

ARTICLE NINETEEN

IN the end Geography governs; and Geography always governs in terms of the sea, since at the beginning the waters were gathered into one place. All history is merely a record of attempts to reach the ocean, and empires have endured only so long as they could occupy the advanced sea bases. When these were lost the nation perished. Persons interested in this powerful thesis will find it clearly displayed in Mr. Mackinder's new book. The Germans failed because of historical stupidity. They advanced upon Paris instead of upon Calais. They did not discern soon enough that England on her sea base was the real enemy. Full confession is now made in the memoirs which their generals and admirals are pouring from the press.

It is scarcely to be expected that those persons in Canada, who profess to be concerned about the future status of the country, should have a clearer view of this far end. They are content to dig at the foundations, to remove ornaments which they find offensive, to add excrescences; and none will be more naively astonished when they find the fabric coming down. The word "nation" is in their mouths. They do not know what a nation is. They think a nation can be fabricated in much the same way as a failing business concern is reorganized, and the original shareholders frozen out. They cannot understand that there are yet "loyalists" in the world, who are willing to take arms in their hands, or go out once more into the wilderness; or, if no wilderness remain, return to the homes which their fathers left.

A nation is like an army. An army must have a base, else it will perish in the air. When Canada went to war its base was in England, its source of supply even for boots and clothing, and for the very weapons in the hands of its soldiers. In times of peace the bases were, and are, in the United

States. There is a suspicion at the moment that these bases are not so secure as one would wish. The truth is, they are no bases at all. They exist for us only at the convenience and by the consent of the country in which they lie. We are not protected by so much as a specific paper treaty, and even a treaty of the strongest paper is a poor defence, as Belgium found out to her cost.

Our access to the sea is governed by the Treaty of Washington, which was signed on May 8th, 1871, and ratified in London on June 17th of the same year. By Article 29 it was agreed that for a term of years goods might be conveyed in transit through the ports of New York, Boston, and Portland, and any other ports which might be "specially designated by the President of the United States," without the payment of duties, but under "such rules, regulations, and conditions as might be from time to time prescribed." This "term of years," according to Article 33, was to begin when the Legislature of Prince Edward Island *inter alia* had given a certain "assent," and was to continue for a period of ten years, but could be terminated by two years' notice from either side. It is all very well for that small, but powerful, Province to dominate Confederation. It was too much at any time that the Legislature of Prince Edward Island should have the power to decide whether or not Canada was to have any access whatever to the sea. A search of the archives in Charlottetown would determine if this Treaty ever was in force, but there is now at any rate an opinion in both countries that the provision has lapsed.

At the present moment, there is a nice illustration of the value to us of our sea bases in the United States. England requires wheat, and we have wheat which must be sold. All ports except Portland are closed to us by a simple device. The American railways are forbidden to carry Canadian grain or grain products without a permit from the General Operating Committee. These permits are sometimes granted for small quantities which in practice are limited to occasional shipments of flour; but the delay and difficulty in securing

these permits makes the export of wheat impracticable. A single route by the St. Lawrence, even in the summer, is too precarious. The explosion in the elevators at Port Colborne brought into prominence the necessity of an exit by Buffalo. The Treaty of Washington may permit us to enter, and clear, without duty. It does not compel American railways to carry our goods. Upon this flimsy fabric our sea commerce is based.

A nation without a sea-base depends for existence upon itself alone or upon the sufferance of its neighbour through whose territory it must pass for access to the world, in search of such supplies as are necessary for its existence. It must also have an outlet for its own surplus with which imports are to be paid. Forty years ago Canada had a dim perception of this truth, and inaugurated a policy of self-sufficiency which to that extent deserved the name of "national." That policy has failed. It was never thoroughly tried, or rather it was nullified by a contrary policy of manufacturing for export. Imports increase, and now in despair we have abandoned the home market, and are supplying Greece and Rumania upon our own credit. Two contrary policies at the same moment cannot succeed.

Canada also is governed by Geography through the relentless instrument of climate. The keeper of a lighthouse in the Newfoundland Labrador may continue for a time to clothe his women in flimsy fabrics from a Toronto department store. When the supply ship fails, he and his family will revert to the practices of the people amongst whom he lives, or they will perish from cold and hunger. No city in Canada could endure for a month if its coal supply from the United States were cut off. This supply is not automatic. It is subject to embargo. A nation's first duty is to itself. Ambitious young nationalists would do well to reflect upon these things, else they may find themselves with a nation—without a people.

Two courses are open. We may content ourselves with such sea-bases as we have, and direct our life accordingly. We may endeavour by persuasion, or by force, to secure

sea-bases from the United States. If the United States had not entered the War, we might conclude that they were sunk in sloth and would not defend even their own possessions. At one stroke they dispelled that illusion. The truth is, Canada, apart from the Maritime Provinces, has no sea-base on the Atlantic coast, unless the Hudson's Bay route is taken seriously; but now that the money is spent the opinion expressed upon these pages nine years ago is generally accepted as correct. That illusion also is at an end.

It is a principle of history that a free nation must have reasonable access to the sea by communications which are fairly secure. That access is secured for Canada by the St. Lawrence, but only for seven months in the year and that only in time of peace. During the other five months communication is obtained by three lines of railway: the Canadian Pacific, the Intercolonial, and the Grand Trunk Pacific. Of these lines the Canadian Pacific runs for 150 miles through United States territory. The Grand Trunk Pacific skirts the border of Maine for 100 miles. The Intercolonial is only a little further removed.

All access to the sea, even by the St. Lawrence, is under direct control of the United States, on account of the projection of the State of Maine to within 30 miles of the St. Lawrence. This one outpost dominates the life of Canada, which exists only by the will of its neighbour. For many years we have been striving to create a line north of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and St. Catherine's Bay on the Saguenay; but the natural difficulties are insuperable and national energies are required for more immediate needs.

At the first touch of War the problem obtruded itself. In the autumn of 1914 Canada was able to dispatch a contingent of 40,000 men by the St. Lawrence. During that and the succeeding winter all reinforcements were obliged to proceed by rail; the Canadian Pacific was useless for the purpose, since it passed through foreign territory. The port of St. John in New Brunswick was consequently unavailable, and the burden of traffic fell upon Halifax alone. It was only

after the United States became an ally that reinforcements from Canada began to move freely by the shortest and natural route, through Maine.

There is a way out. It is to be found in the League of Nations. If it is not found therein, then that instrument has no force, and its signatories no sincerity. According to Article Nineteen, "The Assembly may from time to time advise the reconsideration by members of the League of treaties which have become inapplicable, and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world." Whatever the status of Canada may in the future be, its existence will depend upon the outcome of this issue. The issue then is large enough to warrant an extended examination. It is nothing less than the relations in the past, at the present, and in the future between the United States and the British Empire, which many wise men on both sides are now considering.

International relations between Canada and the United States began on the day the Treaty of Peace was signed in Paris, September 3rd, 1783. The relations between the two countries have been governed by the inexorable logic of the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, October 19th, 1781; and the consequences of that event are in daily operation.

At various times disputes grew up; but they were always composed by a process of compromise, in which essential justice was rendered to both parties. International relations are much less exact than the terms of a problem in mathematics or metaphysics. They are not governed by rigid law; even the principles of right and wrong cannot always be evoked with confidence since all the right is never on one side and all the wrong on the other. In the growth of nations problems arise slowly and unsuspected. No one is responsible or blameable for these problems. They are a part of life itself. They may be solved by arbitration. They may be postponed. They are often in the end solved by war alone.

The material for dispute between nations always exists. It may flame up under sudden friction, and that friction may

have its origin in the most remote causes. Problems which have lain dormant for centuries may suddenly assume a vital importance for one side or the other, possibly for both. We in each country are now in the situation of two men who have inherited adjoining farms, with old servitudes yet in existence. Such an affair can be settled only in a moment of passionate enthusiasm. This is such a moment.

But the method should vary with the mood; not by commissions, by diplomatic conventions, by formal exchange of arguments; not by remembering past disputes, but forgetting them, and looking to the future in a friendly conversation between the persons immediately concerned. Only the historical sequence of events should be kept in mind, since all our relations are merely a part of general history. From the beginning we on both sides have laboured to remove any cause from which offence might come; but in every case the settlement was delayed until grave danger was actually at hand.

The Ashburton Treaty of 1842 was only effected in sight of war. By this treaty the north-east boundary of the United States was established, but a state of war had already existed. In 1839 hostilities had broken out in Aroostook county. Arrests were made by the authorities of New Brunswick and of Maine; the President was authorized to call out the Militia; ten million dollars were voted for military defence; and General Winfield Scott was sent upon the scene. He was able to arrange a truce on March 21st, 1839, on terms of joint occupancy; and arbitration took the place of war.

The danger had been foreseen; but for fifty years it was allowed to remain. As early as 1794 the Jay Treaty provided for a Commission to decide what the St. Croix river—the Maine boundary—actually was; and four years later the Commission decided that it was the river falling into Passamaquoddy Bay. The islands in that Bay were next in dispute, and by the Treaty of Ghent 1814, this matter also was referred to a Commission. A survey was undertaken in 1817–18, and a further Commission appointed. This body met first at

St. Andrews, N.B., and later in New York in 1822, with disagreement on both occasions. The question was next referred to the King of the Netherlands; but the Senate declined to accept his decision.

There comes a time when an affair is so complicated that it can only be solved by war or good-will. This boundary question will serve as an illustration. By the Treaty of 1783, Article 11, the north-east boundary of the United States was held to extend along the middle of the St. Croix river, "from its mouth in the Bay of Fundy to its source," and "north from the source of the St. 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 north-easternmost head of the Connecticut river; thence along the middle of that river to the 45th degree of north latitude."

A fresh difficulty was introduced into the negotiations by the pedantic precision of a draughtsman. In 1621 James I granted "Nova Scotia" to Sir William Alexander, the western boundary of which extended from the source of the St. Croix river "towards the north" to the nearest waters draining into the St. Lawrence. In the light of more modern knowledge this line runs WNW; but in 1763 the clerk who drew the commission to Sir Montagu Wilmot, Governor of Nova Scotia, described the line as running "due north" from the source of the St. Croix.

Out of this arose two distinct opinions. The English held that the "due north line" was forty miles long, and ran to Mars Hill, Aroostook County. The United States claimed that the line was 140 miles long and ran to the highlands which divide the Restigouche and the tributaries of the Metis. By no process of law could such a dispute be adjudicated. It was effected by compromise. Maine received 5,500 square miles less than were claimed. England received a similar amount less than she claimed. Whether settled right or wrong, the dispute was settled, and danger of war was at an end. The Federal Government paid to Maine one hundred

and fifty thousand dollars in compensation for claims, real or imaginary.

An impression has long prevailed in Canada that the United States had the best of the bargain. The growth of this delusion is the most curious in the history of diplomacy, and formal expression was given to it as late as 1907 by the then Premier of Canada, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The delusion arose out of the measures which Daniel Webster thought necessary to employ to secure the consent of Congress to the Treaty. He made the best of the case, and even produced maps upon which certain lines had been drawn, to show that the Americans had received to the uttermost all that they had claimed. Unfortunately his political expedient was overheard in Canada, and it is only within the last ten years that the nature of it was discovered, and the essential justice of the award admitted.

For the sake of completeness the Alaska Award of Oct. 20th, 1903, may be cited to demonstrate how suddenly a cause of difference may arise between the two countries. The discovery of gold in the Yukon gave an importance, much overestimated at the time, to a definition of the boundary between Canada and Alaska. The issue was simple, and yet insoluble by any rigid rules. There was a discrepancy between the maps and the text of the narrative by which the boundary was defined. If the maps were to govern the possession of the islands, they ought to go to the United States; if the treaty were "tried by the text," they ought to go to England. The result was a compromise which did not, and could not, please the extremists on either side. That, indeed, is the justification of the award.

The matters yet in dispute between Canada and the United States are unimportant in themselves, and of so trivial a nature that it is hard to imagine that they might conceivably lead to hostility. They concern for the most part rivers and lakes in which certain commercial considerations are involved, such as water power, fisheries, and navigation. It would be

a convenience to both sides if these were settled; both would gain, and neither the one nor the other would lose.

Slight as these difference are, unforeseen circumstances may arise to magnify their importance. The events leading up to the Oregon Award are worth considering in detail, as they illustrate so well the profundity of historical causes, and the insensible degrees by which nations are eventually brought at least to the verge of war. The Oregon dispute was bound up with the question of slavery, and slavery in turn was governed by the invention of the cotton-gin, by which a wide movement of population was created.

By this contrivance, which was devised by Eli Whitney in 1793, the seeds of the cotton were separable from the fibre. The use of the cotton-gin permitted profitable production of the short-fibred variety of cotton from the uplands of the Southern States. In 1811 Alabama produced no cotton; in 1834 the crop was larger than that of Georgia or South Carolina, and the population of the State had doubled. Slave holding and cotton growing went together, and as they advanced, the free population was obliged either to buy slaves or move north-westward. This movement was joined by the great migration along the Erie Canal and the Lakes as far west as Oregon, and as far north as the Canadian boundary.

New territory was desired, not so much for its value, as for the opportunity of creating new States in which slavery would be adopted as an institution, and the States in which it was prohibited would accordingly be put in a minority. When the Bill for the organization of Oregon was passed in 1848, it excluded slavery, ostensibly in accordance with the "conditions, restrictions, and prohibitions" of the North-West Ordinance of 1787, but in reality by a recognition of the dangerous principle of "squatter sovereignty," under which the people of the territory had already forbidden slavery within its territories. If they could forbid it, they could also allow it. The Oregon dispute really had its origin

in a pressure of population which began on the Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf of Mexico.

But this Oregon was not the present little State which now lies below $46^{\circ} 15'$ North latitude. It was that enormous territory which extends between the parallels of 42° and $54^{\circ} 40'$. It included all that area between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific, between Alaska on the north, and California on the south, an area of 400,000 square miles, drained by such rivers as the Columbia, the Fraser, and the Skeena. The attitude of the United States was well expressed by Stephen A. Douglas, when he declared May 13th, 1864—"I am as ready and willing to fight for $54^{\circ} 40'$ as for the Rio del Norte." When President Polk declared in his inaugural message for the whole of Oregon, both countries were on the verge of war.

No one contended that the title of Great Britain to this region was incontestable. Spain had a claim on the ground of priority of discovery, though discovery, unattended by permanent occupation and settlement, constitutes the lowest degree of title; and the only right which Great Britain secured from Spain was that which was conceded under the Nootka Convention of 1790, and confirmed by the Treaty of Madrid in 1814, that British subjects might settle and trade in the territory north of California. This arrangement was made in the interests of fur traders who formed the North-West Company, and its successor the Hudson's Bay Company; but such occupation was a precarious one upon which to found a title.

On the other hand, the United States was in possession of certain claims which had to be considered unless war was to be declared, quite apart from the right or wrong of the case. They were successors in title to Spain, which, by the Treaty of Florida in 1819, had ceded all her claims to territory north of 42° . They were successors to France under the Louisiana Purchase to any title which she might have possessed; and there is no doubt that Gray, the master of the United States trading vessel, was the first to sail upon the Columbia River, knowing it to be a river, and that Lewis

and Clark were the first to explore the lower portion of the river and its branches.

The title of the United States was good enough to have warranted them in proceeding with the settlement of the territory, or rather to allow the migration of their own citizens, which had been going on, and say nothing about it. Douglas had the right of it when he recommended that the territories be organized and settled without attempt to define the boundaries; but under sudden need and by mutual good-will the dispute was composed.

All questions arising out of the Treaty of Paris have been for the most part settled; and at the first view there is nothing further to discuss. But that is an antiquated view. A time comes when even a treaty may become a legitimate subject of discussion. Many such treaties are being discussed at the present moment. A treaty is not forever final, as is proved by the long contest over Alsace-Lorraine; and it is quite certain that many other treaties are due for revision. Wars breed treaties, and these in turn are the causes of new wars, unless they are revised in the light of fresh events. The continuous validity of a treaty depends upon the continuation of the circumstances in which it was created. As between the United States and England, the circumstances in which the Treaty of Paris was formulated have completely passed away. Yet it is historically important to recall them to mind in order to understand the genesis of the Treaty.

England was defeated disastrously at Yorktown, October 19th, 1781, and after the surrender of Cornwallis held only New York and Charlestown on the American coast. But both sides were determined on peace, although neither fully appreciated the extremity of the other. England was sufficiently committed in Europe; and the military and financial outlook of the Colonies was none too promising. The Colonial treasury was empty, and the army was clamouring for pay. Washington had reported that it was impossible to recruit his forces, and that the arrears of debt and the slender public credit made further exertions impossible.

In Europe England had been fighting France, Spain, and Holland for twenty-five years. In 1782 she faced the armed neutrality of Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Prussia, and the Empire, that is, practically the whole world of that day. In November, 1781, a loan of £21,000,000 realized only £12,000,000. The National Debt had risen to £80,000,000. In the autumn of 1782 fresh disaster came. The fleet of Kempenfeldt was too feeble even to face a French squadron. St. Eustatia, Demerara, Essequibo, St. Christopher, Nevis, Montserrat, and Minorca were lost. Gibraltar had been beleaguered since 1779.

Again, Canada at the time had merely a nebulous existence. To Mr. Oswald, one of the negotiators of the Treaty, "the back lands of Canada was a country worth nothing, and of no importance." To so well informed a man as Burke its value was only that of a few hundred wild-cat skins. Voltaire, for the French, had long since described it as nothing more than a few acres of snow. The American Commissioners did not hesitate to put in a plea that "England should make a voluntary offer of Canada;" and Benjamin Vaughan on the opposing side has left it on record that "many of the best men in England were for giving up Canada and Nova Scotia."

The Treaty of Paris was executed in England's last extremity. Lord Shelbourne, the Secretary for Home Affairs, although in 1766 he attacked the policy of the Stamp Act and assisted in passing its repeal, and in 1768 opposed coercive measures against the colonists, was obliged to declare in 1782 that "to nothing short of necessity would he give way." But he yielded in the best possible temper. On July 27th, 1782, he wrote to Oswald: "You very well know that I have never made a secret of the deep concern I feel in the separation of countries united by blood, by principles, habits, and every tie short of territorial proximity. But you very well know that I have long since given it up, decidedly though reluctantly, and the same motives which made me, perhaps, the last to give up all hope of re-union, make me most anxious, if it is given

up, that it shall be done decidedly, so as to avoid all future risk of enmity, and by the foundation of a new connection better adapted to the present temper and interests of both countries."

In the making of the Treaty of Paris the French were strong opponents of the Americans. De Vergennes was quite willing that the Colonies should be independent; but he desired to shut them in between the Alleghanies and the Atlantic. He would prevent them from having fishing rights on the shores of Newfoundland. He demanded large concessions for France in return for assistance afforded, and supported Spain in the contention that the possession of "Florida" involved the territory between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi as far as the Great Lakes. The defeat by Rodney of the French Fleet under De Grasse put an end to these pretensions, and secured this region for the United States.

Under force of circumstances and for reasons which at the time seemed adequate, England, in order to ensure the continuity of her institutions, was obliged to place the kingship in a line which had long been bred in Germany, and was indoctrined with German thought. England herself was in bondage and striving to mould this new line of kings to her needs. The struggle between England and her kings lasted for a hundred years, and the American war was merely an incident arising out of that struggle.

The best part of England was on the side of the Americans, because they also were seen to be striving for liberty. When the Stamp Act was repealed the joy in London was as great as the joy in Boston. The people were no party to the war; it was declared in opposition to the intelligence of Burke, and Fox, of Rockingham, of Chatham, and even of Parliament itself. It was a King's war, encouraged by the servility of North and the perversity of Hillsborough. As a result it left little animosity as a legacy to a later generation, and all that has long since passed away.

On November 30th, 1782, a preliminary Treaty was arranged with the thirteen Colonies, which was designed "to lay the foundation of future good-will, and to leave as few

causes of future difference as possible between the two nations." Freed to this extent, England beat the Spaniards off from Gibraltar; and as a result effected a peace with France as well as with Spain; and arranged a truce with Holland, which passed into amity and has endured until this day. The *pacte de famille* between the French and Spanish Bourbons was broken, and the liberty of Europe was saved.

In this Treaty of Paris there are the very conditions, specified in Article 19 of the League of Nations, which are fatal to the existence of Canada as a national entity. They have not yet begun to show themselves; if they lie dormant they are none the less real. They will disclose themselves in time as surely as the conditions which led up to the Oregon Award. But the situation will be much more grave. There can be no arbitration, since there is nothing to arbitrate. The treaty itself is the bar.

The present moment of passionate enthusiasm for a common cause should not be allowed to pass. It should be seized for the removal of a danger to the future peace. That danger is far in the future, and can only be removed by an act of generosity, wisdom, and self-abnegation on the part of the United States. That act is the return to Canada of the outpost which fell to the United States as the spoil of war, which is of little importance to them, and is of the very life of Canada. Once the wisdom of this concession is admitted, the method then becomes a subject of consideration. The difficulties are great, but not insuperable if the problem is approached with a full realization of its importance. One State alone is involved in respect of territory, namely, the State of Maine.

