

19 560

ADDRESSES

DELIVERED BEFORE

The Canadian Club *of Toronto*

SEASON OF 1913-1914

Edited by the Literary Correspondent

190313.

11.7.24



TORONTO :
WARWICK BRO'S & RUTTER, LIMITED
1914



F
5547
T&C
1914

CONTENTS

	Page
Officers of the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1913-14 and 1914-15.....	v
Past Presidents of the Canadian Club of Toronto, 1897-1914	vi
Constitution of the Canadian Club.....	vii
— Canada's Best Service for British Ideals: BY MR. NORMAN ANGELL..	1
Newspapers: BY LORD NORTHCLIFFE.....	10
Imperial Relations: BY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE HERBERT L. SAMUEL	17
The Land Question in England: BY RIGHT HON. SIR ALFRED MOND	27
What the University Can Do for the State: BY CHAS. R. VAN HISE, PH. D.....	39
Shakespeare, Fashioner of Fate: BY MR. F. R. BENSON.....	49
~The Salvation Army: BY GENERAL W. BRAMWELL BOOTH.....	58
Britain's Treatment of Canada: BY DR. ADAM SHORTT, M. A.....	65
Railways and the Public: BY SIR WILLIAM CORNELIUS VAN HORNE, K.C.M.G.....	75
The British Consular Service and Its Relation to Canada: BY MR. J. JOYCE-BRODERICK.....	81
~The Street Railway Situation in Toronto: BY MR. BION J. ARNOLD..	94
The Financial Outlook in Canada: BY SIR GEORGE PAISH.....	116
Why Newfoundland Has Not Entered Confederation: BY HON. P. T. MCGRATH	123
The Navy Question: BY MR. Z. A. LASH, K.C., LL.D	135
The Quebec Act: BY HONOURABLE RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, K.C., M.P.	151
Self Government in Canada: BY MR G. G. S. LINDSEY, K.C.....	163
Banquet to Hon. W. H. Taft: SPEAKERS—HON. W. H. TAFT, SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK, SIR JOHN WILLISON, DR. J. A. MACDONALD.....	181
Toronto's Financial Administration: BY FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND, PH. D.....	211
Imperial Federation: The Lesson of the American Colonies: BY MR. A. MAURICE LOW.....	227
Two Years Among Wild Men and Wild Beasts in England's Newest Colony: BY DR. W. S. RAINSFORD	238

	Page.
Australia : BY SIR THOMAS TAIT	244
English Radicalism : BY MR. JOSIAH C. WEDGWOOD, M.P.	255
Workmen's Compensation : BY MR. FRED BANCROFT	262
Home Rule for Ireland : BY MR. WM. REDMOND, M. P.	270
The High Cost of Living and Standardizing the Dollar : BY DR. IRVING FISHER.....	280
Some Rural Problems : BY GEORGE C. CREELMAN, ESQ., LL.D.	292
Antarctic Exploration : BY COMMANDER EVANS, R.N., C.B.	305
Poetry : BY MR. ALFRED NOYES.....	310
The Future of the Canadian Club Movement : BY MR. GEO. WILKIE, B. A.	327
Report of the Literary Correspondent.....	335
Report of the Honorary Secretary	336
Report of the Honorary Treasurer.....	341
Annual Financial Statement	443
List of Members of the Canadian Club, 1913-1914	345

Officers and Executive Committee

For 1913-1914

<i>President</i>	<i>1st Vice-President</i>	<i>2nd Vice-President</i>
J. R. BONE	D. A. CAMERON	G. FRANK BEER

<i>Hon. Secretary</i>	<i>Hon. Treasurer</i>
LESSLIE WILSON	D. H. GIBSON

<i>Literary Correspondent</i>	<i>Assistant Secretary-Treasurer</i>
F. D. L. SMITH	H. D. SCULLY

Committee

W. C. LAIDLAW	D. B. GILLIES	R. G. DINGMAN
H. L. ROUS	R. R. LOCKHART	T. W. JULL
BEVERLEY ROBINSON	FRANK KENNEDY	A. H. U. COLQUHOUN

Officers and Executive Committee

For 1914-1915

<i>President</i>	<i>1st Vice-President</i>	<i>2nd Vice-President</i>
LESSLIE WILSON	G. H. LOCKE	E. J. KYLIE

<i>Hon. Secretary</i>	<i>Hon. Treasurer</i>
<u>E. PERCIVAL BROWN</u>	R. R. LOCKHART

<i>Literary Correspondent</i>	<i>Assistant Secretary-Treasurer</i>
F. D. L. SMITH	H. D. SCULLY

Committee

J. J. GIBSON	W. B. ROADHOUSE	C. V. HARDING
A. C. SNIVELY	DR. G. E. WILSON	A. M. IVEY
MAIN JOHNSON	JOHN M. IMRIE	J. R. BONE

Past Presidents
of
The Canadian Club of Toronto

Founded 1897

JOHN A. COOPER.....	1897-98
W. SANFORD EVANS.....	1898-99
GEORGE WILKIE.....	1899-00
W. E. RUNDLE.....	1900-01
S. CASEY WOOD.....	1901-02
D. BRUCE MACDONALD.....	1902-03
W. R. P. PARKER.....	1903-04
GEORGE A. HOWELL.....	1904-05
E. R. PEACOCK.....	1905-06
MARK H. IRISH.....	1906-07
JOHN TURNBULL.....	1907-08
R. HOME SMITH.....	1908-09
GEORGE H. D. LEE.....	1909-10
J. F. MACKAY.....	1910-11
K. J. DUNSTAN.....	1911-12
A. H. U. COLQUHOUN.....	1912-13
J. R. BONE.....	1913-14

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

Canadian Club of Toronto

(Founded 1897.)

1. The Club shall be called the Canadian Club of Toronto.
2. It is the purpose of the Club to foster patriotism by encouraging the study of the institutions, history, arts, literature, and resources of Canada, and by endeavoring to unite Canadians in such work for the welfare and progress of the Dominion as may be desirable and expedient.
3. (a) There shall be two classes of members—active and honorary.
(b) Any man at least eighteen years of age, who is a British subject by birth or naturalization, and who is in sympathy with the objects of the Club, shall be eligible for membership.
(c) Honorary membership may be conferred on such persons as in the opinion of the Club may be entitled to such distinction.
4. Application for membership must be made in writing through two members of the Club in good standing, and the names must be announced at a regular meeting of the Club and voted upon at the next Executive meeting. Two black balls shall exclude.
5. (a) Honorary members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall neither vote nor hold office.
(b) Active members shall pay, in advance, an annual fee of three dollars.
(c) No one shall be a member in good standing until he shall have paid his annual fee, such fee being due and payable on or before November 30th of each year.
(d) Only members in good standing shall be eligible for office or have the right to vote at any meeting of the Club.
(e) Fees of members elected after November 30th shall forthwith become due and payable.

(f) All members whose fees are in arrears shall be so notified by the Treasurer; and if the same are not paid within ten days thereafter, their names shall be struck from the roll.

6. (a) The officers of the Club shall consist of a President, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President, Honorary Secretary, Honorary Treasurer, Literary Correspondent, and several others holding no specific office. These officers, together with the last retiring President, shall constitute the Executive Committee.

(b) The officers shall be elected at the annual meeting of the Club, which shall be held on the last Monday in April, and shall hold office until the next annual meeting, or until their successors are elected.

(c) Nominations shall be made by a nominating committee appointed at a meeting to be held at least one week previous to the annual meeting. Their report shall be received at the annual meeting, and either adopted in its entirety or after amendment, on motion and ballot.

(d) In case of demission of office, whether by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thereby caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee. The person so elected shall hold office until the next annual meeting.

7. (a) Subject to special action by the Club, the conduct of its affairs shall be vested in the Executive Committee.

(b) The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the President, and five members shall constitute a quorum.

(c) Where the President is unable or refuses to call a meeting, three members of the Executive may do so by giving the others at least 24 hours' notice in writing.

(d) The Executive Committee shall have power to appoint an Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, who shall be paid such remuneration as shall be fixed by them.

8. The duties of the officers shall be as follows:

(a) The President, when present, shall preside at all meetings, and shall, upon request, inform the Club of the proceedings of the Executive Committee since the last report, receive and read motions, and cause the sense of the meeting to be taken on them, preserve order and direct the proceedings of the meeting in regular course. There shall be no appeal from the ruling of the Chair unless requested by at least five members and carried by two-thirds vote.

(b) In the absence of the President, the senior Vice-President present shall preside and perform the duties of the President and have his privileges.

(c) In the absence of the President and Vice-Presidents, a chairman for the meeting shall be chosen by the open vote of those present.

(d) The Literary Correspondent shall have charge of all correspondence of a literary character, and shall edit any literary matter issued by the Club, and in a general way promote and guard the interests of the Club in the daily and periodical press.

(e) The Honorary Treasurer shall collect and receive all moneys due the Club, issue receipts therefor, and pay all authorized accounts.

(f) The Secretary shall take minutes at all meetings of the Club, as well as those of the Executive Committee. He shall issue notices of meetings and perform those duties usually appertaining to the office.

(g) The Assistant Secretary-Treasurer shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Executive Committee.

9. (a) Meetings held on Mondays, between 1 and 2 p.m., shall be deemed regular meetings, and shall be called at the discretion of the Executive Committee, except during the months of May, June, July, August, September, and October. Special meetings may be held at any time or place at the call of the President or three members of the Executive Committee.

(b) No notice of ordinary meetings shall be necessary, but notice in writing of all annual and special meetings shall be sent to each member of the Club.

(c) Fifty members in good standing present at any meeting of the Club shall constitute a quorum.

10. Two auditors shall be elected by open vote at the meeting provided for in clause 6, and shall embody their report in the Treasurer's annual statement.

11. This Constitution may be amended at the annual meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, by a two-thirds vote of the members present, after one week's notice of such amendment.

THE
CANADIAN CLUB
OF TORONTO

ADDRESSES 1913-14

(June 2, 1913.)

Canada's Best Service for British
Ideals.

BY MR. NORMAN ANGELL.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club, held on the 2nd June, Mr. Angell said:

You know of course, that we in the Old Country are coming to take a very lively interest in Canadian politics, for a very good reason: you are beginning to dictate ours. It has become a matter of quite tremendous importance in England what Canada thinks, and if as in favor of any given measure it can be shown that Canada approves it, then the opponents of that measure might just as well quit, right there. (Laughter.) No one in his senses in England will oppose anything that the colonies approve. I suppose it is because we realize that the future, if not the present, is in your hands; that the potentialities are under your control; that finally the pivot will shift from the parent to the children.

So we are naturally interested to know what you are going to do with us—(laughter)—what sort of empire you are going to give our children. I don't suppose we are worrying very much about the actual constitutional forms, ex-

* Mr. Norman Angell was born in England and educated in France. He has lived and travelled in many parts of the world. As a journalist and author he is widely known, his book, "The Great Illusion," being one of the biggest sensations in recent years in the literary world.

cept in so far as they express an attitude and a state of mind, because we have learned that it is not form which matters. Venezuela has, I believe, the same constitution as Canada, and as I happen to have spent some time there I think I can say that you have a better society here than in Venezuela. And you have so infinitely better a society because your underlying convictions are so different, and it is that which counts. And I think the most pregnant question for our common future is this: Is your influence going to be thrown on the side of the extension of those underlying ideas in the world, or is the result of your influence going to be the extension of what one might almost call the Venezuelan idea? I would like, if I had the time, to develop at some length all that is implied in the difference between the two great civilizations of the Western Hemisphere: the English and the Spanish. I should astonish you perhaps if I were to say that the Spanish is based on force, and the British on consent and understanding. Yet that happens to be true. I have not time to argue it in detail, but just look at the result; Spanish America split into an odd score of rival communities, that have at bottom no more real cause for quarrel than Ontario and Manitoba; each possessing quite imposing navies and armies; nearly everyone of them having universal military training, conscription—each one afraid of the other (and perhaps rightly so), each one piling up armaments against the other, and, where they are not fighting one another as states, busy cutting one another's throats as political parties.

Such are the results of a belief in military force as the fundamental fact in society and government. I wonder if we realize how different is the British conception, how far the British imperial development of the last fifty years has got from it. You know there are some people who declare that permanent peace between the nations is impossible, because there must be an international police force to impose the will of the majority upon the minority, and that that will mean war. I wonder if it has struck these people to consider that the five nations of the British Empire—it would be really more correct to call it fifteen or twenty—have got no policemen to impose the will of the majority on the minority. However much the British Government may disagree from any line of action that Canada or Australia may care to take, you are perfectly aware, of course, that it would never attempt to support its own view by force. It is an accepted principle of practice between Great Britain and her daughter States that she shall not use force against them.

You may say this is all very well in the domestic field of British politics or as between British States like Canada and Great Britain, but it won't do when you come to foreigners. Well that depends to what extent the foreigners in question are roughly guided by the same principle. I imagine that some of you are apt to deem your neighbors the United States none too nice at times in their foreign relations, and not of an especially altruistic or self-sacrificing disposition. (Laughter.) Yet you are eventually prepared to base your relations with them upon the same order of principles—upon the assumption that whatever your relations are to be they are to be settled by mutual consent, since you have left the long frontier which marches with theirs for thousands of miles quite undefended.

Now some of us in Europe are trying to see whether this essentially British principle cannot be pushed a little further. We believe that the British Empire is destined to teach mankind what the relation of civilized groups must be; that the principle which governs the relationship of British States should govern the relationship of all States, that what is possible with five is possible with ten, and that if one can make that plain we shall have done a service not merely to mankind but above all to our Empire, and shall have achieved its final security in the only way it can be achieved. (Applause.)

Well, what role is Canada going to play in that matter? Is she going to help or hinder a movement of that kind?

When I said just this minute that you would largely determine the kind of Empire we should have, I was quite serious. Your influence is bound to increase, you will be taking your share in the Empire's foreign policy, your weight will often decide the balance between one line and another. Indeed, I think it may be doing that already.

In order to make plain what I am driving at, I want to give you an idea of the sort of conflict which is confronting us in Europe. The picture is this: Here are two men, both very angry, both talking at once, neither knowing what it is all about, and both flourishing revolvers. What are they to do. We say—I speak of those concerned in the particular propaganda in which I am concerned—they should find out what it is all about. We don't believe there is any real cause of disagreement at all, and that if they do fight—which possibly they may—it will be from sheer misunderstanding, and the only way to clear up a misunderstanding is to understand it. But the other people say: Don't worry about understanding it—give both another revolver! (Laughter.) Fighting is inevitable anyhow; men are natural enemies and these

two have an insoluble cause of quarrel! Now I want you to note this: supposing for the sake of argument that this *is* a misunderstanding, that these men have no real cause of quarrel at all,—nevertheless, they will fight if they refuse to examine the matter. If each says “Oh, hang all argument, just see that you are stronger than the other fellow,” why, there will be a scrap, not necessarily because there is any real cause of quarrel, but because each thinks there is, and because each refuses to see whether there is or not. To refuse to examine the grounds of a quarrel is to make the quarrel inevitable, unless the other party is a poltroon who can simply be frightened, and I don’t think that any sensible man assumes that to be the case here.

Now Canada’s action so far in this quarrel—in helping to provide pistols and in doing so far nothing else—has had the effect of supporting those who deprecate the examination of the causes of quarrel, and who favor the policy of pure force.

Please don’t misunderstand me. I am sure that that was not the intention of your policy, but it may possibly have been part of its result. To furnish aid to the British Navy at this juncture, is in any case a splendid act, and may, for all I know, be a wise and necessary one. Personally, I believe in self defence. Those ships may be needed; Germany may, for all I know, one day attack us. But if she does, it will be because like others of us, she is laboring under a monstrous error.

By joining the party of force I mean joining those who believe that these international conflicts are not misunderstandings to be cleared up, but real collisions of interest which can only be settled by force.

Now certain indications seem to point to the fact that Canadian opinion, as a whole, inclines to that view, and will re-enforce that part which supports it in the Counsel of the Empire. Of course, if it is a sound view and war is inevitable in any case, it will not matter, but if it is not a sound view and war is, in the fine phrase of Mr. Bonar Law—one of the finest phrases ever pronounced by a British statesman—“not inevitable, only the failure of human wisdom”—(applause)—Canada’s action will in that case have helped to lead the Empire into a disastrous policy which greater wisdom might have avoided.

