and under all circumstances, is constantly going about urging the claims of the ideal, regardless of all practical consequences. Merely to represent truth and reality (or what the dramatist considers such) is not to preach a sermon against sin; so even "Ghosts," the most appallingly tragic of all Ibsen's dramas, simply works out a scientific hypothesis which has appeared to many plausible. It is true that the problem in "Ghosts" is not that of heredity, which Ibsen considers settled, but an ethical one. But it is simply raised and discussed without being solved. The dramatist presents here the opposite picture to the conclusion of the "Doll's House." Nora left her husband in order to be free and be herself, and was in consequence the object of severe condemnation. Mrs. Alving remains with her husband, conceals his short-comings and certain unpleasant facts, with the result that two human existences are ruined. Mrs. Alving does not shew her true self, but follows the advice of respectable ortho-

[1] Not very well translated by the English "Ghosts." The German "Wiederkehrer" and the French "Revenants" come nearer to the meaning of the Norwegian title.

doxy. Which course of conduct is preferable? It may be mentioned incidentally that the factor of heredity had been already brought forward in the person of Dr. Rank in the "Doll's House."

"Ghosts" is a psychological vivisection (if the phrase be allowable). The emotions and agonies of these people who suffer so terribly are analyzed quite calmly, and scientifically! The boldness of this drama terrified even those who had hitherto been accounted Ibsen's followers. Its appearance was the signal for the mud volcano of injured conventionality to venemously bespatter the author's name and character. There was vehement disapproval of the "moral" of the play which has no "moral." Thoroughly incensed by its reception, Ibsen lashed the traditional hypocrisy for its attack in a vigorous play produced a year sooner than usual, "An Enemy of the People," one of his keenest and wittiest, but not æsthetically the best of his dramas, for in one part it becomes almost a mere pamphlet. Its chief figure, Dr. Stockman, who can be better identified with Ibsen himself than can any other of his characters, though he is by no means a mere mouthpiece of the author's opinion, reaches the characteristic conclusion that "the majority is always wrong," and that "the strongest man is he who stands most alone."[1] The compact majority is the intellectual mob. Dr. Stockman finds himself in a situation analogous to that in which Ibsen found himself after the appearance of "Ghosts." When the former points out the unhealthiness of the baths in his native village insuperable opposition is aroused and he is deserted on all hands; so was Ibsen, when he showed how vulgarity, cowardice, and hypocrisy lay concealed under what is called popular morality.

It will, I imagine, be generally admitted that "A Doll's House," "Ghosts" and "The Wild Duck" are the plays in

[1] "The occupation with this work," wrote Ibsen in 1882 to his publisher, Hegel, in Copenhagen, "has caused me entertainment. Dr. Stockman and I have got on very well together. We agree in many respects; but the Doctor is a greater bungler than I, and has besides some other peculiarities." Complete German Edition of Ibsen's works, Vol. X., page 317.

which Ibsen's dramatic talent reaches its highest expression, and perhaps it is not too much to say completely attained its end. This end is, as he tells us in speaking of "Ghosts," "to produce the impression in the mind of the reader that he was witnessing something real." There is scarcely any visible stage mechanism. The art of dramatic illusion has reached a higher development than ever before. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the appearance of dramatic illusion can go further than it has in "A Doll's House" and "Ghosts." "In 'A Doll's House,'" says Brandes, "he has surpassed the technique of the most famous French dramatists, and in 'Ghosts,' in spite of the unsatisfactory episode of the asylum fire, has displayed a dramatic certainty, simplicity and delicacy, which recall antique tragedy in the hands of Sophocles." The progress of Ibsen's dramatic art between the years 1873 and 1884 is well illustrated, as Brandes suggests, by a comparison of "The Wild Duck" with "The Pillars of Society." In the latter and earlier play there is the conventional and rather improbable conversion of the chief character, Consul Bernick, the rescue of the ship and of the runaway son; all the bad and disagreeable are smoothed away; in fine we have a typical melodramatic composition. In the later play both the austere beauty and the bitter reality of life are combined with the full ease of a perfected art. "The Wild Duck" is certainly the most pessimistic of Ibsen's dramas. It presents some of the most squalid aspects of human existence: Hjalmar Eckdal "with his mouth full of beer, buttered bread and empty phrases" is assuredly the meanest figure in all Ibsen's works. After the blaze of feeling excited by the reception of "Ghosts" had spent itself in "The Enemy of the People," it would seem as if Ibsen had temporarily lost his faith in the possibilities of life and were disposed to believe that illusion and falsehood are its underlying principles. Falsehood resembles the charm which the physician hangs around the patient's neck.

"Rosmersholm" is mournful but not pessimistic. It extols self-sacrificing love. It begins where "The Enemy

of the People" leaves off. Johannes Rosmer wishes to do from the outset what Dr. Stockman aimed at doing only at the end; to make free and noble beings of his countrymen. Lack of resolution and weakness of will are but poor equipments for the task. He succeeds only in bending the fierce will of Rebecca West, who has skilfully laid her plans for gaining access to Rosmersholm, in the belief that there happiness for which she has an irresistible desire awaits her. But when her aim is attained; after Rosmer's wife has been driven to suicide and she is offered the place of the deceased; she dare not accept, for she now perceives that her own actions have separated Rosmer from her for ever. Love for him gives her the strength to sacrifice. In the opinion of some critics, Rebecca is one of Ibsen's greatest and most admirable creations. Certainly Ibsen has understood how to arouse sympathy for this woman, who is after all a criminal, if not a murderess. In the two shattered individual destinies one sees the conflict between two life principles, each of which is one-sided and inadequate. The real dramatic antithesis is between a weak-willed but scrupulous man and a strong, reckless and unprincipled woman, between a sickly and a robust conscience. Rosmer is a product of an old and effete civilization; Rebecca a product of unsophisticated nature. Her view of life is utterly emancipated, but it is the emancipation of the untrained and undisciplined. The exalted type of humanity which Rosmer dreamed of creating must combine a liberated mind with a purified and strengthened will.

In "The Lady from the Sea" Ibsen returned to the symbolism to which he was earlier inclined, and of which "Brand" and "Peer Gynt" are illustrative. This drama makes the impression of a skilfully executed, though rather improbable, psychological experiment. There are indeed some elements of the same sort of fantasy in the "Wild Duck," but the symbolism here is still precise and explicit. With the exception of "Hedda Gabler," 1890, a study of decadence in a partly unfinished and yet over-refined com-

munity, the chief character of which has been created into a wonderful figure through the art of Eleonora Duse, who makes this example of perverse and exasperated woman neither wicked nor disagreeable, but graceful, complicated and sinuous, this symbolism grows on Ibsen and becomes vaguer and less intelligible in his latest works. Brandes is disposed to regard the "Master Builder," which it seems to us he overestimates, as the culminating point in Ibsen's creative activity. Others consider it to be "John Gabriel Borckman." His last drama, "When We Dead Awaken," is a study in psychopathology; there is almost no action except in the last catastrophe, which appears to be rather unnecessary, and all the characters, with the exception of the hunter Ulfheim, seem more or less mad. It is a drama which is essentially undramatic because it consists almost altogether in an analysis of conditions of soul.

In these later dramas, Ibsen becomes more interested in the fate of the individual soul. Psychological, rather than social problems, are brought forward and examined. There is less æsthetic refinement in dealing with unpleasant topics than there is, for example, in "Ghosts," remarkable for its earnestness and its restraint in suggesting rather than describing the insidious and ensnaring events of the Alving household. In the "dramatic epilogue" there is a tone of coarseness, which amounts at times almost to brutality. The symbolism, too, has become altogether mystical. His art expresses itself enigmatically and seems to us to be on the decline. In "Little Eyolf" and "The Master Builder" there is such a mixture of reality and symbol that they become mutually disturbing and the meaning unintelligible. The result is decidedly unsatisfactory, for one does not know at times which is which; the reality appears sometimes unreal, as, for example, the character of Fru Aline Solness in the "Master Builder," and the imaginary or ideal incomprehensible, as, for example, the Ratwife in "Little Eyolf." "Verstehen wir das Symbol einmal, dann scheint uns seine Verwirklichung laeppisch. Hat die Wirklichkeit Sinn, dann schwindet

uns das Symbol unter den Haenden."[1] Doubtless Ibsen saw a deep meaning in some of these things; it is improbable that he was simply playing with the public. He seems to be in dead earnest. But it is doubtful whether any one except himself will ever know the interpretation; and perhaps, after all, it does not matter. There seems to have been a two-fold tendency in Ibsen's nature. On the one hand, there was the influence of romanticism which scarcely any of his generation in the North escaped, and on the other there was a strong individual bias to logical analysis and hard rationality.[2] In few writers does one find such an extraordinary alternation in this respect as Ibsen's various works disclose. "Brand" and "The Pillars of Society," or again, "Peer Gynt" and "A Doll's House," present such striking contrasts that they might easily have been written by different authors. He who was praised at one time as the great representative of Naturalism was later lauded by the same followers as the great Symbolist. It is difficult, however, to understand how those who place him on a pedestal for the Realism of his "Doll's House" and "Ghosts" can follow him in the mystical extravagancies of "The Master Builder." But perhaps there is not a clear conception of what Naturalism is, even amongst some who dwell in the circles of the so-called Naturalists. To us Realism and an obscure Symbolism appear essentially opposite.