The new boundary that suggests itself is an extension of the line of 40° north latitude, which forms the boundary further to the west; but this would involve a surrender of more territory than is actually necessary to afford a direct outlet to the sea. The natural line is that followed by the Canadian Pacific Railway between the two points, Megantic in Quebec and McAdam in New Brunswick. The area of Maine is 33,000 square miles, and the area north of the

Canadian Pacific Railway is estimated at 8,000 square miles. But the land is thinly settled and unsuitable for cultivation, except along the Aroostook river.

The population of Maine is 700,000, but seven-eighths of it lie below this line, and of this population ten per cent. is Canadian born; only one-third of the State is composed of land fit for cultivation, and of this only one-third, or one-ninth of the whole, is improved; but only one-sixth of the improved land, or less than two per cent. of the whole, is under crop other than hay and forage. The average size of the farms is 106 acres, and of these there are only 60,000 in the whole State.

Two complementary methods suggest themselves:—

1. That the matter should be referred by the American Government, after exhaustive investigation, to the occupants of the area concerned with a recommendation that they should elect to constitute themselves a Province of Canada with all the privileges, securities, and guarantees of such a province. The nature of these privileges, securities, and guarantees, would be a fitting subject of public education to convince the people that their liberties would be as well conserved under the proposed arrangement as at present.
2. That those objecting to the transfer should have their property expropriated and equitably paid for out of Federal funds. This process is familiar to all governments which require private property for public use.

An exhaustive survey of the area involved, its population, properties, and resources, would be necessary, but much of this information is easily available in the Census Returns. To enumerate them in detail would be indelicate: it would be like making an inventory of another man's property.

Will the Americans give back to us this area which they took from us by force at a time when we were fighting alone in Europe against a tyranny which was of much the same kind as that against which we fought yesterday in their company? The case is now laid before them inofficially, and by way of suggestion. If it were reinforced, it is highly probable that

they would see the wisdom and humour of handing back to us what is of little value to them, but of life importance to us. It would be a proof of mutual forgiveness, a sign to the world of an alliance, and of the new spirit which has begun to prevail in all relations between free peoples. If it were done quickly, it would bring conviction to the old enemies that there is no further use in contending against a new world.

Such a proposal as this is one which might more properly come from the United States, as it is their territory which is involved. But one nation cannot be expected to originate a proposal which is of minor importance to itself, although it may concern the very existence of another. And yet it is of the profoundest interest to the United States that Canada should be allowed to develop freely in accordance with the laws of history and of nature, rather than that she should be persuaded to mould a blighted future behind a barrier which was imposed merely by a treaty drawn up far in advance of events.

We are a small and a poor people. Before this war we had pledged our future for as long a time as human vision could reach in developing the widespread territory which was committed to our care. One-quarter of our adult male population went overseas. Many of those who returned are broken men, and yet compelled to sustain the burden which the war has imposed.

It may be urged that this barrier against future development exists merely in our minds and sentiments; but nationality itself is an affair of sentiment, which none appreciate better than the people of the United States. This proposal for an act of generosity on their part will, it is believed, appeal to their just and generous nature, and will be entirely in harmony with that spirit of idealism which impelled them to come to the relief and rescue of the distressed nations of the world which were striving to be free, and to remain in freedom. Here is a master chance for putting the League of Nations to the test.

THE EDITOR

THE LAST DAYS

THERE is a law of the diary as there is a law of the sonnet. The diary, if it is printed at all, must be printed as it was written, to recall a mood of the moment. It may be a record of events; it must be a record of the impression made upon a mind by those events as they occurred. If a diary is retouched or amended by memory, it then becomes a false and worthless thing. Even errors of taste must remain as they stand in witness to a tasteless mind.—[EDITOR U.M.]

BOULOGNE, 22nd December, 1918.

When I came within the barrier at Charing Cross at eleven this morning I had a sense of security and freedom. In my pocket was the "white pass," which was my authority for moving freely in the area occupied by the British Army, and to come home by "an alternative route." The train, which was at one time so full of mystery and an omen of evil, was now nothing more than the "Continental express." Civilians were hurrying along the platform. A large "foreigner" was carrying two heavy bags whilst he held his papers in his mouth.

For luncheon on the train to Folkestone I had white bread, soup, roast mutton, rice pudding, cheese, coffee, and a pint of stout, all for five shillings. There was no cabin available in the boat, as most of the rooms are occupied by the "messengers" who are passing to, and from, France. I sat on a bench and talked with an "elegant" woman with new furs, who had been for four years a refugee at Richmond, and was now on her way home to Charleroi. She allowed that the English had been very "gentle" to her.

Boulogne was as usual,—sparse lights shining in the bleak wet, clusters of sodden officers waiting for something to happen, feeble horses, and the glare of motors. On the dock my pass was stamped. The officer gave me a permit for the

train. I presented it at the station and received a ticket for the Boulogne-Cologne express, which, the man claimed, would leave at 7-30. I had dinner at the club. The train left about 10, and the three hours on the platform were not unpleasant. They were quiet and free from care. The Cologne express this night was making its third trip. There were ten coaches, each one containing 36 berths, three rows of six on each side hinged against the wall. I was alone in the coach, and went to bed with three new blankets. I was promised coffee in the morning, sandwiches and beer by day, and dinner somewhere at night.

December 23rd, 1918.

This morning I awoke outside of Arras station, and recognized the place at once. Some women had permission to travel, and they came on board with much talk. We passed through the station, a dark, broken cavern, and entered the area of devastation. The moon was three quarters waned; there were three stars, one on each side and one ahead. The clouds were still and broken. Until daylight I watched the passing battle-field under the moon. At one spot three lights moved afar off as if three women were searching for their dead. A sheet of iron flapped against a broken bridge—that was the only sound. Points of trees, rows of white crosses, canals empty of water, dragged themselves by. Ruined houses began to appear. Their condition grew better. At 10-40 we came to a town. There was a hut with the name "Mons" scrawled with paint on the door. The town was Valenciennes. The man in the hut probably thought it was Mons. We stopped—the engine sobbing over the destruction of her material world.

From all houses the doors are gone, and the glass broken. Fire marks the walls; but in the fields are white-and-black cows, and men are at work in the gardens. We pass squalid trains with rusty engines. The trucks show women and children at the doors or lying on straw. The ruin of the country is made more marked by the ineffectual attempts at repair. The line is strewn with poles, insulators,

lattice posts, and broken trucks. New telegraph poles arise from the débris. At the points are red lights in open defiance of the enemy. Crossing the Channel it was strange to see the boldness of the sailors hoisting a lantern. Children assemble at the crossings in wonder at the train. Quievrain is reached at 10-10, the town full of German signs, but no abodes or inhabitants. There is much railway material—cars of all kinds with marks in all languages. One bearing the legend "Kaisirliche Poste" was used as a cook-house.

From Quievrain the road runs on a 12-foot embankment across a level plain, with small fields cultivated to the margin of the flooded ditches. The houses are better. Lorries appear on the road. Trees are untouched. The sky has broken into moving clouds. A string of villages with factories and *ateliers*—all in ruin. St. Ghislain at noon. A steady rain. Mons at one o'clock. The station intact, the town undamaged. An accident is reported, and there are five trains stalled ahead. Charleroi at 10 with supper in the canteen. The town well lighted, and the shops gay with flashy goods.

December 24th, 1918.

Awoke at Hergenrath, which, according to the map, is the first station within the German border. A country of pleasant hills; then a descent into the plain and entrance into Aachen, as they call Aix-la-Chapelle. Duren at 10. A few Germans moving upon their dull business on the rich cultivated land. The winter wheat is showing. Stacks are yet untouched. The houses are intact. The long railway sidings have a comical look of futility. At 11 a Lancashire lad in the uniform of an officer, looking from the window, announced that the cathedral of Cologne was in sight. It was so. The two spires were there. The approach to the town was slow—between factories, decayed rolling stock, aerial travellers, and other machinery. Germans were lifting rotten sleepers and extracting the spikes. I affected not to see them. I saw bayonets in their hands.

At 11-30 the train rolled into the fine station of Cologne. The few passengers were lost in the vast space. I put down my bag, and went to the R.T.O. He told me that Deutz was just across the river, and that I could not telephone. Deutz was my destination. The 1st Brigade of Sappers was there with "Jim" in command. I put my bag in the baggage room. A young German woman, who was eating something, took it, and gave me a check in the usual way. I put my haversack over my shoulder, and went in the street. I had not been in Cologne since 1896, and it was all strange. The streets were filled with civilians. They took no more notice of me than if I were a ghost or a shadow. Their eyes seemed holden. There were a few soldiers, mostly Guards. I saw a bridge, and walked across it. At the middle I stopped and wound my watch, so that the army joke might be fulfilled. In Deutz I saw a sapper. He did not know where Headquarters was, but he knew where his own orderly room was. I walked with him—over a mile. Inside the room I met Father O'Sullivan, and came away with him. We got into a street car, as if we were in Boston. The car was crowded with people, but all were silent. They were clean, well dressed, mostly in black, and the women were grave and correct. They did not stare or embarrass us in any way. We descended at Doppel Street, entered a noble house with a sentry at the door with bayonet fixed. The C.R.E. was at luncheon.

After luncheon the horses were brought. Amongst them was "Gipsy II.," looking as well and as humorous as when I picked her at Otterpool in June of 1915. I gave her sugar. We rode into Cologne, dismounted, and examined the cathedral. In the western background are ever the twin towers like saw-toothed bayonets. A sapper, who in virtue of his craft has an eye for wide impressions, found in this edifice a resemblance to an enormous man with shaggy head and hairy chest, and powerful arms, but with no loins nor legs nor guts; and he contrasted it with the church at Amiens with its single spire, which, as he said, arose like a rod of spikenard in the wilderness.

We recrossed the Rhine, and rode down the right bank of the river along a tow-path. At a spot where a little bay formed, we put the horses in the water to drink, and "Gipsy" pawed powerfully with her foot. The vision which "Jim" and I witnessed 15 years ago in the "pictures" at Truro was fulfilled. This being Christmas Eve, dinner was a cheerful affair, and we sat until three in the morning.

DEUTZ, December 25th, 1918.

At 10 we went in a car to the outposts, the furthest point being the church at Lindlar. The route lay by Ostheim, Heumar, Rosrath, Imme-Keppel, Hoch Keppel, Vellingen, Lindlar. Once clear of the town the road lay through a planted forest of oak, spruce, fir, elm, pine. The forest is laid out like a town, and the plantings of each year can be discerned. In some areas the trees are about a foot high, but in none do they attain to great size. Through the forest one reaches the Agger, and drives up a branch of the main stream. Snow lay upon the ground as we arose, but in the river on the right the grass was green, and narrow ditches drained the land. Groups of people were on their way from church, following paths across the hills, and they would reply cheerfully to our "Merry Christmas." They were, for the most part, old women, young women, children, and old men.

A bridge-head has little to do with a bridge. It is an area as large as an English county. If one point of a compass be placed upon Cologne and the other upon Bonn, which is twenty miles to the south, and the compass be turned eastward in a great half-circle and back to the river again at the north, the line will fall far within the broken hills which border the Rhine valley. The line itself follows a good contour, and a commanding position is not sacrificed to topographical exactness. The army believes in a margin of safety.

After travelling twenty-five miles in a north-easterly direction we came to a sign which indicated that we had reached the limits of the bridge-head. There was a fire of sticks in the road. A few ground sheets spread over a frame

formed a shelter. Two Canadian boys in uniform were standing by with their hands in their great-coat pockets. They looked very cheerless. One was tall, the other was short; he had a cast in his eye. His name was Cooper. This was the Army of Occupation; at least, this was all we saw. But we knew, and the Germans knew, that men and guns beyond belief were concealed in farms in the folds of the hills.

The Rhine had been crossed on December 13th, but I was not there to see. The crossing was a ceremonial, and one who rides in ceremony sees nothing but his horse's ears, save for the moment when he turns "eyes right," and then he sees only the saluting officer. But it must have been to the observers a great show of power. From eight in the morning until four in the afternoon, so it was described to me, the troops were crossing in columns of route, ten yards between battalions, fifty between brigades. The troops marched without open enthusiasm, without emotion, void of passion, with no sign of imagination, without any apparent pride, but with the slow relentlessness of a glacier, with the inevitable power of a geological movement, file after file of fours with bayonets fixed, wagon after wagon, gun after gun, lorry after lorry—no haste, no confusion, no halts. Each column passed the saluting point to the minute, every horse and every man in his appointed place: and this after a march of nine days at twenty miles a day with rations none too abundant, for the rail-head was left perilously far behind.

We passed on into the neutral zone which extends ten kilometres further, and turned about at Lindlar. Civilians were going and coming, unheeded by the sentries, although they allowed that they would stop any "suspicious characters." They did not explain the grounds on which they would "suspect" a person. On the return journey we stopped and smoked a cigarette in a little wood on the hillside. It was free of snow, and the red needles of the fir lay clean upon the ground as in the woods at Orwell where "Gipsy I." lies buried.

At Imme-Keppel we called at a road-side house for rest and warmth. There was a commodious room on the right of the hall. It contained a table, a bench, a few chairs, and an open cupboard with a few glasses and bottles. On the wall were homely pictures,—an old woman sitting in a high chair with a soldier kneeling to receive her blessing; a placid river; and a Christmas scene with the legend, "Come Herr Jesus, and sit with us." We warmed ourselves, had a hot drink, which the woman called coffee, and a glass of "alcohol-free" stuff with a neighbour who came in.

This man had been on the Russian front far east of Riga, and we had much talk with him. He had a way of saying "Yes," which meant, "Yes, we made a mistake. We were led astray. But there it is. What is to be done? I do not know. See what you can do to clear away the mess." Also, he was sorry for us. He was done with war. We were far from homes. Our job was not finished. We were "sent." We could do no otherwise. The sum of his reasoning was: In Russia there are good people and bad people; in England there are good people and bad people; in Germany there are good people and bad people.

At 3-30 we went to the opera house in Cologne. I saw the Germans in the mass. These Prussians looked all alike as they sat in rows:—hard, dull, lean faces; sloping shoulders, and not much head behind their ears. The women, on the contrary, were short, stout; puffy rather than fat; sallow rather than white; of colour not a trace. The opera was "Lohengrin," and it was like a solemn festival. There was no seat, and we stood within the door, like Faust and Mephistopheles watching the villagers at play. In a glass I looked that I might see the scholar's cloak and the red feather.

DEUTZ, December 26th, 1918.

This morning we called upon General A. C. Macdonell of the 1st Division, and returned to luncheon with him. In the meantime we drove to Bonn to call upon General Currie. He lives in the house of a woman who is sister to the late

Kaiser, and the woman also lives in the house beneath the English flag. General Currie was engaged, but Major W. J. Shaughnessy entertained us with a hospitality like his father's. Bonn, being the Headquarters of the Corps, is alive with the usual appearance of activity.

DEUTZ, December 27th, 1918.

By the east bank of the river we drove to Siegberg, which is well within the bridge-head opposite to Bonn. Here I found the 6th Field Ambulance, now commanded by Lieut.-Colonel Hardisty, with Major McKechnie second in command, installed in a noble house with nothing to do, as there are no casualties and no sick. There are yet about sixty of the original personnel left.

DEUTZ, December 28th, 1918.

Remained in the house all day. The warmth is better than the cold rain.

There are things that are disturbing. The children disturb me most. The army is disturbed. It has lost resentment. It does not like this job. The people are growing fond of us,—we are so gentle. We are as well behaved as if we were merely visitors, and any officer who boasts of some little imposition is received with chilly silence. To the Germans we are like ghosts or shadows. The children are wistful for a smile or a kind word; they do not understand the immense silence and sadness of their world.

In all these years I have never discovered much hatred in the trenches against the Germans. The word "Boche" itself is used in a humorous sense, as a pet name. At Brigade Headquarters there were signs of resentment; at Division it was marked; at Corps the hard official habit of mind was adopted; the Army was negative; but as one went back amongst civilians the dislike was extreme, created largely, I think, by those who, upon another occasion, performed their whole duty, in Mr. Kipling's phrase, by "killing Kruger with their mouth."

In a few weeks a million English soldiers will have looked upon the Germans, and will be governed by what they see;

and what they see is,—grave men, placid women, who move in the streets as solemnly as a governess going to church, and little children with the pallid unwholesome face of hunger. Also, the soldiers compare Cologne with London. In Cologne the people throng the streets in a leisurely way. They are quiet, polite, deferential; but make no advance. I have scrutinized thousands of faces, and not once discovered an improper look or gesture. By nine o'clock they are in their houses like homely country people.

London to the soldier is a city of harlots, who may bring disgrace upon him. In Cologne he finds that the opera is his recreation, and he compares it with the stupid folly of the Circus and the Strand. In short, the English soldier is puritanical; he always was. The people are astonished at our shyness. We are like strangers at a village tea-party, striving to make as little disturbance as possible. For example, one lives in a fine house with electric light and glass doors. The man and woman live on the other side of the door, which is covered by a curtain. We turn out our lights so that they are not disturbed; and if one has occasion to get up in the night, one uses a candle. They ask us what it all means, and we can only say again, that the English army contends with armies, not with women, and children, and civilian men. A deeper reason is that no enemy has ever done us any permanent harm, that is, they never carried off our women, and we do not know what hatred means.

DEUTZ, December 29th, 1918.

Walked in the streets regarding the spectacle. The spectacle of real interest in the bridge-head is the Germans themselves. It seems incredible that one can see enough of them. For four years they were as elusive as ground-hogs; and the belief grew that there were none, that they had all gone home; but this belief could be quickly dispelled by lifting one's head above the parapet. An occasional prisoner, and on certain days of the year whole companies marching down, that was all one saw of the Germans; but here one may

stand all day to the eye's content. They throng the streets, stream across the bridges, and inhabit the villages; but it is in the opera house at Cologne they are seen in their native haunt. The children now know me, and suggest in a negative way and in timid tones chocolate and cigarettes. They say, "Nicht Schokolade? Nicht cigarettes?"

The situation is full of humour. In four years' occupation of Belgium the Germans devised a system which they applied to themselves even before we arrived. In each house are found the names of the inmates beautifully written and posted inside the door. But their rules were too strict for our taste, and we relaxed them for our own convenience. We do not ask them to take off their hats to officers, and they are clear of the streets at nine instead of seven, as the earlier hour interfered too much with their business. Every evening before dinner I walk across one bridge to Cologne, and return by the other. The spell of the Rhine has fallen upon me—a wide, deep, swift-flowing river, giving back the lights, blue, yellow, red, white, in long wavering shafts.

In the morning to Cologne to buy scores of the operas in the shop of A. J. Tonger. The place was comfortably filled with men, women, and a few officers. They were as solemn as if buying music were a sacrament. The shop was like the library of a college, and busts of musicians adorned the alcoves. A woman was selecting a piece, and the assistant hummed the tune for her. An English officer, who spoke German, was turning over a pile of sheets in a confident way. The man who attended us wore a G. clef in gold as a pin for his necktie. We bought "Tannhauser," "Lohengrin," "Mignon," "Carmen," "The Flying Dutchman," at four to six marks each. He did not know if he had Charpentier's "Paris;" he would ask his colleague. Had he "Parsifal?" "I should hope so," he said with almost religious fervour. Every day at luncheon the C.R.E. translates the opera of the day for the young men. Captain Bate has attended nine performances. It is a new world to these young men, and they wonder at our knowledge of the technique, that a singer must

stand or sit in a traditional way, or wear a dress of a certain cut and colour.

For the benefit of those who are to write the history of the war, let it be recorded that Cologne was first occupied by a Canadian subaltern of sappers. This young officer was returning from leave. At various times for four years he had been returning from leave, and the ethics of the return is to arrive at the front without delay. But in the meantime the corps may have moved to a new area. It is the business of the Railway Transport Officer to direct inquirers to their units; but the R.T.O. is the last man in the army to know where a unit is at any given moment. The *permissionaire* turns his face eastward and takes to the road. He enters any train that appears to be going in that direction, and completes the journey in a chance lorry, mess-cart, or ambulance.

For four years there was a fair degree of certainty that the conveyance would not go too far. The German line from the sea to Switzerland was an effective barrier. At one station this sapper officer saw a train heading in the right direction. It appeared to be commodious and he went on board. It turned out to be the armistice train, and it deposited him in Cologne. He could have gone to Berlin, but his immediate concern was to rejoin his unit. When the train proceeded he was the only British officer in Cologne. In this strange circumstance he did the obvious thing. He went to an hotel, engaged a room, and having taken possession waited until his unit arrived for his support. His name is Birkett.

DEUTZ, December 30th, 1918.