Admitting for a moment that Mr. Bonar Law is right, and that war is the failure of human wisdom, it is evident that our policy should be of a two-fold nature; to retain our relative armament *and* insist that we also do our share towards a better understanding. (Applause.)

You may say that that is very vague. Well, this thing that we call public opinion is vague. Yet a thousand years of warfare—the warfare between rival religions—was brought to an end by just this vague thing—by the fact that the people who counted got rid of a few mistaken ideas. It is one instance the more of the ultimate fact which distinguishes Canada from Venezuela—the force of a few prevailing ideas.

What are some of the ideas which need clarification, if we are to come out of this squabble without catastrophe?

I will try and indicate a few.

A great fat book has just appeared in England to prove that Germany is bound to fight the British Empire, because Germans must get food for their ever-increasing millions. This coming conflict, is, we are told, in the last resort the struggle for bread—Germany will fight because Germans need the wheat of Canada.

Well, now I put it to you—cannot Germans have the wheat of Canada—by paying for it? And could they get your wheat without paying for it, even if they did change places with Great Britain as “owners” of Canada? We, the British, are supposed to “own” Canada, in the meaningless phrases that still obscure the discussion of international politics. Does that mean that we can get a single sack of Canadian wheat without paying for it? Don't you see that the fact of conquest is not going to change the bread problem for Germany one way or the other.

But, you may object, although the economic position would remain the same, Germany would like to turn Canada into a German colony, a place where German law, German speech and German Government prevail.

Have you ever thought what the permanent conquest of a virile modern civilized community really means? I imagine that you deem a Canadian as good as a Boer. Well, in order to reduce a population of about 100,000 adults, inhabiting a territory which could not support them the year around, it took 400,000 of the finest soldiers in the world three years and cost two billion of dollars. Just work it out by rule of three, and see how much money and how many men it would take to conquer a population just as virile and twenty times as numerous inhabiting a still larger territory, perfectly able to support them the year around. (Laughter.) And will you also note this: that even where conquest has taken place, it has generally been impossible or inadvisable to stamp out the language or laws of a civilized community,—that was the case of French Canada when French Canada meant a few thousand

farmers. How impossible, how unthinkable, therefore, would it be to stamp out the language, law, literature of a great self-governing community, possessing a great press, habits of self-government, a cheap literature, and so on! What is the truth in this matter? If we could imagine a physical impossibility—the German conquest of Canada—Germans would get pretty much the same Canada that is open to them now. And for this reason, Germans—the nation which certain of our more timid friends are so fond of representing as quite wickedly shrewd and self-seeking—will not attempt anything so foolish. God has made Canada one of those nations which cannot be conquered and cannot be destroyed, except by herself. (Applause.)

What are some of the other ideas that need a little examination? One is the idea that most of the Empire's wealth can be obtained at the cost of a single naval victory. If that is true, the fact is a standing temptation to foreign nations. And our statesmen are busy proclaiming it to the nations.

A British Minister once declared that "the whole fortune of our race, treasure accumulated during so many centuries, would be swept utterly away if our naval supremacy were impaired." And a Canadian one, that even without war the mere possession of stronger power by a rival nation would take from us "the sole guarantee of the Empire's continual existence." A great British general has declared that we carry on our trade merely on sufferance until another nation has greater power unless we had preponderant power; and Mr. Frederick Harrison says a naval defeat would mean bankruptcy, starvation, chaos. These phrases were terrifying and portentous, but quite without meaning—fortunately for those among others who have money invested in that Empire and desire to attract more thereto. If Germany, as the result of a naval victory reduced Britain to bankruptcy she would herself be bankrupt; if half of our population starved, masses of hers would starve also. If Germany prevented Canadians sending us in England their wheat they could not buy German goods, and could not be a German market. If Germany prevented us selling our goods we could not buy the Canadian wheat, which would come to the same thing. If Germany wanted to profit by her victory she would have to allow us to carry on our business as heretofore—and she need not conquer us in order to do that. If a nation could not carry on its overseas trade unless it had preponderant naval force, how comes it that Germany has for twenty years been gaining on us in overseas market, although all that time she had been

inferior in power to us? How could we have used our power to prevent that competition? Trade depends on having things to sell and knowing how to sell them, not in having more force than someone else. Though we destroyed every ship Germany possessed sixty-five million people would go on working and competing with us in the markets of the world! Where these high-sounding phrases of the statesmen are not meaningless they are monstrous absurdities, old notions and old political "axioms" which we have inherited from conditions long since passed away. It is in the false principles laid down by British statesmen that German aggressive policy found its justification. So long as English public opinion condones these ideas we cannot reasonably look for sounder opinion upon the continent; and as long as such represents the foundation of political ideas in Europe it is impossible to arrive at a better policy.

Well! again you may say "where does Canada come in, what can she do to help in the better understanding of these things?"

Now the truth is this, that while you have done your part towards giving everybody another revolver, have you done your part towards helping to finding out "what it is all about" You are a nation, you have come to man's estate among the peoples of the world. You take your share in the Empire's policy by adding to its military force, are you also fulfilling your share of this other part of the work, contributing to a better understanding of these problems, using your influence to see that the Empire's attitude shall be one that makes understanding possible, that it shall be not only strong but right?

I will try to make clear what I mean by taking one instance among many.

There is a movement in England at the present moment among the more informed commercial classes, and among the best legal authorities towards the abolition of the right of capture at sea—towards putting private property by international agreement in time of war at sea on the same plane that it has been placed on land. (Applause.) Now Canada has a very special interest in that—it would in large part secure from interruption in time of war those cargoes of food stuffs destined for England which it is to your interest to sell and England's to buy. Your neighbor, the United States and most of the great nations, are in favor of this world reform, but England has mistakenly, as so many of her people are now coming to think, so far, for special reasons—obsolete reasons

so many think—opposed it. Now, when the offer of naval help was made to Great Britain, did Canada even express any desire as to the attitude the Empire should take on this matter? You may say that she properly could not do so, that it would have been an impertinence. But as a matter of fact, your right to express just such opinion is specifically recognized in the very first resolution of the last Imperial Conference. By the very fact of this offer of help, you are taking part in her military policy, consequently you are giving support to her general policy. Are you not concerned with what it is? Shall you strengthen her progressive party—those who are trying to create a civilized law among the nations, or are you going to support the party which is indifferent to that and which bases everything upon sheer force? And let me say again, that you can furnish help to the Empire in the shape of ships or money, and still be in favor of the party of law as against the party of force.

I have mentioned the immunity of private property at sea, but that is only one of the many reforms that progressive people at home are hammering at. There are all sorts of plans of international co-operation, conventions to make loans by neutral states illegal, to frame working arrangements with reference to rendering judgments of the courts of one nation operative in others—plans which are very hard to carry through because European Governments, dominated by old diplomatic conceptions, refuse to concern themselves with these things. But the younger and more vigorous nations are free from these preconceptions. Why not use your influence to see that some of the more modern methods in international relations be given at least a trial? If Canada can make a present of thirty-five millions for battleships, could not a fraction, say two per cent. of that sum, have been set aside for aiding the work of international co-operation, for helping these international conventions designed to build up a body of real international law, to subsidize such work of world organization as the International Agricultural Bureau? The moral effect of setting aside even a fractional sum for such purposes, or still more of expressing a favorable view of such efforts as those to secure immunity of cargoes from capture would be enormous—it would probably suffice to turn the balance in the case of the British Government.

And more important perhaps even than this, is the question of what your educational institutions are doing to contribute to the understanding of these things. Does there exist in Canada a University Chair of International Relations.

established for the purpose of enabling the whole problem of the conflict of nations to be studied systematically, scientifically? These things are difficult questions—difficult, however, mainly because they are overlaid with all sorts of false theories which the past has bequeathed to us—and we shall not go straight on them unless we take a little trouble. The newer nations have, of course, the greater chance of going straight on them, because they are less hypnotized by the past. But are those newer nations taking the trouble?

In any case our future is in your hands. More and more are we looking to you. I repeat the question with which I started, "What are you Canadians going to do with us?" (Long applause.)

(September 24, 1913.)

Newspapers.

BY LORD NORTHCLIFFE.*

AT a special luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 24th Oct., 1913, Lord Northcliffe said:

Gentlemen,—Please let me first thank you for again so warmly receiving me in this room. I sometimes feel like somewhat of an intruder in these Canadian Clubs, because I think I can claim to have spoken to more Canadian Clubs than almost any Englishman, and more than most Canadians. But I am bound to say that to be commanded, as I have been by your Secretary, to speak for thirty minutes on the subject of "Newspapers," is one of the most difficult propositions that I have ever been up against.

I have been engaged in the business of newspapers since I was a boy. We had a very distinguished politician in England, the third Sir Robert Peel, who was a candidate for Parliament in a constituency where most of his votes were in the hands of men whose wives kept lodging houses in Brighton. He said in a speech one time: "I was born in a Brighton lodging house, I live in a Brighton lodging house, and I hope to die in a Brighton lodging house!" So I might say about the newspaper business: I like it as well as I like anything in this life; but I don't like to have to deal with it in thirty minutes! (Laughter.)

In this particular audience there are special reasons why it is very difficult for me to speak of it, because I speak in a city which is the most highly newspapered city in the Empire. There is no other city in the Empire with six excellent daily papers in a population of half a million. On our side of the water, as the head of the famous and progressive house of Cassell, Mr. Arthur Spurgeon, who is present here to-day, said to me, "I don't think we have any city with six daily newspapers, and we have cities of more than a million."

And I speak not only to an audience trained to watch six papers, but you have in this audience editors whose names

* Lord Northcliffe has had a meteoric career in journalism. He commenced work in the newspaper business in a minor capacity, and is now the chief owner of the London "Times," controlling in addition, several other big English periodicals. He has extensive interests in pulp and paper mills in Newfoundland.

are famous far beyond the bounds of this city, even beyond the Atlantic. So it behooves me to be very, very careful and very precise, and to confine myself exactly to what I know about newspapers. (Laughter.) And the more I see, the more I realize that there are many things I don't know about them. The only thing that can save me to-day is the fact that I am limited to thirty minutes. (Laughter.)

Many of you have come back from charming holidays, such as I have spent, among your Canadian lakes and rivers. It may not have occurred to you, when you were in the lonely haunts of the moose, the bear and the salmon, that you were in the birthplace of many of the newspapers of the world, because on the Canadian forests so many of the newspapers of the world base their supplies. Many of your vast forests have been recklessly destroyed, as you know; many are gone never to return. But, wiser than your neighbors, you have passed stringent laws to prevent further destruction of your treasure. But you have this consolation of knowing that these forests that have gone across the water in the form of paper have gone into the making of newspapers which have done something to make the grandeur and resources of your country known to the world, and have directed to you some of the people of the old countries.

Nothing is more remarkable in the streets of Toronto than the accents of the Scotch and the English that one hears, and of a good class, not as some gentlemen I remember seeing here two or three years ago—"bronchos," I think, they were called (laughter)—who very plainly and frankly said to me that they had come here to avoid work, and had no intention of doing any work at all! The class I meet now are a very different class, and I rejoice to think that, even at somewhat of a sacrifice, your forests have gone to make newspapers which have directed these people not only to Toronto, but to the whole Dominion.

The very fact that newspapers are the chief agents in the modern movements of people you could not have attracted but by the publication of the fact of your natural resources, that very fact, I think, is a stirring, striking proof of that new force in the world, which is hardly yet recognized, which is summed up in the word "publicity."

Publicity is a very difficult thing to define. It acts in all kinds of ways, with which people are hardly acquainted, and among other ways during the last twenty years it has caused newspapers to enmesh the whole world in one vast net of information getters.

I wonder, when you read your daily newspaper, or your six daily newspapers—for the excellent man at the news stand in the King Edward tells me that many people do buy the whole six—(laughter)—whether you realize that through these newspapers you are in direct touch practically with every part of the world? If, for example, a distinguished citizen of Toronto were ever lost in some lonely part of Siberia, in a very few hours one of your newspaper men could communicate the fact to his agent in London, and the news would be flashed from there to St. Petersburg, and to the newspapers of Siberia—for they have newspapers there. In my opinion this is one of the greatest forces the world has ever yet known. That strange net of news gathering renders it practically impossible for any evil person long to escape justice, because the newspaper has the world in its service, using every invention, the wireless, the telegraph, the telephone, and last but not least, the photograph.

An accused gentleman, recently, assumed the medical title of doctor, one Crippen. Five and twenty years ago Dr. Crippen would have been continuing his medical practice in some remote part of the world; but what happened? The same has happened over and over again. It was this: the photograph of the suspected man was found, and a specimen of his handwriting. That photograph was published far and wide, together with the facsimile of his handwriting. Somebody compared the writing with a signature in a hotel register in Belgium, and it was found that the man who wrote the signature was trying to get tickets for Canada. They proved the identity of the man not merely by the facsimile of his handwriting but by his photograph. They telegraphed the news of this to a certain ship sailing at Antwerp for Quebec. One of the officers on that ship bought the paper containing the picture, and compared it with the people going across the gangway. And so this great modern force served to prevent further intrigues of that celebrated man.

Very few realize that among all the newspapers of the world there is that unwritten agreement by which they help each other in an emergency to provide news of the people of their own city. I should not have the least trouble in finding any person from London who had disappeared in your own city. I would merely have to communicate with one of my friends—and I am glad to say that the editors of all your papers are my friends—and I should soon discover him among your half million people. This is an aspect of the newspaper to which I do not think sufficient importance is given. It is a

most important aspect, because it will and must inevitably act as a great deterrent of crime.

There are people—but I must say they are people who have never been back of a newspaper during any great national crisis, such as any war,—who imagine that newspapers flourish by wars, and stir up troubles. That is far from true. Practically every great war in recent times has crippled one newspaper, and hurt all of them. Newspapers have had some little to do with somewhat lessening the number of wars the world is having. We have had lately in Europe one of the most horrible wars, not only in our time, but of any time. It is difficult to conceive why out of all modern inventions these various armies should have resorted to barbarities; but it is true. That war never received the attention it should have on this continent. The time to stop a war is, as the Irishman said, before it starts. And if, as you people know who live in a country which has the finest forests in the world, you want to stop a forest fire, the best time to do so is before it has got a start. That war in Europe was made up by men who met in secret, as has been revealed by their secret documents published in the London "Times," and sprung upon the world before anyone knew what was happening. I believe publicity would have been the only means to stop that war. When the war broke out I do believe all the powers of Europe did their best to stop it, but though the Czar of Russia, and the Kaisers of Germany and Austria tried, they could not. I believe that the world is wearying of that war and is going to stop it.

On this side of the Atlantic you are far removed from war, and I hope you always will be. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Mr. Spurgeon and I have been lately quite close to a great war, I suppose as close as you are to the Province of Quebec, and we have sometimes been drawn into wars involuntarily whether we like it or not. But when I see these statements in English, and in other papers, that the newspapers encourage wars, I do not believe it. To describe the military preparations of other nations, is not to encourage war, but to stop it. Had we known the military preparations of the Balkan States, we could have prevented the war.

You here, on this continent, especially those on the other side of your lovely lake, are apparently always engaged in that form of war that we read of, described in the short generic term "graft." When I open your newspapers in this city I see mention of it. We have outgrown, I trust, in England, that sort of thing—in the Middle Ages there was a great deal of it; what was called "the favoritism of kings"—the alloca-

tion of lands and fees, sinecures—was one form of it. It seems to me such a thing is practically inevitable, in view of the vast treasures of your country, that self-seeking men should be trying to make money for themselves at the cost of the public weal. I sometimes think that your newspapers use that term too frequently. Perhaps you will allow a passing stranger to point out that the constant use of this word creates an extraordinarily bad impression when cabled abroad. Recently in England we had considerable discussion of the purchase of shares by two Liberal Ministers in an American company which had no connection with the English company, I refer to the Marconi scandal, as it was called, of which you have heard. Although a strong Conservative, I did not like the attacks upon those Liberal men. And just as our newspapers made too much of it, so Canadian newspapers give the impression to a passing stranger that there is terrible corruption here, which is not true. (Applause.) This is one of the dangers of newspapers. I do not pretend that the newspaper is more perfect than any other human machine. But when those things go farther it creates an unfavorable impression.