One frequently hears it urged against Ibsen's dramas of modern life that they deal too exclusively with the dark and seamier aspects of human existence and have a decidedly pessimistic trend. The prevalence of a marked "Tendenz," it is claimed, impairs their artistic value and interferes with their enjoyment. It has already been remarked that it is not Ibsen's aim in these dramas to sermonize or to preach against hidden sins and show that "their wages is death." "The method, the technique of the construction," he has insisted, "entirely precludes the author's appearing in his speeches."[3]

[1] Bullhaupt Dramaturgie des Schauspiels, IV. 193.
[2] See Brandes' Ibsen, p. 69.
[3] Vol. X., pp. 308, 309. German Edition.

It may be true that some of the characters are indirectly judged; but their judgement is not Ibsen's direct aim as little as it should be the aim of any true work of art. In art it is the *how* and not the *what* that is important and decisive.[1] So far as morality is concerned the standpoint of art is or ought to be passive. It aims consciously (or should aim) as little at being morally instructive, as it aims (or should aim) at being informative. Its attitude is simply non-moral. In this respect music is perhaps the highest of the arts (from the standpoint of form), for in no other can the subject matter be treated in a fashion so completely free from ethical implications. In almost every important drama production, it may be said, there is some tendency, either a conscious or unconscious bias, resulting from the author's own experience of the world. This may, I think, be maintained of Shakespeare's two greatest tragedies, "Hamlet" and "King Lear," both of which are unmistakeably pessimistic; allowing the philosophical use of such terms as optimism and pessimism at all. Even Ibsen with his successful striving at objectivity, has to select that material which he considers typical; and presents it in a manner which appears to him adequately to represent human life and reality. It may, of course, be objected that his choice of the typical is mistaken and that he has seen things through a distorting medium; but it must be borne in mind that the critics who object to Ibsen's tendency have also a tendency of their own; the real point at issue being that theirs is different from Ibsen's, so that an objection of this kind has always a double-edged character. But exception is taken to the nature of the "Tendenz" in Ibsen's dramas which is repellent to the large majority of theatre goers. Their darkness and gloom are distasteful to those with whom optimism would seem to be received as an axiom. For many, a comfortable existence necessarily involves a certain amount of illusion, as that experienced physician, Dr. Relling, recognized. The world is

[1] This was clearly recognized by Ibsen. See ibid, Vol. I., p. 261. It is true that he does not always follow the maxim of "art for art's sake;" his art at one period of his life was used largely as a weapon of attack on the worm-eaten social fabric. But as a real artist, he never desires to prove anything in his dramas, nor does he allow his ethical sympathies to run away with him.

really good and well ordered because they *want* it so. Others, again, seem to be optimists out of sheer terror, praising the world much as they would praise a highwayman in order that their lives or their pockets may be spared.

Of Ibsen's pessimistic attitude towards the existing order of things, especially to the present constitution of society both in his own country and elsewhere, there can be no doubt. But it is desirable to understand both the origin and significance of this pessimism. The term, as is well known, embraces several kinds and shades. Pessimism may consist in the conviction that life itself is an evil, either because the sum total of human happiness compared with suffering and want is infinitesimal or because the former is at all events outweighed by the latter; or it may consist in demonstrating the worthlessness of all that is or can be considered most valuable. Those who hold such views may then either prescribe asceticism, like Schopenhauer, or recommend labour in the cause of progress, like Edward von Hartmann; the latter somewhat illogically, I think, since it is recognized that every advance in civilization entails an increase in human misery. But these forms do not cover Ibsen's pessimism. His is not the pleasure-seeking pessimism of a Schopenhauer, who, because life is not a continual round of enjoyment, held that the universe is morally bankrupt and life a poor business which does not pay the costs of its continuance. Undoubtedly, Ibsen finds the world bad, but does not trouble himself with the question whether life is or is not a good. Sceptical as he is, he never draws the conclusion which some are inclined to draw from an utterance of Goethe's at the age of seventy-five, that he had not enjoyed four weeks of actual happiness, that a happy life is therefore impossible. On the contrary, Ibsen believed in the possibility of human happiness.

Brandes and others have rightly perceived that behind Ibsen's pessimism there lies a firm belief that human society can and ought to be improved. Pessimistic like Carlyle in regard to present-day affairs, Ibsen, like Carlyle, had at the same time undoubted faith in the possibilities of the future;

in the advent of the "third kingdom" described in "Emperor and Galilean." Mankind[1] appears to him rather as pitiably bad and wretched, than as essentially and incurably wicked. He regards the men of his age as contemptible because they are frightened to think matters out to their final logical conclusion. With the Danish philosopher, Kierkegaard, by whom he was not probably, however, directly influenced, he would say: "their thoughts are thin and frail as lace; they themselves are the weakling lace-makers." So Brand had cried, complaining of the ideals of his generation:

"Ye need such feebleness to brook
A God who'll through his fingers look,
Who, like yourselves, is hoary grown,
And wears a cap on his bald crown.
Mine is another kind of God,
Mine is a storm where thine's a lull,
Implacable where thine's a cloud,
All loving there where thine is dull,
And he is young like Hercules,
No hoary sipper of life's lees." [2]

Self-development and self-realization, individualism and freedom, are, according to Ibsen, the ultimate ideals of human existence. Thus Nora had to leave her husband and her children when once she realized that she had been living in a sort of minority, in a Doll's House, where she had been thinking as a child and had been treated as a mere "song-bird." This conclusion has been sometimes condemned; and the general criticism at the time was to characterize it as immoral. Great actresses at Berlin and Vienna demanded a more harmonious ending and actually played the final scene differently, making Nora remain with her children. But to Ibsen it would have been immoral to have continued life under such conditions as those of the Helmer household, and he characterized the altered conclusion as "a barbarous piece

[1] See speech at Stockholm in the year 1887. Ibid., Vol. I., p. 528.

[2] Pp. 49, 50. Brandes' work on Ibsen, translated by W. Archer. It seems that Brandes and some German critics have over-estimated Kierkegaard's influence on Ibsen. Jaeger asserts that when "Brand" was written Ibsen was unacquainted with the writings of the Danish philosopher, and that even later he made no deep impression on him. There is, however, a striking similarity in their attitudes towards the men and societies of their times. The model for Brand was probably supplied in part by the Norwegian Pastor Lammers, who was active in Skien in 1855-1856.

of violence." When Helmer says, "You forget, Nora, that you are in the first place a wife and a mother;" the answer comes, "I don't believe that any longer, I believe that I am a human being like you; and if not, I must strive to become one." "I must find out," says this seemingly frail creature, "who is right, society or I?" Our sympathy is with Nora, by no means a pathological type, particularly when we see the character interpreted by the convincing art of powerful actresses like Sorma and Nazimova. Originally, Ibsen had, it seems, very little sympathy with woman. He spent much more time in the company of men. He derived but small pleasure and probably no stimulation from conversation with women, whose admiration he certainly never sought. In his earlier works, like "Lady Inger," "The Pretenders" and "Brand," he had regarded love as the essential trait of woman's character; that love which is ready to sacrifice itself without any expectation of reward. "To love, to sacrifice all and be forgotten, that is the saga of womanhood," he had written in an earlier drama. Even up to the time of "The Pillars of Society" he had a personal aversion to the woman's rights movement and ridiculed the enthusiasm of J. S. Mill, whose writings on the subject and whose personality appeared utterly unattractive.[1] He was not inclined to extend his fundamental principle and apply the same measure of freedom and individuality to women as he had to men. But, once he recognized that this idea was one of the rallying points in the general fight for social progress, his attitude became changed. He could no longer regard her merging her being in that of another individual as her highest aim. The woman question became a question of mankind. "Modern society is not human society; it is solely a society of men." It was in all probability his reasoning faculties which wrought the change in his feelings. A recent Norwegian writer, John Paulsen, maintains that the influence of Ibsen's wife was strongly exerted in this direction.

[1] "I consider," he wrote sarcastically to Brandes in 1873, "that you do Mill an injustice when you doubt the truth of his assertion that he has all his ideas from his wife."

A pessimistic philosopher like Schopenhauer emphasizes the illusory character of human love; but not so Ibsen. Love's Comedy does not consist in the "inevitable erotic illusion," but, in the degeneration of marriage and human character as the result of the "prosaic philistinism of the legal union." Life is not in itself joyless; it is society, depressing and enslaving in its pleasures and conventions, which is to blame for the absence of happiness. Ibsen's pessimism has its origin in ethical rather than in metaphysical grounds. It arises from a conviction that certain standards of life are attainable, and yet not attained, because of the selfishness of mankind. In his eyes mankind is stupid because it is selfish, rather than bad because it is stupid. Ibsen feels indignation with men rather than compassion; and here are interestingly enough to be noticed traces of Puritanical influences. For this lack of sympathy with mankind obviously results from the conviction that suffering has an educative power. Miserable men and miserable communities can develop and become great only through suffering and adversity. This seems to be the view put forward in "Emperor and Galilean." Is Ibsen here generalizing from his own case; he who had experienced the bracing effect of struggle and adversity? That his view is one-sided; that all mankind is not pitiful; that he takes too misanthropic a view of marriage, is surely obvious. Once in conversation with Brandes on the subject of "Love's Comedy," when Brandes remarked, "there are diseased potatoes and there are sound potatoes;" Ibsen replied, "I am afraid that none of the sound ones have come under my observation." Hence it is that so many of his charcters are as the Parisian physician said of Oswald Alving, *vermoulu*. Ibsen's natural instinct to test the apparently genuine in order to see whether it will ring true became through exercise developed to such an extent that he was later constantly probing into everything in the painful expectation that it would turn out to be hollow.