The afternoon was spent in the woods, walking on the moss to one's spurs. Woodmen were at work. Women were carrying off branches for their warmth, and thin blue smoke went up from the clearings. Logs were piled with scrupulous exactness, such pit-props as one saw in the field. It was like regarding the work of men who were now dead.

DEUTZ, January 1st, 1919.

Last night we sat in this house. At midnight there was a sound of bells. It was the New Year. The staff came in to offer their good wishes to the C.R.E. The streets were silent except for two New Zealanders who, as the sentry averred when he was asked for an explanation of their injurious language, were merely "talking about old times." In the morning there was a flashing of sun through the clouds. I watched the Rhine. It was like a slow old man, with sad, brown, and wrinkled face. Barges were passing. On the bow of one was yet a Christmas tree. An aeroplane was patrolling overhead. The two bridges are typical. The new bridge is a bridge as any rational people would build. The "Hohenzollern" bridge is a contraption of towers, turrets, battlements, and embrasures, like a thing on the German stage. The four equestrian figures, two at each end of the bridge, are beautifully weathered, but there is something comical in the bronze truculence of tail, mane, and plume.

DEUTZ, January 2nd, 1919.

The main roads in the bridge-head are paved with stone or cement blocks. Other roads are well metalled, or made from the soil, but good. Then there are by-roads, and farm roads, from which one can work up the hills by bridle paths. The whole area is marked by wood, copse, orchards, farms, heaths, dry and wet meadows, fen, moor, moss, water, with flowing rivers and rushing streams, with pools and ditches. This day we drove southwards to Siegburg. The route lay by Ostheim, Urbach, Wahn, Spich, Troisdorf. We crossed the Agger at Volberg and again at Siegburg, where it falls into the Sieg, which comes from the south-east; and the Sieg again is crossed on the way back to Bonn. It was a brilliant day, the hills on both sides of the Rhine being in view. We returned by Cologne where I bought three packages of cigarette papers for 1 mark 80 pf. They were marked in English, "Made in Vienna." Five francs is equal to 7m. 50 pf.

DEUTZ, January 3rd, 1919.

A dull but dry day. We rode for two hours down the right bank of the Rhine to the bridge of boats, and saw Germany in all its monstrousness of factory and machinery. The twin towers of the Cathedral stood up like saw-toothed bayonets. An old excursion steamer was anchored in a bay; the prow was a fish. The paddle box was a grille. The stern was raised high for a restaurant. It was like all of Germany, an impossible dream. At a dock we dismounted. Forty children crowded close with dull, apathetic faces. They were of all ages and sizes, but singularly devoid of beauty, except one girl of eleven to whom I gave a two-shilling piece. One child of three was eating a piece of disgusting, black, sodden bread. They were as nervous as wild animals. They were pale to yellowness, and not a trace of colour showed in any face. We have an armistice with the soldiers: we continue a state of war against the children.

DEUTZ, January 4th, 1919.

We rode for two hours, and had pictures taken. The photographer, a German, was much disgusted that we could not look fierce. They do not understand that a soldier may be pleasant yet implacable, victorious without arrogance, at once merciful and just. The English are frightfully righteous, they say. They ask the meaning of it, and the only answer is that the English make war upon armies, not upon civilians, not upon women and children.

An old woman in black was turning over a dust heap looking for chips, and she was at her task as we returned. A boy was poling a raft in the overflown water. A child asked if he might roll his hoop under the horses. Men and women were digging turnips and cutting cabbages in the fields.

I wrote to Sir Archibald Macdonell upon his knighthood. I expressed my pleasure upon his decision to accept this honour from "the other King," as a sign that he had agreed to let by-gones be by-gones,—a King whom he had served so long, so loyally, and with such signal success.

The opera was "The Flying Dutchman," done with all the pomp of pre-war days. In the final phrase the woman made the B natural with ease and sureness. The "steersman" of the ship had a telescope to his eye to observe the other ship which was only ten feet away. In that is the history of Germany, and the meaning of the war. The German must have a mechanism for everything. If he would draw a curtain, he must have a string and a pulley. If he would lift his blind, he must have a crank and a cogged wheel. In the mess-room of this house is a peristyle against the wall like a mantelpiece. It conceals a radiator. On the floor is a grate filled with pieces of wood nailed together. Below this wood are electric lights covered with red paper, and underneath the grate is a piece of metal to protect the floor from the imaginary heat. There is also a sheet of stamped bronze to conduct the smoke that has no existence. The contraption is to him a fireplace, and in his mind it is much better, more "efficient," than the English fireplace which is built of stone, and burns fuel directly. He builds of wood, hay, straw, stubble, and thinks it stone. The world to him is a stage, and the false was the true. His whole fabric was a tower of Babel; his stones, brick; slime for mortar. His very empire was a fabricated thing made by hands, as by one who thought to add a cubit to his stature. The fabric has come to the ground, and can never be rebuilt.

The goat, in the Greek verse, gnawed the vine to the root; but the vine was quite sure it would yield grapes for wine to be used when the goat lay dead upon the altar. We are the vine; the German is the goat. The German is shattered. He is a dispersed people. The dispersion began even before the war; that is the meaning of his penetration into other lands. Those who have to do with the making of peace would do well to come to this country and see the material they have to work with. In all our previous wars we followed one principle: that we must continue to live in the same world with our enemies; and in our peace policy there was what appeared to the world as something comical. Yet the method

worked, and it yielded an empire which the shock of the last four years could not move. It gave us Botha and Smuts.

I am afraid of Wilson and his pride of intellect, his American belief that things are much more simple than they really are, his pre-occupation with laws, leagues, and legislation; but I am much more afraid lest French, and, I may add, Celtic, passion and logic may turn us aside from our old Imperial way. The English always perceived the majesty of events. They saw God walking upon the waters. They found because they did not seek. It is a hard saying, that the business of the Empire is to save not ourselves, but the world. A spirit is moving amongst the Germans. It is our business to protect this brooding spirit and not leave it to the mercy of the world. They look upon us as administrators of God's judgements, but they look that we shall act without passion. They are quite apathetic, ready to accept what may befall; but if we forsake our old Imperial way, we will have lost our place in the world.

We yielded to Foch and the French our leadership in land war. It is now time to resume it in peace. The Germans put all their trust in us. Even I, myself, in some obscure way resent the presence of French officers in this bridge-head, as if they would interfere in a delicate job which is peculiarly our own. Only this morning we were talking with a woman about her dogs, and she apologized for some imperfection in their coats on the ground that they had been hungry for so long a time; and she did it in such a deprecating way, as if protesting: "the fault was our own—not yours!"

During these two weeks I have had a sense of shame, as of one looking upon a naked soul, or upon a woman in her agony. I am not writing in ignorance. I have seen the war face to face. Our own soul also is at stake. My fear is that the business of peace will fall into the hands of lawyers, pedants, and traders, who see only a victim to be destroyed, and ourselves destroyed with the sacrifice. We are not God.

DEUTZ, January 5th, 1919.

Father O'Sullivan, a priest winsome and wise, the chaplain, said Mass in a church. I examined a park of German ambulances, and reflected upon the suffering they denoted. They were a poor convoy. General Macdonell called. In the evening the moon appeared new over the Rhine. Professor Dale came to dinner. He was very sensible over the Khaki University.

At 11-30 I crossed the river for the last time, its surface like burnished metal giving back the light. The 1st Division is moving out to-morrow, and the war is over.

January 7th, 1919.

The train left Cologne at 5 a.m. and at sunrise I awoke, the sun looking as it looked in Flanders, shining through the yellow mist across the level plain. Past Eschwielerhof the country was sparse and rough. White birches and young pines grew above the ledges of rock. After Aachen a tunnel with flaring lights; then red hills, and smoky clouds in a pale blue sky; houses on the short hillsides. Hergenrath at 9-30: a wide horizon upon the hills; woods broken by red quarry faces; brawling streams; red roofs, white spires, and square towers; a difficult country; one sees why the Germans preferred Belgium for their march. The journey brought us past Herbersthal, Verviers, Ensival, Papinster, Gafontaine, Nessonvaux, Trooz, Heime, Seraing, leaving Liege some miles to the north, through low hills and green valleys. At Ensival a river, probably the Vesdre, was crossed, and we reached the Meuse. From Huy to Namur the train followed this noble stream up a rich green valley with bold cliffs on either hand, showing tilted benches of rock. A man was ploughing with oxen, and the meadows were white with sheep. Namur was reached at 3-30; then we followed the pretty Sambre, a gentle stream, until the valley widened out to a pleasant countryside. Charleroi was reached at 7-30 and we had dinner in the canteen; a gross affair.

January 8th, 1919.

Awoke upon a sunless day. A windmill was in sight. We must be east of Mons or west of Arras. We were at

Somain near Douai. We had made little progress in the night, and were now due at Boulogne. Soon we came into the area of roofless houses and blown bridges. There was the usual acrid smell in the air. The shell holes are quite grown with grass, but no single point arises in the desolation. It is all a shambles, a slaughter house, squalid as a shack wherein murder had been done. In the course of the day we passed the towers of Mt. St. Eloi, and I looked upon a battlefield for the last time.

The train arrived at Boulogne at 6 in the evening. The railway people thought we were an ambulance train, and sent us on to the hospital in Wimereux. Before they discovered the mistake and brought us back it was midnight. I had supper at the club. The hotels were crowded, and I went back to the train to sleep.

BOULOGNE, January 9th, 1919.

Crossed the channel in the morning over a sunny, stormy sea, but had for the passage the comfort of a state cabin. Here ends the record of my experience in this—my last, and only—war.

STAFF OFFICER

WAR

How can I picture thee? Thou hast thy morn,
 Thy shadowy eve, and night as doth the day,
 Thy morn's proud pageant, liveried bold and gay,
 Whose plumed and bannered stream through banks deep-worn
 Of cheering multitudes is bravely borne,
 Thy evening's flaming sky and shadows grey
 Of long-drawn ranks of death in disarray,
 All ashen-hued and hushed and havoc-torn.

Then, curtained dark, thy night's Gethsemane,
 Whose tears and blood earth's gentlest spirits flow,
 Where sireless infants suck the breasts of woe,
 And Age lies broken-crutched, while, songlessly,
 Life's summer, stayed at noon, garlands in gloom
 Her withered flowers and buds that ne'er may bloom.

DUDLEY H. ANDERSON

WHILE ORPHEUS SLEPT

While Orpheus slept no song of passioned bird
Across the richly flowered fields was heard;
The brook, once noisy with its revelry,
In silence journeyed toward the songless sea.
The drooping blossoms mutely suffered wrong
From winds whose lips had lost the gift of song.

While Orpheus slept, the lark, devoid of skill,
Ascending beat on beat at last grew still,
And voiceless, as a soul that unforgiven
Might wait before the silent gate of heaven,
It hung with trembling wings and heart distressed,
Weak with the notes perforce that it suppressed.

While Orpheus slept and Hermes' lyre unstrung
Let slip the golden hours of day, unsung,
Love woke to silence, and in dumb surprise
Wandered with dull uncomprehending eyes
Through brooding meadows, where no music lent
Its witchery of measured ravishment.

While Orpheus slept no idle sun-warmed breeze
Wafted the murmur of contented bees,
Nor echo answering to the listless swain
Encouraged him to try his pipes again;
God-like, no footsteps lightly passed along
The dreaming flowers, stirring them to song.

While Orpheus slept, then love was bought with gold,
And mortals toiling suddenly grew old,
Finding no prayer their silent lips could pray,
Nor hope discerned to lighten their dull way,
But watched with yearning eyes and waited long,
Listening in vain to catch the immortal song.

There came a singer through the purple morn
Whose silver voice tuned to his harp was borne
On winds once dead, that now to music sprang,
Life-filling all the valley as they sang,
And lo, a cry as of release from pain,
"Orpheus awakes and walks with us again!"

PERCIVAL ALLEN

DALHOUSIE

1819—1919

Here, where the mighty pulse of Empire beats,
Here, where the iron gates of Commerce swing,
That room be made for sinewy Trade to bring
To anchor, or to send abroad, her fleets,
Rose,—modest, thorough, one of Learning's seats,
Whence for a hundred years Thought showed the way
To realms where Beauty, Truth, and Wisdom lay,
Like to some trusted guide a traveller meets

'Mid storied scenes. Here came they, young, keen-eyed—
Those thousands now upon her sacred roll;
Here taught to see, to think, to do, to bide;
Here taught their kinship with the mighty whole
Of things, they, going world-wide did their part
In war or peace, at council, altar, mart.

ALEXANDER LOUIS FRASER

INDUSTRY AND FINANCE

ALL wars appear to involve relaxation of the contemporary moral code, and this relaxation is usually characterized by public and private disregard of consequences, resulting often in an orgy of extravagance. All classes in the community are infected by the desire to raise their standard of comfort, but the social groups most infected are those to whom luxurious living is a new experience. When living becomes more luxurious and when larger numbers attempt to enjoy greater luxury, there is at once increase in the demand for goods and reluctance to engage in the increased labour necessary to produce them. This social paradox constitutes the problem encountered by the industrial world at the present moment. Demand is extraordinarily active; wages are much higher than they were in pre-war days; working hours are much shorter; the quantity of product per working hour has not increased, and there are fewer workers than there were.

The doctrine that wealth is a fixed quantity susceptible of immediate division or of expropriation by the State is responsible for many misconceptions. The fact is that wealth is being used up every hour, and that the cessation of the labour of production means the stoppage of consumption within a very short time, because the quantity of goods accumulated in stores is in general very limited. Indeed, when the demand for these goods is active, as it is at present, the reserve stocks are insignificant in proportion to the consumption.

The war has been a great educator. It has shown in the most demonstrative manner that production is the most important factor. It has shown that pecuniary cost, and even the distribution of the surplus product, if there is any, are both of minor importance compared with production. This has been demonstrated by urgency of demand for certain

products—munitions, food, and clothing, conspicuously. At whatever cost, these had to be provided in huge quantities and at high speed.

I have before me a detailed statement of the number of shells fired on the front of one army corps in France during the operations of one week—by no means the most important week of the period of the war. The cost of these shells ran into millions; but the cardinal point was the supply of shells, not the cost of them. The victualling of an army is costly; but the important point is the victualling, not the cost in terms of money.

In peace, as in war, the important fact is production. Unless consumption and the well-being of the community contingent upon it are to decline, production must be maintained. How can this production be maintained? Three methods alone are known to history. One is by compulsory labour; the second is by voluntary labour; and the third is by free labour, whose participation is induced by payment of wages. The first method was employed more or less rigidly throughout Europe during the Middle Ages, as well as in earlier times. Slaves were captured or whole populations were conquered and the captives set to work to produce for themselves and for the community. The habit of wandering inherited or acquired by the labouring people brought about regulated settlement. People were prevented from wandering and were compelled to work. In modern times, obligatory labour has been employed as a punitive measure. I have seen armed guards standing over convicted beggars digging in the fields, or working in factories, producing compulsorily. As a measure devised to counteract the disorganization of Russian society caused by the special character of the Russian Revolution of November, 1917, the Soviet Republic placed the following clause in the first article of its constitution:—“Universal obligation to work is introduced for the purpose of eliminating the parasitic strata of society and organizing the economic life of the country.” In other words, the Soviet Republic reverts to the practice of the Middle Ages.

The most conspicuous example of voluntary labour is to be found in the munition works of Great Britain during the war. These works were largely occupied by people who had not previously engaged in manual labour. The most arduous work was done by men and women of education and refinement, who volunteered their services either gratuitously or for compensation unimportant to them. The stimulus of national danger sufficed to produce this anomaly.

The third, and by far the most frequent, method of production is by means of free labour working for wages. The wages system has certain drawbacks, but it is a system for the adoption of which the working masses struggled for centuries. They struggled against compulsory labour for the State, or for the farmers of the State revenues, and against the social restrictions such compulsory labour involved. They desired freedom to move from one place to another and from one employment to another, both denied them under the system of compulsory labour. They desired freedom to earn what they could and to enjoy their earnings.

The real industrial revolution was the emergence of the free labourer after the close of the mediæval struggles. These struggles closed at different periods in different countries. In England they were practically over in the sixteenth century, in France at the end of the eighteenth, in Germany in the beginning of the nineteenth, and in Russia in the middle of the same century. But freedom brought its inconveniences. It soon became apparent that the individual worker, though free, was often at a disadvantage in making a bargain with his employer. He was at a disadvantage when labour was plentiful and he had to take what wages employers offered, irrespective of the value of his labour to his employers. He was at a disadvantage also when fluctuations of trade occurred and threw him out of his customary employment. When labour was scarce, as it was at intervals in the economic history of every country in Western Europe, the labourer had a certain advantage. He could demand higher wages, knowing that employment was certain. The normal condition

of the individual labourer, destitute as he usually was of means to enable him to place a reserve price upon his labour, induced him to endeavour by means of combined action on the part of more or less numerous groups to place this reserved price upon his labour and to refuse to work unless he obtained it. The practice of striking for higher wages was a mere continuation of the previous practice of striking against compulsory labour. Under serfdom peasants frequently revolted, refused to work, or fled from the estates to which they were ascribed. In modern times the combinations of labourers which resulted in these strikes have been resisted by capitalist employers who have sometimes been able to secure the aid of the State in resisting the demands of their workmen. Combinations of labour were from time to time prohibited. It is, however, fair to say that in some countries, and notably in England, combinations of employers were also restricted contemporaneously. Bit by bit, by means of industrial struggles, the legal right of working men to organize themselves into groups for the purpose of securing better conditions of labour and higher wages was recognized in Great Britain, and to a certain extent this right also came to be recognized in other countries. The gradual adoption of universal suffrage greatly facilitated industrial organization, partly through legislative measures and partly through the alteration it involved in the political centre of gravity. These struggles towards improved conditions were, however, accompanied by, and their success was largely due to, contemporaneous increase in production. The most important period in the history of the struggles was undoubtedly the period when combination ceased to be illegal, and that period in each country was characterized by industrial expansion.

It was, for instance, during the period of great briskness in the trade of Great Britain, between 1868 and 1874, that the foundations of the modern Trade Union were laid. Had production at that time not increased by leaps and bounds, there might have been much industrial discontent; but real wages could not have advanced as they did. The material

means to provide for this advance would not have been in existence. In other words, the gain to the workers was due primarily to increased production, and their increased share in the product was due to the demand for labour being in excess of the supply as well as to their trade organization. In other words, had there been no increased production while the population was increasing, there would have been no surplus product in which the workers could have shared. It is very evident that this condition arises whatever may be the character of the industrial organization. Under a system of compulsory service, voluntary service, or wage-payment, the same condition must arise. If there is a relatively small total fund, there is a relatively small share to each person who participates in the fund. The total fund in question is the total product achieved by the co-operation of the whole industrial and agricultural population.

With the growth in political power and in social influence of the workers, there has very naturally arisen an idea that the worker should not be regarded as subject to the fluctuations of the market for his labour. This idea has led to the adoption of schemes of insurance against unemployment, a natural and appropriate complement to insurance against risk of loss by fire and insurance against other contingencies. The sound view is undoubtedly not that fluctuations in employment can in the nature of things be prevented, but that the injurious effects of these fluctuations can be avoided by the creation of adequate reserve funds during periods of prosperity. This is merely applying to labour a principle which has always been recognized as applicable to the conduct of any particular industry or any particular commercial or financial undertaking. In these the primary concern is, or ought to be, the continuity of the business—its continued solvency in spite of the fluctuations which are incident to all kinds of life.

But the aims of labour have, in recent years, gone further. Not only does the worker desire by means of combination and by "collective bargaining" to obtain an increased share

of the product, but the claim has been advanced on the part of the worker to assume the rôle of organizer of labour. That is to say, that instead of the workers being employed by a capitalist or by his agent, he should himself employ the capitalist, or rather that groups of workmen should associate together to obtain capital and to conduct a business. There is, after all, nothing new in this idea. Since the emergence of free labour, there has been nothing to hinder such a development. Many workmen have organized themselves in this manner. Yet experience has shown that the general mass of the workers find such grouping rather unstable. There is a very definite reluctance on the part of working men to entrust their future to amateurs in organization. They want above all to have security for their wages, and they are unwilling to barter security of these for security of employment, which they cannot but realize is a wholly different matter. An offer of a permanent partnership and consequent permanent employment in a business is valueless unless the business is permanent. If a workman is offered the choice between employment in an industry conducted by men like himself and employment in one conducted by experienced managers, he will in general choose the latter, because he recognizes the greater likelihood of permanence in the enterprise.