There is a class of people in our part of the world that likes to represent our country as toppling to its doom. One would think from what they say that the chief occupation of the people of England is gathering hay in front of the stock exchange! (Laughter.) There is no danger in that kind of thing for home consumption, but when every Sunday they are pumped across the ocean, some people almost believe them. I think they are intelligent people, too. (Laughter.) But it is hardly possible that a country so imminently close to bankruptcy should be able to lend money to the whole world. (Laughter.) The two things don't go together. We have people who always like to represent our country as in a very poor state, and telling of the number of industries we have lost. That, I believe, has always been the English way: England has always been going to the dogs! (Laughter.) I have seen a pamphlet two hundred years old complaining of the same—its title was "The Annihilation of English Commerce." These articles, numbers of them, are put upon the cable, and people become almost sympathetic with England. I want to say, a more highly prosperous people do not exist on the face of the globe! (Hear, hear, and applause.) I say that with due consideration, for I have travelled nearly all over the world. Some people think that because we have lost two or three hundred thousand people every year, we are going down. But

from the loins of England have sprung how many nations? When I say "England," I very naturally include Scotland, and my own country of Ireland. There are this country, Australia, South Africa, and many many other parts of the world we do not usually consider as being in the run of modern civilization, that have been brought into cultivation by England. To me, it is no sign of lack of prosperity that we send out these people every year. We send out just the kind of people that you want—not always, but very often. We have even seen in London Canadians of whom Canadians are particularly proud, and you have over eight millions. But we send you just the people you want, people of muscle rather than people of mind—you have the minds here, and want people to do the labor. (Laughter.) We have sent you Scotchmen to control your newspapers and many of your businesses, and most of the offices. I was under the impression that the Province of Quebec got some of them. The fact is that we can send these people, and I hope always shall be able to send these people. (Applause.)

You will have here shortly, I understand, quite a distinguished member of the British Government. He and I don't at all agree in politics—I loathe his telephone! (Laughter.) I prefer to walk, it is quicker! (Laughter)—but if you could get him to discuss his views of England and of its future, it would be extremely interesting. He pointed out to me that despite this drain on our population we were still vigorous, and he asked me what was to prevent your having a population here of a hundred million people. I see no reason at all to prevent it. The city of Manchester contains more highly skilled workers than any other city of the world; Yorkshire and Lancashire have more skilled workers than any other similar parts anywhere else. They do not emigrate, because you have nothing here for them to do. The north of England has orders for three years. I quite agree with Mr. Samuel, the Postmaster-General, though I don't agree with him about Home Rule. (Laughter.) I think he will alter his tone before he gets back from this trip. We have not only natural wealth, but skilled fingers. We make these things well. (Applause.) English-made goods you may find in Paris, Berlin, St. Petersburg, New York. (Applause.) Why? Because these workers will not make bad goods! (Applause.) They say: "It will not be good for us to turn out inferior goods; we shall lose our trade!" It is most strictly the fact that the people most opposed to bad spinning in Lancashire are not the employers, but the workpeople. It is a very highly developed state of

civilization where the workers decline to make bad goods. (Applause.)

This has little to do with newspapers, except this: that I wish to raise my voice in protest against the morals and tone of the Sunday newspapers that pour into this country from somewhere.

You must not let me close without a word for the Toronto newspapers. I am not one of those people who fear competition. It is a good thing for the papers when each competitor has five others to watch. You can imagine, careful though he be by nature, how careful that makes him, even in so small a thing as the typographical appearance,—I don't think there are better printed papers in the world than in Toronto. I won't speak of the skilled editorial writers, because their names are well known on our side of the Atlantic, and they are constantly quoted there.

On behalf of the whole profession which Mr. Spurgeon and I represent to-day, I want to say that I believe the newspapers of the world have vastly improved since Charles Dickens told us of the *Eatanswill Gazette*, and Mr. Jefferson Brick's *New York Journal*. Charles Dickens was an accurate observer, and many of us remember what the papers were like in those days of sixty years ago. I do claim, however, that while newspapers are not perfect, yet they have advanced materially, at least in proportion to the advances in applied electricity, and quite as much as the advance in medical science—and I cannot speak of the subject of medical knowledge without comparing those days with the progress of the splendid Canadian hospitals with which your country abounds. (Applause.)

(October 4, 1913.)

Imperial Relations.

BY THE RIGHT HON. HERBERT SAMUEL, M.P.,*
Postmaster-General of the United Kingdom.

AT a special luncheon of the Canadian Club held on Saturday, 4th Oct., the Right Hon. Mr. Samuel said:

Mr. President and gentlemen,—Let me thank you in the first instance very cordially for the warmth and heartiness of the reception with which you have honored me. I am now approaching the end of an interesting tour through Canada. I have visited all the chief cities of the West; I have motored for some hundreds of miles over the prairies; I have seen the processes of your agriculture, from the breaking up of the virgin soil of the prairie to the handling of the grain in the elevators; I have seen some of the development of your manufactures. And wherever I have met Canadians, they all say to me: "Well, sir, what do you think of our country?" (Laughter.) And I will tell you one thing that has impressed me very greatly. The vast expanse of prairies—that I knew I should see. And the remarkable inflow of population into the West and into cities such as this—that I knew I should see evidences of. But I found to my surprise the great development which has taken place, within the last three or four years in some instances, in the cities of the West. I found that such places as, not only Winnipeg, but Regina and Calgary, Edmonton and Saskatoon, Vancouver and Victoria had developed, and had reached a higher stage of civic life than I think any of us in the Mother Land knew was the case. And most satisfactory of all, this development has been not only in material things but one finds there a fine and vigorous civic spirit; one finds there that men who are at the head of things are zealously interested in their schools and in building up great new universities; they are looking to the beauty of their cities, the dignity of their public buildings, the charm of

*The Right Hon. Mr. Samuel is one of the ablest and youngest Members of the present British administration, in which he occupies the position of Postmaster-General. He has been trained in statesmanship almost from childhood, and next to Mr. Asquith is said to be the most lucid debater in the Liberal party. He was one of the first British Cabinet Ministers to make a tour of the Dominion while holding office.

their parks. Here also, as far as one can gather in a visit which has necessarily been brief, here also the same spirit animates Canadians in the older Provinces. All this is a cheering thing to find, to one who comes from the Old Country. There we thought there was danger in these new lands, where men face vast and urgent practical problems, that there would be developed too much attention to material things, that men would be wholly given up to materialism. In some aspects our civilization is too materialistic. There is a fine saying of Emerson's, which is pregnant and truthful: "Things are in the saddle, and ride mankind." And whenever one finds the effort on the part of communities to put things in their proper place, subordinated to and dominated by the higher human interests, that, I say, is an encouraging and hopeful sign. (Hear, hear, and applause.) That is what has struck me in the cities of the West.

I have heard it said here that Canadian civilization is on the whole, less commercialized than American civilization, south of the boundary line. I know not enough of either Canadian or American life to make it other than an impertinence on my part to make any such generalization. But if it be true, or largely true, that your life here is less commercialized, then I say, that is a precious distinction; cherish it always! (Applause.)

But naturally the circumstance that strikes an observer first, is the great material development of Canada. We are very conscious of that growth in England. The social and economic links that bind together the Mother Country and this Dominion are growing stouter every year. Our population in the Mother Country is not stagnant. Our own increase of population is about half a million of people every year, and we can afford to send you many of our best; and gladly do we send you a large outflow of immigrants from us, to be an inflow for you. All our towns and cities, almost all our villages, have some connection in Canada with immigrants who have left us. I remember, not long ago, in the North of England where my constituency is situated, I was changing trains at Darlington station, in Durham, at midnight, when I saw gathered on the platform a crowd of people; I heard singing, and walking down I saw a group of twenty or thirty young people, with their baggage, starting as emigrants to become settlers here; and with them was a group of friends, the choir of their church, singing hymns to bid them farewell as the train was coming in and as it went out. What was touching, and impressed me, was the spirit in which these people

went out to face what to them was a great adventure, a great change. But they come to a country where on the whole life is easier than in the Mother Land, where the prospects are better, where still they find themselves speaking the British language, under the British flag, among British institutions. These young people are links, they are channels which carry the knowledge of Canada to the Old World.

Things are very different from what they were thirty or forty years ago, when the Dominions, or colonies as they were called then, seemed very far away, their affairs were almost unnoticed, their statesmen were unknown, their views and opinions ignored. Now, their opinions, their actions, their people are very constantly in the thoughts of the people of the Mother Land. And all this must have its effect upon the organization of our Imperial system. It is upon that I propose to address you briefly to-day.

Ten years ago there was started in England a great political campaign. I do not propose to enter upon matters of controversy, either Canadian or British, but I may be permitted to remind you of the fact that ten years ago there was started by a great statesman, whom we all respect, even if we don't agree with him, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, (applause) a campaign which I believe was inspired mainly by the sincere desire to promote the permanent unity of the British Empire. His proposals became the subject of acute party controversy. I would ask your leave to-day to tell you, not in a controversial spirit, and very briefly, what our reasons are, in the Liberal party to which I belong, the British Liberal party, for opposing the proposals of Mr. Chamberlain; although we claim to be as eager as he to maintain and strengthen the bonds of union between the various portions of the British Empire. We were told that unless we agreed to change our fiscal system, and impose taxes which do not now exist, upon wheat and other articles from foreign countries, while giving a preference on grain brought from the British Dominions the result would be disaster to the Empire. We, on our part, held that without that the British Empire could be maintained, and did not fear that without that the British Empire might crumble. That became a great party issue at the elections.

That reminds me of an incident, which may be unimportant, but which is interesting, because it happens to be true. (Laughter.) In our country there are many music halls, as you have them here, with such names as "Empire," "Hippodrome," "Coliseum," and so forth. At Stockton, near my constituency, in North Yorkshire, during a recent election, a lady

canvasser was going about, and was visiting a home where the voter chanced to be out but the wife was in—we still hear in these days of woman not having the vote, (laughter) and I think in view of the militant suffrage agitation going on it is likely to be a very long time before Parliament will grant woman suffrage—this canvasser, who was working in the interests of the Unionist candidate, was trying to induce the woman to urge her husband to vote for food taxation, “because if we don’t have it,” she said, “the Empire will fall to pieces.” The wife replied, “Really, ma’am, it would make no difference to me, because I always go to the Hippodrome.” (Laughter.)

Well, I tell you that, not only because I am assured by people in my constituency that the incident actually occurred, but also because it illustrates a spirit which exists among our people generally, a profound scepticism as to whether the Empire would fall to pieces if we don’t adopt any particular policy. But we who opposed the policy of Imperial preference, and oppose it still, do so in the interests of the Empire itself, because, whether right or wrong, we are ourselves profoundly and quite sincerely convinced that it would be deleterious to the British Empire in the long run.

So far as foodstuffs are concerned, the Dominion and the Mother Land stand in the relation of seller and buyer. In one sense their interests are the same. A seller would be very sorry if there were no buyer, and a buyer would be sorry if there were no willing seller. Each has a common interest in that which concerns the prosperity of the other. But also, in the commercial world, the interests of seller and buyer are contrary to one another. The seller wants the highest price for his commodity, and the buyer wants to purchase as cheap as possible. So, in a sense, their interests are opposed, and this is a fact which must be faced when we are dealing with the commercial aspect of the question, which is not the most important aspect, but this aspect is the one which is at issue when we are discussing matters of tariff reform.

The interests of the Dominion and of the Mother Country, when dealing with food materials, are not the same, but contrary to one another, because Canada, for example, wants to get the highest price she can for her grain in the markets of the world, while the Mother Country wishes to get her grain as cheap as possible.

Secondly, in regard to manufactures: We in the Mother Country want the Dominions, as far as possible, to be a market for our manufactures, and to a great extent they are. But you want, and quite properly, to see your manufacturers able to

meet the needs of your own consumers here within your own boundaries. Both these desires are perfectly right and proper, but to a certain extent they are contrary. If you have a system of bargaining of any kind, you will sooner or later come up against that divergence of interest. You cannot make political arrangements which will be satisfactory, on the one hand to the grain growers, who want higher prices, and on the other hand to the grain consumers, who want lower prices; on the one hand to our manufacturers, who want to supply their products to your people, and on the other hand to your manufacturers, who want to keep the market for the products of your own country. We should each of us be putting great and vital economic interests in the hands of the other party, our own interests into your hands, and your interests into our hands.

Our view,—we may be wrong,—is that we should each find local interest conflicting with Imperial ties. Whenever the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Westminster, or whenever the Finance Minister at Ottawa, wanted to modify any detail of these arrangements, the Chancellor would have to get the consent of Australia and New Zealand, of South Africa and of Canada, and the Finance Minister would have to get the consent of the Governments and the Parliaments at Westminster and the other capitals. So you, and the others, and we, should feel that our own interests were not in our own hands; we believe that closer contact might mean, in the long run, nothing more than greater friction. (Applause.)

There is another consideration which has weighed with us very greatly; we have, as you know, in the Mother Land, a great mass of poverty,—we have millions of people who live always only just on the safe side of destitution and sometimes crossing that line. Sickness, or a brief period of unemployment, may plunge them into penury. We are dealing with many of these social problems in a vigorous, practical and successful manner. (Applause.) But still the fact remains, that we have this great mass of poverty. I suppose it is true to say that man for man, the English people are not so well off in pounds, shillings and pence,—in dollars, in actual income—as the people of Canada, for example. Now, we hold the view, rightly or wrongly, that a tax upon foreign grain supplies would mean an inevitable increase in the price of all grain to the consumers. This is not the occasion to argue that economic proposition. But we believe that that result would follow the imposing of such a tax. If the price were not raised, we do not see where the encouragement to the Canadian farmer would arise,

which is one object of the proposal, for if the prices were not raised he would not have any more inducement to grow grain. And if the price were raised, then it would be imposing a fresh burden upon our poor, and to that we are unalterably opposed. (Applause.) Not only because we think that it is wrong to make life harder for those whose lives are already too heavily burdened. That in itself is sufficient, it is sufficient for most of us. But we do not want our people to feel that the Empire imposes this fresh burden. We do not want this position to arise, that if bad times come in the Old Country, if people in days of distress find it more difficult to live, that anyone should be able to go to the mass of the people of the Old Country, and say to them, "Yes, you are suffering partly because prices are higher, partly because there is a tax upon imported food. If you are suffering economic stress, you are suffering for the sake of the Empire and the Dominions." That would be bad for the Dominions, bad for our people, and bad for the Empire as a whole.

Perhaps I have been led further than I intended to go. It is not my intention to argue these propositions but to state them. I am anxious only to make this plain, that so far as the party is concerned to which I have the honor to belong, and to which I have belonged all my life, so far as the Liberal party goes in England,—and this is not necessarily the same thing as the Liberal party in Canada (laughter), and as I pointed out to the Canadian Club in Winnipeg it is not necessarily a different thing (laughter), so far as the English Liberal party is concerned, if we have opposed Mr. Chamberlain's program, and stood resolutely against it, it is not from indifference to the Empire as a whole. Still less is it from hostility to the Empire. But it is because we believe it would be counter to the fundamental principles of Imperial statesmanship, contrary to the interests of our people at home, at the heart of the Empire, and contrary to a sound policy of Imperialism, to run the risk of placing in antagonism to one another local interests and Imperial ties. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We do not feel that a policy which is liable to create an antagonism between Imperial patriotism and the economic advantage of the masses of our people can ever be made a stable basis for Imperial unity.

It is not on the economic, but on the political side that progress may be made. I for one think our Imperial constitution has certainly not reached its final form. The constitutional links which make for Imperial unity, apart from sentiment, and public opinion, which after all are the most powerful of

all, are four. There is, first, the Monarchy, which is common to the whole Empire. Happily preserved through a thousand years of history, it forms a bond uniting all portions of the King's dominions, both the white portions of the Empire and those great parts which lie in tropical and sub-tropical latitudes. And owing to the devotion to the constitution, and the splendid sense of duty, of the occupants of the throne, especially during the last three generations, the Monarchy now, I believe, stands more firmly based than at any time in the whole history of our Empire. (Applause.)

Secondly, there is the supreme legal tribunal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, on which representatives of the Dominions sit, which I believe is regarded as a perfectly impartial and highly competent court. I have, indeed, heard in Canada severe criticism of the Privy Council by one legal gentleman; I found that he had quite recently lost two cases, which may account for his views. (Laughter.)

Thirdly, there is the Imperial Conference, which meets once in four years, composed of the Prime Ministers of the Mother Country and the Dominions, and other Ministers, and which debates subjects of vital importance to the whole Empire. It arrives at conclusions which are by no means ignored, but are mostly carried into effect; but it has no executive authority.