The development of Ibsen's mind, as disclosed in the dramas of society, shows a wonderfully logical sequence.

Moving deliberately from one point to another, without turning back or taking a leap, he reached the goal that he aimed at attaining, and then went beyond it, probably because his was one of those natures, like Goethe's, to whom development is inevitable. "I must keep constantly at work," says Rubeck in the dramatic epilogue written in Ibsen's seventy-second year, "and create work after work until my last day."[1] It is to be hoped that very soon an adequate treatise on the art form of his dramas will be forthcoming in English, for Ibsen is undoubtedly, from a technical standpoint, amongst the most remarkable of modern playwrights. So far as it can be judged at the present time his work is epoch-making in the history of dramatic art; its influence is clearly evident in all contemporary dramatists of note in Germany and in England, and to a less degree in France. Ibsen has been the most discussed dramatist of the last twenty-five years. What can be more satisfactory for a productive spirit? Ibsenism now stands for a distinctive tendency in art.

The development of the dialogue in recent dramas, which in most instances falls far behind the achievement of Ibsen's best plays, shows the immediate influence of the Norwegian dramatist. Until recently the development of the drama had certainly lagged far behind that of the novel, by which it has been overshadowed. Indeed in the nineteenth century the novel took so predominant a place that it may be considered one of its special art-forms, and this position it probably owes to the fact that it satisfied the demands of the age for naturalism; whereas even in the most skilful modern French dramatists, like Augier, Alexander Dumas *fils* and Sardou, tradition and convention supply the most prominent elements. It has been shown even of Zola himself, one of the acknowledged leaders of the naturalistic school, that he is by no means free from this influence. But with Ibsen all traces of conventional romanticism have disappeared. What is

[1] A contemplated autobiographical sketch was never executed owing to a sudden failure of health. The most authentic sources of information in regard to his life and opinions are a volume of letters; the prefaces to "Catalina," "The Banquet at Solkaug," and "Love's Comedy," and a few speeches and newspaper articles.

characteristic of his dramas is, as Jaeger has well put it, this: "The invention of a new dramatic formula corresponding to the naturalistic formula in the novel." A peculiar feature of this drama is that it begins at what would be almost the closing point of an ordinary play. The situation is well defined before the play begins, so that the task of the play is to further illuminate the given situation and develop it to its remotest consequences. A conventional pre-Ibsen dramatist writing the "Doll's House" would have made Nora's forgery the climax probably midway in the play, and represented all the rest as its consequences in the last act. With Ibsen, on the other hand, this act of Nora's has taken place before the curtain rises, and the consequences are the principal matter. Again, in "Rosmersholm," Rebecca West's intrigues with Fru Rosmer are left out of the play; the dramatist simply develops its material and spiritual effects. This analytic method of dramatic construction reminds us of that great representative of ancient tragedy, Sophocles (in Oedipus Rex). What is distinctive and epoch-making in Ibsen's treatment is his power to produce a naturalistic representation in dramatic form. His originality consists in the capacity to make men divulge their most secret thoughts without resort to monologue or any other improbable device. Even those critics who are altogether opposed to the naturalistic aim of Ibsen's dramas admit that his capacity for the invention of a dramatic situation has probably never been surpassed. Only seldom can a technical fault be found with the construction of the plot. The dialogue of these dramas grew steadily more and more realistic. Whereas most dramatists make their characters speak to a greater or less degree the language of the author, each character with Ibsen speaks its own language, and does this in the best plays so consistently, even to the least details, that Norwegians say they can recognize the lines of a Dr. Stockman or an Ulrik Brendel among a hundred others.

But it has been said of this speech that "it is the language of the newspaper recorded with the fidelity of the phonograph," and while we recognize the exaggeration of this

remark we can also perceive in it the suggestion of a sound criticism. Ibsen has frequently so chiselled at the dialogue and reduced it to such a bare amount that it seems as if he had sometimes aimed at economy of speech as an end. Where this happens, the realistic dramatist seems to have failed in his aim because he has gone beyond it. In striving to be realistic he has occasionally become unnatural; for human beings rarely converse with that measured precision, directness and concentration which characterize some of the dialogues. Nevertheless his best works present a series of the most probable characters. So natural, so alive do they seem, and so unconsciously do they reveal themselves, that one is almost inevitably led to speculate about them as about real people. It is true that many of them are simply average individuals representing qualities nothing more uncommon than those with which we ourselves daily come into contact. Many of them produce the bourgeois impression. And yet it would be inaccurate to say that there are no exceptional characters to be met with in these dramas. One has only to think of Dr. Stockman, Johannes Rosmer and Rebecca West in order to be reminded that these are not average human beings. There are indeed no heroes and no villains of the traditional kind. In the "problem dramas," Ibsen presents and clinically examines human nature as he finds it, especially typical specimens of modern business and professional men and society women, whom he endows with many excellent qualities, so that public opinion regards them as attractive, worthy and honourable. Many of the characters must needs be commonplace ones; for are not these after all in a decided majority? This fact conditions the character of their speech. Some English writers have commented on Ibsen's lack of style; but Norwegian and Danish critics, who probably are more competent than others to judge in this matter, do not appear to be impressed by this defect. More noticeable is certainly the lack of humour for which translation cannot be held responsible. "Neither the creator nor creatures appear to feel impulse to play with the things of life," says Mr. Henry James.

No! they have no leisure for such whims! They are too busy learning how to live; they have not yet reached the stage where they can play. The characters reflect the temperament and attitude of their author, to whom, doubtless, owing to a constitutional deficiency, there was nothing very amusing or droll in the world.

By limiting the scope of his art, Ibsen makes it all the more perfect of its kind. Those aspects of the human soul which he knew he describes with masterly skill. But they are not the whole. Yet a criticism which maintains that Ibsen shirks the great crises of the human soul is surely refuted by reference to such situations as those in "A Doll's House," "Rosmersholm" and "Ghosts." This criticism could be shown to be still more inapplicable, on turning back to earlier dramas, "Lady Inger of Oestraat" and the "Pretenders." Or, can situations of the greatest spiritual crisis be developed only through and in conflict between man and the forces of Nature and not in the struggle between the individual and society?

Previous to Ibsen the drama and poetry were united. The dramatist was regarded as a poet. Prose was largely, if not altogether, the handmaid to verse. No great dramatist had *consciously* put forward a prose conception of the drama. But so long as the drama remains poetic it is bound to be more or less romantic and, to this extent, unrealistic. Ibsen aimed at making the drama realistic; (shall we say scientific?) and at banishing the romantic element. He wanted to discuss life critically on the stage. With a given situation and character, he is not concerned to show what would be the greatest and morally finest thing that could be said or done but, as Mr. Symonds well puts it, what is the most probable thing the individual will say or do under the circumstances. Ibsen was well aware of an objection which might be made to the literary form of these dramas, and met it in replying to some remarks of Mr. Edmund Gosse's in the year 1874. To Mr. Gosse's criticism that "Emperor and Galilean" would have gained in force had it been written in

verse, he answered: " I must contradict you with regard to this point; for the piece is, as you have yourself remarked, constructed on the most realistic lines. It was the *illusion of reality* which I wished to produce. I wished to create the impression on the reader (or observer) that what he experienced was an actual event. *Had I employed verse, I should have worked against my intention* and contrary to the task which I set myself. The various average and insignificant characters, which I purposely introduced, would have become confused with and been no longer distinguishable from one another, had I allowed them to speak in rythmical tempo. We no longer live in Shakespeare's time; even amongst sculptors there is much discussion about painting statues in natural colours. Personally, I should not care to see Milo's Venus painted; but I would prefer to have a negro head executed in black rather than in white marble. In general, *the literary form must adapt itself to the degree of ideality which attaches to the whole representation.* My new drama is no tragedy in the old sense: what I wanted to present are actual human beings; and just for this reason, I did not allow them to speak with the tongues of gods." [1]

Ibsen's aim in the dramas of modern life is not tocreate in imagination a more comprehensive and abundant life; not to reinterpret it afresh, but to analyze and imitate it. It may, and probably will, be denied that this can be the true aim of dramatic art any more than of painting, since, the more skilful the imitation the less distinguishable it will be from a mere photograph. To discuss this question here is impossible; but it is obvious that there is a limit to which the imitation can be carried. This is shewn in the case of Ibsen himself, for most of his characters express themselves in far weightier and more concentrated utterances than do men and women in daily intercourse. It must, nevertheless, I think, be admitted that Ibsen's intention is admirably achieved at the moments of the best balance of his powers. Ibsen's dramatic art is, at least, the best of its kind, even if the kind

[1] Vol. X. p., 223. German Edition.

be not admitted to be of the highest. He himself tried his hand successfully at the romantic drama in the "Vikings." In revolting deliberately, however, against this dramatic trend, he found and developed his own special talent. And thus far in the best specimens of his art he stands not only unsurpassed but unapproached. "There can hardly be a doubt," says George Brandes, a judge whose pronouncement in this matter must carry the greatest weight, "that Scandinavian literature has produced its best in Ibsen's dramas."