Unless there were definite ascription of workmen to particular employment and to particular places, involving of course complete absence of freedom of movement, and therefore of freedom of any kind, even the nationalization of industry, still less the local "socialization" of it, would not in the least alter the fundamental condition mentioned above. There would still be variations of product as between one period and another and as between one place and another; there would still be variations in management; and there would still be grounds of dispute between the workmen and those under whose orders they worked, whether these were private employers, persons elected by the workmen from among themselves, or functionaries of the State. Moreover, a State organized on an industrial instead of a political basis

must be destitute of a court of appeal. There is no room for such a court in an industrial State pure and simple. Everyone in such a State is engaged in the industrial struggle, and his interest is inevitably opposed to the interest of every other worker. This has been well illustrated in the recent railway strike in Great Britain. There, the railway signalmen appear on the evidence available at present to have struck, not against a railway company, but against the Government, and through the Government against the rest of the community. There was thus no body which could act as arbitrator or hold the balance in such a dispute.

Instead of resulting in a diminution of industrial struggles, there is every reason to believe that nationalization or "socialization" of industry would alike result in an increase in the number of such struggles and in the greater bitterness of them. The movement of goods necessary to maintain the population would frequently be impeded and the life of the community imperilled by pressure at one strategic point or another.

In the recent strike the workmen desired to utilize their strategic position to obtain a maximum advantage in their own favour; and other groups of workmen might be counted upon to do the like. A serial strike movement is indeed more likely to be effective than a simultaneous strike of all industries. The ineffectiveness of the general strike as an industrial weapon has been proved wherever the general strike has been attempted. Modification of the general strike has invariably begun before the close of the second day, and progressive modification has gradually destroyed the general character of the strike.

The temptation to unscrupulous adventurers and to certain types of financiers to take advantage of the weapon of the industrial strike has already become very great. The connexion between some groups of speculators and the organizers of recent strikes is hardly a matter of doubt. This country is probably entirely free from such formidable

and dangerous conspiracies; but their malign influence is very widespread, and indirectly they may affect us at any moment.

It is very evident that those movements which aim at the aggrandizement of one social group over others—at the aggrandizement of the town proletariat, for example, over the agricultural groups, or of the latter over the first—do not make for the growth of society, but rather for its disintegration and destruction. It is evident, also, that in those countries where the people have a firm grip of the realities of life, and where they are willing if necessary to volunteer social services in cases where these are abandoned by wage-earners who have been rendering them, the strike movement is doomed to failure. The Winnipeg strike, for example, was broken by the spontaneous organization of volunteer workers. This is a sound and perfectly effective means of breaking a strike. If the people who customarily work for wages refuse to work, the necessary work must be done by others who are able, at least for a time, to work without wages. It must be realized that in the absence of obligatory labour there can be no obligatory employment; and that neither obligatory labour nor obligatory employment afford security for the production of the means of life. The experience of history is wholly against the conclusion that either is efficient.

The world has changed during and since the war. If one of the characteristics of the change is a deepened sense of reality and a desire to look the facts of life squarely in the face, and if another is a keener sense of the interests of the community as a whole, the world has changed for the better. If, on the other hand, we allow ourselves to be misled by fantastic illusions and catchwords availing nothing for progress, and if we allow ourselves to fall into the habit of striving exclusively for our individual advantage against the interests of the community, the world has changed for the worse.

It is, perhaps, true that the undisguised ferocity of the Soviet Government of Russia is an incident rather of Russian than of universal communism; yet the disintegrating effect of

the Soviet policy would probably manifest itself wherever communism might be adopted. Ananias and Sapphira may not, perhaps, fairly be regarded as types of communists, but people like them have been numerous enough to render communism as a rule unworkable. The fact that the institution in Russia even of a modified communist system has only been accomplished, in so far as it has been accomplished, by force, is not in its favour. It has shown itself to be, indeed, merely autocracy in other hands. A close examination of the various attempts at the establishment of communistic societies in historical times will, I think, show that arbitrary authority has either been employed to found them or such authority has ere long made its appearance in them, while always there has been a sacrifice of freedom. Indeed, freedom and communism are mutually exclusive.

One of the great benefits of the War is that it has brought such fundamental questions of social development into the field of everyday discussion. They have long been familiar subjects of study among scholars, but the general public has hitherto been practically unacquainted with them. Now they must think of them, and it is to their interest to think of them seriously, and to refuse to be misguided.

The existing order of society has, on the whole, withstood well the tremendous strain of the war. There were many grumbings about the concentration of wealth and of financial power; yet the world has owed much to this very concentration. The War has been conducted by means of an intensified form of concentration of wealth. The Governments have, partly by compulsion, but more largely by voluntary disposition of funds, through loans and otherwise, been able to adjust the daily burdens of the war. The manner in which the people of Great Britain pooled their resources is really one of the marvels of the time. Only a pervasive sense of the common interest of the nation, amplified by a sense of the common interest of civilized mankind, could have caused them to do what they did. The people who did this were the people who, by prudent management

or otherwise, had liquid resources in their hands. It is quite true that the worker is an essential element in society; but, in a great crisis such as the War, he would have been helpless without the instantly available organizing power, experience, and resources of those whom the more extreme among them now regard as social parasites. The middle class may have all the defects attributed to it by Matthew Arnold and by the Marxists, but it has nevertheless its uses. The absence of such a class in Russia has brought about the downfall of the country with the downfall of the dynasty. Had Russia possessed a strong middle class, the country would have been saved, even if the dynasty had fallen.

To our own country the War has brought its problems, but the effects of the War should not be misread. Had there been no war to disturb the economic equilibrium, there is a strong likelihood that ere this Canada would have experienced a financial crisis from interior causes. Relatively to the readily realizable resources of the country, enormous sums had been borrowed, the imports, in consequence of loans, largely exceeded the exports, and expenditure of proceeds of loans was for the most part in permanent works like railways, the growth of whose revenues is necessarily slow. The heavy debt in which these operations involved the country was incurred through a spirit of optimism partly justified by the unquestionable value of the natural resources, but very largely unjustified because of the inevitable slowness with which these could possibly be developed and because of the inevitably fluctuating character of the harvests.

In 1913, the time was clearly approaching when it would be necessary for the country either to face the reality of an imminent crisis and to deal with it intelligently, or to drift into an economic decline. There was before us the example of the United States, and of Australia, and New Zealand. In these countries a spirit of optimism, with exaggerated views of the future, had induced excessive borrowing for railway construction. In 1873 the crisis came for the United States; in 1877 for New Zealand; and for Australia a little later. In the United States the railways nearly all passed

into the hands of receivers, and the foreign investors suffered the loss of a large part of the capital they had invested in the railways; in the other countries, the people had to shoulder the burden. In all there was a period of depression — partly psychological and partly economical — for at least ten years. The same situation threatened this country in 1913. The War postponed the crisis. It is to be hoped that it prevented it. A huge market was at once opened up, alike for the products of agriculture and of industry. Our factories were working day and night and our exports advanced by leaps and bounds. Wages and the cost of materials advanced together in response to the stimulus of demand.

The effect of the sudden cessation of munition requirements was modified by the continuance of demand due to the greatly increased resources of the people, and the diversion of industrial energy from munition making to the requirements of peace times was thus the more easily accomplished. Nevertheless, the strain upon industrial organization has been very great. Had those who have been glibly called "profiteers" not conserved such profits as they were able to secure from their munition making and applied these to renewal of their former or establishment of new enterprises, the country would have experienced a period of unemployment in which there would have been much suffering.

The industrial development of this country, compared with that of the United States and that of Great Britain, is as yet in its infancy. The amount of industrial capital actually accumulated from the surplus profits of industry is comparatively small. Almost all of the industrial enterprises are conducted by means of borrowed capital. Diminution of the earnings of the capital so employed leads at once to the cessation of the stream. An enterprise which possesses large reserves accumulated from previous successful years can endure the strain of a period of depression or a period of declining profits; but an enterprise which is living from hand to mouth, which depends upon credit and upon being financed by banks, cannot endure such a period. If from any cause

its profits decline below a certain point, it must go out of business. If it does go out of business, the number of employers in its particular branch of industry is diminished, and employment is restricted. The disappearance of an employer means to a working man a diminution of the competitive area for his employment.

Whatever interpretations may be indulged, the workman is essentially a partner in industrial enterprise in general and in the particular enterprise in which he is engaged. The economical management of this enterprise and the stability of industrial management in general are alike essential to his own security.

The huge populations of modern States have in a very real sense been brought into existence by the industrial system, and experiments in radical alteration of it are for that very reason fraught with danger. The technique of industry and commerce is inevitably complex, and is probably destined to become more and more complex. Each part of the huge system depends upon other parts. It is a commonplace to say that "the world is one city" and that it is not a matter of indifference to the artizan in Toronto or Montreal that the rice harvest of Japan has been a failure, or to the artizan of Osaka in Japan that the wheat crop of the Argentine has been deficient.

Social isolation has a certain charm; but the way of the world is not the way of Thoreau. Our wants become increasingly varied, and variety of consumption implies variety of production and a wide field from which we may draw our supplies. This in turn involves transport, international finance, co-operation of many disparate communities and interlocking of disparate civilizations. Selfish and isolated action by individuals, by groups or by nations, reacts inevitably upon themselves. Nothing but harm can come to a people whose ideal is the avoidance of work rather than the execution of it. The inevitable end of diminution of working hours beyond a certain point is, either economical decay or obligatory labour.

JAMES MAVOR

THE SONNETS

To W. S. 1616—1919

Your pipe now stopt these threescore lustres gone,
Whose note yet sounds in growth of riper days,
And unbesmeared by sluttish time your stone,
Swept by the love you greeted with your lays,
Where swells the proud full sail of your great verse,
Holding in your eternal lines its way,
Let alien pens having got your use disperse
Their poesy under what muse they may:
These painful feet grope at your jealous heart
That vaunts the marble of your monument,
As fit to dull time's tooth in scope and art,
Yet shares withal the Arch-poet's discontent,
Who sought to ease His heart when He reviewed
His powerful rhyme and saw that it was good.

ii

Thus did I cull from your unfading wreath
Some envied sprays to deck mine own withal,
Guiltless, for I had marked the daisied heath
Undimmed, though houses of gold crowns might fall;
Nay, in my fondness I must needs engraft
Your noble scions on my younger stem,
That haply by my loving handicraft,
I might ennoble it and cherish them.
But even as meadows cropt the greener grow,
Or hedgerows pruned the more, the more do thrive,
The while those shoots thus painfully we mow,
Robbed of their sap, oft fade and scarce revive;
So if my clippings little verdure bring,
Your deathless stock is ever burgeoning.

ALEXANDER MACPHAIL

CRITICISM AND MORALITY

IT IS the function of the literary critic to help the men of his time in that difficult but most necessary task which the development of modern publishing has made urgent, a task which has been dwelt upon by two of our own wisest and best critics—Lord Morley, and Mr. Frederic Harrison—under the title *Choice of Books*. Probably few have accepted this prophetic vocation more whole-heartedly than Carlyle, and few have exercised a more commanding influence in determining the direction of the public taste of an age. The present article aims at estimating the success with which he fulfilled this duty of censor, by considering one typical case of the guidance he gave his contemporaries in fixing the value of literary work. His famous article on Sir Walter Scott casts light upon his subject, upon himself, and upon the canons of criticism by which such judgements should in general be guided. This is a matter still worth our careful study, for, whether we like it or not, the writer of fiction has perhaps the widest and most potent influence over average readers in any period.

Carlyle himself once made an heroic attempt to produce a novel. Needless to say, it was to be of the didactic sort. It was begun during the days of his early married life in Edinburgh, and various entries in his journal tell us of its progress, from the completion of the first chapter—when he said that Heaven only knew what it would turn into but that he had sworn to finish it—to the melancholy record not long afterwards of the burning of the manuscript. The incident was an amusing one, reminding us of the love poems which Hegel addressed to his *fiancée*, and of which Edward Caird remarked that they contain too much psychological analysis of the tender passion to be quite successful as poetic expressions of it. In later life Carlyle's dislike of works of fiction—unless *Wilhelm Meister* may be so called—was intense. His wife has told us that he never opened such books, and Sterling

tried in vain to convince him how much he had missed. George Eliot sent him *Scenes of Clerical Life*, but despaired of his ever getting beyond the title page. One might infer from this that he was like Charles Darwin, incapacitated by other interests from this special form of mental enjoyment. Yet it was Carlyle himself who in *The Diamond Necklace* worked up the musty records of a French lawsuit into as sensational a story as ever proceeded from the pen of Wilkie Collins, and it was he who lit up the old monkish chronicle by Jocelin of Brakelonda until Abbot Hugo and Abbot Samson have become more real to us than Scott's Father Ambrose or Father Eustace.

Whatever else may have explained his neglect of the novel, it was assuredly no want of imaginative faculty. And it is quite plain that in some fields of English fiction he was thoroughly at home. His references, although drawn from a rather limited area, are numerous. As the author of an elaborate article on Scott he must, of course, have read widely in the Waverley novels; but the tone in which he speaks of them might suggest that he would forget the characters with great rapidity. Such was far from being the case. He uses them again and again for purposes of illustration. For example, when he wants to brand the attempt at disguising religious decay under elaborate ritual he reminds us how Jeannie Deans's innkeeper defied anyone to thatch Groby Pool with pancakes.¹ He is thankful for even that dreary book, Harte's *Life of Gustavus*, because it furnished forth materials for the portraiture of Dugald Dalgetty.² The "somniferous Town-Council Harangue" to which James I had to listen at Dumfries was, he presumes, got up by some extinct Dominie Sampson of the neighbourhood.³ The dark swelling vein in Mohammed's brow recalls to him the horse-shoe on the forehead of Redgauntlet.⁴ He compares Naigeon, the apostle of atheism, to Gowkthrapple and Rentowel in *Waverley*, apostles of "a kirk of the other complexion."⁵

¹ *Past and Present*, III, i. ² *Life of Schiller*, Part III. ³ *Historical Sketches*, I, 19.

⁴ *Heroes*, II. ⁵ "Diderot," *Crit. Misc.*, III, 183-4.

But it is to the eighteenth century humorists that Carlyle returns with peculiar zest. The soldiers in *Wallenstein* have for him a rugged sharpness of feature which suggests Smollett's seamen.¹ The questions he would like to ask about Samuel Johnson's boyhood would, he fears, be so many as to carry him through the whole list of Corporal Trim's auxiliary verbs.² Sterne's dead asses,³ Walter Shandy's tutor,⁴ swine-feeding parson Trulliber,⁵ Gil Blas,⁶ Partridge,⁷ Commodore Trunnion,⁸ Uncle Toby,⁹ Ernulphus cursing¹⁰—these are all made to serve as a storehouse of satire upon the foibles of mankind.

But Carlyle shows little sign of acquaintance with the novelists of his own time. He had indeed looked into enough of Balzac and George Sand to record his pity for an age which found there a spiritual guidance.¹¹ He ventures the opinion that if Fenimore Cooper had not written so much he might not have written quite so badly.¹² He had read and even enjoyed *Alton Locke*.¹³ There is an occasional reference, with a note of utter scorn, to Dickens.¹⁴ Thackeray's novels do not seem to be named. The fiction to which our author most objected was clearly that of his contemporaries, whom he adjures either to devote themselves to catering for "children, minors, and semi-fatuous persons of both sexes" or to sweep their work into the dust-cart, and begin dealing with what is true. As they stood they were mere *restaurateurs*, pandering to mankind's silliest mood, and their popularity was the condemnation of their age. In a diverting passage of *Biography* he suggests a search for "the actual stupidest man in London," with a hint that the hacks for the Minerva Press would be most likely to include him. And yet, he adds in a mood of larger charity, "of no given book, not even of a fashionable novel, can you predicate with certainty that its vacuity is

¹ *Life of Schiller*, Part III. ³ "Boswell's Life of Johnson," *Crit. Misc.*, III, 93.

² *Ibid.* ⁴ "Characteristics," *Crit. Misc.*, III.

⁵ "Boswell's Life of Johnson," *Crit. Misc.*, III. ⁶ Carlyle's *Journal*.

⁷ "Diamond Necklace," *Crit. Misc.*, III. ⁸

⁹ *F. R.*, II, 49. ¹⁰ *Historical Sketches*. ¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² "Sir Walter Scott," *Crit. Misc.*, IV, 27.

¹³ *Crit. Misc.*, III, 48-9.

¹⁴ "Some Pickwick, or lowest trash of that nature" (Froude, *Carlyle's Life in London*, I, p. 128.)

absolute, that there are not other vacuities which shall partially replenish themselves therefrom, and esteem it a *plenum*."

His feeling on this point was too deep-seated to be wholly explained as that of a *laudator temporis acti*. Froude makes a great deal of the early influences by which Carlyle was surrounded, and there is no doubt that the upbringing of a boy in a pious Scottish household one hundred years ago would be such as to leave a permanent mark upon character. We know how a Puritan looked upon the novel. Who can fail to detect the remains of that prejudice, once so prevalent among the Presbyterians of Scotland, in the remarks on this subject which are put into the mouth of Professor Gottlieb Sauerteig? We are told that the art of the novelist "partakes more than we suspect of the nature of lying," and regret is expressed that the merits of *Tom Jones*, of *Crusoe*, of *Wilhelm Meister*, were not exhibited in some work of genuine biography, some true record of an actual life. How much finer would a *Reality* be, "were the significance thereof as impressively unfolded, were the genius that could so unfold it once given us by the kind Heavens!"¹

This almost philistine attitude is plainly revealed in the essay on Scott, and it comes out at least as clearly in the phrases of moderate appreciation as in the paragraphs of immoderate contempt. Throughout the article Carlyle's chief sympathetic interest is in Scott as a man, in the honest, healthy-minded laird, full of humour and sagacity, hospitable to his friends and beloved by his pet animals, upright as became the countryman of Knox whose teaching had moulded him though he knew it not, meeting with commercial disaster but fronting it resolutely, and in the end carrying off the burden of his debts on "his strong Samson-like shoulders."

But when at an advanced stage of the paper we reach the question for which we have long been impatient, namely, how Scott is to be placed in the scale of literary values, we are told that "there remains after so much reviewing, good

¹ "Biography," *Crit. Misc.*, III, 52.

and bad, little that it were profitable at present to say." Our critic thinks, indeed, that the Waverley Novels are extraordinarily good of their kind. Among his colleagues who supply the shelves of a circulating library the author might be looked upon as a demi-god. *Guy Mannering* and *The Heart of Midlothian* were far above the common run of such mental confectionery. Indolent, languid men, for whom the great interests and the great problems had no fascination, would find there an almost perfect resource for beguiling the time.¹ Moreover, as a means of making history live, of bringing before us past ages as filled by living men, "not by protocols, state-papers, controversies, and abstractions of men," these tales had a high value. There was a vividness in the depicting of scenery, an imaginative brilliance, a graceful delineation of figures and characters. But, Carlyle adds, it is only the everyday mind that will find itself reflected. The intelligent country gentleman may recognize upon that canvas intelligent country gentlemen like himself, with the opinions, emotions, principles, doubts, beliefs, which belong to that class. As commonplace readers are the immense majority, Scott did well for himself in writing to their taste. From the point of view of a pecuniary enterprise both the plan and its execution were beyond all praise. We had before us an author who divined with unerring accuracy what the temper of a poor, paralytic, sceptical age would lead men to pay money for, and who produced that printed commodity at a speed and on a scale little short of miraculous. What then were those other qualities, less marketable but more to be revered, which our critic missed in Scott, and without which he refused to call any writer eminent? What was that "other kind of spirit which dwells and struggles in the inward parts of great men?"

¹ Cf. Coleridge, *The Friend*, I, i, "For as hath been decided, to fill up pleasantly the brief intervals of fashionable pleasure, and above all to charm away the dusky gnome of ennui, is the chief and appropriate business of the poet and—the novelist." Carlyle's judgement in this respect upon Scott is scarcely more severe than J. S. Mill's. Writing of Alfred de Vigny's historical novel *Cinq Mars*, Mill said, "Sir Walter Scott, having no object but to please, would not have told the story of Richelieu and Cinq Mars without greatly softening the colouring, and the picture would have been more agreeable than M. de Vigny's, but it would not have been so true to the age." (*Dissertations*.)

Carlyle tells us quite definitely that Scott had no moral message, no realization of what earnest people in that distracted period were seeking for, no spiritual food for anyone who wanted a higher service than to be amused. "Not profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for edification, for building up or elevating in any shape." Lovers of Scott have commonly found this criticism querulous and unfair. Some have said that Carlyle, like Balaam, came to curse but *malgré lui* was obliged to bless; that the features he acknowledged are just those by which the highest art in fiction is signalized, and that the qualities he desiderated are not proper to fiction at all. It is simple to dismiss the whole essay with the comment that the Waverley Novels were not issued as either homiletic or philosophical literature, that one might equally blame *Paradise Lost* as deficient in logic or *The Pilgrim's Progress* for its absence of wit, and that a writer must be judged by his success or failure in the task he has set himself, not by his having declined some other task which his critic thinks higher or more urgent. But this does not exhaust the matter. Two questions may fitly be asked about Carlyle's criticism: (a) what were the motives which led him to offer it? and (b) to what extent did he touch upon a real weakness in the writer whom he criticised? For the discussion of Scott was typical of his method in literary estimates.