Lastly, there is the Committee of Imperial Defence, which is mainly composed of representatives of the Home Land, but which is developing more and more into an organ of the Imperial body politic. Dominion Ministers attend its meetings from time to time, and keep in close contact with its proceedings, and while there they have an opportunity of keeping in touch with those who are directing the foreign policy of the Empire. But the Committee itself deals not with policy but with methods.

These are the four constitutional links of Empire, these four and no others. The Dominions have great influence in directing the policy of the Empire as a whole, but they have no formal and direct share in its constitutional working. There is no central Legislature, no central Executive formally representative of all portions of the Empire. But when you attempt to solve this vast problem you find yourself faced with the greatest of difficulties. It is the difficulty of reconciling local autonomy with any form of central government. This the Mother Land recognizes quite as fully as the Dominions—I say, with all sincerity—that the local freedom of the Dominions to manage their own affairs is absolutely essential to the well-being of the Empire. (Applause.)

You, Mr. Chairman, spoke of me as a representative in the flesh of Downing Street. Well, of Downing Street in a sense, but let me assure you, not of the old spirit that prevailed in Downing Street two or three generations ago. (Hear, hear.) That is gone; that is dead. We realize, not only in the interests of the Dominions themselves, but also of the Empire as a whole, that Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, must manage, free from all interference of any kind, their own local affairs. The freedom of the Dominions is the strength of the Empire. (Hear, hear.) The Roman Empire died largely because its government was too much concentrated at the centre. The British Empire lives, and will endure, because of these living, autonomous institutions in the parts. (Applause.)

We are faced, I say, by problems of formidable difficulty whenever we attempt to reconcile, however tentatively, the freedom of the parts of the Empire with central government. I believe the problem is not insoluble. But I express, not only my own opinions, but I am sure, those of the Government to which I belong, when I say that we recognize that no error could be greater than the error of pressing these problems to a conclusion before they are ripe. No folly could be greater than that of a statesman who, eager for glory, should sit down and attempt to pen a complete and logical constitution for the Empire as a whole. If a really Imperial constitutional organization comes, it will come as our British institutions usually come, not by manufacture, but by growth. (Applause.) And any steps that are taken must be tentative and cautious, so that if they are found to be in a wrong direction they can be changed before harm is done.

But so far as the spirit is concerned, I can give you the assurance that whenever Canada is ready to take a step forward, and whenever the sister States, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, are ready to draw together in some form of central union, you will find, I believe, in the Mother Country on all hands the most sympathetic desire to meet the wishes of the Dominions.

Then, lastly, our system of Imperial relations must touch the question of defence. There must be a system of defence. (Applause.) And if there is a system of defence, it must be adequate for its purpose. The very reason that makes us maintain defences at all must make us maintain them on a scale commensurate with the object they have in view, to maintain the security of our dominions.

But our defences should not be exaggerated. We do not hold in England the view, that the bigger our navy is, the bet-

ter it is. We regard armaments as in themselves not a good thing, but a bad thing; a necessary evil, but an evil; an evil, but still necessary. We have no desire that our armaments should be swollen beyond the actual need, that we should call upon any of our people to bear burdens heavier than the case requires. But we have to consider questions in council week by week of international relations. We, members of the Imperial Government, would feel we should be doing less than our duty if we failed to provide against possible risks. In these questions we have to consider not only the international situation of the moment; friendships are not always enduring; try as we will, our efforts may be defeated. The Imperial Government of Great Britain harbors no aggressive design of any sort against any people on the habitable globe. (Applause.) Our only object is to maintain the peace of the world. Our Empire, Heaven knows, is vast enough to content the most ambitious, and to satisfy any one with the vastness of its area. But pacific as we may be, and desirous to be on good terms with all the world, we are never quite sure that quarrels will not arise. History shows through all its pages that they may come, swift as a storm out of a summer sky. It is too late then to provide your defences. And surely though we may desire to secure permanent peace throughout the world, it is folly in this stage of the world's development to act in practice as though the permanent reign of peace had already been securely obtained. Therefore it is with us in the Mother Land a first principle of national policy to make secure the command of the sea. (Applause.) For that we hold to be vital. This is the policy which I think is equally held by both the great political parties in our State. We are burdened with a heavy National Debt, created mostly by wars in the past, wars out of which our Empire took its rise. But great as is that debt, and heavy as are other demands upon us, needing vast expenditures to meet them,—and of late years the taxation in the United Kingdom has been very greatly increased,—yet in spite of this, the people of the Old Land you may be quite sure, the British people, would spend their last penny rather than lose or even risk losing the command of the sea. (Applause.)

I do not intend to express any opinion upon the matter which is in controversy here in Canada, but only to express my belief, which I think is widely shared among members of both parties here, that the present provision for the defence of the Empire, and the present organization for the defence of the Empire, cannot be regarded as their final form. It cannot be right that a burden which is borne for the common advantage

should press upon one pair of shoulders alone. (Applause.) But what action the Dominions should take, or whether they should take any action, this as we fully realize is a matter for them, and for them alone. It is a subject vitally important, indeed, in the interest of the Empire as a whole. But the principle of Dominion self-government, in which, as I have said, we believe as firmly as you, leads us to be reticent, and to wait patiently till the various parts of the Empire shall decide for themselves what they will do.

I have spoken to you today of Imperial Relations, economic, constitutional, strategic,—all these are manifestations in practice of an underlying will; the will to be one. (Applause.) And I have in my own mind a confident belief that not only is the unity of the Empire to the interest of its parts; and not only is it a matter of sentimental attachment of the Mother Country to the Dominions, and of the Dominions to the Mother Country; but also that the maintenance of that unity, taking the matter at its broadest,—I believe that the maintenance of that unity is to the advantage of the world as a whole. (Applause.) Nearly one-fourth of the land area of the world is comprised within the British Empire. Within this Empire, within these vast dominions the nations and tribes and peoples that compose it are living at peace with one another. So long as there exists this vast political unity, that peace will continue, and history shows that its influence on the world beyond tends to ensure the peace and to promote the abiding prosperity of the rest of mankind. (Long applause.)

(October 14, 1913.)

The Land Question in England.

BY RIGHT HON. SIR ALFRED MORITZ MOND, M.P.*

AT a special luncheon of the Canadian Club held on the 14th October, Rt. Hon. Sir Alfred Mond said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I owe you at the same time thanks and an apology. Your indefatigable and courteous secretary communicated with me by wire last Friday at Coniston an invitation to address you here on the land question. Well, gentlemen, you had given me such a kind reception when I had the honor to address this Club three years ago that I felt it would be impolite to refuse the invitation. But I owe you an apology, because I have neither had the time nor have I had the materials in order to make to you a speech at all worthy either of the occasion or of the audience I see before me. I must ask you, therefore, to accept this afternoon the few remarks I intend to address to you as the best I can do under the somewhat difficult circumstances.

I would like to correct one or two misapprehensions I see have crept into the public press. I see I was announced to expound the land policy of Mr. Lloyd George. Well, gentlemen, I am not authorized, nor am I in a position, to expound our distinguished Chancellor's land policy. I would advise you to wait till he expounds it himself! (Laughter.) I have not even the cable summary of his speech to enable me to know what he said in opening the campaign. But I would like to point out that not merely may there be some misapprehension as to the speech he made, but Mr. Lloyd George has the intention of making at least six speeches, in which he will progressively deal with the different aspects of the land question in England. Therefore the impatience shown by some of the press because they cannot get from the cable all of his policy is unreasonable; they would do well to be patient till they have the full report of his six speeches.

I think I may, however, say that Mr. Lloyd George is neither a land nationalizer nor a single taxer. In an old country, where

*Sir Alfred Mond is head of the Mond Nickel Company, which has extensive Canadian interests near Sudbury. He is a supporter of the present Liberal administration in England, and has always taken a leading part in promoting advanced legislation, particularly with reference to the land problem.

there have grown up complications through centuries, complications which you in a new country have happily escaped, one has to proceed very carefully, slowly and cautiously, in order to improve conditions, and at the same time take care not to destroy what already exists. Therefore I am certain there is going to be no revolutionary movement; our old country is going to destroy no old interest today.

Of course, when we speak of the land problem, every country in the world has a land problem. As soon as any country begins to alienate land to private interests, it has a land problem, and you find it endeavoring at some stage of its existence to reobtain control of what it ought never to have parted with, namely, its land. When you have a new country of vast area and a small population the problem has not become apparent or pressing; though I can imagine that in a city like Toronto in a short time you will face the problem of having to purchase back at a great price land you have alienated for very little not many years ago. (Applause.) When dealing with England, a tiny country with a very large population, naturally you have the problem, both in town and in the country districts, in a very acute form, particularly when you have permitted those who have been in the ownership and possession of the country for many generations to control your legislature almost entirely unchecked, and they have passed legislation almost entirely in their own favor. The divorce of the people from the soil on which they have been born is a great problem. I sometimes wonder, when I hear the enthusiasm of those who call upon the Englishman to defend his native land, how much land he has, and how he feels when gallantly asked by those who have taken the land from him to defend it against a common foe.

I think the simplest thing for me to do will be to divide my discussion of the land question in England as shortly as I can into these two main lines: first, as to the problem from the rural point of view, and second, as to the problem from the urban point of view. Of course, some general considerations apply to both, but there are distinct problems.

England has a land question of its own. The land system in Scotland and that in Ireland are vitally different from the system in England. Therefore analogies drawn from legislation in these countries could by no means apply to English conditions.

First as to the rural problem. The great bulk, speaking very generally, of the soil of England is in the possession of a considerable number, but not a very large number, of fam-

ilies, who have acquired it very many centuries ago, or acquired it recently. The landlord, as we term him in England, is not merely the owner of the soil he lets for agriculture, but is also the provider of a large proportion of the capital. That is to say, those farm houses that many of you have seen in England, those hedges made, those drains put in, have all been provided by the owner of the land. When the English farmer rents a farm, he rents not merely the land but the homestead, on which a large amount of capital has been expended by the landlord. The farmer, on the other hand, furnishes the agricultural machinery, the live stock, the seed, and provides his labor. He and the landlord are in a way partners, and this dual ownership has complicated the land system.

Now we have a third person, who is largely unknown on this continent but looms large with us, the agricultural laborer, of whom you have heard a good deal, the hired working man, who is usually housed in a house provided by the landlord but let to the farmer. There you have a triumvirate which the system is asked to support, the landlord, the farmer, and the agricultural laborer. It is asking a good deal of agricultural land to ask it to support three different sets of people instead of one. That is one of the economic difficulties we have to face.

In England the usual practice is for the farmer to have the land on a one year rental, an annual tenancy, which can be given notice to on either side, either by the landlord or by the tenant. Although it is perfectly true that in practice this annual tenancy is extended sometimes for the life of a man, sometimes for generations, for as long as the man pays his rent and farms his land properly he is not likely to be disturbed—yet the uncertainty of tenancy is undoubtedly holding back the agriculture of England. That is one of the points on which the farmers most greatly complained to the Commission that has investigated the problem for the Government. If you ask how the problem has become more acute than perhaps it was some years ago, I may reply by saying that on every sale of large estates taking place, changes of tenancy and rent may occur; this creates more insecurity for the farmers than when a man is allowed to continue on his farm, as he commonly does when estates pass from father to son. You must not consider the English landlord as a grasping tyrant, grinding all he can out of his tenants; any picture such as that is grossly unfair and untrue. On the whole the agricultural landlord has been reasonable as regards his land. On the whole he has tried to do his duty by his neighbors. So it is not a question of tyranny; it is much more a question of the

system at stake. The system is not applicable to the business of scientific agriculture. The farmer has had legislation passed considerably in his favor. But the farmer who improves his farm is liable to have his rent raised on the improvements he has made. That does not, of course, lead to the best class of farming. If he leaves the farm he is legally entitled to compensation for unexhausted improvements. These laws do not operate as much in favor of the farmer as they should.

But what the farmers want are two things: they desire a greater fixity of tenure, so that a farmer may know that if he does his duty on the land he will be allowed to remain on the land on which he has sunk his capital; and also many of them want some system of impartial tribunal for the purpose of fixing a fair rent.

The original Irish Land Acts touched the same questions; in 1885 the start was made with judicially fixed rents by their Land Acts. And two years ago the Scotch—who are always more wideawake and clever than the English (laughter)—got a Land Act passed; applied at present to holdings of fifty acres or under, but they wish to get it extended; they also have a tribunal to adjust by law the rent that is to be paid. The English farmer is beginning to ask why he should not have something of a similar character. That is one more of the points to which we have given attention in the new program.

I won't enter upon the long and vexed question of the damage done by game preserves. Of course there is a certain amount of damage done by them, and also a certain amount of exaggeration about it. It is a fact which nobody who studies England can deny, that the soil of a country should not be utilized rather for the purpose of producing pheasants than for people to live on it and till it. I think no sane economist can have any doubt on that point. (Applause.)

These are some of the problems that assailed us at the very beginning. There are many others. For example, the English law of entail. Many estates are in the hands of trustees, who are holding them for the eldest son, and he has no permanent interest, but only a life interest in the same. Some landlords have no capital to use as it might very properly be utilized. This is one of the factors which tend to diminish that progress in agriculture we think we have a right to demand.

One thing which to my mind transcends all other questions is the application of scientific methods to agriculture. No doubt we could almost double the production of the agricultural products which we raise today; this could undoubtedly be brought about in the way of better education, greater re-

search, more application of State money,—what I might call treating agriculture more as we treat industry. To eliminate the loss of poor methods of farming will pay any nation that has the energy and the enterprise to take it up. (Applause.)

I have dealt briefly with the farmer. But I don't think that English agriculture has been as flourishing for many a day as it is today. The increase in price in agricultural land during the last few years has been quite remarkable. I come now to the unfortunate agricultural laborer, the landless man on low wages, with long hours, and of low education, who faced a future of more or less semi-starvation with the workhouse as his refuge in his old days, from which, I am glad to think, our Old Age Pension Act has rescued him. In order to deal with this man, I ask you for a few moments to go back in history; you can't understand the questions of a country with a history such as ours unless you go back to the causes of those questions. Go back, then, to the beginning of the 18th century, and you would have a view of a country in which agriculture was carried on to a very much greater extent in the way in which Germany, France and Italy carry it on than in the way in which it is carried on in England today. That is to say, you had attached to your villages quantities of common land, land to which every commoner had access in certain strips for cultivation and pasturage of cattle. While they had small plots of land, they had surplus labor to give to the farmer for harvest time. A large number of small people were raising stock. They had neither great wealth, nor great poverty.

This summer I happened to have a house in the south of England, in that part known as the New Forest—it is known as "New" because William the Conqueror planted it when he came to England—that is what we call "new." (Laughter). That Forest has always been Crown property, and so it is today. The foresters have largely maintained their old common rights, and the people have to this day the right to turn their cattle loose in the Forest, much as I see them in the bush here; and they are relatively prosperous, at any rate not poor. That is like the condition of England at the beginning of the 18th century.

There arose a school of agricultural reformers, among whom the most prominent was Arthur Young; they contended that the common lands were a bad method, inefficient. They asserted that if you have land enclosed, fenced and drained, and privately owned it can be cared for much more economically. This led to Enclosure Acts mostly in favor of large land

owners known as "lords of the manor." Between 1702 and 1760 the enclosure of about 400,000 acres had been effected by 246 Acts of Parliament; while in the reign of George III. 5,686,400 acres were enclosed under 3,554 Acts of Parliament. And a great deal more than that has passed from the people. A very interesting book has appeared recently, published by Mr. Fisher Unwin, written by Mr. Joselyn Dunlop, on "The English Agricultural Laborer," which shows that there has been a very good kind of transformation taking place in his condition. The whole class of peasant proprietors was practically extinguished. From being an independent person, the laborer had become dependent upon some person to employ him in order that he might live at all. The result was a state of misery, of which very few people have any conception. From that condition, at the end of the 18th century, there has been a great improvement. Another great change came over English agriculture because of the high wheat prices during the Napoleonic wars and shortly after their close.

That was really the beginning of the difficulty we are still laboring under today. We are trying to reverse those conditions. We are trying today to get the small farmer re-established over all the wide country, and England turned to a country where the agricultural laborers shall have a little land and a house of his own,—to make him in fact an independent human being. (Applause.)