Ibsen's plays are not likely to become popular any more than Goethe's dramas or Shakespeare's tragedies. Apart from their portrayal of certain aspects of human life, which most people wish buried out of sight, they demand the exercise on the part of the audience of powers of insight, memory, imagination and reasoning, which are possessed by only a very small fraction of the theatre-going public. This kind of drama is too complicated and perplexing to be agreeable; its threads cannot be gathered up on coming in at the second or third act. So the English public, particularly, prefers Gilbert and Sullivan and Henry Arthur Jones. Multiplicity of events is more important and desirable than internal connexion and the development of a fundamental idea. "Die Masse koennt ihr nur durch Masse zwingen." Frivolous amusement rather than stimulation of the imagination and intellect must, therefore, be the aim of the successful theatre manager. Like the theatre director in the prologue to "Faust," he must require of the author:

"Chiefly enough of incident prepare!
They come to look, and they prefer to stare.
Reel off a host of threads before their faces,
So that they gape in stupid wonder: then
By sheer diffuseness you have won their graces,
And are at once most popular of men.

If you've a piece, why, just in pieces give it:
A hash, a stew will bring success, believe it!
'Tis easily displayed, and easy to invent.
What use, a whole compactly to present?
Your hearers pick and pluck, as soon as they receive it."

But in Ibsen's best plays comparatively little external action occurs; and the situations are developed directly towards the inevitable conclusion.

Ibsen's dramas demand for their successful presentation the very greatest skill and power on the part of the actors and actresses. In such plays it is necessary that all the words should be heard by the audience without any effort; since nearly every word supplies a thread in the development of the situation. In a spectacular play, or roystering farce, or ordinary melodrama, on the other hand, it is not important to catch the exact words; so long as the general drift of the actors' speeches is understood, one may be quite happy. But in a drama of the Ibsen type, the words are all important, the gestures less so, and the dresses nothing in comparison. Perfectly articulate enunciation on the part of the actors is absolutely essential to their enjoyment. It is much easier for playwrights who laugh and cry according to traditional prescriptions to portray surprises, swoons, intrigues and murders, which are the commonplace theatrical fare, than to substitute for these the incidents and catastrophes of spiritual history. It is not surprising that older artists, brought up on conventional tragic scenes, prefer to retain them, since they offer them greater professional opportunities. The danger with the conventional actor, who supposes that it is impossible to be bad without being a villain or self-sacrificing without being a hero, is that under his interpretation Ibsen's plays are liable to be degraded into melodrama or farcical comedy. Managers of theatres will also hold to these latter so long as they are commercial successes. A well-known English manager has pitied Ibsen for his incapacity to produce effective plays, declaring that he sees what ought to have been done to make Hedda Gabler a real play. His case, as Mr. Bernard Shaw has wittily remarked, "is parallel to that of the late Sir Henry Irving, who saw exactly what ought to be done to make a real play of Goethe's Faust and got Mr. Wills to do it." All who ever saw Irving in this piece must have been painfully impressed

by the glaring mutilation and caricature of the original.

Even those who witness Ibsen's plays with distaste or weariness will probably return to the accustomed theatrical diet with a keener consciousness of its artificialities. Ibsen occupies, to accept a suggestion of Mr. Shaw's, a position in the history of the drama somewhat analogous to that of the naturalistic and impressionistic school of French artists in the development of painting. Just as this school has undoubtedly exercised a greater influence than the number of its direct and immediate adherents would indicate; so Ibsen has exerted a greater influence than the number of dramatic writers who have expressly followed him might lead us to suppose. He has reformed and will, we trust, continue to reform playwrights who are even opposed to him.

J. W. A. Hickson

THE INTELLECTUAL PREFERENCE

FOR THE beginnings of the movement, which resulted in the Convention bringing about the reduction in the rates of British periodicals, we must go back for some years. Indeed, it may be said to have been set on foot at the moment when the affairs of the Post Office had reached that point of prosperity which gave it freedom to think of other things besides questions of domestic ways and means. For many years the Department had laboured under a crippling deficit, which forbade the consideration of schemes that seemed to involve additional expenditures, and it was only when the deficits gave sure signs of disappearing that the Department could raise its eyes from its internal affairs, and see what could be done as a member of the British Empire.

The movement, which was crowned by the granting of the intellectual preference, was fairly embarked in 1898, when, owing to the initiative of this country, the Imperial Penny postage was established. This measure was designed to promote trade, and still more to make easy the communications which flowed between the British immigrants and those who were left in the old home. When the new settlers found that they could keep up their old associations at no more cost than the postage on letters circulating between two towns in England, they were encouraged to write freely, and thus the sentiments which they had brought with them to this country remained fresh and unimpaired. But it was felt at once that the measure was only a partial one. While letters are still the mediums by which the intimacies of domestic life are maintained between friends, they no longer serve as means for the imparting of information of a public character, nor did they ever serve in any large degree to give information of what is being done in the fields of science or speculation. The

newspapers and magazines have performed these functions, and it was clear that the aims of the promoters of the Penny postage could not be considered achieved, while the postal arrangements operated to prevent the easy movement of the vehicles of current science, speculation and literature within the various parts of the Empire. It was well, indeed necessary, to provide the means by which the domestic affections of those leaving their old homes should be kept active, but it was no less necessary that the parts of the Empire should participate in the intellectual life of the whole.

At the time the Imperial Penny post was adopted, the question of lower rates on newspapers and magazines was mooted, and after the return of the Postmaster General to Canada, there was some official correspondence on the subject, but the question does not appear to have been brought expressly before the public until 1902. In that year, the Imperial Conference sat in London, and among the resolutions offered for acceptance by the Council was one which pointed out the immense importance of periodical literature in moulding public opinion, and declared the desirability of every part of the Empire taking steps to cheapen the cost of transmission of newspapers and magazines circulating within the Empire. At that time, the postage rate between Great Britain and every other part of the Empire was one cent for every two ounces or fraction of two ounces. This rate was fixed not by the parts of the Empire, but by the Universal Postal Union, and was the same rate as was applied to newspapers and periodicals passing anywhere within the civilized world. It cost no more to send a paper from Canada to Russia than to England or to any of the British Colonies. At this time Canada was receiving from the United States, through the Post Office, newspapers and periodicals at the rate of one cent per lb., that is one-eighth the rate charged on newspapers and periodicals sent to this country from Great Britain. In fact, in quite a peculiar sense, Canada and the United States were one postal territory. The rate on newspapers and periodicals from the United States to Canada was one cent per lb. when they were

sent from publishers to subscribers. If the domestic rate in the United States had happened to be nothing at all, then under the Convention between Canada and the United States, newspapers and periodicals would have come into Canada and been delivered to subscribers without any postal charge whatever.

The resolution had been laid before the Imperial Conference in the summer of 1902, and the Postmaster General of Canada waited a reasonable time to see if any action was to be taken thereon. As the resolution appeared to fall fruitless so far as the Post Office Departments within the Empire were concerned, he caused letters to be written to every Colony within the Empire, drawing their attention to the motion before the Imperial Council, and stating that, in pursuance of it, Canada was prepared to send its newspapers and periodicals to every part of the Empire at the Canadian domestic rates. This, of course, could not be done unless the United Kingdom and the various Colonies would be willing to accept them on those terms, and each Department was asked whether it would consent to receiving Canadian newspapers and periodicals at the Canadian inland rates of postage. The effect of the proposition was that a subscriber to a Canadian newspaper, residing in Great Britain or any of her Colonies, could receive it without paying more postage than a Canadian subscriber would pay. As this rate is the nominal one of one half cent per pound, the proposition made by Canada, if accepted by the Empire at large, would have prepared the way for the dissemination of information concerning the social, political or other activities of Canada anywhere throughout the Empire for charges which were practically insignificant. The proposition was coupled with an expression of willingness on the part of Canada to accept the newspapers and periodicals published in any one part of the Empire if paid at the rates of postage charged in the inland service of such part of the Empire.

The proposition made by Canada was received by Great Britain in a spirit of reserve. Canadian newspapers and period-

icals were to be allowed entrance into Great Britain when paid at the Canadian inland rates, but on no account was this to be taken as a concession of lower rates on British newspapers and periodicals addressed to places in Canada. A number of the Colonies agreed to accept Canadian newspapers and periodicals at the Canadian rates of postage, but none of them except New Zealand made a reciprocal offer. New Zealand made an offer of one penny per newspaper weighing up to eight ounces, on all papers coming to Canada, which was gladly accepted by this country. Since that date, New Zealand has extended its offer to all parts of the Empire, and it has been accepted by many of the Colonies. A number of the Colonies declined to allow Canadian newspapers to enter into their circulation except at the rate then paid, that is, the Postal Union rate of one cent per two ounces. Their reason for declining Canada's offer was to avoid embarrassment with their own people. They did not feel that they could reciprocate with Canada, that is, to allow their people a specially low rate when sending their newspapers to this country, and they foresaw dissatisfaction if the Canadian correspondents of their people were given an advantage in the matter of rates in the interchange of newspapers and periodicals. But with several the objection went further than that. They feared that their own domestic rates would be imperilled, if their people became aware that the Canadian rates were so exceedingly low. In but few countries is the circulation of newspapers and magazines given special encouragement. Even in Great Britain, while there is a low rate of postage on newspapers, the rate on magazines is exactly the same as the international rate fixed by the Postal Union for printed matter generally, that is, one half penny per two oz. In most of the Colonies, not even newspapers are conceded a lower rate than the general one fixed for printed matter. The postal administrations can see no reason for giving a rate which seems to them less than self supporting, and they would not welcome pressure on the part of their public, such as might be expected if the inwardness of Canada's policy and practice were understood.