It may be granted at once that prejudice played its part. Scott was an Episcopalian in religion, and while a mere Englishman like John Sterling—who knew no better—might escape Carlyle's resentment for this offence, it was rather heinous in a Scotsman, especially to one who could never look at a shovel hat without feeling irritated.¹ Moreover, it carried with it in the author of *Old Mortality* a disposition to depict Scotland's heroes as well-meaning fanatics, and to poke fun at those conscientious scruples about doctrine which had been the tokens of her seriousness and her piety. A Jacobite, an aristocrat, drawing Graham of Claverhouse as a

¹ Froude, *Carlyle's Early Life*, II, 4.

chivalrous gentleman, and caricaturing the martyrs of the Covenant as Habbakuk Mucklewraths, could scarcely hope for unbiased appreciation of his "art" from the author of *Portraits of John Knox*. It was Scott's boast that in conversation with George IV about the Forty Five "he always said 'the Pretender,' and I always said 'Prince Charles'." Such courtesies were not quite after his reviewer's mind, nor was the editor of *Cromwell's Letters* likely to deal sympathetically with *Woodstock*. In truth it would be difficult to name a critic of literature who was less capable than Carlyle of putting from him his own disagreement with a writer's point of view, and estimating by literary canons alone. Nor could one find any whose judgements on the men of his own time were more vitiated by the same prejudice. A volume of melancholy interest might be constructed with the title *Carlyle on his Contemporaries*. Swinburne's savage epigram avenged the memory of Charles Lamb, but there are many other cases not less heinous. Newman, we learn, had not the brains of a moderate sized rabbit. Gladstone was "on the whole one of the contemptiblest men" that our critic ever looked on. Macaulay's *History* was wholly worthless,¹ and the *Autobiography* of John Stuart Mill was "a mournful psychological curiosity, but in no other point of view could it interest anybody."² One might illustrate the same feature from articles upon authors long gone. It is significant that Scott's *Abbot* is chosen for special contempt, a view which will hardly appeal to the innumerable readers whom that romance has delighted, but which should cause no astonishment to those who remember how the unfortunate Scottish queen is there set forth, and who know Carlyle's method as a critic. We may compare the curious fact that in his *Life of Schiller* there is such grudging appreciation for the exquisite pathos of the Fotheringay scenes in *Maria Stuart* of which Macaulay so truly said that they were equal to anything produced in Europe since Shakespeare.³

¹ Carlyle's *Reminiscences*.

² Froude, *Carlyle's Life in London*, xxxiii.

³ Trevelyan, *Macaulay's Life and Letters*, p. 487.

Nietzsche has coined the term "moral idiosyncratic" to denote one in whose estimate the moral values so transcend all others as to be practically incommensurable with them, and even to put every other value out of sight. The description fits Carlyle precisely. Indeed, he sometimes goes further, and implies that if moral worth is not present no other worth can be there at all. If a book did not embody, or at least prove itself harmonious with, his own view on the deep issues of life, he could scarcely allow that it had intellectual merit. If a man was what Carlyle considered a rogue he also judged him to be intellectually despicable. The plainest instance of this is his extraordinary scorn for Bacon; apparently he thought that the *Novum Organum* was sufficiently discounted because its author in his capacity of chancellor had been proved corrupt. "A hungry Jew of Whitechapel, selling Judgement for a bit of money; they twitch the purple cloak off him, and trappings off him, and say with nostrils dilated in disgust: Go! He goes, one of the sorrowfullest of all mortals, to beg bread in Gray's Inn, to augment the sciences, if from the like of him the sciences have any augment to expect."¹ Where the estimate of a work on logic is thus infected with moral considerations, what may be looked for in the criticism of novelists?

But this merely suggests to us that Carlyle in speaking of Scott had the will to disparage, and that we should scrutinize what he has said with more than the usual caution. Perhaps amid the numerous enthusiastic panegyrics it may turn out of advantage to truth that we should have the comments of one who made it his business to search for flaws. And probably even the most devoted admirer of the Waverley Novels must feel that somehow and in some sense Carlyle's shafts have struck home.

For the question is not as to where Scott should be placed relatively to other novelists, or whether the writer of novels should aim to be a moral teacher, or whether the "novel with a purpose" is to be preferred to the novel that has no purpose.

¹ *Historical Sketches.*

Probably Edward Caird made the best comment on the view that poetry is a criticism of life when he said that it is so only in the sense in which the character of a good man is a criticism upon the character of a bad. No doubt the author of fiction has missed his calling if he uses his hero or heroine as a lay figure through whom he may speak his own mind on the "problems" of the age. But among the artists who depict life with realistic success there remains a contrast between him who chooses to set forth the superficial aspects and him who can probe the depths, between him who is absorbed in the small things and him who seizes on the great things. The contrast is less striking in a time of social and spiritual tranquility; but becomes acute when the social foundations are heaving and the spiritual anchors are loosening. It meets us everywhere in the history of literature. In a certain sense the shallow writer may be the more vivid, the more lifelike, the more interesting. Perhaps Bulwer Lytton was a better craftsman in the novelist's art than Charles Kingsley, but the mind that gave us *Alton Locke* and *Yeast* was far ampler than the mind which produced *Ernest Maltravers* and *Pelham*. Few have gone into ecstasies over George Eliot as Macaulay and Whately did over Jane Austen, but the depths of *Felix Holt* and *Middlemarch* could never have been reached by the authoress of *Pride and Prejudice*. Disraeli had not a tithe of Anthony Trollope's gift for making characters distinctive and individual, yet *Sybil* is the work of a man who thought strenuously, and even the best of Trollope—even *The Warden* or *Doctor Thorne*—is that of a man who thought superficially.

It is when tried by such a test that the weakness of Scott becomes apparent. When Carlyle spoke of that "other spirit which strives and struggles in the inward parts of great men" we know what he meant. He could not easily apply the word "great" to a man who had lived through so momentous a time, and to whom that time had communicated so little. For, try as he may to be a "pure artist," a writer can no more conceal his general outlook upon the world when he produces a novel than when he produces a sermon. It

reveals itself in the sort of situation which he thinks it worth while to place on the canvas, and to which he thinks it reasonable to bid his public attend. It becomes obvious in his perspective, in the type of character he makes central, in the forces he relegates to the background, in the very tropes of his rhetoric and still more in the turn of his unstudied phrases. The French Revolution, with all that it had meant and was so plainly yet to mean for the prospects of European society, the seething tumults of English life which were making old formulas antiquated and old restraints ineffective, the ambiguous and very menacing future to which the thoughtful were looking forward with mingled hope and fear, all this was to Scott as if it had never been. For had not the arch-disturber been safely shut up in St. Helena? Had not Providence by the lips of Lord Eldon bidden us return to the wisdom of our ancestors? Had not Lord Liverpool decided for "the stern part of duty" against insurgent workmen, and had not Lord Castlereagh and Lord Sidmouth secured us against demagogues by the Six Acts? What was to prevent England from returning to the pleasant, decorous paths of the eighteenth century? Such insight was sufficient for the circle of Mrs. Rawdon Crawley in *Vanity Fair*, but something deeper might have been expected in Scott.

In truth it was the spirit of the eighteenth century that lived in him, with its social pleasantness, its unchallenged gradation of ranks and privileges, its contempt of "enthusiasm." The sort of person he loved to depict was one in whom the outside was primary, and the inside distinctly subordinate. Himself a middle class man, he seems to have gazed with fascinated eye upon the ways and doings of "persons of quality," in whom his interest too often resembled that of a prosperous milliner in the ladies of fashion whom she adorns for a ball or a rout, and whose mutual relations she is permitted to study from afar. The acquiring of enough cash to bring his own establishment into colourable likeness to that of a viscount or an earl, was the poor ambition of his first years, more important to him, alas, than his literary repute.

And he could seldom write without dwelling again and again upon the details of the high life that he so much envied—how men of birth and condition comport themselves towards their inferiors, how the heir of an historic but decayed estate shrivels up by his very look the presumption of a self-made attorney, what intricacies of etiquette have to be threaded on the hunting field, what distinctions are prescribed by the code of honour defining what class of men may with propriety challenge another to a duel—these and the like were objects of thought that obsessed him. No doubt he presented them in a style very true to life, but many of them were not worth presenting at all, and of others we may be thankful that the life to which they were true is very foreign to our present interests. With equal fidelity to fact, how different is the atmosphere in which the same social customs confront us in Thackeray, how much stronger the grasp upon realities, how much more genuine the feeling, and how much more prophetic the vision!

This, I think, is what Carlyle had in mind when he reproached Scott with fashioning his characters not from the heart outwards but from the skin inwards. The illustration he gives of this, when he compares Mignon with Fenella, is not perhaps very convincing; it is one of the many occasions when we must smile at the Goethe-worship. But compare the treatment of an almost identical life tragedy in *The Heart of Midlothian* and in *Adam Bede*. Place the picture of Geordie Robertson and Effie Deans side by side with that of Arthur Donnithorne and Hetty Sorrel. How different is the depth of the analysis! How different the psychological penetration! Each perhaps gives what the author intended, but the thing aimed at was far from the same, and the object of the one was far more worth an artist's while than the object of the other. The portrayal of Scott gives us, relatively speaking, only the externals, the scene as viewed by conventional respectability, the sort of comment on a village scandal which was to be expected from "intelligent country gentlemen." Who that has read George Eliot's masterpiece can forget how much more he saw there, how he seemed to look

into the inmost recesses of two souls, how the springs of character were exposed like nerves under a scalpel?

Two other examples seem worth looking at, trivial features to dwell upon in a novelist's work, yet very significant of the manner of man he was. Hunting scenes and duelling scenes are abundant throughout the *Waverley Novels*. That they are presented with great fidelity to the social habits which formed their setting is not in dispute. But the standpoint from which Scott regarded them is very obvious, and it is not that of the most enlightened men even a hundred years ago. It was that of the "unworking aristocracy" which has been branded forever in *Past and Present*, of an order whose race was visibly near to being run in the generation that preceded the Reform Bill. The two privileges of hunting a stag until it drops with terror and exhaustion to be torn in pieces by dogs or thrust through the heart with a knife by the most distinguished lady present, and of shooting a fellow-man because he has offended one's "honour" by some disparaging remark, were then being guarded by the English upper class as the very *palladia* of its gentility, as the twin barriers by which the insolence of trade was to be for ever reminded of its limitations. The present writer must confess that he passes with all speed over the chapters in *Waverley* and *Lammermoor* where callousness to the sufferings of a stag is so integral a part of "good old English sportsmanship," where it is made so obvious that female sensitiveness towards animal pain belongs to the lower ranks, that a relish equal to that of the heroines of Sophocles for the sight of blood is part of the education in calm repose that marks the caste of Vere de Vere. Most readers of the present time will probably find something disagreeable even in the details so long drawn out in *The Pirate* of the lingering death of a harpooned whale. And in the many accounts we have of "affairs of honour" there is never a suggestion of the point of view which is now a moral commonplace, and which Bentham had placed in such direct terms before the Duke of Wellington. Imagine Scott either writing or sympathizing with that letter on the duel with Lord Winchelsea! He would have been much

more disposed to speak of it in the language of the warlike company of St. Ronan's Well.

Some of us are not now ashamed to say that we do not like such passages in the novels, and that we do not read them with zest. Did Scott himself like them? For instance, is it not one of the most amiable features in Lockhart's picture of him that he surrounded himself with animal pets? We seem forced to conclude—and it is a conclusion very fatal to the repute of a man whose admirers call him "great"—that his taste for such things in "smart" life was artificial, affected, one of the qualities that he felt called on to assume if he was to be numbered, not with mere literary men who, according to Major Pendennis, were about that time "damnablely disreputable," but with the genuine Scottish lairds who had to drink themselves under the table if the landed tradition was to be sustained. Otherwise might he not have been suspected of evangelicalism, of benevolence, of effeminacy, of the hundred and one maudlin sensibilities which were making people, especially in the ranks of Dissent, forget Lord Chesterfield and talk of Elizabeth Fry?

It was this snobbish aspiration towards a class in which he was not born, but to which birth was the only recognized portal, and this docile copying of sentiments upon which he should have been a candid critic, that made Scott the sort of person whom Carlyle could least endure. The "gigman" was constantly breaking through. Our Chelsea prophet simply could not understand how any real man could find nothing better to do during the first twenty-five years after the French Revolution than paint the manners of an obsolescent feudalism. Probably, since all novelists have some sort of purpose whether they know it or not, Scott intended by the winsomeness with which he presented the old civilization to arrest in some measure the rising tide of democracy. When those two champions of Toryism, Messrs. Taper and Tadpole, sat down after the Reform Act to concoct an election cry, one of them suggested that "something might be made of the king's prerogative." "Not much," sighed the other; "it's a raw time yet for prerogative." It was a raw

time, and destined to become more so, for even an imaginative reinstatement of Jacobite aristocracy, and with all his genius Scott could not further it. One cannot help feeling towards him as one might towards some literary lion at the contemporary court of Louis *le Desiré*, who had neither a backward insight into the upheaval that was past nor a forward vision of what was yet to come, but who devoted his talents to bringing back the features of life under the ancient regime, and to bid a populace which wanted bread console itself with the glorious memories of Louis XIV.

Probably this way of looking at Scott seemed more in place when Carlyle wrote his article than it afterwards became. Happier times bring leisure for more dispassionate indulgence of the reproductive imagination. We can read *Waverley* with an interest and a delight that must have been mixed with other feelings in Jeremy Bentham or James Mill. And if Scott's admirers had not claimed for him a position in literature of such surpassing eminence, if they had not insisted—to use Emerson's phrase—that he was “no mere contemporary but an eternal man”—if they had been content to view his genius as the same in kind with that of Jane Austen or Anthony Trollope, though, of course, far higher in degree than either, it would be superfluous to insist upon these limits to his grasp and amplitude. There is indeed much reason to call him, as Pitt was called in statesmanship, the sublime of mediocrity. But if Carlyle did him less than justice, it was because others had done him so much more, and we may well recognize with him that before even a novelist is admitted to the very first circle of literature he must do something else than reflect and revive and recombine the elements of bygone ages as they actually were. He must have some voice of leading for the men of his day and of all days, some note of sincerity like that of Burns which makes deep answer unto deep, some insight into the everlasting things. It was a canon of criticism which the Edinburgh Reviewers needed to learn, and which the reviewers of our own time still need to ponder.

HERBERT L. STEWART

THE OPEN AIR

God of the Open Air, I cry to thee,
Let me no longer walk in alien ways,
Give me great sanctuary for thy praise,
Let me be free.

Unfold thy spaces broad, thy windswept sky;
Fain would I smell the starry-scented rain,
Join hands with thee and earth on thy domain,
And once more lie

Beneath the naked moon, the joy-strewn stars,
To dream alone my dreams where none may follow,
Apart from tawdry shams, tinsel and hollow,
From prison bars.

There, through the balsam magic sunsets wane
And Nature throbs with all life's ecstasy
While birds in choir thrill forth love's symphony;
Ah! once again,

God of the Open Air, I hear thy call.
Here are dull copper moons and close-shut days,
Here Mammon's temples rise from out the haze
Of mists that pall;

Here lesser loves bind fast with chains of fear
The ever clanking feet that walk to death,
Here is no room for life, no time for breath,
Men are too near.

Still dost thou call, thy gifts are for the taking,
The ether of the wild is potent wine
Brewed by great mother earth, fair love of thine,
All sadness slaking;

Brewed from the sun-kissed rocks of elder time,
Straight health-primed pines, and lakes of midnight blue,
From amber sunshine and from tender dew,
Nectar sublime.

God of the Open Air, the untrammelled sky,
 Bring back to me that silence of the Soul
 That dwells in lonely places, and cajole
 Me, ere I die.

To cheat Fate for a spell, however brief,
 Let me to thy warm Lethæan waters creep,
 Cleansing world-weariness, and so . . . to sleep.

 Away with grief

And that great shaggy monster, boredom dread,
 That ever lurks the background of our bliss;
 Let thy glad waves take in one royal kiss

 All tears we shed,

And toss them to the darkest edge of night,
 Till new thoughts flood the brain in sparkling springs
 Divinely restless, like young quivering things

 That seek the light.

God of the Open Air, the sinewed North,
 Thy followers have dwellers been in dreams,
 And where the bloodshot eye of danger gleams

 Stride boldly forth

To brave the wailing winds, the uncharted snow,
 The crash of thunderous storms, the forest fire;
 Where man's hot blood keeps pace with man's desire,

 Onward they go.

The strong give battle and the weak must fall
 When men would match their cunning 'gainst the wild,
 The eternal fight of the unreconciled.

 Hark! to the call

From white metallic stars, o'er snow-capped heights,
 And instinct answers madly with the cry:
 "God, let me live . . . so that I glad may die
 'Neath Northern Lights."

MARIAN OSBORNE

EBEN PICKEN

E BEN PICKEN is dead, and with the closing of his little shop on Beaver Hall Hill there will go from many in Montreal the sense of pilgrimage in buying books. The uptown shops with their easy light and ordered shelves will furnish our libraries; we shall come away from them with our fingers clean; but in our hearts will be no quiet of a shrine entered, no refrain of "Dust o' books I love you so" beating in our thoughts.

"That place with the dirty windows full of old papers?" one woman asked when shown where Eben Picken sold books for forty years and hung no sign. "It does not look respectable." Neither has it these last years. When his one assistant died Mr. Picken would allow no other to touch that litter of volumes, and the city traffic of many summers has blown in its dirt unhindered from the street. The shop is very small, only about fourteen feet wide, the wall lined from floor to ceiling with shelves. A broad counter, running half the length of the room was lost beneath a depthless pile of books and prints, and an old stove and chimney divided the public from the Bookseller's special den into which only the most favoured or courageous dared enter. There at the back were the oldest books, brown with age and crumbling plaster, chaotic beyond even their owner's knowledge; and there he would sit at his desk, in dust and draughts till a click of the door announced a customer, when he emerged to stand, hands at his back, behind his stall, waiting for the incomer to speak.

A holy hermit never graced his cell with greater dignity than did this tall, grey figure, grey-eyed and grey-haired, which stood so fastidiously erect and spare against the books. The high domed head was more akin to one in an old engraving on the shelf than to any that daily passed the door. How

Lamb had loved the recluse, the formal graveness of his speech, the kindness that followed slowly and graciously when called, the knowledge of the world brought to a cloistered life through books! How he would have approved his chilly manner when asked if he kept stamps, or delighted in his answer to a stranger, who finding she had not the money to pay for a book hesitated to take it. "Supposing I never come back, Mr. Picken?" "Madam, that would be worse for you than for me!" The muddle of books had been Elia's delight; "who would have them a whit less soiled?" "Books which are no books" had no place on those shelves, and the spirits of dead authors might have whispered many more detached thoughts from old bindings and engraved portraits; a very revel of talk must have sounded in those hours of night when the souls of books and pictures find their tongues.

No alien from books ever entered that haunt who did not feel himself an intruder, no lover of them ever came from it unenriched. Intimacy once gained purchase was a thing apart, and a reader might spend unstinted hours among the spoils, lured on, if fortune were kind, by Eben Picken himself. He always had some old engraving, but lately in Italy, some living writer, often of Montreal, that his praise might help, and to a few he showed his treasures like the old little manual on Wife Beating that had come from a poet's use. Rarely did a visitor leave with only the book for which he went; "Dreamthorpe," Tolstoy's "Twenty-three Tales," "Under a Foolscap" are in the library of almost everyone who frequented Mr. Picken's shop.

He loved beautiful books. Before the war they were sure to be on his counter, especially at Christmas, old friends in the new garb of Rackham, Dulac, or Pogany, travel and art, the loveliest of children's tales, a vellum bound poem from the Kelmscott Press, the Mosher bibelots. Only the season's best sellers were absent, and his scorn of journalism masking in books' clothing found expression when "My Year of the Great War" came tumbling back on him after the

Christmas sale. It was his first and last attempt to cater to popular taste.

Into this quiet life, bound by strong threads to the publishing houses of England, and open to Europe through his search for rare prints and engravings, the war broke as an unconquerable disaster. He could see no good nor benefit from it. It was a blight on writers' souls. The hatreds and passions of the easily swayed citizen were abhorrent to him and when the world grew wild with hope over the Russian Revolution he shook his head in doubt. Russia was to him the insoluble enigma, fear of whom helped make Germany a menace to the world.

Of Mr. Picken's personal life and character those nearer to him must speak: I only knew him in his shop. He was perfectly aware that he was a curiosity, and the summer invasion of American tourists bored him; it was difficult to make him part with his books to a person he disliked. But to those with whom he found sympathy he held open door, and there was special pleasure for him when a man in service blue or khaki turned to his stall for refreshment from the weariness of war. No Puritan ever gave a compliment with more austere delicacy, no man ever made a gift more graciously. Many parcels went to France, gay with cards and pictures from his wealth of coloured scraps.