This question would have been solved at least a hundred years ago, if it were not for the industrial development; that has obscured the issue. We see today a large population, paid miserable wages, three or four dollars a week, out of which they have to feed and clothe themselves and their families. It is too little; it can't be done! (Hear, hear.) You cannot get efficient labor at this price; the labor you get out of the people is inefficient. If we had more economic wisdom, we should see that a rise in wages, far from increasing the difficulty of getting efficient labor, would be likely to diminish it—(applause)—because the money will go farther, and if a man gets more wages he will work under better conditions. One of our most derelict counties is Essex; to this came a large number of Scotch farmers—and the Scotch farmers are the best we have. (Applause.) They will take up farms, places that others could not make pay: they get them for low rents, and on long leases, you may be sure! (Laughter.) They found a few poor agricultural laborers who had been working for very low wages; and they immediately raised their wages. Now when a Scotchman parts with any money that he need

not part with, you may be sure he expects he is going to make something out of it. (Laughter.) Very well! that was what resulted in this case in Essex; these Scotch farmers got better labor by raising the wages. (Applause.)

These conditions are intensified by the housing problem. It is not difficult to understand, but it is difficult to solve. For one thing, we are something like a hundred thousand cottages short. Secondly, there is a continually increasing standard of requirements for cottages. Some of you, when motoring through England, have seen those cottages, clad with honeysuckle and roses, and have thought "How charming they are!" But when you investigate them more closely, you find there is no drainage system, the water comes through the roof, there are no windows, the floors are damp, the people in them are living much too close together, breeding tuberculosis and crippling rheumatism and typhoid. And you understand that this has been their condition for centuries. A great many of these cottages are in rural areas, where disease is much more rife than in cities.

A low wage affects the business man who wants to build cottages. Unless he is able to get sufficient rent he cannot have interest on his capital. If a laborer is getting a low wage, he is not able to pay him more than one or two shillings—that would pay a week's rent for a cottage. A cottage cannot be built to pay rent and repairs on such low terms.

There are two policies dividing public opinion, the one is in favor of state and rate-aided cottage building, and if the cottage is cheaper than is economic to the laborer the state and local authority bear the difference in cost. The other is for the laborer to get a large enough wage to enable him to pay a fair rent.

Personally I am in favor of a man getting an economic wage, to enable him to pay enough rent for a cottage. The question then arises, how far his wage can be raised. There you come back to a very difficult question which has occupied the House of Commons as far back as 1796, when a Bill was read a second time, whereby there would be a legal minimum wage for agricultural laborers. I am not fond of legal minimum wages if they can be avoided; but when this plan has been established by trade boards it has worked extremely well. If there is no other way out, I am sure I should not be surprised to see a legal minimum wage taking care of agricultural wages.

Then there is the difficulty which faces every country today—how to keep the people on the land, how to prevent the

overgrowing of cities. This problem is right in front of us, and it is baffling. As long as people on the land cannot earn as much as in the city, you can't keep them on it. The first thing to do would be to pay a man sufficient wages to induce him to stay on the land. Then, of course, you have to counteract what you might call the city pleasure movements—to make country life more attractive. Not in the way of the reformer and leader in benevolent philanthropy, which has been adopted often by the clergyman and the squire, who between them have bestowed upon the agricultural laborer a well-meant but misplaced attention, which has induced many to quit and go into the town, where nobody looks after them. And there are many other aspects of that kind. A good many of those living on the land, as I have said, have been benevolently disposed, but a very considerable amount of despotism has been shown, affecting people's religious and political freedom. He who has great favors to bestow possesses great power; for when a man can't get a new kitchen range put in because he is not of the same political complexion as his landlord, you can see that while the landlord is doing nothing absolutely wrong there is a strong inducement for him to vote as his landlord wants him to. (Laughter.) These conditions lead one more and more to see that houses must be provided, and not merely by private individuals but by local authority, so that the man feels, as he does not now in many an English village, that if he comes up against the landlord it does not mean exile or ruin. In some villages today many houses belong to one man, and if any man goes up against the landlord today he has to quit the place. Such a man does not know what to do when he is forced to move and to seek employment elsewhere. Here you are more used to mobility than we are, you are more used to traveling and getting about in a large country; our people are fearful and afraid of moving about trying to get another job. When a man has a house he feels that whatever happens he can stay there as owner as long as he likes.

Another question has had great attention given to it and has been the occasion of a considerable amount of legislation. I was drawing your attention to the divorce of the people from the land, and the extinction of the small holder. There has been some legislation along these lines already. The Government now in power has passed—not by any means the first Act, but I think the most effective one, which came into force on the first of January, 1908, which gave the County Councils power to acquire by purchase small holdings not exceeding

thirty acres or less than three acres. Since then, in 1908 and 1909 County Councils acquired 60,889 acres for the purpose of the Act, and six thousand small holdings have been created. That is at least a start in the right direction, but we want to do a great deal more. (Applause.)

In the matter of land for public purchase, where there are great private interests, as in England, it is much more difficult, you can understand, for the private interests get the best of much of the legislation. It is safe-guarded with so much red tape, and tied up with so much machinery, and so much of supercharges and legal charges, which enable men to receive so much more than they have asked privately, that you have to charge high prices. I think the guiding principle should be, that the people exist first, and the land exists afterwards. (Hear, hear.) Where public interest conflicts with private interest, the public interest ought to be first considered. (Applause.) That simple principle would effect a great change in our legislation.

A good deal has to be done along these lines also in the urban districts; because in our towns you are right up against similar difficult problems of private enterprise under private control.

The constituency I have the honor to represent, Swansea, in South Wales, like our whole district, is growing at a rate I think you can scarcely understand here so far as population is concerned. We are short an enormous number of cottages. Our corporation at present is laying out a garden city of some six hundred cottages. We have some of our towns girdled around by people holding up land with no other purpose than to try to get as much as possible out of it. (Hear, hear.) These people are serving no earthly purpose to the community; they are employing neither brains nor capital; they are simply sitting there to make use of the necessity of the people who will come to live there, in order to enrich themselves out of their need! (Applause.) Any legislation which tends to destroy that kind of thing is useful. Speculating in land has never done any good to any community. (Applause.) The developer of land is an inestimable boon to any community. (Applause.) But there will be this divorce of people from the land so long as legislation is a tool in the hands of those who own the land simply to use it for themselves.

Then you have the leasehold system. It is impossible sometimes to acquire a piece of freehold land at all from a wealthy man. I think the architecture of our cities shows this. People are not willing to expend large sums to enrich other people's

property. I think any system of purchase which would enable people to acquire freehold property in cities would be good.

I am not sure that we shall not have to limit what is a fair rent for a man to charge in the city. You find in the industrial portions of our city rents are beyond reason, owners charge the workmen rents which cannot be paid by them without hardship. This manipulation will have to be curbed in some way by legislation.

Another evil we suffer from, which may affect other places as well, is our extremely inequitable system of local taxation. (Hear, hear.) Like many other things, that dates back to the reign of Queen Elizabeth. (Laughter.) It is unsuitable in England to-day. The idea of rating a man by the rental of his property is unsuitable. A more unsuitable system to our industrial conditions you would find very hard to imagine anywhere. (Applause.) It is another great defect, that we rent and value not the site of the building; we rate the rental value of the composite object, the site and the building; that is to say, if I have a house in a street of high site value, it may be a small building at a low rent, and I pay much less in local taxation than the man next me, who puts up a high building. The result of that system is to discourage building enterprise. If the moment a man puts up a building you immediately fine him for having done something to increase the prosperity of the community, you encourage people to use the land badly; the worse they use it the less you fine them! (Applause.) A more unbusinesslike national method of taxation I think it would be impossible to find. (Applause.) By the Parliamentary group on land values taxation one point will be pressed,—and I am glad to see that the Chancellor mentioned it in his Bedford speech,—I am confident that if you shift the taxation from the building to the site value you effect a great improvement. And I don't see how you can hurt any person. (Applause.) When you see vacant land contributing not one farthing above the lowest rate, if I bought a piece of land and put up a store or a building of any kind, immediately the rate collector would charge me a rate on it! Of course it won't all be done in a day. I hope it may be done in my life time. (Applause.) You have to do it slowly, gradually. You can't shift all at once contracts and legal bargains which have been in force for many years.

The whole question of taxation of land in general for general purposes is in a muddle. It would be impossible for me to explain this afternoon, or possibly on any afternoon, the enormous complexity of it, and its relation to our local taxa-

tion account and our Imperial taxation account. There is the greatest muddle almost that ever existed, and where it very strongly needs reform. Educational funds are partly paid to local authority and partly to the central body. All through we need some system of land taxation to relieve the poorer and highly burdened classes where land has become of enormous value, and any such reform is to be very greatly encouraged. When we talk of site value, we mean unimproved site value, not buildings, so any man may develop it as much as he can. The definition adopted by the Finance Act in great measure is, value denuded of any form of improvement created by any individual, but made by the concretion of efforts of the community in which it is situated, which gives that land a value.

I have only extremely imperfectly and very hurriedly dealt with a few corners of the problem. You realize, from the few remarks I have made, how complex and difficult and vast it is. We can't end it by any patent pill in order to deal with land reform; there is no one royal remedy, no one road, to the solution of a large number of difficult problems. There will have to be a large number of remedies. You will have to combine ideas of many schools today antagonistic in order to achieve final success.

I saw a very amusing article in a paper the other day, which said that the whole English land situation could be summed up in four lines. It said the Conservative side of the question was this, that letting farmers buy land they would thereby become Conservatives; while the Liberal aspect of it was that by keeping a man a tenant he would thereby be discontented with the landlord and become a Liberal! (Laughter.) According to that reasoning, we should have a great mass of Liberal farmers; but the percentage of farmers who vote Liberal is extremely small. The farmer is essentially by temperament Conservative.

But that is not the essential difference between the Unionist and the Liberal land policy. The Unionist land policy, as Lord Lansdowne has outlined it in part, is based more or less on the model of the Irish Land Purchase Act, which is based on State aid by cheap money loaned by the State, to enable the farmer to pay the landlord a high price for his farm. When a landlord like the Marquis of Lansdowne sells lands, he would very well like to deal with English questions the same way. I can well understand that. But I fancy that when he goes to his friends in the city, the financiers, to ask them where the money is to come from, and on what terms, he would be up against a financial proposition that no responsible statesman would take up.

I am not opposed to land purchase on political grounds. But Lord Lansdowne would not make it compulsory, so what can the farmer do in case the landlord won't sell? If our plan were introduced, it would enable the farmer to lease the land at a fair rent whether the landlord were willing or not. The English farmer does not wish to buy the land; he does not want to tie up his capital, but he wants to pay a reasonable rent. If he buys the land, he has to raise a mortgage, and perhaps is no better off, perhaps is worse off, than if he had to pay rent to the landlord. You have merely substituted the mortgagor for the landlord. Many farmers have no desire for this system in England; in Ireland they have. There is no use to try working out land reform for people by giving them what they don't want. That, therefore, is the difference between the two policies.

The problem is very big. All we can do, or hope to do, is not so much to try to lay down a hard and fast line, which you must follow, and which every one must follow, as to establish the facts which will be published in October. These facts we shall have to thrash out by discussion and argument, in the manner common in British communities. We shall review the conclusions and arguments, and we think when that winnowing process has worked out for some time, and every one has contributed his thought and experience, all will be satisfactory. I sincerely trust and hope it may so work out the program, and help to regenerate the country of which we are all proud, and from which many of you have come; and may restore to the land many of those now divorced from it, and may get rid of the disgrace that a great many of our population are living under the subsistence line in places worse than those in which many animals are housed; that it may place them in homes, not merely houses, so we shall have a free and decent people dwelling in decent homes. That will be, not only a great land reform, but a benefit to the whole community.

If we succeed in bringing into practice only partially all this dream, I think we shall not merely have done a good service to the country, but shall have done a great service to the Empire. (Applause.) It is of essential value to you that the stock from which the Empire is recruited shall be of the finest; that the people of the Mother Country shall remain strong, virile, healthy; and that everything in human reason shall be done to improve conditions; so that you can at all times be proud of them in the face of the entire world. (Applause.)

(October 21, 1913.)

What the University can do for the State.

BY CHARLES RICHARD VAN HISE, PH.D., LL.D.,*
President of the University of Wisconsin.

AT a special luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 21st of October, Dr. Van Hise said:

Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—It is a very great pleasure indeed for me to respond to the cordial invitation of your secretary to address you. I suppose that few present have seen more of Ontario than your visitor. I have travelled your railroads from one end of the province to the other; I have walked along your railroad lines; I have canoed your lakes and streams at various places, from Lake Winnipeg to Lake Timiskaming. Therefore, I know something of the growth of Ontario, and of this city of Toronto during the past twenty-five years. This morning the secretary of the American Club, Mr. Miller, kindly took me to the new suburbs. I was amazed at the growth of the residential portion of the city since I was here three or four years ago.

In speaking upon the subject, "What the University can do for the State," I am talking on a topic assigned by your secretary. I suggested one or two other subjects which I thought might be more interesting, but he insisted that the subject named was the one upon which your president desired that I should address you.

The universities in the United States, whether state or endowed, are far more like than unlike the universities of Canada and of England. The universities of the United States were originally patterned after the English universities. Some have developed in different directions from others; but all have the same fundamental purpose—the teaching of ideas and ideals to the youth of the nation, and the advancement of knowledge. However varied the ways

*President Van Hise is one of the leaders in the movement to make the University serve the people in a practical way. His policy is to carry the message of the professor to those who can profit by it in every day life. Wisconsin is one of the most democratic States in the Union, and its university has led the way in stimulating interest in popular government.

in which these two fundamental principles may express themselves, their essential ends are the same.

At the inauguration of Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell, as president of Harvard University, Mr. James Bryce, then Ambassador of Great Britain to the United States, gave an address, in which he uttered what I think was the most pregnant sentiment of the celebration. He said: "A university should reflect the spirit of the times without yielding to it."

A university in reflecting the spirit of the times should not yield its freedom. I do not know how it is in Canada, but we are absolutely free in the universities of the United States to hold any heterodox notions we may choose regarding higher mathematics, or even philosophy—(laughter)—but when we get to subjects such as sociology, political economy, or political science, then many people are somewhat sensitive about what the university teaches. It is clear that the university must hold itself absolutely free to investigate and teach the truth as it sees it throughout the fields of the political and social sciences. Only so can an institution be a university; only so can it be sure not to yield to the spirit of the times. (Applause.)

While these statements are somewhat dogmatically made, I fully understand that the spirit in which this work is done must not be that of the advocate; it must not be that of certainty. We must realize that for all subjects, everywhere, knowledge is incomplete. No man knows everything about a grain of sand; nor ever shall. Therefore, it is the function of the university for all subjects ever to advance toward completion and perfection, without expecting to reach either anywhere. While the university professor should be free to teach and investigate, his attitude must be that of the seeker after truth, that of the judge, and not that of the advocate.

However, it is not these commonplaces that I am expected to emphasize here to-day; they are presented as the trunk of the university, from which the special branches to be considered spring. The fundamental spirit of all true universities in these essential respects are the same everywhere and must continue to remain the same.

Gradually it dawned upon some people in the university world, and first at Oxford, that it was not sufficient to teach students who came to the doors of the university; that it was not sufficient to advance knowledge; that the university had a third function—that of carrying knowledge to the people. Of the Oxford University extension movement you all know. What are the fundamental principles upon which this move-

ment is based? They are these: The advancement of knowledge has been greater in the past sixty years than in two thousand years before. Until about 1850 the development of knowledge was so slow that the ideas which the people might utilize to their benefit were fairly well assimilated; but during the past sixty years transportation has brought all parts of the world together; communication has become instantaneous; discovery has taken place in every direction with amazing speed. Thus, knowledge has far outrun the assimilation of the people. We know enough about agriculture so that if it were only applied in Ontario the agricultural wealth of the province could be doubled in a decade. (Applause.) We know enough about medicine so that, if the knowledge were applied, infectious and contagious diseases could be eliminated from this city in a score of years. We know enough about eugenics so that, if the knowledge were applied, within a generation the feeble minded would disappear, and the insane would be reduced to an insignificant number.

It may be said that it will be sufficient to teach the new knowledge to the boys and girls in the schools; and this, of course, should be done; but since many of you left the schools, a vast portion of this new heritage has accumulated. You have twenty-five or fifty years more to live. And you are but illustrations of the people throughout this province and the nation of Canada. Therefore, it is not sufficient to teach the new knowledge to the children in the schools; it must be carried to the mature everywhere. (Applause.)