The British public, however, were not long in grasping the importance of Canada's action. The administration was made subject to two attacks: one, from those who desired to foster the diffusion of Imperial sentiment throughout the Empire; the other, from the British publisher, who clamoured for a reduction in the inland rate on periodical publications. The latter would, in view of the Post Office, be fatal to the revenues of the Department. The officials professed to be unable to define a periodical publication in terms sufficiently exact to mark it off from vast quantities of other printed matter, which it resembled in certain aspects. They had placed before them, the Contemporary Review, the Nineteenth Century, the Court Calendar and the London Directory, and asked themselves what were the characteristics of the two first, which would warrant their acceptance as magazines, and which, being absent from the two last, would enable the Department to reject them as such, and to justify their action before all the world. They had no doubt whatever that the Contemporary and Nineteenth Century were magazines, or that the Court Calendar and the London Directory were not entitled to be so regarded, but where were the infallible signs? They would have to consider many periodical publications, whose characteristics were not so sharply defined as those mentioned, and which ran more closely towards the borderland which separated the true magazine from the spurious, and they found themselves unable to make a definition which could be safely applied. Accordingly, even had the Department been disposed to concede the validity of the argument for the special treatment of magazines, which they intimate was more than doubtful, they would have considered themselves estopped by the want of an adequate, self-working definition of a magazine.

With the question of inland rates was inevitably bound up the other question of the rates to Canada. The inland rate on magazines was exactly the same as that on magazines to Canada, that is, a half penny per two ounces, and any proposition affecting the rate to Canada necessarily involved the inland rates as well, as it was not to be supposed that,

in the absence of special conditions, the British public would endure a higher charge on magazines passing between two towns in Great Britain, than was allowed on magazines crossing the Atlantic to Canada. A Departmental committee, appointed to enquire into the effect of lowering the inland rates, reported that the anticipated loss of a general reduction would be greater than the Department could afford to bear.

Thus the matter of rates stood until 1905. The very low rates allowed by the Canadian Department on newspapers and magazines posted for Great Britain was quietly producing its natural result on the mind of the British public. Questions were being asked as to whether it could be a fact that the very high rates charged in Great Britain were necessary. Canada's experience rendered the answer doubtful, as it was claimed that, although Canada had an immense territory with a sparse population to serve, and had four years before reduced her domestic rate on letters to two cents an ounce, and had accepted the penny rate of two cents per half ounce within the Empire, she was gradually surmounting an enormous deficits. In the year 1903 Canada was able to proclaim that the era of deficits was past. With these facts carrying home their lesson to the British mind, a renewal of the struggle for the lowering of the barriers, which prevented the free dissemination of British periodical literature in so important a Colony as Canada, could not be long delayed.

On the 22nd. February, 1905, a resolution was introduced into the Canadian Senate by Sir George Drummond: "That the attention of the Government be directed to the local, foreign and Imperial postal charges, with the view of remedying certain inequalities therein, and the Senate affirm the principle that the conveyance of letters, newspapers, books, periodicals, etc., should be at a lower scale of charges within the Empire than at the time ruling within any foreign country." Sir George Drummond, in speaking to the resolution, placed in salient contrast the various postal rates between Canada and Great Britain and between Canada and the United States—

the Imperial letter rate of two cents per half ounce with the Canadian and United States rate of one cent per ounce; the Canada-Great Britain postcard charge of two cents with the Canada-United States charge of one cent. But it was the newspaper and magazine rates to which he gave particular attention. He declared the rate of one cent per two ounces or eight cents per lb. to be indefensible however it was regarded. Place it alongside of the rate from Canada to Great Britain of one cent per lb., or observe that it meant a charge of $175 a ton, which Sir George Drummond stated to be ten times greater than the cost of ocean conveyance warranted.

At the time these charges were being exacted by the British Post Office, the American News Company was bringing British periodicals to New York for $2 per 100 lb. The practical effect of this high rate was to prohibit the transmission of British periodical literature to Canada, and as the rate for the same class of matter from the United States was only one cent per lb., the result was that nearly all the periodical reading matter in the hands of the Canadians came from the United States. Sir George Drummond pointed out the serious consequences, political, commercial and social, of this intellectual divorce between Canada and the mother land, and of the growing intimacy between Canada and the great Republic to the south, and urged that the attention of the British Parliament and people be directed to these facts. Sir George Drummond was vigourously supported by the Secretary of State, Mr. Scott, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir Richard Cartwright, and the resolution was adopted by the Senate.

A little later than the date on which this resolution was adopted—on the 16th March, 1905—a deputation consisting of a number of members of the British House of Commons, among whom was the present Postmaster General, Mr. Sydney Buxton, waited upon Lord Stanley, the Postmaster General, to urge upon him the desirability of some action looking towards the reduction in the rate of postage on British newspapers and magazines addressed to the Colonies. The

deputation was introduced by Sir Gilbert Parker, who, as a Canadian, was familiar with the conditions in this country. His argument followed well-beaten lines, and may be summed up in one short paragraph from his speech: "British trade is naturally affected by the competition of American advertisements: in other words, the higher postal rate on newspapers and magazines going to our Colonies is practically a tax upon the advertisements of British goods and manufactures upon the production of British publishing houses, upon British printing and upon British authorship: it provides protection for American publishers: it retards the development of mutual understanding and reciprocity of feelings and sentiments: it is a handicap upon information concerning the industrial and commercial output of this country and of general commercial trade: it tends to place Canada, its thought, feeling, business methods, and commercial life, under an American instead of British influence. It is, in fact, a premium upon Canadian and American reciprocity." Sir Gilbert Parker concluded by reading a petition signed by the President of the Canadian Press Association, by the President of the British Empire League, by the late Premier of Ontario, and by the heads of the Canadian Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce, which he took to be fully representative of the industry, the thought and the commerce of the country. The petition set forth the unsatisfactory circulation of British weeklies and monthlies, and urged that the rate of postage be reduced to one penny per lb. General Laurie, who was at one time a member of the Canadian House of Commons, also spoke of the reduction in the rates, and suggested that Canada might perhaps bear part of the burden by carrying the British newspapers and magazines addressed to Canada free of cost from Liverpool in the Canadian steamers.

Lord Stanley, the Postmaster General, gave the deputation no reason to hope that their desires would be met. He pointed out that the American publisher enjoyed an advantage arising from his proximity to Canada which could not be overcome, but that, setting aside that advantage, if Great

Britain were to compete on equal terms with the United States, it could only be by reducing the British rate to an equality with the American rate, that is, from four pence to a half penny per lb. This rate would be lower than the inland rate, and he asked whether any member present would be prepared to justify a lower rate to Canada than the rate to a town in his own constituency. The half penny rate to Canada would be inevitably the stepping stone to a reduction in the inland rate, and in the rate to other colonies. The amount of the loss to the revenue would be appalling. He could not tell the effect, but an examination of the American Departmental reports led him to believe that the large surplus that the British Post Office turns into the Treasury would be practically wiped out.

This was the last word of the late British Government on this question. When the present Government assumed office and Mr. Sydney Buxton became Postmaster General, he was at once approached on the matter. As a member of the deputation which waited on Lord Stanley, he might be taken as having committed himself to the views of the petitioners, but having crossed the threshold of office, he became cautious, and the reply he made to an enquiry in the House of Commons on the 8th March, 1906, was scarcely more encouraging than the position taken by Lord Stanley. He pointed out that the rate of four pence per lb., which was charged on newspapers, high as it appeared to be, was in reality not high enough to cover the expense of the service, and that a general reduction in the rates to the colonies, and in the inland service, to a point which would meet the conditions in Canada, would involve the country in a loss of revenue which could not be undertaken by the British Government. He recognized, however, the peculiar situation of Canada, and stated that, if the object they all had at heart was to be attained, it could only be by some special arrangement, entailing probably some sacrifice on either side, and in a form which would not create a precedent.

Shortly after this date, negotiations were opened between

the British and the Canadian departments along lines indicated by the closing words of the answer to the enquiry in the House. The proposition must be of a special character, involving mutual sacrifices, and in a form which would prevent the arrangement from becoming a precedent. The key to the situation was the arrangement between Canada and the United States, by which each country sent correspondence of all classes to the other on the same terms and conditions as governed the inland service in the country of origin. So long as this was in force, the rates on newspapers and periodicals in both countries being little more than nominal, so long would it be impossible for Great Britain to enter into a special arrangement with Canada. The United States rate to Canada was but one cent per lb., and the lowest rate that Great Britain would consent to consider was a penny or two cents per lb.

Matters had reached a crisis in the arrangement between Canada and the United States, and whether Great Britain had to be considered or not, Canada would have been compelled in her own interest to insist upon a review of her relations with the United States in the matter of newspapers and periodicals. The terms of the convention between Canada and the United States were adopted as far back as 1875, when Canada was much less advanced industrially than she is to-day. The business of publication in this country was confined to the daily and weekly newspapers, and while these met certain obvious needs of an intelligent community, and met them very well, the daily and weekly newspapers did little to foster the higher intellectual interests of the country. We had to look abroad for all periodical literature of the better class, and as the only sources of supply for an English-speaking community were England and the United States, the average Canadian was compelled to have recourse to the United States for his periodical reading matter, as the postage rates from the United Kingdom to Canada were prohibitive.

At that time, therefore, it was almost pure gain to Canada to have an arrangement with the United States which made

Canadians participate on equal terms with United States citizens in the benefits of the United States postal service. But as the time passed, conditions changed. Canada became ambitious to have a periodical literature, which would express her own growing aspirations towards nationality. However high the character of the best magazines in the United States might be, they were not Canadian, and therefore fell short, in essential respects, of what was required in the periodical literature which must contribute largely to the education of the Canadian people. What was desired was a periodical literature published in this country which would compare favourably with the periodical literature of Great Britain and the United States. But the Postal Convention with the United States rendered this practically impossible. Canadian publishers, who sought to break the way for magazines which would in the course of time become a credit to the country, found the field so completely occupied by the United States magazines of all classes that their attempts seemed hopeless.