Latterly he was lonely and often ill. The death of his brother, the grief of war among those he knew, his own anxiety left his last years sad. He would have given up his shop had not his friends persuaded him to remain; maybe he also felt that he would miss the visits and correspondence that came to him through his one pursuit. Death was kind and saved him from retiring. He spent his last day among his books, and Beaver Hall Hill, the home of by-gone churches, lost its last witness to the world of hermit thought.

EILEEN B. THOMPSON

MY FOREST

Dear forest of my dreams, I tread
Your aisles so dim and fair,
And feel your benediction shed
To shrive my heart from care;
The fragrance of your silences
Enfolds me like a prayer.

Your joy of morning garnered long,
The calm content of eaves,
And love of mothering breasts of song
Which nested 'neath your leaves,
Are with me all adown the ways
Which flickering sun-light weaves.

The cleansing and the darkness brief
When Summer thunders rolled,
The Spring-tide's hope of opening leaf
And Autumn's pain-touched gold—
A symphony of joy and grief
Your solitudes enfold.

The clamour of my futile ways
Your centuried calm debars;
You hold the strength of steadfast days
Which clothe with growth your scars,
And patience of the leafless nights
You watched with God and stars.

I wonder if, when God shall make
The earth again anew
And to a world our hearts will wake
Fairer than dreams and true,
The things we loved may come again
And God will give me you.

EMILY MACNAB

PRESBYTERY AND EPISCOPATE

WE have had of late not a few evidences of a desire for closer fellowship between the two historic branches of the Protestant Church in Canada—the Anglican and the Presbyterian. The history of these two communions would seem to warrant the opinion that this is an entirely natural movement. They are sprung from, and conserve the traditions of, the two national churches of Britain. It is true that in Canada the Presbyterian Church is a synthesis of various Presbyterian bodies, but it is equally true that they were all Presbyterian, accepting the same doctrinal standards and general polity, and having their roots in the one national church. Their differences were an evidence of the national characteristic of individual independence rather than of any radical divergence of doctrine or polity. In a somewhat similar manner the Church of England in Canada embraces a variety of types, sometimes called parties, though they have been fortunate enough to escape division. Behind each body is a great stream of continuous and united history, expressive of the religious thought and feeling of their respective nations. They began about the same time in similar protests against the Roman Church. If it is claimed that the Church of England is a continuation of the pre-reformation Church in that nation, it may be claimed with equal fairness, as Professor Storey has shown, that the same is true of the Church of Scotland. The differences have been largely incident to the differences of these two peoples and the circumstances of their histories.

When we recall the similarity of the histories of these two communions, each beginning in the same Reformation movement, each continuing through the succeeding centuries as the official church of their respective nations, each reproducing itself in this country and conserving its historic traditions, it is natural that we should find them to have much in

common to-day. They have perhaps escaped, as much as any, the sectarian spirit. They have, beyond other Protestant communions, a wealth of church tradition and a feeling for history, which have given them a church sense such as could not be expected in communions whose history is neither so long nor so intimately connected with the life of a nation.

For long these two churches considered themselves mutually exclusive in principle. The controversy between Prelacy and Presbytery is one of the long chapters in Church history in Britain which we should all like to forget. Scotland resisted the attempt to establish prelacy in her midst with all the fury of her aroused and terrible wrath. Having succeeded, she set forth with a furious zeal to impress Presbytery upon the rest of the United Kingdom. We have happily long since passed the days when such controversies are possible. More than a century ago Principal Hill, of St. Andrew's, spoke of civilization in Britain as having arrived at the point where such fierce intolerance was a thing of the past. He took up the position, generally accepted by the more catholic-spirited Presbyterians since that time, that while Presbytery can show as good a foundation in the earliest church as Episcopacy, it is unwarranted in claiming that it is a form of polity devised by the holy apostles as eternally binding upon the Church. Since that time the more liberal Presbyterian churchmen have taken a view with respect to their polity very similar to that taken by Hooker two centuries before with respect to Episcopacy, that it can show a very respectable antiquity and is admirably suited to the needs of their church. Not a few Presbyterians have acknowledged with respect to England what Hooker acknowledged with respect to Geneva, that while they cling to their own polity as suited to their needs, another form of polity is better suited to others situated differently and with different traditions.

The question has been raised as to whether or not in this new country, where the local traditions of these two communions are not so accentuated as in the old land, where

they have grown up side by side in every community (in Britain generally speaking they have been separated by "the Border"), and have much the same history and face the same tasks, it might not be possible, in the general movement towards the reunion of Christians, to have these two communions brought into a closer fellowship.

There are, no doubt, many considerations which suggest the wisdom of such a course and likewise many obstacles in the way. It is not my purpose to enumerate such. I wish rather to set forth one point where the difficulty would seem to be more apparent than real. It is the thought of fitting a bishop into the Presbyterian order. There are, no doubt, many sides to this question. The point I wish to call attention to is that from a consideration of the earliest forms of Presbyterianism as represented by Calvin and Knox, there seems to be no incompatibility between the Episcopate and Presbyterian polity. No doubt from the time of the "Second Book of Discipline" onwards there has been a dead set against anything like a bishop in the Presbyterian Church; and no doubt also, Anglicans will have some sympathy for Presbyterians in this when they recall Scotland's experience of Protestant bishops. The "Tulchan bishops" were foisted on them merely as a means to turn the rich revenues of the establishment into the hands of a greedy and unprincipled nobility. The Scottish Church has never been able to forget that unfortunate experience. They remember that episcopacy in their case was a means of despoiling their Church and thwarting the good work of the Reformers. But be this as it may, there seems to be nothing opposed to the institution of the episcopate in the thought of either Calvin or Knox. On the contrary, it is evident from their records that they regarded the institution with very great respect, and especially in the case of Calvin, with veneration.

Calvin, like the other reformers, lived in protest against the evident abuses of the old church system. He sought for the Church such a life and faith as he found in the New Testament and early Church. Like Knox, he was convinced

that the fabric of the Roman Church was so identified with the corruptions against which he protested that it must be repudiated and overthrown. It was of a piece with the corrupt type of Christianity which it bodied forth. Accordingly he did not attempt to reform an old Church, but set himself rather to the more difficult task of forming a new Church. To this end he learned very early what so many free churchmen of our day apparently never learn, that, in order to prosper, a Church must be organized and maintain a discipline. The experience of the Reformers before the Reformation had shown the futility of a unorganized and undisciplined Church.

When Calvin repudiated the Roman system he had no thought of repudiating every institution in it. His standards were the Church of the New Testament and the Church of the Fathers. In his appeal to these standards he avoided those literalistic views of inspiration which bound so many of his successors and at the same time gave a deference to the Fathers which seems so generally to have gone out of fashion among his latest followers. No one could find fault with Calvin's knowledge of or respect for patristics. At any point before the eighth century he found himself in an atmosphere which he could respect as Christian.

As for the office of bishop, he found traces of it in the New Testament and the thing itself in all the Fathers. On the text of Titus 1, 5, "for this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders (presbyters) in every city as I had appointed thee," he says, "we may learn from that text there was then not such an equality among ministers of the church but that one person presided in authority and council above the rest." This is a clear repudiation of the doctrine of "the parity of ministers." After quoting from Jerome respecting the orders of the early Church he says, "All, therefore, to whom the office of teaching was committed, they called presbyters, and in each city these presbyters selected one of their number to whom they gave the special title of bishop, lest, as usually happens, from equality dissension should arise." The wisdom

of this last clause is perhaps sufficiently illustrated by three centuries of Presbyterian history.

Calvin's dislike of the office was rather his dislike of the bishops of the Roman Church. They seemed to him worldly, lazy, unworthy, and they did not preach as the laws of the primitive Church demanded. But even here there are exceptions, for there is a letter of his to an old friend on the occasion of his elevation to the office of a bishop in the Roman Church in which he says, "Episcopacy has proceeded from God and was instituted by God." Farther on he says, "In esteeming the episcopal office we must not regard the people's judgment but God's only, by whose authority it is constituted." He ends by advising his friend "either to do the duty of a bishop or else to resign the bishop's seat." Even the hierarchy itself, though the name is distasteful to him, is condemned in his eyes only by the abuses of it by unworthy men. This he expressed in his deliverance to the Imperial Diet at Spires on the "Necessity of Reforming the Church." "Let them show us," he says, "a hierarchy in which the bishops are distinguished, but not for refusing to be subject to Christ, in which they depend upon Him as their head, and act solely with reference to Him, in which they cultivate brotherly fellowship with each other, bound together by no other ties than the truth; then indeed I will confess that there is no anathema too strong for those who do not regard them with reverence and yield them the fullest obedience."

Yet it is the fact, all this to the contrary notwithstanding, that Calvin gave no place to the office of bishop in the Genevan Church. For this many reasons may be given, such as the democratic temper of Geneva, being the first of the modern republics; his slight attachment to such conceptions as apostolic succession and grace communicated by ordination; the difficulties of ordination in a Church that recognized no antecedent for centuries back; but no doubt the chief of them is that in Geneva Calvin was in reality, if not in name, principal of the divinity college, bishop of the diocese and president of the republic all in one. He did not need the office of

bishop because he was the real ruler, civil as well as ecclesiastical, of that community. It is doubtful if in the modern world, since the Pope has been shorn of his temporal power, any one has had more complete authority over a people than had Calvin in Geneva. So long as he lived the people did not want for ruling, nor the Church for a bishop. But as Hooker acknowledged, it was no doubt the sort of rule and discipline Geneva needed in those days, and perhaps the sort, with some modifications, which some sections of our modern free churches would not be much the worse for having, if they would only stand it.

Yet Calvin was cast in too large a mould to be a mere doctrinaire ecclesiastic insisting upon the form of polity which he devised for Geneva as binding upon all branches of the Church. In a long letter to the Duke of Somerset, Protector of England during the minority of Edward IV, he freely offers advice on many points in the English Church, but he does not breathe a word against episcopacy. He earnestly advises that both bishops and priests should be sworn to conform their doctrine to the Thirty Nine Articles. In the same letter he says, "I hear there are two sorts of seditious persons who have elevated their heads against the King and State of the Kingdom; the first, a kind of heady and humorous people, who, under the pretence of the gospel, would bring in confusion and disorder everywhere; the others are hardened in their unchristian superstitions; and those in authority should restrain both." It would seem that this first class consisted of those who afterwards claimed the support of Geneva and vexed the judicious soul of Hooker. These Calvin said should have been restrained, for he shared none of their dislike of episcopacy. In his answer to Cartwright's representation of archbishops and bishops, Calvin's attitude toward the episcopate in England is put beyond question. "I had always a great reverence," he says, "for the bishops of your Church, to whom I give inward reverence as well as outward respect and would gladly have served them in settling in the English Church." From which it is perhaps a fair inference, that

while some Presbyterians, from the days of Melville onward, have girded at the very name of a bishop, Calvin, the father of them all, would have felt at home in such an episcopal order as they had in the England of his day, always provided, no doubt, he had been archbishop.

If our first Presbyterian ancestor was John Calvin, for I do not care to trace our descent, as some have done, to Abraham or even to St. Paul, then the next in the line of succession was John Knox, his disciple and friend. Even more than Calvin he was essentially a practical minister unfettered by academic theories of polity. He was, perhaps, less influenced than any of the Reformers by the humane charm of the new learning. He hated Rome with a furious hatred and was something of an iconoclast, as well he might be when we consider the bitter fruit that tree had borne in his native land. The ruling passion of his life was to establish in Scotland that purer and simpler type of Christianity with which the Reformers in other nations had identified themselves. To this end he bent all his great energies, using what seemed to him the best means at hand. They were not always mild and gentle means, but on the whole they were such as seemed necessary in these days.

Like Calvin he had learned the lesson that if a Church is to maintain itself it must have a discipline, and that to this end ministers and elders as well as people must be under constituted authority. Now this is the very thing that the Episcopate aims at; and the question arises why did he not set it up as an institution of the Reformed Church in Scotland? The answer is that he did; the superintendent which he set up in the church was merely the bishop with the name changed and the theory somewhat modified. Knox changed many names of institutions, the substance of which he appropriated. The abuses of the Roman Church seemed to him to have defiled the very names. Accordingly he substituted minister for priest, admission for ordination, congregation for church and superintendent for bishop. Of course the theories of these offices were considerably modified. In the case of the

Superintendent it is quite true that Knox set little store by the episcopal theory of succession and special grace. With respect to succession it is not surprising, seeing that they were coming out of a church utterly corrupt in his eyes. How could he be expected to wish to maintain a succession that lay through such a church? Between Knox and the Reformers on the one hand, and the pure early Church on the other, there stretched at least eight centuries of life with which they did not care to claim any relation. Thinking thus, it was natural that Knox should have scorned a formal succession and instead claimed a succession of doctrine and spirit from the early Church. It was this same abhorrence of Roman corruption that led him to set so little store by the grace of episcopal ordination and consecration. These men, whose lives seemed to him so notoriously wicked, had been ordained and consecrated. That whole corrupt Church had been built upon the sanctity of consecration. Little wonder that he could not see any special grace in ordination, either for minister or superintendent. The imposition of hands, concerning which Calvin had spoken so respectfully, Knox considered only a mark of superstition: accordingly no such ordination had a place in the Scottish Church during his lifetime. This departure from apostolic usage he justifies thus:—"Albeit the apostles used the imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not necessary." He evidently thought that such a practice involved a belief in the impartation of some miraculous gift. Accordingly he classes it among "the works of man's invention" such as, to use his own words, "pilgrimages, pardons and other sic baggage." He had evidently forgotten that in the earliest case of ordination on record, Moses was commanded to lay his hand on Joshua, not that he might receive the spirit, but because the Spirit was already in him.

Apart from this change of name and modification of theory, Knox established the substance of the Episcopate in his institution of the Superintendent. Neither is the Petition of the Lords of the Congregation in 1558, nor in any subsequent

official protests against the abuses of Rome, was Episcopacy mentioned, though they seem to have specified their grievances with great fulness. Reference to "The First Book of Discipline" and the Acts of Assemblies during the lifetime of Knox provides ample evidence of the Church's desire to maintain the Episcopate under a new name. Nor was it, in the mind of Knox, a mere temporary expedient, for in his sermon at the admission of John Spottiswood to the Superintendency of Lothian, he asserted the necessity, and not the bare expediency, of superintendents or overseers, as well as ministers.

A consideration of the place and powers given to the superintendents in that Church is sufficient to make his ultra Presbyterian successors question whether they are really of the spiritual lineage of Knox. The district assigned to the superintendent was called his diocese. The "First Book of Discipline" ordered that superintendents "in their visitations must try the life, diligence and behaviour of the ministers" of the diocese. By Act of Assembly (December, 1562) there was given "power to every superintendent to translate ministers from one Kirk to another, charging the ministers so translated to obey the voice and commandment of the superintendents." The "First Book of Discipline" appropriated to the Superintendent an annual living five times the amount of that of any parish minister. In 1567 when it was resolved to deprive all Roman Catholic bishops, it was agreed in the General Assembly, by the churchmen on the one part, and the lords and barons on the other, that superintendents should succeed in their places. They were constant members of Assembly, not elective as ministers were. Lord Glamis in his letter to Beza in 1574 informs him "that it has been the custom ever since the Reformation, that the superintendents, or bishops, still nominated the ministers who met in General Assemblies." In the Edinburgh Assembly in 1562 "it was concluded by the whole ministers assembled that all ministers should be subject to the superintendents in all lawful admonition." The Assembly of July, 1569, gave them the power of assigning to parish ministers their stipends.

If ministers had a grievance they must bring it to the superintendent, though they had the right of appeal to the General Assembly. The Assembly of 1565 petitioned the Queen "that none might be permitted to have charge of schools, colleges, or universities but such as should be tried by the Superintendent." By Act of Assembly of 1563 it was ordained "that no work be set forth in print, neither published in writing, touching religion or doctrine until such time as it shall be presented to the superintendent of the diocese and improved by him or such as he shall call of the most learned within his bounds."

Perhaps the thought of the Knoxonian Church on this subject is truly reflected in a letter written by Erskine of Dunn, superintendent of Angus and an intimate friend of Knox, to the regent in November, 1571, in which he asserts not only the expediency but also the divine authority of the episcopal office in the Church of Christ. Considering his intimacy with Knox, and the fact that the regent could not be ignorant of the fundamental principles of polity in the existing establishment, it is exceedingly unlikely that he would misrepresent either the thought of Knox or the constituted polity of the Kirk.

Many changes of polity have been made in Presbyterian churches since that time; but the fountain head of this communion is at Calvin and Knox. To Melville who followed hard on at the heels of Knox many of these changes are to be traced. But it is questionable if there is anything in his thought incompatible with the thought of Knox, apart from his ultra republicanism introduced into the Church under the formula "parity of ministers." This proved to be a mighty weapon in fighting that prelacy which designing men attempted to set up in Scotland, and in this it succeeded. But it is a question if the "parity of ministers" has ever been lived up to among the successors of Melville. At any rate it finds no support in the thought of Calvin and Knox, and this represents the original genius of the Presbyterian and Reformed Churches.

ROBERT W. DICKIE

EDUCATION IN QUEBEC

DURING the debates on the school question last winter at Ottawa, when special mention was made of the Province of Quebec, it became distressingly evident that some of our English-speaking politicians had never taken the trouble to study the details of school history. There were found men who were prepared to pull up the educational system violently by the roots, and anxious to transplant it to a strange soil, when it would surely have been more profitable to have studied the laws of growth of the plant in its own habitat with a view to helping the local reformers of both races who are just now making a special effort to produce a more vigorous growth in Quebec. Such a radical plan of pulling the system up by the roots must be studied and finally judged by reference to the whole history of education in this Province.

A little knowledge is a dangerous thing in the hands of theorists and system-worshippers who think the time opportune for imposing an Act of Uniformity in education.

Education in Quebec has a history of great interest, with many changes, but it has not been written in an easily accessible form. From the day when public school boards were organized in 1846, until to-day, when a great campaign is going on among both Catholics and Protestants to secure a compulsory attendance law, the history is one continuous fabric, into which many colours have been woven during the course of the years, but withal the warp has never been changed, and different materials have been woven in only as woof. The pattern of the fabric is rather complicated and well worthy of historical study. It is difficult enough to pick out the strands of the completed product without some knowledge of the plans in the minds of the master workmen.

A few months ago there was published in Montreal a book written by the late Superintendent of Public Instruction of

Quebec, Hon. Boucher de La Bruère. His volume is entitled, *Le Conseil de l'Instruction Publique et le Comité Catholique*. He begins by admitting that the final history of education in this Province has yet to be written, and offers his volume as a fragment, to be put along side of similar writings by his predecessors, the *Memorial of Education*, by the first Superintendent, Dr. J. B. Meilleur, and the work of his immediate successor, Hon. P. J. O. Chauveau, entitled *Public Instruction in Canada*. There are also to be had the important essays by Abbé Adélarde Desrosiers, Principal of the Jacques Cartier Normal School in Montreal, and by Dr. G. W. Parmelee, English Secretary of the Department of Public Instruction, on the history of the French and English schools respectively; they are to be found in volume sixteen of *Canada and its Provinces*. These essays, which sketch the history in outline, are the most complete works we possess on the state of education in earlier times; but they are not in a form that makes them accessible to individuals who have not access to a large library. The volume by the late Superintendent comes most opportunely to fill a great want, and it can be recommended to all who wish to study the subject.

Le Conseil de l'Instruction Publique is just what its name implies; it tells the story of the growth of the Council and of the Catholic Committee of the Council. The subject is one which appealed to the writer, who was evidently prepared to see the Council supreme in our educational system, quite beyond the immediate jurisdiction of Parliament in its control over the administration of the schools; in this he was a disciple of Hon. C. E. Boucher de Boucherville, who wished to set education entirely free from the changes of politics. The author shows in many places his personal views on partisan questions which have agitated our local politics, and at times he writes a well-reasoned brief for the Conservative side, which he once supported. He seems to consider our present system a *fait accompli*, which is not likely to be greatly changed by additions; he evidently is a

firm believer in administration rather than legislation. He shows nothing but antipathy to the Liberal policy as upheld by Mercier and Marchand, of subordinating the Council of Public Instruction to the Legislature and of making it more responsible to public opinion as represented in the Assembly. In one whole chapter the late Superintendent pleads against the possibility of reforms which we now see are surely coming, as that of compulsory education. He looks upon the system which he has administered as nearly a finished and perfected product, and seems to warn all radical reformers to keep their hands off. Such an attitude is interesting, but suggests questionings here and there on the part of those who may not hold exactly the same ideas which he did on these reforms.

For English readers who love the British ideal of fair-play, any history of education in the Province of Quebec in its initial stages must prove humiliating reading. It is the old story over again of the domination of a minority which held power under an irresponsible form of government, and tried to rule regardless of public opinion. Such an attempt was of course a humiliating failure, and education suffered grievously in consequence—not merely French education but education in general. Until the Acts of 1841 and 1846 were passed, public education was left almost entirely to private initiative and got practically no support from taxation. This proved a great retardation and meant that Canada began late in its history to build up a school system, and that this organization for long years had to make use of schools which were founded by private initiative and often very inadequately equipped. We must never lose sight of this late beginning when we compare the early stretches of our school history with that, for instance, of the United States, or of European countries such as England or France.