It was this situation which led us at Wisconsin to undertake extension work. The extension movement of Oxford began by the lyceum method of instruction. The professors went out and spoke to the people, giving perhaps, two, four, or six lectures upon a subject; and directly after the lectures there were colloquiums. That was good work to do; and work of this class continues to the present time. But the method was found to be limited in its application. For the most part it was a method of pouring in knowledge upon the recipient and not asking the latter to dig out knowledge for himself. It was an informational, rather than an educational method. Therefore, the lyceum method of extension, while it has performed a brilliant service, and will continue to do so, has failed to accomplish all that was expected when the extension movement was launched at Oxford some sixty years ago.

Therefore, at the University of Wisconsin, when re-organizing our extension work some eight years ago, we placed the movement upon a broader basis. In addition to lyceum work, correspondence work was undertaken. At the present time, Wisconsin has about as many students doing work by correspondence as at the university— somewhere between five and six thousand. While a part of these students are doing work of college grade, many of them are doing work of a lower grade. (Applause.) When this plan of correspondence work was first broached to an eastern educator, he asked: "What about your standards? Is it proper for a university to do work outside of the university buildings and not of college grade?" I replied that we did not publish the names of the correspondence students in the catalogue of our institution, or change the requirements for our degrees; and we failed to see that it demeaned us to do such educational work not elsewhere provided for. For our part, at the University of Wisconsin, we propose to do any line of educational work for which we are the best fitted instrument, without regard to anybody's ideas anywhere concerning the proper scope of the university. (Applause.) This does not mean that we are to take up the work of the elementary school or the secondary school. For such work we are not the best fitted instrument; but the university is the best fitted instrument for the education of people not in school who wish to add to their education.

The Wisconsin system of education, in addition to elementary and secondary schools, provides for continuation schools. Although established only two years ago, some fifteen thousand boys and girls who have finished the elementary work are in schools of this kind. But everyone of us should be students in a continuation school throughout life. It is to serve this large purpose for the people of Wisconsin that the university extension division of the university was organized.

Our faculty in the University of Wisconsin—I don't know how it is in the University of Toronto—were somewhat conservative when it was proposed to enter upon this new work. Some were afraid that the standards would be lowered. We said, however, that no department would be obliged to take up extension work. On that basis a few departments began the work, but soon many departments joined in the movement. At the present time opposition to the Extension Division has entirely disappeared. (Applause.) The professors state that the correspondence work is well done—as

well as in the university. We, of course, do not accept extension work alone for a degree; only one-half may be done *in absentia*.

It is a great satisfaction to me that the extension movement has opened the door of opportunity and made an education available to any boy or girl without respect to condition of birth, without respect to his ability to go to college or university. (Applause.) To illustrate: In the little village of Blooming Grove, eight or ten miles from Madison, a boy lived on a forty acre farm. He had a mother, an aged grandfather, and others, to support. It was simply impossible for him to get away from that little farm; but he was interested in astronomy. Not having any money, he made his own telescope, including the lens. Two of the comets discovered one year bear the name of that boy! (Applause.) He took correspondence work in mathematics at the University of Wisconsin; and has now become an astronomical instrument maker.

Thus, extension has a twofold purpose; not only to carry knowledge to the people, but also to find a way for the boy or girl of parts, whatever the condition of birth.

The extension work of the University of Wisconsin is along various lines. I shall mention only a few of them.

We have a municipal reference bureau, the purpose of which is to give information to any municipality in the state regarding sewage systems, forms of charters, systems of water works, city planning, municipal ownership of public utilities, etc. This bureau serves as an expert adviser to the municipalities in Wisconsin throughout the state.

Another field is that of debating and public discussion. I do not know how it is in Toronto and Ontario, but the Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians over in Wisconsin are so cantankerous that in almost every little crossroads community there is a debating society! (Laughter.) In my youth the questions discussed were such as, "Is George Washington or Abraham Lincoln the greater man?" "Is man's intellect equal to woman's, or vice versa?"—perfectly futile questions, which begin nowhere and end nowhere. (Laughter.) It seemed to us, however, that here was an educational opportunity. The burning questions of the day, such as the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, methods of taxation, currency reform, the tariff, all of which were before our people, have been taken up by our extension division and a careful syllabus of the arguments on both sides of each question has been prepared. For of each political and social

question regarding which you differ among yourselves, there are honest arguments on each side. Wise action depends upon the weight of argument between the two.

Upon the same questions covered by the syllabi, little bundles of books and pamphlets are made up containing material upon them. When the crossroads debating society wants to discuss the tariff, the syllabus on the subject and the accompanying bundle of information go to the society. The preparation of the debate with the material involves study; it is educational work. Thus, wherever is a crossroads debating society is a powerful educational force. (Applause.) Besides furnishing material to societies that already exist, the department of debating and public discussion has organized many more. If we are to have in Wisconsin the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, as doubtless we shall in the near future, it is high time to get the people seriously thinking upon the great questions upon which they will be obliged to pass. (Applause.)

Another of the lines of work of the extension division is that of travelling exhibitions and public institutes. To illustrate: An institute on hygiene runs three days in the village of Sauk, and a school of philanthropy continues for three months in Milwaukee. A tuberculosis exhibition goes to any little town which asks for it and furnishes a room in which it may be placed. The physicians in the town co-operate by giving lectures upon the prevention of tuberculosis, the means of elimination of the disease, and the conservation of health. The cost of such an exhibit is small, and this method of work to eliminate the disease from the state is far more efficient than extensive sanitariums costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. (Applause.)

Another line of extension work is that of expert service to the state. Your president raised the question whether the university were subordinate to the legislature or the legislature subordinate to the university. Now this is a tender subject with us—(laughter)—and a tender subject with the legislature. (Laughter.) They scarcely enjoy an intimation that they do not rule. But I am very glad the point has been raised, because with it I can illustrate a principle. At the university we carefully refrain from tendering our advice until we are asked; but it has become the habit of many members of the legislature of Wisconsin to believe that intuition is a poor guide in regard to a complicated measure. Therefore, a legislative reference library was created and placed under the charge of Charles McCarthy, Doctor of

Philosophy of the University of Wisconsin. While Dr. McCarthy's department is the official source of information for the legislature, the professors of the university, when asked, give such assistance as they can. As a matter of fact, professors of the university have had a large part in formulating some of the most important bills. For a number of difficult measures the legislature has appointed expert commissions to report to the succeeding legislature. At the present time more than forty men of the instructional staff of the university are doing regularly expert work of various kinds for the state; and many other men are doing such work incidentally.

When the public utilities commission was established, it was believed by the railroads that they would be dealt with unfairly; it was believed that this new commission would take away their property. But United States Senator LaFollette, then Governor of Wisconsin, appointed a scientific commission consisting of an experienced statistician, an able lawyer, and the professor of transportation in the university. The latter was in Germany at the time, but by cable was asked to take the place. Officials of the railroads have told me that they think the Wisconsin commission has been fair to the railroads. Neither side would go back to the old plan; on one side hold-up bills to be defeated by questionable methods; on the other side deep-seated suspicion of the railroads and resentment concerning their methods. We now have peace, because we have the rule of reason applying to both parties.

In Wisconsin, in addition to a public utilities commission, we have a tax commission and an industrial commission. The bill creating the latter commission was largely the work of Professor John R. Commons, of the university. After the bill became law, the Governor asked Professor Commons to take the chairmanship of the commission. The industrial bill laid down the broad principles that there should be reasonable conditions of safety and sanitation, leaving to the commission the working out of the detailed regulations under these broad principles of law. It is sometimes said that professors are not practical; but the commissioners did not evolve these regulations from their own heads, they sat at various places to hear the points of view of both manufacturers and laborers. The result was that both sides agreed upon many of the requirements to be enforced; and there is general satisfaction on the part of both workingmen and employers. After the commission had been in operation two years, vari-

ous amendments were suggested to the legislature by the commission, practically all of which were adopted. And now Professor Commons, having done his constructive work with the industrial commission, has decided that a professor cannot possibly spend \$5,000 a year and has returned to the university, at a salary of \$3,500, to carry on his work of instruction and research.

Returning to the extension work of the university we estimate that we reached last year, directly and indirectly, some two hundred thousand of the Wisconsin people. But President Falconer knows that this was not done without money. When our extension movement began, some seven or eight years ago, our ideas were but a rainbow vision in the sky. For the first year the regents granted the sum of \$7,500 for this work. The next year we asked the legislature for \$20,000 a year for the following two years, and they voted it. The next session we asked \$50,000 for the first year of the biennium, and \$75,000 for the second; and they gave it. The next biennium we told the legislature we could not do all the extension work from Madison as a centre; that we ought to establish district centres; we, therefore, asked for \$100,000 and \$125,000 for the two years; and they granted it. Last year we asked the usual increment of \$25,000 per annum for this year and next; and the legislature voted it. The above amounts, you will understand, are in addition to the appropriations for agricultural extension, for which work the legislature gave \$60,000 per annum more. Of course, in the province of Ontario the agricultural extension work is carried on by Guelph.

In voting large sums of money for extension the legislature has not crippled the university, or failed to provide for its growth in other directions; indeed, our support for other lines is larger than it would have been had we not undertaken the extension work; for if a university does for the people what they want done, they will have confidence that there are sound reasons for spending increased sums in other directions. In addition to the appropriations for this extension work, the last legislature gave for general university purposes about \$1,200,000 a year, and have voted for buildings and land, during this year and next together, \$1,400,000.

While the university extension movement was actuated at the inception by no other purpose than to perform a larger service to the state of Wisconsin, we have found that it was wise simply from our own point of view. Of course, a university nowhere exists for itself; its existence is justified

only as it performs service to the people. By liberal support of its university a state will increase its material wealth and at the same time add to the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth of the commonwealth; which after all must ever remain the chief purpose of a university. We produce things for men and women; and if in creating things we forget the highest development of human beings we make a fundamental mistake.

This principle of carrying knowledge to the people, this principle of finding a way for the boy and girl of parts, is fully developed in Ward's "Applied Sociology," a book of some two hundred pages. Ward shows that the greatest loss of a nation or a province is its loss of talent. You know that not all the ability of Toronto is born in the handsome residential sections of the city. You know that talent is quite as likely to be found among the children in manufacturing districts adjacent to your docks.

It has been sometimes proposed to take all property and distribute it equally. That proposal has never met with the approval of the majority of an Anglo-Saxon people anywhere; and I doubt if it ever will. But equal distribution of wealth is not fundamental to a democracy. So long as you have a system of education, such that the boy or girl of parts can find a way, so long you maintain the essentials of democracy; and if ever your institutions develop in such a way that this is not possible, then, whatever your forms of government, a real democracy has ceased to exist.

When elementary education was democratized in the states, it was regarded as a great achievement—as far as they could possibly go. But later, in the Middle West, the people were not satisfied, and secondary schools were developed at public expense. The East regarded this as a great innovation, an unwarranted waste of public money. But the movement extended from the Middle West to the far West, to the South, and to the East. Still later came the idea of democratizing university education. This was deemed highly socialistic. Men said: "That is a proposal to take *my* property to give a university education to some other man's boy!" But there were no funds in the Middle West from private sources to build universities; and yet there came ever stronger pressure from the boys and girls for a university education. The state university system is the result, and this system has extended from the United States into Canada, from the province of Ontario to the Pacific Ocean.

In short, it has become the North American ideal not only to democratize primary and secondary education, but to democratize higher education; and if this be accomplished, it will be a new thing in the world. We know that German universities, while state institutions, are available only to the well-to-do classes. This same is true to a large extent of the ancient and honorable universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which have done so much to make Britain a great world power. Only recently has England, by the development of her municipal universities, realized public responsibility for higher education.

If in Ontario you develop good elementary schools, secondary schools equal to any, a system of continuation schools where boys and girls who are obliged to go into the shops at an early age may proceed with their education, and a university with the broader ideal to-day advocated, the province of Ontario will move forward, materially, intellectually, and spiritually, with a speed vastly greater than even the amazing acceleration of the past.

(October 27, 1913.)

Shakespeare Poietes, Fashioner of Fate.

BY MR. F. R. BENSON.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club held on the 27th October, 1913, Mr. Benson said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—As is usual, I take it, on the part of the guests at your hospitable board, I commence with an apology. The President has kindly said some very complimentary things, and it is for me to try to show the gratitude and appreciation that Mr. Flower, the Chairman of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, and myself feel at this warm welcome. Also I have to make a little personal explanation. I sensed, when I came into this room, that there was a kind of feeling that the President was a little late. He was a little late, let this not be a bone of contention between us—(laughter)—he surprised me in the act of trying to remedy, not only the ravages of time, but of the hardness of Canadian water, at any rate, of the river bed on my face.

The President said, "I see you are a little cracked." I wish to explain that this cracked forehead, broken nose and black eyes are due to the exploration of the depths and shallows of your waters, not necessarily your strong waters. They are due to not looking before I leapt, a dive into the dark, while bathing, not to any difference of opinion between the President and myself. (Laughter.)

The President said that some of the thought and some of the work of this city took cognizance of that which the birds of the air and the beasts of the field and the angels were doing. Now, that only leaves me the opportunity of speaking for another power. (Laughter.) In doing this, I may find some justification in the magic letters D-L, which, thanks to one of your great universities, I have now the right of adding to my name. That degree which, I need not say, I count as a very great honor, I shall hope to try to deserve

*Mr. Benson has managed the Annual Festivals at the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre at Stratford-on-Avon for the past thirty years, and his repertoire company has become famous as a school of acting. His company was the vanguard in the movement to provide for Canada more plays from Great Britain.

by service in the future more than I can pretend to at the present moment. Be that as it may, it gives me the pleasure and the privilege of addressing you as a brother Canadian. (Applause.)

What song have I to sing before this illustrious, this inspiring meeting of practical poets? To sing it aright would need the genius of my master, the Bard of Stratford-on-Avon. I will begin by telling you a little story. A well-known bishop, in the course of his diocesan visitation in Warwickshire, found himself the guest of a large farmer, the best agriculturist of the district. In the course of a morning walk, the farmer took him along a pathway. On the right, there was a very good crop of wheat; on the left, some enemy had sown tares. Needless to say, the field on the right belonged to the farmer. The bishop, who had failed up to this moment to draw his host into conversation, asked, "To what do you attribute the difference between these two crops?" The farmer, with a dramatic gesture, pointed first to the smiling field on the right and then to the blue sky above, as he replied, "Muck and Him." Now, I think that English yeoman, worthy descendant of that Merrie England, which has written the noblest pages in our history, had gotten near defining the basis on which the English-speaking Empire has been reared—that is, a close connection with Mother Earth, an ear to listen to that mother's many voices, the practical power to make use of her wise messages, the eye that reads the signs of the times, the far vision that obtains strength for manly purpose by lifting its gaze to the hills. The farmer went on to say, "I owe my success as a farmer, above everything else, to what I have learned from Shakespeare." I wonder how many members of the English speaking race say that. Marlborough, on the Field of Blenheim,—"Shakespeare taught me to win my victories." Just as Condé, in another land, of another dramatist, said,—"Of course, I won my battles because I knew Corneille's plays." Or, again, an engine driver, after his first visit to the theatre, where he saw the play of "Macbeth," made the following comment: "That will just help me to drive my engine better to-morrow."

So much for the practical value of the poet's message, the quickening life-rhythms that help us to accomplish our daily tasks. What is the meaning of this word, poet? The Greeks invented it because, to that strenuous people, with their intense love of liberty under the law, having as their ideal the freedom of the world, whether under republic or a

constitutional monarchy, there was little difference between thinking and doing, and so they called the singer, "Poietes," the man who thinks and does, the man who fashions destiny for himself and for the world. "We Greeks defeated the Persians at Marathon because we have ever loved the beautiful." And we, who speak the rhythmic measure of Shakespeare's tongue, pride ourselves above everything on being a practical people who love doing and being, who love the strong, full, free life that pulses through the melody of Shakespeare's verse. Of us has it been well said that our empire depends on the boundless capacity of its members for poetry. "Show me a nation's laws and I will tell you the measure of her decadence; let me hear her song and I will tell you the glory of her achievement." (Applause.)

A friend, who was describing to me the organization of one of the trans-continental railways, referred to one of its chiefs, who also happened to be the founder of a great university, as the poet of the party. "What," I asked, "has he published?" "Oh, no books," replied my friend. "I mean that he had the poet's vision and imagination, the stout heart and strong right hand that express thought in terms of action whereby he was able with spade and axe and dredger to carve out his long poem; using the earth as his parchment, he traced channels of communication by bridge and tunnel and inland sea for the thought and commerce of the nations. Just as to-day is being done at Panama, where the East meets the West; where the turbulent waters of the Atlantic are being mated to the peacetime of the rising and the setting sun.