It was, also, observed that as business methods developed in the United States, a change was coming over the character of the magazines. Where the better class of magazines retained the high standard of their contents, their advertising space became greatly enlarged, until the pages devoted to exploiting business enterprises were greater in number than the literary part of the magazines. Along with the increase of the advertising space in the better class of magazines, there has grown up a class of periodical which is given over almost exclusively to advertising. The characteristic features of this class of periodicals are a few, short, often trashy, stories, a page or two which are obviously collected from other publications, and a great mass of advertisements, frequently of a sort that do not obtain access to the better publications. Periodicals of this sort are the fungi of the literary world, and they spread amazingly. The officials of the United States Post Office Department in their annual reports bewailed the manner in which they had become entangled with these publications through the want of foresight on the part

of their predecessors. Their post offices and railway mail cars were being encumbered with the millions of copies which issued weekly or monthly of this matter, which the sober judgement of the officials placed outside the pale of reputable periodicals. For that Department there was but little chance of a remedy, as the publishers had recourse to the courts, and up to date nothing has been achieved in the way of abating the evil. The service in Canada was equally hampered by the masses of trashy periodicals which the Convention enabled to flow as freely over this country as through the United States. In 1904 a partial remedy was sought. The Convention was amended so as to permit each country to be the judge of what it would allow to come from the other country at the nominal rate of postage granted to publishers. Thus, if Canada took exception to one or many United States publications, alleging that it would not give them circulation in this country, if published in Canada, it could require the United States Department to prevent these publications from coming into the country unless they were prepaid with stamps at the printed matter rate of one cent per two ounces. This proved a fairly effective check, but it gave rise to a certain amount of feeling between the two countries, which was undesirable. Publishers in the United States, whose periodicals were, so to speak, blacklisted, complained that they were being treated harshly and unjustly by the Canadian Post Office, inasmuch as there were many other publications admitted on the privileged terms which had no more title to favour than the publication which had been passed upon and rejected. This was quite true, for with the best will in the world to administer the amendment fairly, it was unquestionable that there were many periodicals of the poorer class still coming in under the publishers' privileged rate. It was impossible for the Canadian Department with its resources to pass upon all the periodicals coming into Canada, and the consequence of its inability was a partial administration of the law, which was irritating to United States publishers, and unsatisfactory to Canada.

To the Canadian publishing interests, the situation was one of perplexity and doubt. The Canadian Department had certain definite views, based upon the Post Office Act, and it desired to apply these views to the various questions which were submitted by publishers. It was unable to do so, however, as the Canadian publishers were entitled to object to any regulations imposed by the Canadian Department when these were found to be stricter than those in force in the United States. The double-mindedness which was being developed in the Canadian Department by its efforts to give effect to views imposed upon it by its Statute, and at the same time to keep in line with the totally irreconcilable views of the United States Department, was prejudicial both to the Department and to publishers, and it was soon clear that the only remedy lay in obtaining relief from the convention by denouncing the parts which dealt with newspapers and periodicals, and making a new convention, which would secure to Canada the necessary liberty of action.

The amended convention made with the United States gave Canada two cardinal advantages. It imposed a rate of postage on newspapers and periodicals passing from either country to the other, which, judged by the standards in other countries, was not too high, and yet was high enough to give to Canada a free hand in dealing with her own publishers. Canada could now make such regulations as seemed best, and it was no longer open to Canadian publishers to say that United States publications were being admitted to the country on more favourable terms than were being conceded to them. The second advantage was, that it put Canada in a position to negotiate with Great Britain on lines acceptable to Great Britain. The rate of postage between Canada and the United States was raised by the new convention to one cent per four ounces, and this rate was high enough to encourage the British Post Office to consider a special arrangement with Canada, if the means could be found of making the arrangement of so particular a character that it could not be used as a precedent for demands for similar concessions on the part of the British public and of the other parts of the Empire.

But where were the grounds which would justify the British Government, in the eyes of the Empire at large, in lowering her rates on newspapers and periodicals going to Canada, while declining to make any reduction either to the British public or to any of the other colonies? Merely sentimental reasons would not suffice, as every other part of the Empire could put up a case of greater or less strength on those grounds. There must be some concession on the part of Canada, which the others were not in a position to make, and the means by which Canada could make this concession was found in the fact that part of the British mails for Canada were carried by a Canadian line of steamers. For this service the British Post Office paid the ordinary transit charges to the Canadian Post Office, and if the Canadian Post Office would agree to forego those charges, a low postage rate could be allowed.

It was on these lines that the agreement was reached between Great Britain and Canada. The rate was reduced from four pence per lb. to a penny per lb. on all British newspapers and magazines sent to Canada by the Canadian line of steamers, and Canada agreed to take from the docks at Liverpool all such British newspapers and magazines as were tendered for conveyance by the Canadian line of steamers, and carry them across the Atlantic, free of charge.

Thus, then, was the apparently impossible achieved. When the will to carry the scheme into execution manifested itself, the way was soon found. The British Post Office was able to see the means by which, when a general reduction was impracticable, the case of Canada could be segregated from the case of the Empire at large, when the pressure from the head of the Department was serious enough. That the scheme had not run ahead of public opinion in the two countries, but that it was eagerly awaited, is clear from the immediate bound forward in the volume of periodical literature coming from Great Britain to Canada. In cases of this sort it is not usual for a very prompt response to be given by the public. Some time seems necessary for the digestion of the scheme, and the preparation of the plans for taking advantage of it. But in

this case, no sooner had the reduction been announced in the two countries than steps began to be taken to exploit the new situation to the fullest extent. The catalogues of the leading newsdealers were all supplemented by columns giving the special rates to Canada, and several of the largest publishers of periodical literature sent their agents to Canada to look over the new field opened to them.

The increase in the volume of newspapers and magazines coming to Canada from Great Britain has been beyond all precedent. Comparing the total number of mail bags sent from Great Britain to Canada by both Canadian and New York routes during the months of May and June, 1907, with the number sent during the corresponding months of 1906, there is an increase of 47 per cent., which is greatly in excess of any previous increase; but, in order to come more exactly to the figures which indicate the actual increase which is due to the reduction in rates, it is necessary to look at the number of bags which reached Canada from Great Britain by the Canadian line alone, since it is by the Canadian line only that British newspapers and periodicals may be sent at the reduced rate of postage. During the months of May and June of this year, the number of bags of British mail coming to Canada by the Canadian line is 146 per cent. greater than for the corresponding months of the year 1906. The growth of the business is still in its beginnings, and there is no reason to doubt that the volume of British periodical literature read in Canada will at no distant date reach great proportions, with marked consequences to the intellectual and commercial life of the people of this country.

RODOLPHE LEMIEUX

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

IN these days of educational uncertainty, there is comfort in turning to a system which is settled and fixed. There are two main views of education. The one is, that it has to do chiefly with the affairs of this world; the second, that it is other-worldly in its aim. Speaking generally, these divergent opinions are held by Protestants, and Catholics, respectively. In Catholic countries a system of clerical education prevails; in Protestant countries the schools are secular.

There are few communities which are so uncompromisingly Catholic as the Province of Quebec, and few which are so protestingly Protestant as Ontario. Accordingly, the two opposing systems have grown up side by side in their original purity. In Ontario the schools are free from theological teaching; in Quebec they are frankly clerical. For purposes of comparison, nothing could be more admirable, but that would be too large a task. The present intention is to consider one system alone, leaving to Ontario the congenial task of glorifying an education from which every vestige of religious teaching has been removed.

In the outset it is well to set forth somewhat formally the two opposing doctrines. In Ontario the most recent statement of one side of the case is contained in "The University Act," 1906: "No religious test shall be required, nor shall religious observances be imposed." The Board, however, may make regulations touching the attendance of students on public worship in their own churches, under their own ministers, "provided always that attendance on such forms of worship shall not be compulsory on any student."

So late as January, 1907, a comparatively recent date, the Archbishop of Montreal restated the other side of the

case, and set forth the doctrine of the Catholic Church in regard to education in non-sectarian schools. In a formal pronouncement he said: "Every school of this nature—and Catholics must know it—is condemned, because (it is Leo XIII. whom I quote) there is nothing more pernicious and more apt to ruin the integrity of the faith and turn young people from the paths of truth. Never will such a school be established at Rawdon or at any other place in this Catholic province."

This statement of Archbishop Bruchesi from his chair may well define the attitude of the Church. The report of the Faculty of Arts of Laval University for 1905-6, which was read at the exercises closing the sessions of those years, may be taken as representing University opinion. It was stated officially as follows: "to separate religious teaching—dogmatic and moral—from scientific teaching—literary and technical—is to establish an impossible neutrality; and even, if such could be realized, absolutely immoral."

To make perfectly sure that all educated Catholic opinion is at one upon this point, we shall cite a representative from the classical colleges which stand between the university and the schools. The annual announcement of the Collège Bourget puts the matter plainly: "Religion being the base and principal object of education and society, consequently a complete course of religious instruction is pursued in the College."

Up to this point we have considered only that form of education which, with some degree of vagueness, is called "higher." We must not overlook the view which prevails in the public schools, as such places of instruction are called in other countries. In a document like the report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, which gives an account of public monies expended, it might be considered improper, or at any rate injudicious, to set forth the abstract basis of education. The volume, however, contains a statement of fact which confirms the impression hat, in the opinion of those who have thought most

about the matter, education is not a matter of compromise.