The earliest school law was that of 1801, which established the Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning; it was under this law that McGill University first secured its charter. The purpose of this Royal Institution was to establish free schools, which were to be unsectarian; the

Institution itself was in no way responsible to public opinion but was a corporate body of men appointed by the Governor-in-Council. For nearly half a century the French Canadians stoutly refused to have anything to do with the Royal Institution or its schools, as these schools could give no dogmatic religious teachings, and were under the control of Protestants, often of Protestant clergymen. It was proposed at this time to set aside Crown lands for the support of education, but the complete lack of understanding between the Family Compact and the French-Canadian people prevented Quebec schools from enjoying this source of revenue, which is such a boon to the Western Provinces in building up an efficient educational system, and has enabled them in a short time to compete successfully with the older provinces. Under the Act of 1801 only 84 schools were opened, and most of these had disappeared before 1841. The Montreal High School, through its predecessor, the Royal Grammar School, can trace its history back to the Royal Institution.

By the law of 1824 Fabric Schools were authorized. The law permitted the "Fabriques" of the Roman Catholic Church to spend one-quarter of their revenues on education and schools, but gave them no financial aid, either from the Treasury or by a local tax. Various other attempts were made by the Legislature to provide public schools but with little avail. When a petition setting forth their political grievances was sent to England by the Quebec reformers, special mention was made of their need of schools and of the *impassé* under the existing policy. In his famous report Lord Durham presented a special memorandum on education prepared by Mr. Arthur Buller.

The first law establishing public schools was passed in 1841. This was before the passing of the Municipal Corporations Act, and before the principle of Responsible Government was fully accepted in practice. It was necessary to find new local bodies to control the schools; commissioners, with rather restricted powers, were to be chosen by election. The power of taxation was not given to the commissioners but to the

new municipal authorities created by the Governor-in-Council. The people feared that these appointees were in many cases political agents who would not make their zeal for education the guiding motive of their actions. Such a hybrid system only served to further delay the real beginnings. Under this law one Superintendent for both Upper and Lower Canada was appointed, with an assistant from each province; Dr. Meilleur received this appointment in Lower Canada; Abbé Desrosiers remarks that "unlimited and absolute authority was given by the law to the General Superintendent of schools—the arbitrary right to fix courses of study, choose books, make regulations, and have the final voice in all disputes." For five years efforts were made to tinker this Act into working condition by repairs, until finally it was replaced in its entirety.

One clause in the 1841 Act caused a considerable amount of agitation; it was the clause which made a school tax compulsory. Some reactionaries said this compulsory contribution was an attack against the liberty and rights of the parent, and that their opposition was meant to protect the sacred interests of the children; just how the power on the part of the commissioners to refuse to levy a tax would have saved these interests, is rather an enigma. It is hard for us to-day to understand how such arguments were seriously meant;—they are reproduced here chiefly because the same arguments are being used to-day against a compulsory attendance law. Some few would have wished to make the people believe that the ulterior motive behind the compulsory part of this bill was a desire to attack their religion; but this argument was effectively countered by the splendid stand of the leaders among the Catholic clergy who advised their people to accept the bill without more opposition. Mgr. Bourget, Archbishop of Montreal, even went so far as to interdict a certain parish which refused to operate the law. The Draper-Viger Ministry weakly gave way, however, to the clamour of the demagogues and in 1845 repealed the clause in question, making the contribution voluntary. The principle

of voluntary contributions was considered to be ridiculous by all those who had the best interests of education at heart; and in his election speeches Mr. Hippolyte Lafontaine frankly told his electors of Terrebonne County that, if elected, he would impose a compulsory tax to support the schools. He was able to do this the next year.

At last United Canada did secure a Government that was responsible to public opinion; one of the first Acts of such a Government was to organize a public school system. By this Act the election of school boards was made compulsory—and authority was given the Governor-in-Council to appoint commissioners with the full powers of elected commissioners, in case of the failure to elect commissioners, or in case the commissioners failed to assess or levy any rate. It is a distinct misunderstanding of the evident facts of the case to refuse to call Quebec schools public schools because they are of two kinds. Ontario has three kinds of schools: besides the common schools there are dissentient schools for Catholics, and others for negroes, but they are all alike subject to Government control and they all receive taxes. So in 1846 there were set up in Lower Canada school boards to control public schools and to levy a rate. No restriction was made in the law about the religious belief of the commissioners or about the language to be used in the schools or about religious teaching, while the local clergy of any denomination were allowed to visit the schools. Under such an arrangement some special provision would have to be made to protect the minorities; whether an English minority along the St. Lawrence or a French minority in the Eastern Townships. Therefore local religious minorities were allowed the privilege of forming separate or dissentient school boards, consisting of trustees or syndics, who would have the control of the taxes paid in by members of the minority. Our dual board system dates from the beginning of our public school history, and was the evident solution of the difficulty of the educational problem of Lower Canada, after the long and futile struggle to impose one single neutral system on the French-Canadian people.

This Act was the work of Lafontaine and his able lieutenant, Morin, who based their local educational unit of organization on the model of the parish system in vogue in Lower Canada. Such a basis has proved itself to be broad enough to form a permanent system and was distinctly superior to the single-school organization prevalent at the time in the New England States. But, on the other hand, the unit is proving to-day to be too small for the proper organization of secondary education, and in Quebec our model schools and academies are local schools in many cases, cut off from the surrounding district. We have never been able to graft in any larger unit of organization for secondary school purposes, and consequently our secondary education in rural parts suffers from the lack of just such county academies as are to be found in New Brunswick.

The Act of 1846 dealt with education in Lower Canada alone. The Union Parliament thus recognized the principle of provincialism in education. If ever it was possible to have formed a uniform system for the two provinces, that was the time when both provinces were under the rule of one parliament for all purposes. But it was then recognized after the long series of failures that local or provincial control was the only feasible one. If the schools are to do their work well, they must not be the ground of strong partisan disputes. The legislators who drew up this Act of 1846 were statesmen who saw the real facts of the case; they realized that the schools could not be governed as an army is organized and governed, but they would have to be administered locally, and be made to conform to local opinion. In the final analysis the successful school depends on good relations between the board, the teachers, and the parents; these three parties must do their individual duties and they must also co-operate. And those larger bodies who draw up the course of study, those who examine teachers for diplomas, and those who inspect schools, must keep closely in touch with local opinion. Here was evidently an activity of the community where local control was essential, and those to-day who plead for a huge central-

ized system as nearly as possible uniform in all Canada, have really forgotten the fundamental factor of the need of the co-operation of parents, teachers, and school authorities. Under no conceivable system can the schools be run without local control; how then any national system could prove a protection to local Protestant or Catholic minorities is a question which cannot readily be answered. A cut-and-dried, inelastic, imperious system without shadow of turning, such as is found in an army, does not fit in with the self-evident facts of school organization, and would never have worked, nor could it have been made to work, in a country such as ours, where several provinces with peculiar racial and religious characteristics, and with long histories of their own, were later on to come together voluntarily to form a great and lasting confederation on the principle of diversity in unity.

The first Superintendent of Instruction for Lower Canada was Dr. J. B. Meilleur, who was appointed under the Act of 1841; he remained in office until 1855, and was succeeded by Hon. P. J. O. Chauveau. The duties of the Superintendent under this Act of 1846 are interesting. He received from the Receiver-General all sums of money appropriated for the purposes of education under this Act, and distributed it to the school boards of the municipalities according to law and in proportion to the population as ascertained at the last census. He prepared all forms and recommendations, advising the boards as to the management of the schools. He also had to examine the accounts of the boards to see that the moneys were properly applied to the purposes for which they were granted. It was also his duty to make an annual report to the Legislature of the actual state of education in the province, with the necessary statistics. But not a word is said about text books or course of study; here, it seems, the local boards were all powerful. But as time went on the need of more uniform practices as regards books and course of study became evident, and we find these matters were by the Act of 1856 put under the jurisdiction of the Council of Public Instruction.

The need of some central body to exercise control over the schools and to stir up negligent boards to action soon began to make itself felt, and the Act of 1856, in response to this need, created a Council of Public Instruction, which was to play such a large part in the subsequent history of education in Quebec. At first eleven, or more up to fifteen, persons were to be appointed to this Council, to hold office during pleasure. Their duties, as outlined, were to make regulations for the Normal Schools, which were to be established, to make rules and regulations for the Boards of examiners, who granted diplomas to teach, to choose text books, to draw up the course of study for public schools, and to hear charges which might be brought against teachers with a view to revoking their diplomas. It is interesting, in view of the Cartier celebration this autumn, to remember that the Act of 1856 was presented to Parliament by George Etienne Cartier, who then held the position of Provincial Secretary in the Taché-Macdonald Ministry. The first members of the Council were not appointed till 1859.

Mr. Boucher de La Bruère calls attention to the fact that in 1856 in connexion with this Act an attempt was made by some extreme radicals to introduce neutral schools. Mr. Pepin fathered the amendment, but he secured very little support, the only memorable name among those who voted for it being that of Antoine Aimé Dorion, who was leader of the radical wing of the Liberal party in Lower Canada. The amendment secured only 19 votes, and as Mr. Boucher de La Bruère says, it served to alienate from the chiefs of the Liberal party of that epoch the sympathy and confidence of the great majority of French-Canadians.

So far we have traced the general organization up to the stage in which it stood just before Confederation. In one sense the Ontario school system is in the same stage to-day. There were separate school boards where there was a demand for them, and above and in control of them and of the general educational policy of the province was one central Council or Minister. In Quebec the principle of the dual system has

subsequently been carried further and up through the very Council, so that to-day so far as regards administration and inspection of schools, as regards Normal schools and examiners for diplomas, as regard the course of study and the choice of text books and the language of instruction, each Committee of the Council is supreme. The language and religious questions solve themselves at once with us. While both parties must work together to secure reforms in the law, there is no possibility of any majority by any administrative regulation imposing its will on an unwilling minority. In Ontario the local dissentient boards have much the same rights as to religious instruction and inspection, but they are under the control of the Minister of Education at Toronto, just as completely as all other schools in that province. In some of the Western Provinces, local dissentient boards have certain definite rights as regards language and religious teaching, but they, too, are under the central authority of the Minister of Education and are visited by the same Inspectors as all other schools. We alone in Quebec have carried out the dual system completely, and the subsequent history after 1856 largely centers in these changes in the Council, by which this duality was completed.

This dual system was made part of our constitutional practice at the time of Confederation. As the stereotyped form then given was very largely due to the demand of the Quebec Protestants for protection and security of tenure, the facts of the case are well worthy of reproduction, particularly as they do not seem to be generally known. No recent writer has emphasized the great stir in Protestant circles in Lower Canada caused by this question at Confederation, and no one has told the details of the parliamentary history of Clause 93 of the British North America Act, which is our educational Concordat.

The original draft of Confederation presented to the Quebec Conference in October 1864, proposed to give the provinces complete control of education. An amendment was submitted to this Conference by Hon. T. D'Arcy McGee,

who moved to add to the clause giving the provinces unlimited control, the following words, "Saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in both Canadas may possess as to their denominational schools at the time when the Constitution goes into operation." This amendment passed in the Conference without any opposition from any quarter. The question seems never to have been raised at all during the many debates on Confederation of giving education to the control of the Federal Parliament; the Fathers of Confederation seem to have taken it for granted that the existing laws on education formed an enduring foundation on which future systems were to be built up. But a storm of protest arose in the Eastern Townships; it took the form, not of advocating some other system but of demanding further constitutional privileges for the Protestant minority of managing their own schools before Confederation stereotyped the whole system. This agitation was further fanned by the memory of the action of the Sandfield Macdonald-Dorion Government a few months before, which had tried, apparently against the advice of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to reduce the subventions to two Protestant institutions, Richmond College and Lachute Academy. Dr. Parmelee tells at some length of the beginnings of this agitation and of the meeting in the Mechanics Hall in Montreal in 1864 for the formation of an Association for the Promotion and Protection of the Educational Interests of the Protestants of Quebec. This meeting and the discussion in the press led to a dignified reply in the *Journal of Education* by Superintendent Chauveau. To quote Dr. Parmelee's words, "Chauveau conclusively showed that no discrimination was made against the Protestant minority either in the law or in his administration of it. On the contrary, he proved by official documents that the Protestants received more than their share of educational grants in proportion either to population or school attendance; that the Roman Catholic dissentients were nearly half as numerous as Protestant dissentients and were subject to the same grievances, if there were any; that

French and English inspectors equally visited all the schools in their respective districts regardless of the language spoken by the pupils."

The matter was brought up in Parliament in March, 1866, during the debate on Confederation, when several of the English members from the Eastern Townships communicated with Mr. A. T. Galt, M.P. for Sherbrooke and Finance Minister, asking him to see that certain amendments were incorporated in the local constitution of Lower Canada before Confederation passed. On March 7th, Mr. Galt addressed a letter to these members, promising on behalf of the Government that various changes would be made in the education laws of Lower Canada to protect Protestant interests. He stated the same at a public meeting in Sherbrooke. In answer to a question from Mr. Luther Holton, Liberal member for Chateauguay, Hon. J. A. Macdonald, the Attorney General, promised that certain amendments would be brought down before the close of that session. "Those who doubted the sufficiency of the clause," says Dr. Parmelee, "and demanded more specific legislation to precede Confederation, do not appear to have suspected the good faith of the French-Canadian majority so much as they doubted whether the political experience of the country had been long enough to give reasonable assurance of the course of political action in the future. A French-Canadian member, Letellier de St-Just, who was afterwards lieutenant-governor of the province, gave forcible expression to the same view: 'I have heard it said that the Protestants of Lower Canada ought to be satisfied with their prospects for the future because we have always acted with liberality towards them. But that is no guarantee for them, for we would not content ourselves with a mere promise to act liberally, if we considered that our interest or our institutions were threatened by a majority differing from ourselves, and in any case that is not the way to secure the peace of the country... When we observe a man like the honorable member [Sir Narcisse F. Belleau] acknowledge that we do not agree with the Irish, despite the

identity of our religious belief, it may be easily foreseen that difficulties will arise with populations differing from us in origin and belief.'” An ordinary Act might be repealed, if it did not work well, but not so with Confederation; the Protestants realized that this Act would be practically irrevocable. And so they were anxious to have certain rights guaranteed to them and perpetuated in the pact which was to be the Constitution of the Dominion.

The Government was quite prepared to fulfil its pledge, and in the autumn session, on July 31st, Solicitor General Langevin introduced a Bill to give effect to this promise. The first clause guaranteed a certain definite appropriation per annum for the different classes of schools in Lower Canada, and these moneys were all to be divided according to population at the last census. Two deputy-superintendents were to be ex-officio members of the Council of Public Instruction; other members of the Council were to be maintained in the existing proportions. One of the most important clauses read as follows: “Whenever four Protestant members of the Council of Public Instruction shall declare that the management of the Protestant Schools must be separate, the Governor-in-Council shall order a separation, and a Protestant deputy-superintendent shall be placed at their head, with the same powers as the Catholic schools, and a separate Council will thereafter be appointed.” The Bill was really Galt’s Bill, and represented a compromise between the demands of the Protestant agitators and what the majority of Lower Canada preferred.

Mr. A. A. Dorion, Liberal member for Hochelaga, at once rose and asked if it was the intention of the Government to introduce a similar measure affording the same guarantee for the rights of the Catholic minority in Upper Canada. In view of Dorion’s dislike for separate schools, his desire to embarrass the Government is quite evident. Hon. J. A. Macdonald replied that “this was a measure which had been promised to the House and the country when the question of Confederation was proposed, and it was now introduced by

a Catholic member of the Government in accordance with that promise, and to protect the rights of the Protestant minority of Lower Canada. As regards Upper Canada it was not the intention of the Government to introduce any Bill for separate schools." But the partisan cue had been given and an actor quickly appeared on the scene. Mr. Bell, member for Russell County of Upper Canada, introduced a Bill to extend similar and equal privileges to the Roman Catholic minority of his province, and he urged that the two Bills should be put through *pari passu*. The Government supporters from Upper Canada objected that the Separate Schools Act, originally passed by Taché in 1855, and amended to give more privileges in 1863, had been in operation only a short time, seemed to be working satisfactorily and gave certain special protections not enjoyed in Lower Canada; the Government supporters from the lower province insisted on taking the two Bills concurrently. The Government saw it was necessary to surrender their Bill, and Mr. Galt at once resigned in protest.

But on August 7th, Mr. Langevin went through the formality of moving the second reading. Mr. Macdonald said, "this motion gave him the opportunity of making certain explanations to the House. This session the Government, in pursuance of pledges, believed it a duty to bring down a Bill of which the second reading was now moved. They were assured from the long-trying liberality of the Lower Canada majority that had the Bill stood alone, a majority in its favour would have been obtained. But another Bill had been introduced extending to the Catholic minority of Upper Canada similar privileges to those proposed to be given to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada. The Government had no doubt that the Bill would meet with the most decided opposition of a large majority from Upper Canada, including that of every member of the Government from Upper Canada but himself. Had the Lower Canada Bill stood alone, he repeated that there was no doubt a majority would have voted for it, yet when the

two Bills came up together, the Government had ascertained that the majority of Lower Canada would have felt it their duty to their co-religionists in Upper Canada to insist that the two Bills should pass through the House at the same moment. Then we should have had the unfortunate spectacle of the majority of Lower Canada in conflict with the majority of Upper Canada just on the eve of separation. The provisions of the Bill form part of the guarantee provided by Confederation; any laws on the subject in force when Confederation is consummated could not afterwards be altered, and each section would have felt itself suffering under grievances which there was no constitutional method of escaping from. Canada, therefore, instead of starting on a new race of Confederation in peace and harmony, would present to the Lower Provinces an unfortunate spectacle of two houses divided against themselves. Instead of a double majority, we should have had a double minority." Mr. Galt, in explaining to the House the cause of his resignation, said he thought the Government had taken a course which the best interests of the country required; but it was one which he could not approve of. It was not that he thought the Protestants of Lower Canada would be dealt with unfairly by the Catholic majority, but it was because he had, in his place in the House and in the Government, taken certain grounds on this question which rendered it impossible for him to be responsible for the policy of the Government on the measure. Mr. Cartier promised to make every effort in the new constitution to obtain for the local legislature a law as liberal for the Protestants as that proposed by Mr. Galt. He agreed to grant the Lower Canadian minority all the religious rights enjoyed in Upper Canada by the minority.

The remarks of Mr. A. A. Dorion on this occasion are interesting and worthy of being reproduced here. He said he did not believe it was wise to guarantee an annual fixed sum of money in the form of a school grant and deprive the local legislature of the right to revise this appropriation; he also objected to the setting up of another superintendent in

the department and the authorization of another Council. He considered it was the greatest mistake, even in their own interests, to grant the minority in either province exceptional privileges, which would excite the prejudice and hostility of the majority and divide the two populations into two hostile camps. Dorion all along preferred one uniform system in Quebec.

The famous 93rd clause of Confederation, defining the powers and limits of the Provincial Parliaments in dealing with education, was drawn up in London by the Canadian representatives and was largely the work of Mr. Galt. Sir Joseph Pope, in his *Confederation Documents*, reproduces in facsimile the paper on which Mr. Galt wrote out the additional part of the resolution. It was sub-section 7 of clause 41 of the resolution of this Conference. The first sentence goes back to Mr. McGee's amendment at Quebec; the remainder was drawn up in London and was to provide a regular method for the minority of seeking redress if deprived of its rights. This was all the more necessary as there was to be no Supreme Court to decide whether laws were constitutional or not, and the Federal Legislature could not over-ride a Provincial Government in its control of local affairs, unless such a right of appeal was definitely provided for. The sub-section in question reads as follows: "Saving the rights and privileges which the Protestant or Catholic minority in any Province may have as to denominational schools at the time when the Union goes into operation. And in any Province where a system of separate or dissentient schools by law obtains, or where the Local Legislature may hereafter adopt a system of separate or dissentient schools, an appeal shall lie to the Governor-General-in-Council of the General Government, from the acts and decisions of the Local Authorities which may affect the rights or privileges of the Protestant or Catholic minority in the matter of education; and the General Parliament shall have power in the last resort to legislate on the subject." Clause 42 of these resolutions was a fulfilment of Cartier's pledge, and in the final Act it became sub-section 2

of Clause 93, which reads as follows: "All the Powers, Privileges and Duties at the Union by law conferred and imposed in Upper Canada on the Separate Schools and School Trustees of the Queen's Roman Catholic Subjects shall be and are hereby extended to the Dissident Schools of the Queen's Protestant and Roman Catholic Subjects in Quebec."