In this sense, you above all people, are poets, fashioners of fate, in that you are pioneers making roadways, *ad astra*, toward the stars, building up a brave new world. Shakespeare stands out pre-eminent for all time, king of the poets, prince of pioneers.

He was also a member of the dramatic profession. As a humble follower of the same craft, a sort of cheap kodak wandering through many lands, taking various sense impressions of many varying phenomena, I venture to address you this afternoon.

Here let me say, it was the actor's side of Shakespeare's genius that places him supreme upon his throne, even more than his gift as a thinker and a writer. It was this that enabled him to sympathize with and to live the life of all the various beings whose story he sings for us. He was able to enter into and identify himself with the being of bird and

beast of man, woman and child, God, devil or angel, also with that touch of Hellenic and Indian pantheistic paganism which gives him so much of his power, he was at one moment the essence of the storm, the lightning, the wind, at another the wave, the river, the tree, or the flower.

Son of a strenuous age, his art is that of expressing thought and feeling in terms of action. He knew all the opportunities of life and used them. He combined intimate knowledge of the particular with an understanding of the universal truths of which they are the expression. Surely a practical man for his generation, and for all the generations to come. I have thus quite inadequately tried to define the meaning of the word poet. Let me, if I am not trespassing too long on your time and patience, give you a few concrete examples of the influence this man exercises on to-day as I have seen it at our Shakespeare festival at Stratford-on-Avon. The festival we wish to make a race festival for the sons of the King folk—the men who can—around the shrine of the representative genius of the Anglo-Celtic race. Such as was the shrine of Delphi or the Olympic festival for the Grecian States.

The little theatre on the banks of the Avon, within a stone's-throw of the church where three hundred years ago Shakespeare was buried, stands in what I suppose might be called a village, one of the cradles of the strong, home-loving people of England. It was built mainly by Mr. Flower's uncle and some friends; quietly, in the face of much opposition they did for themselves that which they believed worth doing, but could get few others to do. (Applause.) Mr. Flower and these men thought that Sir Philip Sidney was right when he said "the drama was the art that gives noble pleasure to a noble people which shall thereby become nobler." They thought there was some fear lest Shakespeare's successors should become less noble if they ceased to listen to his song. And so the pilgrims come from all over the world for the message of the master singer of his own land and his own time and of every land and all-created space, and they read in this festival something of the Pax Britannica. The striker reads harmony and cessation of industrial strife and useless wars of aggression. He also reads some message of the need of readiness (on the part of all who speak the English tongue) to strike a blow, if need be, when the homestead is in danger. The striker saw what our festival meant, saw that it leads back to harmony, to a sense of proportion, to that sense of beauty which is the chief constituent of com-

mon sense, which is always uppermost in the minds of a people who preserve their reverence for nature and a love of art. "Sir," said he, "I tell my union things in the words of Shakespeare, which if I said myself they would do me in as I went home in the dark." Another, an old man, came out of his cottage and said, "God bless you, Sir, you have shown me in those history plays how we Britishers became what we are and how we can keep so." And the Indian Rajah comes, and he says, "I will take back to my people the story of your festival, I will tell them of your rejoicing in drama, in folk song, in folk dance of Back to the Land of the Garden City, and then our two nations will understand each other's religion better than they do." And another, a learned sage of the elder Aryan stock, went through India, and said, "I have found the heart of England by Shakespeare's grave and it is gentle, kind and tolerant, as well as proud and strong." (Applause.)

And so while we are singing Shakespeare's songs at Stratford, we dream of many things, that seem coming with the rising of to-morrow's sun. Among them of a great Aryan empire or confederation that shall embrace all those who speak the tongue in which Shakespeare sang, America, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, South Africa, and all our sons and cousins in the Dominion over sea, together with that old Land of India, wise in counsel, valiant in war. Such is the empire dimly shadowed in Shakespeare's verse, the empire of the King folk, the strenuous, dominant people who are always busy doing in the drama of life. One of the melodies of the drama is the ceaseless swing of the pendulum between freedom of expression for the individual, as represented by the singer and the artist, and the adjustment of that individual note to the collective interests of the common weal, the work of the law giver, liberty under the law. (Applause.) An empire or confederation, call it what you will, founded on principles of association and expansion, not of exploitation, harmonizing with our poet's song that sounds for ever as a challenge, a trumpet call to the peoples to care for those things that really matter, those things that never pass away, the only practical foundation on which an empire can be built. And what does one mean by an empire builder? What does this splendid institution, the Canadian Club, exist for? What do the King and the constitution exist for? What does drama exist for? For nothing but what your chairman said, "to spread among others and understand for ourselves, to make our own and the property of our brothers and our children's children, the full joy of the strong, free

life. I know nothing of art for art's sake, or law for law's sake, or song for song's sake, I only know these things for life's sake. (Applause.)

My theme would tax the ability of a far abler speaker than myself to describe, or, if possible, a still busier and more strenuous people than my audience, to carry out in action. My halting remarks are so lamentably crude and inefficient, I must refer you again and again for better confirmation to the life rhythms of Shakespeare, which we have come here to sing.

If a certain note were uttered clearly and harmoniously in this room all the finger bowls on the table, all the glasses on the shelves, would ring out that triumphant sound and be shattered into fragments. Such is the physical power of the word. If you expand this principle, you will readily understand how when the hosts of the mightily shouted the walls of Jericho fell prone, or the topmost stone of the Pyramids settled in its place. One night at a concert in the Albert Hall, above the massed orchestra, above the thousand voices singing in the chorus, I heard one clear, ringing, thrilling note, that of Madam Albani, the soprano. And so is it always with the power of song. The balanced harmony of one true musical note soars like the eagle above all the rest of the winged tribe and seems to reach the centre of the sun. Such is the pureness and the truth of the notes that Shakespeare sang. Here let us remember that the master singer blends with his own song, the song words of his folk and of his times. Do we sing now as our forefathers sang? Have we not in accepting the service of machinery, without understanding its limitations, lessened our capacity for singing? Has the factory with the dust and clatter, the jarring and the groaning, produced melodies for the laborer that will compare with the work songs still remembered, still chanted among us, of harvest, of the loom, of the shipyard, the hammer, the forge, the village green? Do not the wheels of our industrial machine creak over much to be truly economical? Does not noise and ugliness mean waste of power, waste of life? Cannot the artist and the singer do something to amend? (Hear, hear.)

Sir William Crooks has shown us that if we strike a glass tube with different colored hammers, the note will vary in accordance with the difference of color. Further that no two persons in the whole of the world can evoke the same note, though they use the same hammer. Has not the law giver of to-day something to learn from the artist and the scientist

on the value of the personal equation? And again, it has been shown by science that the musical note of an Albani, the song of any true singer, the note of every one of us in our capacity of poets, rings out beyond the realms of the earth's atmosphere, and when it has reached the regions of infinite space which are tuned to the music of the spheres its vibrations become so rapid that they pass into the form we call light. It is no far stretch of the imagination to think of the Shakespeare melody blending with the brilliance of the rainbow and your Northern Lights, shedding a beam of freedom, hope and courage across the paths of the children of men. (Applause.)

Is it a vain dream? Sometimes I fancy the Arch-Priest and Poet of the world's destiny saying to the angel of fate as he holds the balance of men's history between his finger and his thumb, "to which of the sons of the mighty shall be entrusted the future shaping of my world?" You and I at any rate believe that those who speak the tongue in which Shakespeare sang, who won the right of freedom through years of agony, by their Catholic sympathy, by their infinite capacity and courage, that finds inspiration in the hour of disaster, that laughs at death with a stout heart, that never knows when it is defeated, and therefore can rest assured of ultimate victory, that ours is the right to undertake this poet task. So through the measure of Shakespeare's matchless music rings out the call of the blood. Oh yes, we singers from the old sleepy mother land are beginning to feel the inspirations sent us by our children over the sea. Dimly are we waking up to the richness, the limitless possibilities of our inheritance.

A quotation from Service:

"The men, aye, of undying love to the Motherland,
We hear at last and soon shall understand."

We are weary and faint by the way because we have not always listened to our singers, we have not trained our eyes to the revelation of the poet and the artist of to-day and long ago. We have accepted without question a mechanical and soulless attitude towards material progress, an attitude unworthy of true empire makers, but you have sent us a summons to new exertion and the motherland is preparing to respond. We realize something of what is meant by being the "melting pot" of the world. Something of the privilege and responsibility of saying every day to two thousand immigrants, "Bread and salt, brother." "There are no strangers in this land. It is a land so large that hate dies out in its

borders." And so on the neutral ground of art and song will be forged the chain impalpable but permanent, that links the Aryan races together. An empire founded upon truth and justice and beauty, so strong that none dare quarrel with her, so just that none will wish to, so free that men will gladly die for her, so lovely that the women and children will embroider with joyful patterns the hem of her sheltering robe. (Applause.)

The sound of Shakespeare's song has gone out unto all nations. Great is the power of the word. Greater still is the power of the fair thought, of which it is the symbol. "What a piece of work is man, how noble in reason, how infinite in faculty, in action how like an angel, in apprehension how like a god, the beauty of the world, the paragon of animals." This was brought very near home to me on the occasion of my first visit to America, when I saw the fair thought of new world citizenship altering expression, and color-moulding contour prevailing over artificial distinctions of creed and caste, redeeming from the curse of heredity or of hate. In a moment, as Masefield phrases it, "a word can become a star or a spear for all time." A morning star of promise, a spear to strike down error and flash the light of progress into the uttermost darkness. So of Shakespeare, the seer and the singer of our race. His genius, as the Saga tells, must be able to see the wind as it sweeps through the trees and the grasses, to hear the wool grow on the sheep's back. Thus attuned, can he catch the rhythm of the red blood lilting through the veins of men and women, of the west wind as it caresses the smallest flower, the roar of the thunder, the tramp of the warrior, the joy leap of the dancer, the murmur of the brooks, the ceaseless surging of the sea, the still small voice, and the mighty heart-beat of the world. So equipped like Odin can he march to the edge of the world, dare to look over into the beyond, the back of God's speed, if need be he will give his eye as the price of wisdom, and with what remains of sight will look the future squarely in the face. On wandering with the will to the good from East to West will find that there is no East and no West, only a globe circling through space in harmony with eternal law. Full of courage he returns after reading his runes, undismayed at the fate which he himself is helping to fashion.

One other note will you catch if we sing our song aright. The melody of the great peace for which the world is always waiting; the realization of the brotherhood of man, the "touch of nature which makes the whole world kin," not in terms of

abstract intellect, or pink-blooded copy-book headings, but of a common humanity realized through patriotism and intensification of national life. (Applause.)

As we drew near your shore the stars were suddenly paled in a flood of opal radiance and one said, "see the halo of the Northern Lights." And then the icebergs swept down toward us, the silent sentinels of the Northern Sea, and just as Orpheus with his lute, "did make the trees and the mountain tops that freeze, bow themselves when he did sing," so did they open up their ranks and give passage to Shakespeare's messengers; and then the river led us hundreds of miles along its splendid channel, and the maple leaf, red as the blood of all the people of all the world, flashed out a welcome; and we passed through orchards, through gardens and farmsteads and smiling wheat fields; through groves and woods and the busy hum of varied industry till it seemed to us that we came into the presence of the Queen of the Snow-Land, sitting in the sun on a throne of precious metals and gems, in a bower of oak and cedar and pine, of twining plants and flowers, with a canopy of azure over her head. At her feet were piled up apples, red, gold and green, corn and oil, olive and vine. The mists of night and morning were her garment. In her hair glinted the flame of the woods, in her eyes gleamed the fires of earth and of heaven, in her right hand was the sceptre of courage, in her left was the orb of hope. The guards at her gates were strong and gentle, the women of her train were very beautiful, and the children exceeding glad. On her banner was emblazoned "free opportunity of life for all," across her shield was written, "Service is power." In her courts, we the latest pilgrims to her shrine, kneel down and humbly pray for her benison as we offer our tribute of Shakespeare's song, the singer, of whom, it may be said in the words of the Wandering Piper, "And I will lead you forth to play high in the sunshine, close to the waterfall, into a land of sun and vines, yea and of men that sing, sing far away forever."—"The Song of the Pioneers." (Long applause.)

(November 3, 1913.)

The Salvation Army

BY GENERAL BRAMWELL BOOTH.*

AT the first regular meeting of the Canadian Club, held on the 3rd November, 1913, General W. Bramwell Booth said, after a long burst of applause:

Mr. President,—Among the many interesting functions which my dear father attended, and of which he subsequently spoke to me with more or less pleasure or pain, his presence at the Canadian Club six years ago was one to which he frequently referred as being one of the most pleasant and gratifying experiences of his whole life. Therefore it is doubly pleasant to me to hear you refer, Mr. President, to the pleasure from your side which that visit had given you.

The fact that I am here to-day is a melancholy circumstance to me. I would so much rather, if in God's providence his life had been spared, that he had been here, and he had strong hope of living to visit you again when that misfortune fell upon him in the loss of his sight, and the operation after for cataract, which proved unsuccessful.

I am glad, however, to be here, though I am well aware, that at present, at any rate, my only claim upon your attention, and the only ground upon which you can care about seeing or hearing anything from me, is the mere fact that I have been appointed his successor. You know, when a man comes into a position as successor to his father, it is not always an advantage. I quite understand, and am not angry, if anybody should find ground for misgiving about me. One of my most intelligent and faithful men said to me, when we were all feeling great grief in our loss, speaking about my appointment, "Well, you know, General, after all, looking at it from the best point of view, you are only a makeshift." (Laughter.) I quite understood and appreciated his feeling, and my reply was, "God helping us, we will shift something!" (Applause.)

My dear father was a remarkable man. He had that faculty of associating himself with the difficulties of others

*General Bramwell Booth is the eldest son of the late General Booth, and was born and raised in the ranks of the Salvation Army. He is the author of several books and numerous pamphlets on social and religious subjects.

which lies at the root, I suppose, of great benevolences, that capacity of placing himself in the other man's position, and looking at wrong and crime and vice and the neglect of God and the disparity of righteousness from the point of view which those he was studying held. It was that that helped so much in the cultivation of that whole field of sympathies which his life has called forth. It gave him the creative touch which was so valuable and has inspired not only thoughtful men, men of intelligence and means such as yourselves, but has inspired the lowest and basest types with the ambition to do something for their fellows.

I asked Sir Rider Haggard, that eminent writer whom you know, to write a book about my father's work in the Salvation Army. He replied: "I will do so on two conditions: first, that I shall only write about what I shall see." "Right you are!" said I, "you shall see everything." "Second, that you don't pay me anything for it." "Right again!" I said. (Laughter.) He spent three months investigating the work, and wrote a very clever book. When it was finished, I asked him, "Haggard, tell me what impressed you most, what single incident?" He went night and day into all manner of places, at unexpected times, and he said: "Well, a prostitute brought off the streets of Glasgow by the police, who was put into the Home there, was ready to do work for another after being three months in the institution. She had received some sort of spiritual help and light, and had been sent out on an errand." That is one of the methods adopted of showing confidence: we have no locks or bars, no one need stay an hour anywhere. "She found another woman on the streets, a young woman, and came back to the warden of the institution and told: "I saw a young girl—she could not have been more than seventeen, on the street corner; I knew what it meant, and I want her brought into the Home." The warden said that the place was full. "Then let her sleep in my bed," she replied, "and I will sleep on the landing." The warden mentioned the expense of her clothing." But the girl replied: "If you will trust me to send me out I will work extra with my needle to earn enough to pay for her clothing." The day Rider Haggard was in the institution that girl had called with the extra money she had earned, four or five pounds, with her needle, in order to pay for the clothing of that other wastrel on the streets of Glasgow. Sir Rider Haggard said to me: "It is more to me as evidence of what you are doing, a greater tribute to the power of your father's spirit, that you are able to inspire that poor street

woman with the ambition to save her sister, than if you should have moved the principalities and powers of the world." I think you will agree with me that one of the great features of the Army is that it is able to place in the hearts and minds of the people a desire, not only to help themselves, but to be of some service to their fellows in misfortune. (Applause.)