It would be inconvenient to cover in a general statement the practice which prevails in various countries. In the United States each State follows its own system. In some there is a compromise; in others, a complete divorce of education from religion. In England there is a tincture of religious instruction; but it does not extend much beyond drawing a map of Palestine, and inculcating good manners. In the United States classics and religion were abolished; but both are gradually coming back.

Under the provisions of the "North America Act," the control of education was handed over to the governments of the various provinces. It is worth enquiring how this has resulted in so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned. The whole system is under the control of a Superintendent of Public Instruction, assisted by an executive, called the Council of Public Instruction, which, for purposes of more effective administration, is divided into two Committees, for the management of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Schools respectively. These Committees never meet in general council, and for all practical purposes each Committee is supreme within its own sphere. We are not now concerned with what the Protestants do. Our main interest lies with the Catholics. This Committee is composed of twenty-eight members, and is nicely balanced. The Bishops do not constitute a majority; but, with the Vicar Apostolic, they are half the number. The other fourteen are faithful sons of the Church, and it may readily be understood that such a body of educationalists would not be guilty of any revolutionary conduct.

It should be said that we are speaking entirely of the education which is provided for Catholics, and paid for by them. They form eighty-six per cent. of the population, and yet make not the slightest suggestion as to how children of other faiths shall be educated. This reticence of expression might well be considered by those who speak most loudly of "clerical intolerance," and hold fast to the hatreds

of those ages when both parties were equally arrogant, if not equally ignorant.

If sufficient has not been said to make it clear that the education of Catholics in Quebec is religious, without compromise, an examination of the annual announcements of the institutions will serve to confirm the impression, especially if the calendars of the classical colleges be chosen. It is in these schools that secondary instruction for boys is given by the regular and secular clergy. There are nineteen of these colleges, all affiliated to the University of Laval, with the exception of St. Mary's and Loyola Colleges, which are directed by the Reverend Jesuit Fathers. All follow the same programme, which is drawn up by the Superiors and other representatives of each college, who, for this purpose, meet in convention at Laval University every five years.

In the Seminary of St. Hyacinthe the course of study covers eight years, and the schedule for each year begins with religious instruction. In the elementary classes the *Catéchisme du diocèse* is relied upon; for the three following years the *Catéchisme de Persévérance* is employed; and in the senior years instruction is derived from Raymond's *Histoire apologétique de l'Eglise* and Schouppe's *Cours de religion*. In the last two years there is a special course in Dogma. To illustrate further the religious character of these institutions: the calendar of the Collège Sainte Marie is adorned with a sunburst enclosing a crown of thorns with sacred emblems within; and the annual announcement of the Collège Bourget begins with the invocation, "*Vive Jésus*," with a cross between the words.

Anyone who is familiar with the annual announcements of educational institutions will recall the allurements which are held out to students—museums, gymnasia, and workshops. The authorities of the Seminary of St. Hyacinthe offer quite other attractions, namely, the presence in the College chapel of the complete body of the young martyr of fifteen years, St. Prosper. A note explains that the relic

" is an object of especial veneration by the students and the people of St. Hyacinthe, who have seen two great plagues disappear—the drought and the cholera—as a result of a procession made with the body of the Saint along the streets of the town in July, 1854."

Every Sunday in these colleges an hour is devoted to the teaching of Christian doctrine and morals. Each student, in his respective grade, is required to give both an oral and a written account of matters previously explained; text-books suited to his age and literary attainments are put into his hands. The diocesan catechism and the Gospels are given to the youngest students, that is to those following the three lowest grades of the classical course. In the three highest grades, the elementary catechism is replaced by a work on Catholic doctrine, more complete, more scientific, and more congenial to the maturer mind of the student. In every grade, the memorizing and recitation of the Gospels is obligatory—in French, for the youngest boys; in Latin, for those from the second to the fifth grades; and in Greek, for the last year students.

Besides this regular Sunday course, other religious exercises frequently recall to the young man's mind his Christian duties. At the beginning of each year, three and even four days are exclusively devoted to prayer and reflection. Preachers, carefully selected, entertain the Community about the great eternal truths taught by Our Lord and His Holy Church. Pious associations in honour of our Blessed Redeemer and His Holy Mother have been formed, to these most of the students make it a point to belong, and these entail special obligations of dignity and good conduct.

After rising at half-past five the Community assembles in the chapel for morning prayer, a short meditation or spiritual reading, and Holy Mass. Besides this, on Sunday, attendance at solemn High Mass, Vespers, and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is obligatory. Weekly confession and communion are earnestly recommended.

Before dinner, a quarter of an hour is given to the read-

ing of the Gospel and a few considerations on the Christian virtues. From 6.30 to 7 P.M., the Rosary is recited and spiritual counsels are given by the Superior or by a priest appointed by him. Evening prayers follow at 8.15. These are the principal exercises, intermingled with study and recreation. However numerous, they in no way interfere with the sound literary and physical training of the young man.

Every day, except Sunday and Thursday in winter, and Tuesday in summer, three hours of out-door recreation are given, during which skating, sliding and ball-playing are freely indulged in. Tuesday and Thursday P.M. in winter, there is no class work, but "congé." On Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, four hours are spent in class and five in the silent study hall. In summer, a whole day is given to rest, with but three hours in the study hall. It is needless to remark that the religious exercises are never omitted.

The University of Laval has for its Cardinal Protector, the Prefect-General of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. Its supreme council, established by the bull "*inter varias sollicitudines*," is composed of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province, who are also members of the Council of Public Instruction, and the Archbishop of Montreal is Vice-Chancellor. The classical colleges are under the bishop of the diocese in which they are situated, and are subject to his inspection. Nor are the public schools left entirely without advice. During the past year the work of revising the new course of study for Roman Catholic schools was completed. This work was entrusted by the Roman Catholic Committee to Abbé G. Dauth, Vice-Rector of Laval University. "That distinguished educationist," according to the public report, "spent over a year in completing the task, which is the result of a comparative study of the systems followed in other countries and of the most renowned treatises on pedagogics." He also obtained information from certain communities of men and women in this country, and was aided by the experienced counsels of lay and ecclesi-

astical teachers and of other persons who are an authority on the subject, such as Abbé L. St. G. Lindsay, inspector of religious educational institutions in the arch-diocese of Quebec. Within the last year two normal schools were opened; the one by the Ursulines at Rimouski, the other by the Sisters of the Good Shepherd at Chicoutimi. Of 5,414 teachers employed in the schools, 4,812 belong to religious orders; the remainder, 602, are drawn from the laity, but are members of the Catholic Church. It may readily be supposed that a body of men who live in such near agreement would preserve a degree of harmony in the education which is offered in school, college, and university.

We shall now turn to a somewhat close consideration of the course of study which is followed in those seats of learning, known as classical colleges. There are nineteen of them, and as the curriculum is much the same in all, we shall select the course which is followed in the Montreal College on Sherbrooke Street.

But let us see first what is understood by a classical course. A course is termed "classical" from the classics on its programme, the study of the great masterpieces of Latin, Greek, French and English literature, by which the student is trained to mould his thoughts and express his ideas according to the rules laid down by these standards of pure literary beauty.

A superficial glance over the programme of the six years Classical Course will readily show in what kind of work the student is engaged from his first to his last year; and that his whole time and mental energy are by no means absorbed in literary pursuits. The Course is divided into six grades, called respectively, on an ascending scale: Elements; Syntax; Methods; Versification; Belles-Lettres; Rhetoric.

These six years are completed by two more, during which the young man is carefully trained in mental and practical or moral philosophy, in Holy Scripture and scientific apologetics, in physics, chemistry and other natural

sciences, in mathematics, algebra, geometry, trigonometry. Before a B.A. degree is granted, examinations in the subjects taught during these eight years are required. About these two last important years nothing shall be said, for they are not generally reckoned as part of the Classical Course, properly so-called.

The following is a schema of the different subjects taught to young men in the classical colleges from the Elements to Rhetoric. I shall not refer to the religious studies, as I have spoken about them in another part of this paper.

1st year: Elements: *Latin.*—Latin Grammar; recitations and daily exercises from French to Latin and *vice versa*. *French.*—Close study of the French Grammar; analysis of sentences; Lafontaine's Fables to memorize. *English.*—Elementary Reader; Ollendorff's exercises, versions, and themes. *History.*—Sacred History, Universal Geography. *Arithmetic.*—The four simple rules.

2nd year: Syntax: *Latin.*—Grammar; translations from *De Viris Illustribus Romae*, or other similar works, and French into Latin; Phaedrus' Fables. *Greek.*—First rudiments; translation into French. *French and English.*—Grammar; History and Geography of Europe. *Arithmetic.*—Decimals; fractions.

3rd year: Method: *Latin.*—Grammar; Translations from Phaedrus, Cornelius Nepos, Ovid, Quintus Curtius, Cæsar. *Greek.*—Grammar, Anthology, translations from Luke's Gospel and Acts in Greek, Aesop, Lucian. *French and English.*—Roman History, Geography. *Arithmetic.*—Fractions; Square Root; Proportion, and Discount.

4th year: Versification: *Latin.*—Grammar, composition and prosody, exercises; Virgil; Selections from Fathers of the Church; Cæsar; Sallust; Themes: French into Latin, to memorize and translate. *Greek.*—Grammar, Anthology; Selections from the Greek Fathers: Lucian; Xenophon; Homer; Themes: French into Greek. *French.*—Elocution; composition; epistolary art; masterpieces of

the French Stage, to memorize. *English.*—Grammar; Selections from Goldsmith, Irving, Longfellow, to memorize and translate. History and Geography of the Middle Ages. *Mathematics.*—Elements of Algebra.