It is interesting to be able to prove conclusively from original documents that these guarantees of permanency and all these safeguards of minority rights were the work of the Protestant champion in response to the demands of the people of the Eastern Townships. It would hardly seem wise for Protestants to be the first to wish to tear up these guarantees, even for the sake of a larger scheme in which Protestants would have a majority capable of controlling the outlines of the general policy. For a minority needs protection, when it needs it at all, in the local sphere just as much as in the wider one. Under such a larger scheme, however benevolent the local majority might be, still the local minority would be caught between the upper mill-stone of federal pressure and the lower one of provincial opposition. This is supremely true just because school administration is so largely a local matter, and must ever remain so.

It is interesting to see how far some who profess the faith which Sir John Macdonald held, have really travelled from his standpoint on the school question. All along, from the days of the Taché Bill of 1855 until 1890, when he opposed Dalton McCarthy, he stood for a policy which made for goodwill and mutual understanding in education, and he was prepared to grant to local minorities such rights as were necessary for their protection on the school question. We have seen how he almost alone of the English Ministers was prepared in 1866 to pass the Langevin Bill and the Bell Bill concurrently.

It is instructive to note how these provisions of the "Langevin Bill" were subsequently fulfilled. The grants for public schools are still divided according to population, and are much higher than the minimum mentioned in this Bill.

In 1868 a Protestant Secretary of the Department was appointed with the rights of deputy-superintendent, and he became ex-officio a member of the Council. The membership of the Council has always been kept in the same ratio of two to one. And later on the Boucherville Ministry in 1875 practically made the Protestant Committee supreme in its own sphere. In 1866 other criticisms were made of the existing law as being detrimental to Protestant interests, which the Langevin Bill made no effort to meet. Since that day, however, these objections too have been removed. I quote from Dr. Parmelee's words: "The Protestants, when dissentient, may determine their own rate of taxation, collect their taxes and divide the municipality into districts." It was also objected as a grievance in 1866 that the Protestant school municipalities were often divided to suit the wish of the Catholic party but in a way that did harm to the schools of the Protestants. "The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may now establish school municipalities, or alter the limits for Protestants only or for Roman Catholics only, so that the minority is not affected by changes in limits of school municipalities, unless it wishes to be." So after all the fears of the Protestants of 1866 have proved themselves to be groundless; we have complete administrative control of our own schools, and there has been no sign of any such domination as was then feared.

The story of this pre-Confederation agitation has been told at length because of the recent signs of discontent among a few politicians who desire to tear up the solemn pact so far as it relates to our separate school system, forgetting that the guarantee of the permanence of this duality was the demand of our Protestant forefathers. The excuse offered for this agitation is that it is meant to improve education in this province. But in consideration of the fact that all the demands of the Protestant representatives of that day have been granted and other privileges besides, and their fears have proved groundless, while a way is left open for Protestants and Catholics to work together for all reforms that will benefit

them equally, and while education is always being improved under the present system, it does seem that the Fathers of Confederation acted very wisely and with a proper consideration of a *bonne entente* among the French-Canadians and the Protestant citizens in this old province where the French-Canadians were the first comers.

From Confederation onwards the history of education is largely that of the Council of Public Instruction; for information on this period one must go to the volume by Boucher de La Bruère, who tells us all we wish to know about the Council up to the early years of the twentieth century, as well as the main features of the work done by the Catholic Committee. There exists nowhere a similar summary of the work of the Protestant Committee. It is to be hoped that the present English Secretary of the Department may some day be given a chance to write his reminiscences and give us a history of the Protestant Committee.

In 1867 Hon. P. J. O. Chauveau, who since 1855 had been Superintendent of Public Instruction, became Prime Minister of Quebec and took the portfolio of Minister of Education, with Mr. Cherrier as President of the Council of Public Instruction. In 1869 the Legislature made important changes in the school law and modified considerably the constitution of the Council. Since 1859 this body had consisted of fifteen members, of which eleven were Catholics and four Protestants. In 1869 the number was increased to twenty-one, of whom seven were Protestant and fourteen were Catholic. Before this time the Council had given the Protestant members the privilege of meeting together in committee to discuss matters dealing with their own schools. After this reorganization the Council was divided into two committees. Each committee had the direction of the school affairs of its section of the community. Moreover, the Council was given the power to decree the creation of two Councils with distinct jurisdiction over the Catholic and Protestant schools; but the Council never used this power of splitting itself up into two distinct entities. The committees by the

law of 1869 were not given full control, as they had to submit their findings and their actions to the whole Council for its approval. When this reorganization took place, Mr. Cherrier resigned as President of the Council and he was succeeded by Mr. Crémazie. At the same time Mr. Henry Miles, a professor from Bishop's College, was appointed the English secretary of the Department.

The next change took place in 1875, when Hon. Charles E. Boucher de Boucherville abolished the Ministry of Public Instruction entirely and placed education administration beyond the influences, more or less changeable, of the atmosphere of Parliament. Mr. Gédéon Ouimet then became Superintendent of Public Instruction and held the position until 1895, when he was succeeded by Hon. Boucher de La Bruère. By the law of 1875 the two committees were given complete powers in the control and administration of their own schools. The Council as a plenary body now meets only on special occasions to consider matters of common interest or to advise the Government on impending legislation or the need of reform. The volume by Boucher de La Bruère gives a detailed account of these few meetings.

As one reads the charming story, told in such pellucid French, with a swing and vigour which holds the reader so completely that the book will be finished in one evening by any reader who takes the least interest in the subject, one forgets to criticise; but on second reading one cannot but ask questions as one comes to reflect on what is given there as the whole story. It is true that the work of building up our school system since the first Act is largely the effort of Conservative statesmen; yet the author fails to do justice to the important share added by the Liberals. He usually touches on Liberal views to slight them, either by faint praise or even by reasoned denunciation. The latter he uses freely for Honoré Mercier's advocacy of compulsory education. One would have liked to have been told more of what Mercier did in stirring up the people of Quebec to the need of education; probably he accomplished more than any other man in making

the cause of education popular among the masses during the few stormy years he held power. His achievement in founding Night Schools is enough to win him an important place in any history of education. One of his favourite epigrammatic perorations, when speaking about education, was "Versez l'instruction sur la tête de vos enfants, vous leur devez ce baptême." His son-in-law, Sir Lomer Gouin, was only following in these illustrious footsteps when he emphasized so strongly during the last election the importance of educational improvements in Quebec.

One of the most interesting chapters of the book dealing with recent history is the story of the attempt of the Marchand Government in 1898 to put education under the control of a Minister, such as is found in other provinces. In 1895 the Council had appointed a special committee to recodify the school law; this committee was at work when the Marchand Government took office. The new Government decided as a part of this new school code to take unto itself more supervision of education in the hope of quickening the pace and of putting this branch of the service under Parliamentary control. The most important change was to abolish the position of Superintendent and to substitute a Minister responsible to the Legislature. The Superintendent is responsible to the Committees of the Council and he carries out their orders; the Council itself is supreme. The Speaker of the Assembly once so declared. The Superintendent has to have some means of presenting his report to Parliament; the Provincial Secretary does this and answers any questions in Parliament, but he can only answer as he is informed. A committee of the Cabinet was appointed, consisting of Messrs. Marchand, Archambault, Robidoux, and Duffy, to study this matter. The question was not submitted to the Council of Public Instruction for its opinion. Hon. Mr. (now Judge) Robidoux brought in the bill in December 1897. His reasons for the change from a Superintendent to a Minister can be summarized as follows: for more than one reason it belongs to the Government to create the future of a nation. The Government must

develop the industry of a country; it must study the aptitudes of a people and help to develop them. Now, if the Government has charge of these aims, it ought to have the means at its disposal and under its direct control. It is by education in particular that these aptitudes are developed. For education to be wisely directed, is it not wise, he asked, to give the Cabinet the task of administering the laws of primary instruction which it passes? The proposal was fought fiercely by Mr. Flynn for the Opposition in the Lower House, and by Mr. Thomas Chapais in the Council. In the Council, where the Conservatives had a large majority, it was defeated on a party vote of 13-9. It was after this defeat that Sir Lomer Gouin, then Mr. Gouin, came to Montreal and made the following memorable pronouncement before le Club Libéral de la Partie Est about the duty of the Liberal Party and educational reforms: "For convinced Liberals what the Marchand Government did during the last session with reference to public instruction is only a part of what it promised and what it will do. To-day, the nomination of school inspectors belongs to the Government, which will see in the future to nominating men of action and of duty... The Liberal Party has promised a Ministry of Public Instruction and it will keep its promise despite certain remarks which people have been able to make. It is a question of progress and our party cannot retreat. The Liberal Party owes to its traditions and to its history to give the people of the Province of Quebec educational reform in all its plenitude."

The next year the Government brought in another Bill which did not contain this change. Hon. Mr. Turgeon was godfather of this Bill; he said the law of 1875 had worked well enough and that there was no imperative reason for giving education to the control of a Minister. Our present school code dates from this Bill of Mr. Turgeon.

It will be readily seen that we have in the history of education in Quebec a panoramic picture in which the shades and the bright spots alternate in a kaleidoscopic manner,

with a decided predominance of brightness. Almost alone of all the provinces we have no vexed problems of administration. The details of this history are well worth careful study and should be better known. And who should know them better than the teachers who are called upon to carry out the provisions of this law and to teach under the regulations of the Committees of the Council of Public Instruction? Students in training are obliged to study the uninteresting details of school law and to handle the dried bones of its anatomy; might it not be well to add a short course on its embryology and morphology? Then the matter would surely become something more than a fossil heap of dry bones. As a matter of fact, we English-speaking Quebecers know far too little about the history of our own province, since it became a separate unity for local affairs. Such a history might well prove a beneficial lesson in toleration—human nature is far too prone to follow Homer and to think of oneself as one's "dear heart" and to look upon all others who do not think as we do as strangers, and to treat them as inferiors and as Philistines. A complete history of education in Quebec might well rank alongside of Locke's *Letter on Toleration*. It could be particularly recommended as a valuable preparation to all aspirants for political honours in Canada, and it might be read with profit by some who have already won a measure of political notoriety.

If our educational system was gradually becoming encrusted like some crustacean with calcareous deposits, that were first meant as a shell to protect it, but later served effectually to prevent further growth, until the shell should be shed, then a *prima facie* case might be made out for breaking the shell, to give a new lease of life and to permit of new growth. But nothing more clearly shows that our school system has not become encrusted or fossilized than the recent campaign for an attendance law, which has so thoroughly stirred up public opinion in Quebec. If our present system was really a *fait accompli*, as Mr. Boucher de La Bruère seemed to consider it, an opportunity would be given for the

opponents of the present system to urge the need of complete change. And undoubtedly the violent opposition to compulsory attendance in certain quarters has done more than anything else to foster and keep alive the cause of those few in Quebec who clamour for national schools. Stubborn and perverse opposition to all reform has always eventually strengthened the cause of the revolutionaries. It is strange that the Quebec newspaper, *L'Action Catholique*, which leads the campaign against an attendance law, has not come to realize this, and to see that the time is fast approaching for it gracefully to give way, instead of keeping up an opposition that is playing into the hands of extremists.

Changes must come in any living organism. Education has never stood still, except perhaps during the Middle Ages; and *L'Action Catholique* seems to find its ideal back in those times, when it was confidently believed that the sum total of human knowledge had already been revealed to man. Educational systems are always adapting themselves to new environments. History affords more than one example of an educational system that has outlived its day, and has come to be quite out of touch with the needs of the time; but none is more illuminating than that of Roman education. In the the time of the republic a young Roman needed an education that would particularly fit him for holding public office, and rhetoric was one of the most important elements of such a training; it enabled him to sway the crowds of the city and to win political honours. When Rome became an imperial city, these offices were given at the Emperor's pleasure. Now there was no useful outlet for this rhetorical training; but the same training was kept up and education quickly became divorced from life and rhetoric became mere display. In modern times educationalists have guarded against such a stultifying of their efforts, and are learning that there is no perfect or ideal system which will be a pattern for all times; certain elements may be fixed and necessary parts of it, but others must continually change.

It surely is a wise policy to make the old fit in with the new in any scheme of reform, so long as there is life and virility in the old which makes it capable of adaptation and of bearing the added strain. It is just because they realize this need of co-ordination that the leaders in this campaign for compulsory attendance in Quebec are demanding such a law on the basis of the dual system. A compulsory law to be effective must be rooted deep down in public opinion and have the active support of a majority of the people. The folly of asking for a national system as a supposedly sure means of enforcing an attendance law in Quebec, passes belief. Such a nationalist policy would create violent opposition in itself, and would surely lead to a school war such as that caused in Belgium about forty years ago by a similar attempt to impose neutral schools. This unsettled state of affairs would be a most inopportune time for attempting to force a compulsory law on Quebec by pressure from without, and would surely defeat its own purpose. Compulsory education must come by the wish of the majority of the people, and the public sentiment that is necessary for its enforcement is fast being created in Quebec.

History is being made in Quebec through this campaign for compulsory education, and the final success of the movement is assured. A few events of recent occurrence will serve to show how far the campaign has progressed to date. In January last Senator Dandurand, an old and tried friend of compulsory attendance since 1884, presented a memorable petition, signed by one hundred prominent Catholic laymen and women, to Archbishop Bruchési, demanding such a reform and requesting His Grace to present the matter before the next meeting of the Catholic Committee. One hundred names may mean very little or they may mean very much. These hundred names were most representative of Catholic thought in Montreal. Among them were found the names of Nationalists, Conservatives and Liberals; the most influential Catholics of Montreal had signed it. Lord Shaughnessy, who has taken an interest in education in Quebec since the days

of Chapleau, signed first; next came the signature of Sir Alexander Lacoste, and following it were the names of Senators Dandurand, Beique, Thibadeau, Beaubien, Boyer, Casgrain, Wilson, Hon. E. L. Patenaude, ex-minister of the Crown, Hon. Charles Marcil, ex-speaker of the House of Commons, Ernest R. Decary, President of the Administrative Commission of Montreal, ten judges from Montreal, a very large majority of the lay professors of Laval University, with two deans of Faculties, ten ex-presidents of the "Chambre de Commerce," every lay member of the four Catholic school boards of Montreal, and a majority of the members of the Central Catholic School Commission of Montreal. One man signed it on his death bed. Among the ladies who signed it were Mmes. Gérin-Lajoie, President of La Fédération Nationale, and Mme. Thibadeau, Hon. President of the Notre Dame Hospital. A few days later a letter appeared in the French papers from Sir Hormisdas Laporte, who signified his regret that his absence from Montreal had prevented him from having the pleasure of signing too. The silence of *L'Action Catholique* with reference to this list of names was more eloquent than a full page of denunciation.

Archbishop Bruchési was requested to present this petition to the next meeting of the Catholic Committee, in February. Meetings of this Committee are held behind closed doors and no report of the debates is kept. But the matter was of such vital importance that members who were present gave out lengthy reports. Judge Robidoux, an ardent friend of educational reforms for long years, placed the question squarely before the Committee, whether a law of compulsory education was contrary to the teachings of the Catholic Church, and as such to be condemned. The friends of the measure have all along held that it was an open question, and have quoted ecclesiastical authorities of other countries to support their claim; but never before had the matter been defined in express terms by competent episcopal authority of the Catholic Church here in Quebec. In answer to this question Archbishop Bruchési declared in express terms "that

the Church had announced no doctrine on this point, that there was no bull or papal decree condemning or affecting the principle of the question, which remained absolutely free in point of view of doctrine and of Catholic discipline." This straightforward answer at once dashed down in ruins the scaffolding of quibblings and of sophistical distinctions which had been so laboriously built up by the opponents of an attendance law for the purpose of condemning it by bell, book and candle to the limbo of lost causes. The Catholic Committee decided, before pronouncing on the matter in question, to demand more complete statistics so as to ascertain if our actual attendance is satisfactory, and if not, to study the feasibility of applying the remedy suggested in the petition.

Nothing is more satisfactory in the campaign for such a law than the fact that we have had a union of hearts and a co-operation among reformers that is most commendable and is the surest prophecy of success. The Protestant Committee has taken the matter up in a practical way and has a sub-committee studying the important aspect of what is involved in such a law in a financial way in capital expenditure for new schools and in increased annual revenue for the payment of the new teachers required. This sub-committee, at the request of its chairman, Mr. Howard Murray, has been given a free hand by the Protestant Committee to co-operate with the Federated Committee on Education, which is carrying on a public agitation for such a law. This latter organization was called into being by the School Attendance Committee of the Provincial Association of Protestant Teachers. On the Federated Committee are representatives of such organizations as the Board of Trade, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Trades and Labour Council, the Local Council of Women, the Kiwanis and Rotary Clubs and over sixty other clubs and societies, together with prominent citizens. The action of the Protestant Committee in co-operating in such an agitation inaugurates a new activity on the part of that Committee. It had several times put itself on record in a general way as being in favour of the principle of compulsory

education. It had usually considered it was doing its duty in administering the schools under its supervision and in giving the Government expert advice when wanted; it had never agitated in controversial matters, even to improve education. But public opinion was thoroughly stirred up and leadership was so evidently needed from those who were responsible for Protestant education, that the Protestant Committee broke away from its traditions and is sending representatives to these meetings of the Federated Committee to plan a public campaign. Such a lead was all the more useful in view of the harm that might be done, not only to the cause of a compulsory law but to educational interests in general in Quebec, by the campaign for national schools.

During the spring months this nationalist campaign was opened in Ottawa. The promoter of the debate in the Senate said two of his main purposes were to give Quebec an attendance law and to secure more of a national spirit in education. The effort to secure more of union and the strength of a national spirit is in itself commendable, if it does not destroy existing systems or abolish local control. Such a union of hearts is not necessarily bound up with a uniform system of schools. Any movement towards a national spirit must reckon with essential differences and existing conditions; it is just here that nationalist theorizing breaks away from solid foundations and builds castles in the air. The promoters expect too much of the schools. The sphere of the school is circumscribed by public opinion; when we analyze society we find the school is only one of the several educating agencies. Public opinion, the press, and the Church are all doing the same work of forming ideas. The ideals which the school is striving for must not be in opposition to those of the community, or the school will break down, and will become the scene of an eternal round of petty squabbles between teachers and parents. The leaders of this nationalist campaign do not seem to realize that the facts of the case here in Quebec are all against the realization of their dream of national schools as the agency for bringing about a union of hearts.

A real union of hearts among the two races in Canada was one of the prime ideals of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and one of his prayers for his native province. His views on educational reform were suddenly interjected into the debate in the Senate by his friend, Senator Dandurand. It was already known that Sir Wilfrid had become deeply interested in the demand for school reform in Quebec, and after Sir Wilfrid's death the Senator was able to assure the world of his leader's adhesion to his side of the controversy. The last letter he received from Sir Wilfrid had dealt with the details of the campaign which the Senator had undertaken, and of the opposition to it from the reactionaries; and it ended with these words, the first sentence in French and the last in English: "Vous êtes dans la bonne voie et vous avez touché la note juste. It is a long chase but you will get there just the same."

The adherence of Sir Wilfrid to the cause of compulsory education was not properly emphasized at the time it was announced in the Senate. The English papers of Montreal, in condensing Senator Dandurand's speech, omitted all reference to Sir Wilfrid's views. But the time is coming when his approval will be better known, and as the news spreads, it will surely have an effect which no amount of opposition can counteract. When the people of Quebec come to realize that Sir Wilfrid was not afraid of the operation of such an enactment for his fellow-citizens, they will more than ever understand how perverse is the opposition of the opponents. The magnetism of Sir Wilfrid's name will work wonders in winning public approval to the cause, and will show up the fact that just as in Lafontaine's time "le parti des éteignoirs" opposed compulsory taxation for the schools by sophistical reasonings, so to-day their descendants are in the very same way using fictitious arguments to oppose a compulsory attendance law, which is but the completion, not the destruction, of the existing system, and which will revivify all our education by assuring for all children equal opportunities in the elementary schools.

IRVING O. VINCENT

THREE MORNINGS

Beauty is the bride of Morning
When flower and web are decked with dew
By brooding Night, with light adorning,
For creature eye when waked to view.

Come East's chromatic glory,
Come Voice, with richest song,
Come Truth, and bring your story
When void to life took form.

Beauty is the bride of Morning,
When bursting buds will cherish light
For fruits sublime, in time performing,
With martial glory in their might.

Come Love and Joy and Peace abounding,
Come Faith, with all your careful testing,
Come Good, with gentleness surrounding,
And march in triumph to your resting.

Summer comes with flowers blooming,
Happy thoughts the mind perfuming;
Peace may sleep where flocks are resting,
Joy will laugh where birds are nesting.

Love and Hope will cheer the trees,
Fruits will ripe with careful breeze;
Ceres smiles at life completing;
New life dawns, behold the greeting!

Nature decks her moulds for duty:
Vision bursts in boundless beauty.

HAZEL BELL