5th year: Belles-Lettres: *Latin.*—The Fathers, Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Seneca, Pliny, Livy, Tacitus, Latin Prosody; to memorize and translate. *Greek.* — General Review of Anthology, Greek Fathers, Plutarch, Xenophon, Homer, Sophocles, Greek Poetry, to memorize and translate. *French.*—Masterpieces of French Literature, to memorize. *English.*—Tennyson, Irving, Newman, to memorize and translate; History of English Literature; History and Geography; Mathematics and Algebra.

6th year: Rhetoric: *Latin.*—Latin poetry, memorization and compositions. Latin discourses; The Fathers, Cicero, Tacitus, Horace. *Greek.*—Demosthenes, Plato, Thucydides, S. Basil, S. Gregory Nazianzen, S. John Chrysostom, to memorize and translate. *English.*—Shakespeare, Irving, Burke. *French.*—Different authors; French discourse; Canadian History; Contemporary History; Geometry.

All the Latin and Greek authors mentioned for each year are not entirely perused and analyzed; but one or another alternately, and considerable selections from their best works are memorized and translated. It is in the sixth year that an examination is held on all the subjects studied from the beginning, for the granting of the title of Bachelor in Letters; this title must be obtained in order to get that of B. A. It is deemed that the long and patient study of the great masters is useful for the healthy development of a young man's mind, and many thinkers deplore the trend of thought amongst not a few educators of our day, who omit altogether for the intellectual formation of young men the study of the Greek and Latin authors.

Let there be technical schools where young men, wishing to be trained exclusively in mathematical, natural, and applied sciences, may find all they desire; but it is wrong to discard completely the teaching of classics as a universal law,

under the pretence that the exigencies of our times require that young men must be equipped for business, when issuing from the university halls and laboratories.

Moreover, a complete classical course, where Latin, Greek, French and English Literature, together with history and geography hold the first place, where mathematics and natural sciences are by no means ignored, especially when such a course ends in two years of sound and serious philosophical research, this course, I repeat, results in such mental development, that one who has seriously gone through it becomes fitted, after very little personal labour, to fulfil the most difficult and responsible stations in life.

But some of these colleges which acknowledge religion to be "the base and principal object of education and science" have become infected with the modern notion that education must be "practical." Forgetting that the educative value of instruction lies in its very uselessness, they have fallen into the heresy of Huxley, that, for the purpose of attaining culture, an exclusively scientific education is effectual.

The Collège Bourget, for example, has a course in "actual business and banking," and the calendar boasts, that "in this department there are counters and a bank fitted out for the convenience of the students, who take an active practical part in all kinds of business transactions; in buying and selling; forming and dissolving partnership; giving and receiving notes, drafts, checks, receipts, orders, etc. Each pupil is furnished with a capital consisting of cash, merchandise, notes, real estate, bank shares, etc., corresponding with the business into which he is to engage himself, and he opens books accordingly. He rents a store; buys and sells merchandise; holds correspondence with different firms; computes all interest, discounts and other calculations in connection with his business transactions; marks the cost and retail prices on goods in private letters; balances the books; makes deposits in the college bank, which is well furnished with a complete set of books and provided with its own checks, deposit receipts, drafts, money, notes, protest papers, as that of a regular banking establishment."

Yet one must not be too hasty in judging this innovation which was called into existence to open up new fields for pupils who do not evidence the required turn of mind for classical formation. If a large number enter elements, all do not persevere. The writer's class, for instance, numbered 139 in elements, and 27 only reached rhetoric.

It may well be that this school-boy pretence of playing at business does not come within Professor Huxley's conception of that scientific education by which culture may be attained; yet it is a concession to the modern spirit, which in time may bring down the whole fabric of religious and classical education. From this the pupils may go on to a study of mathematics; from that to botany and biology; and from that to electricity, engineering and plumbing.

Indeed, it is a little difficult for one whose instruction has been religious and classical to distinguish between the educational value of a course in plumbing and a course in electricity. To us a plumber, a motor-man, a pole-climber and a professor of municipal engineering are much alike. All four smoke their pipes, curse, and wear overalls. The plumber and engineer work underground in a mysterious way with pipes and sewers. Indeed, the plumber seems to be the better educated—the more professional, if efficiency be the test.

But even if we yield the point that the one is a trade, and the other a profession, the matter is not much clearer; because, in acquiring a profession, one does not necessarily become educated. To avoid absurdity, let us lay aside the professions of plumbing and land-surveying, and see if it is any better in medicine, the profession to which I belong. Not all physicians are educated. If any are, it is not because they have studied medicine. No one studies medicine any more; he merely devotes himself to a little piece of it, and does his trade better on that account, just as a man will tinker a pot, who has only a limited knowledge of metallurgy. This talk about the educated tinker will do very well for a valedictory address.

This obsession, that knowledge is education, or that the acquisition of knowledge invariably leads to education,—whether it be a knowledge of patristic Latin, of a frog's lymph-sacs, of a steam-engine, or a kitchen-sink,—is, in reality, the motive of the outcry against religious education. It is charged against us that we do not read the Bible; yet we are aware of the dictum of that wisest of men: the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. In the classical colleges we learn to fear God, to reverence authority and to obey the law. The mark of modern education is mediocrity. Receptive minds look up and are not filled, whilst the incapable are being stuffed. In a system so completely organized as that which we are trying to understand every child of the three hundred thousand in Quebec is individually considered by the curé; because the Catholic Church has made the simple discovery that children differ in mental receptiveness and in capacity for moral development. The average child is best adapted for carrying on his father's business: whether it be farming, lumbering, or trading. He is provided with religious instruction in abundance, because he has a soul to be saved; and with such simple knowledge as his station in life seems to require. But the boy of unusual talent is set apart. The bishop hears of him, and there is a rivalry as to which college shall have the privilege of educating him. It is quite true that the prime object of the bishop is to enrich the priesthood, and boys are well aware that good behaviour must go with natural endowment. If the pupil does not develop those peculiar qualities of which he gave promise, he is quickly directed into one of the professions which in turn is enriched by this picked talent. It is said that Hon. Gédéon Ouimet was the last born of a family of twenty-six children. His father took him to church to be christened and presented him to the parish priest as a tithe. In the province of Quebec the 26th. part of the increase arising from the profits of the land is allotted to the clergy for their support. The curé accepted the offering and paid for the education of this novel tithe.

Enough has been said to show that Quebec has a complete system of religious education; and in doing so, especial restraint was exercised, lest any opinion upon its merits might have been expressed, or any criticism offered. The time has now come to do both, and put it to every test which we can employ. Has this system done what it set out to do? It has kept young feet from straying from the paths of truth; and that, upon the authority of Archbishop Bruchesi, quoting Pope Leo XIII., is what it set out to do. We can proceed no further in this line of enquiry, because it brings us up against the question: What is truth? We shall yield everything, and agree that it is neither a good thing nor a bad thing to be kept in the paths of truth. We shall yield something more, and leave out of account the ineffable beauties of religion, the peace, the joy which comes from a communion with a spirit higher than our own. When we meet with our opponents in the gate, I imagine we shall do better to speak in terms which they can understand, and employ a currency which is familiar to them.

When we were describing the course of study which is followed in the classical colleges, we selected the Montreal College for purpose of illustration, and it must have caused some glee to the opponents of religious education to read the details of the religious teaching given there. Yet I am quite prepared to stand by the results which such a system produces, by asking the judgement of the world upon the careers and characters which have been formed in these schools. I shall agree to any standard which may be set up—excellence of conduct, beauty of character, social attainment, political place and power. No: I withdraw. You must not employ against us the standard of wealth.

It is because French-Canadians are properly educated that they live in comfort at home, govern in their own Provincial House, and dominate the politics of Canada, as they have dominated since Confederation. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is commonly regarded as a good example of a well-educated man, and he is a product of this system. From his College of

L'Assomption also came Hon. Israel Tarte and Hon. Horace Archambault. From Ste. Thérèse College come Hon. Judge Routhier, Senator L. O. David, Hon. Alphonse Nantel, Mgr. Proulx, Mgr. LaRocque, Mgr. Lorrain, Hon. Theo. Robitaille (Lieut.-Governor of Quebec), Thomas Chapais, Thos. Chase Casgrain. From Nicolet College come His Lordship Bishop Bruneault, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Hon. Lomer Gouin, Premier of Quebec. The Montreal College has educated Mgr. Bruchesi, Sir William Hingston, Hon. Gédéon Ouimet, Sir George E. Cartier, Mgr. Williams, and Sir Alexandre Lacoste. I am quite willing to put forward these men as examples of the results of religious education.

And last, but not least, among the arguments which may be adduced in favour of our religious system of education is the birth rate, the increase of population among the French-Canadians since 1760. About 60,000 French settlers, destitute and unable to return to their Motherland, remained in the Province after the decisive battle of the Plains of Abraham. Their sole protectors and consolers at that time were their clergy, who also became their educators in religion, morality, and the other attainments necessary to fit them for the struggle of life. This handful of poor settlers, true to their religion and the land of their adoption, now number three millions, scattered throughout Canada and the United States. How does the birth rate of any other country compare with that of Quebec? Many reasons are given to explain the rapid increase of French-Canadian population. Religious education and the inculcation of sound morality in the schools alone can explain it.

W. J. Derome