I do not know that I should occupy your time in talking about my father, the founder of the Army. I have one advantage over the former General, that when, unlike yourself, Mr. President, I am at a loss what to talk about, I can always speak about my predecessor. (Laughter.) He had a great unity with all classes, so that one of the most prominent Buddhists said to him: "General Booth, you are the reincarnation of our noblest men." That great vision and inspiration so that a Jew, once in talking with him, who knew him rather intimately, said: "You are a prophet, one of our old prophets come back again." And a Roman Bishop once said to him: "General, if you were only in the Church we should make you a Pope." (Laughter.) It was this sense of unity with all which made true also what a French agnostic, a celebrated man, said to him: "Well, General Booth, you may be an Englishman,"—he felt it was a misfortune that he was not a Frenchman, I suppose (Laughter)—"but you belong to humanity!" (Applause.)

I should like to thank the gentlemen here, who, I know, took so deep and interested a part in gathering what was necessary for the Memorial scheme to the General here in Toronto. I believe there are many here in Toronto who participated in that effort. I wish to thank you for your kindness. I think we shall raise some Memorial in almost every country. In Java some \$50,000 has been gathered and the Government has contributed in addition \$25,000 more. On the other side of the world, in Buenos Ayres, they have voted a piece of land in one of their new thoroughfares, in a boulevard which they have called after him, and have also made a grant of £5,000 towards the erection of a suitable building. And we want to do something in England and something in the United States. I mention that, thinking that you would be interested and might like to know what other men are proposing to do. (Applause.)

I think you might well conceive of the Army under the idea of "the helping hand"; and that in every department of human life there is some place which we can take in that capacity, toward individuals and with the community, whether it be municipal or national or religious; there is some place

in all in which our agencies can be of service. (Applause.) And for myself, speaking as the responsible leader of the movement, I assure you that we who are at the centre of things have no higher ambition than to be considered the helpers, without respect to creed, nationality, or race, the helpers of all. (Applause.)

I think that help will, of course, in many cases, be material in its form. We shall take the down and out, the poor, the unfortunate, and raise them by those methods which are known to you as commercial, business methods: work, opportunity, provision in some form or other of capital, using the word "capital" in its largest sense. And I think the material help we can render is one of the valuable assets which you have in the Salvation Army in a community.

And I think the help also will be of a moral and spiritual character. We say—some here will not altogether follow me—but we say, nevertheless, that man is a composite being; you cannot do well for him on one side unless you do well for him on all sides; you cannot do well for him in his body, with his business and his family, unless you also do something for him intellectually and spiritually. Thus we say about criminals: your prison system is excellent; you have many contrivances for helping those poor fellows while you are punishing them; but wonderful as this is, you cannot have complete success unless you care for their souls. That is the philosophy of our religious propaganda. Not that we are out to proselytize, or merely to build up a big society: we don't care whether we are big or little; but to be of real service, not only to be of intellectual and physical help,—the spirit which comes from material things,—but of help to character. While you look at people who are down lowest—one section of our work is among the paupers, the vicious, the criminal, of which classes you have not in Canada a very large number,—you nearly always find that while the trouble is material it is also moral. The man in the lowest position has some crook, some crack, in his character. Therefore to be really able to repair him, there must be something at least done for him which may be of moral and spiritual benefit. I am not claiming any patent for that. I do not say the Salvation Army method is unique. There is no reason to say that. We know that, and we are glad to be imitated. When my father went to visit King Edward, one of the questions His Majesty asked him was, "How do the clergy of the Church of England treat you?" The General was rather in a quandary; he did not want to criticize the clergy of the Church

of England to the King; but he thought a moment and then said, "Well, Your Majesty, they imitate me." (Laughter.) "And I am quite happy to be imitated." The King enjoyed it very much, and the General extricated himself from a little difficulty. Well, I am proud to say that anything we do is the property of all.

With regard to Canada, I am a stranger among you. I am accustomed to ridicule people who visit a country for a month or so and then attempt to criticize it. But while here may I offer one or two suggestions to you in Canada, especially in Ontario? Go ahead and keep your lead with regard to all that encourages the home life of your people. (Applause.) Now, of course, it is easy to make a general observation like that, and you may reply, "Oh, very well, but how are we to do it?" I can only say that it is up to you! But I do say, the home life of a people has more to do, believe me, with the real prosperity, the permanent prosperity, which is what you want, than any other part of its life. (Applause.) The home is the little tributary, the little rill, which runs down the mountain side to feed the great stream of the national life and you, believe me, need to give attention to all that belongs to the happiness, the brightness, the seclusion, the calm, of the true home. (Hear, hear.)

Here in Toronto, and in Ontario in general, you have the opportunity of talking it up. Don't be afraid to set the fashion in these matters! (Hear, hear.) Many of you take part in public functions, many of you are engaged in church life and church work, and some are connected with the press, that most potent pulpit of all pulpits. May I say, you can lift this question to a higher plane by insisting upon the sacredness and privacy of the home, admonishing your people that something is really accomplished for themselves and the nation when they set up and keep a happy home life. (Applause.) You have got the liquor traffic well in hand. I think you lead the world in that matter. (Applause.) I would to God that we in England could follow your steps more rapidly than seems likely at present. That is one great step towards preserving the sacredness and purity of the home.

Secondly, you recognize—there is no man within the sound of my voice who does not recognize—that moral qualities—faith, courage, unselfishness, love—are the characteristics which make enduring power in any people. Take the opportunity, so far as you can, of giving religion a real chance in your schools, because religion is the easiest way of

promoting these qualities. Put it on the low ground of finance,—perhaps I ought not to call that low ground in such an assembly as this (laughter)—but I will say, on the lower ground of finance only, the promotion of these qualities is best secured by the use of religion. Religion is the instrument, the handmaid, most likely to encourage these qualities. Use her, therefore, as a helper for your people's prosperity.

And although I suppose here, as everywhere else, the question of the extent to which religion shall be taught in the schools is a contentious one, and I would rather avoid anything of that nature, still let me speak as an individual not without some opportunity of observation and some experience of what I say: I would urge upon you to give religion a fair chance with the children. (Applause.) I don't mean merely setting up noble examples; that can be done without religion; we don't require the Bible except as a book of history to provide noble ideals for the world; there are many we would agree upon as indifferent Christians who have presented examples of noble work and noble lives. I am speaking of something more than that. It is the function of religion to open the sources of power to rise to those high ideals, and the school is the place in which it can be done with advantage to the future of the nation. I don't think there could be any difficulty if that were seen to be the end. I think it could be done without any thought of proselytizing or denominationalizing. Show the children that a noble purpose, a noble life, is obtainable only by the assistance of divine power. (Applause.)

An eminent Jew, an able and thoughtful man, a large benefactor of charities on this side of the Atlantic and on that, once said to me: "You know I have no regard for your Saviour; I don't like to hear his name mentioned; but I will say this: I taught all my children the Beatitudes before they were twelve years of age; not because I think they are the words of any divine being, but because, speaking as a Jew, I believe them to contain the highest teaching which the mind of man can conceive." (Hear, hear.)

I want one other word: materialism is a great danger to this rising nationality, this great Dominion which is yours, as it is a great danger elsewhere. Thoughtful Europe, at any rate in the last generation, has been greatly disappointed in the tremendous strides which materialism has made in your neighbor, the United States. It has been a disappointment to the reflecting, thoughtful, literary and religious Europe, that things have taken that turn across the border. Now,

beware! (Hear, hear.) The twentieth century is Canada's; you are the coming people: be on your guard; don't set too high a value on merely getting on! Dollars are very, very important, and I am very short of them (laughter) but don't set them too high. Put in your own minds, before your own children and your own clerks, on your 'Change, in your stock markets, in your own counting houses, a place for the higher things. And remember,—allow me to put it so,—a high standard is one of the greatest riches that can be possessed by any people. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Here in Ontario you have the opportunity of raising that standard for all Canada. God give you not only the opportunity but the grace and the courage to use it—if not in His name,—in His name if possible,—but if not in His name then in the name of the advancement and prosperity of what is going to be a mighty nation. God bless you! (Long applause.)

(November 10, 1913.)

Britain's Treatment of Canada.

DR. ADAM SHORTT, M.A., C.M.G.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 10th November, Dr. Shortt said:

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—I assure you that I appreciate to the full the honor which has been done me in asking me to come here to address the Canadian Club of Toronto once more, because I regard the Toronto Canadian Club as my foster mother, in this matter of addressing Canadian Clubs. It was before this Club that I gave my first address and I certainly feel the honor of being asked again.

Without, however, wasting time with preliminary matters, let me get down to my subject which is "Britain's Treatment of Canada."

The question of the relation of the colonies to the mother country and to one another has been one of eternal interest. It may change in its aspects, but must remain a matter of great interest until we work out some practical solution of that relationship in the development of an organization which will express the proper, stable relations of the colonies to the mother country.

Here in Canada, as you know, we have, by reason of our peculiar relations to the mother country, become pioneers in the development of colonial relationship, especially in working out some of the more independent features of the relations with the mother country. Now what I am here to do is not to go into great detail in discussing these relations as such, but to enter a plea for the more careful study of them. I think that no one who has dipped into that matter at all, especially no one who has had the good fortune to deal with the original documents—material of the most fascinating interest—can fail to realize that upon the adequate study of those documents the proper solution of present questions and the proper development of future relations must depend.

What has chiefly stimulated me to take this subject to-day is the frequent observation, in the newspaper press and elsewhere, of what I regard as a mistaken attitude as to the relations of Britain to the colonies.

*Professor Shortt is one of Canada's most distinguished political economists. He was head of the Department of Political Science at Queens University until he became Chairman of the Civil Service Commission a few years ago.

Now these false impressions have been due, I think, to lack of study of the facts, and to the further cause that in our history there have been certain conspicuous landmarks, certain crises, which have attracted special attention, but when their general atmosphere is not well known they have given rise to false impressions regarding their causes and consequences. Let me point out some general features.

In the first place, what was the original colonial relationship? What its stamp? What the fundamental characteristics? When you go back, not only to the early British colonial relations, but to the French, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Dutch and others, you find the development in a crude and very matter of fact way of very elementary principles. These countries saw opportunities to extend their dominion, to their economic advantage, in other parts of the world. This implied an awakening common to them all. One mistake we make is in thinking that this was the result of the discovery of America; it was just the other way, the discovery of America occurred over the head of the development of the idea and practice of extended dominion and enterprise. We find these countries sending out commercial agents, most frequently and most successfully in the form of chartered agencies, or companies, granted monopolies of certain trades. The English Muscovy Company was formed by giving a charter to certain people to monopolize the trade to Russia; it was an old and well known company on the same basis as the Levant Company. Another company was the East India Company, and almost at the same time the Hudson's Bay Company was formed. These companies represented one and the same principle, the sending out of emissaries to exploit those regions for the benefit of the home country. This stimulated to rivalry in the ransacking of the world, and in process of that movement America was discovered. The difference between the Muscovy Company and those trading to new lands was that the former was trading to an old and well settled country while the latter had to establish factories or agencies of their own. You all have read of the factories in India; and those of the Hudson's Bay Co. here, such as Nelson Factory and Moose Factory. These in countries less developed or barbarous were under the necessity of working out their own economy to a greater extent than in older settled countries. Where the question of bringing goods in to market had to be dealt with, it became necessary to make roads and open the country. That led in suitable climates to colonization. But permanent colonists brought new interest.

Suppose a company was organized here in Toronto, with a capital of two million dollars, to develop a new mine prospect back in the north country where there are no settlers. The company gets out equipment, spends money, and employs people to go back and open and work the mine for them. These people build their houses in a year or two, take up their families, and begin to settle. Suppose later on these people sent down a polite note to the company at Toronto, stating that they had decided to take over the mine on their own account, and asking what assistance the company could offer them towards maintaining it! What a commotion there would be down here around the Board in Toronto! (Laughter.) Yet that is practically what has occurred in several British Colonies in the course of time.

One case was that of the Georgia Company, in the State of Georgia. When the returns were slow in coming the Company sent out a new Governor, who was expected to be more vigorous in getting returns; but when they were urged by him to make suitable returns they sent back the Governor himself; as one director pathetically remarked, "It was the only remittance they had ever had from the colony." (Laughter.) That represents the change, from the original idea of sending out emissaries with a view to trade returns merely round to the present idea of self-governing nations within the Empire. It is a long, long stretch, and that sweep is the history of British colonial development. (Applause.)

What I wish you to consider is this: you take a country starting out on that primary basis; you have to consider what it means when development will have changed their point of view, and they face a new situation. But you find those who know little about that change saying, "What do these people mean by telling us they can't do this or that, or accept this or that?" It is not, however, merely a question of the unreasonableness of the demands of Britain, or of the unreasonableness of the colonial attitude. It is a question of facing and understanding a new situation and the marvel is, that the relationship should have held together at all! And we represent the only empire that has held together on that basis. (Applause.)

Now what one objects to in a good deal of the discussion on this subject is the supposition that the relations of Britain to the colonies, and of the colonies to one another, have always been on the same basis. No allowance is made for historical conditions or development. Too much attention is paid to the matter from the present point of view, carrying back that

point of view to the past. That misfortune can be corrected only by more careful study of the facts, and by being a great deal more sympathetic in the discussion of the issues. When, therefore, you say Britain was doing this or trying to do that with us, the first question is as to what were the conditions at the time; was it unreasonable then? Certainly it might be so now; but could Britain have done differently at that time? That is the question you must settle before you can declare whether Britain was just or unjust. In the frequent facing of new conditions and stages there is certain to be a great deal of friction and trouble. We know it in our own experience as in the history of the Western Provinces, and the winning of responsible government by the West. The parties standing out against the movement in Britain or at Ottawa were severely criticised. But all those difficulties have been overcome, and we have come around to the present point of view.

Another aspect of the matter is the further assumption that the British system of government has always been the same so far as colonial government is concerned. That the fight, for example, for constitutional government was a fight to bring the colonies around to what Britain had always enjoyed. But when you look at the facts in the light of closer study, you find the development of responsible government in Britain to be just a little in advance of ours. When the United States broke off from Britain, they took the form which they saw at the time at work in the British system. Thus they started with an independent President, a Cabinet, Secretaries of State, and Legislature. This was simply a reflection of British conditions at the time. Again you find in Canada, that the people we suppose to have been the pioneers in responsible government, did not realize what we now understand by responsible government. If I had time to go into details, I could show you that our form was given to us not by the people who are supposed to have worked it out, but by practical parliamentarians from Britain. There was a series of Governors, Lord Durham, Lord Sydenham, Sir Charles Bagot, Lord Metcalfe, and Lord Elgin, who were chiefly concerned in the practical establishment of British responsible government. The people who were opposed to the Home Government in Canada were supposed to be always fighting for some fundamental principles and those supporting the Government were supposed to be always on the side of the Home Government—that, however, is another myth. I have gone over very interesting letters and documents of William Lyon Mackenzie, whom I

select because he was in the forefront of the rebellion. When he got the ear of Lord Goderich, he wrote to his friends in Canada telling how fine a thing the British Government was, how liberal, how splendid, because for the time being they were taking his side. What was the corresponding wail from the Family Compact? They wrote that if things were not done as they wanted, they knew another country they could be annexed to and live in freedom under another flag. (Laughter.) But there arose another ruler in the Colonial Office who knew not Mackenzie, at least did not know him in that way, and Mackenzie became more rebellious, and the Family Compact more devoted than ever!

This appeal from the parties in Canada, even from helpless minorities in Canada, to the Government of Britain to take their side, and fight their battles, and bring them to the front, is seen in hundreds of documents, and some of the most interesting letters in reply were written by Gladstone when he was at the Colonial Office.

These are merely phases. I am just telling you a few points that bear on my general argument that the British Government did not dominate Canada but simply accepted its policy from Canada. I am asking you to look more carefully and study the facts. (Applause.) When we find this "Downing Street domination," we might suppose the remedy should have been, "Let the people who are bound to run the country take their own way." But when we get down to cold facts, we find that the Home Government was simply supporting one element in Canada, which was giving them all the ammunition, all the information, all their point of view, against another party which was fighting the first. It was a fight between two Canadian elements, both trying to get the ear of the Home Government, stuffing the Home Government, of course, with stories pro and con. (Laughter.) There is an attitude you will appreciate.

Take another concrete illustration, on the commercial side. We find Lord John Russell writing to Lord Sydenham, asking how it is that the Legislature of Canada, just before the Union, sends over such contradictory demands regarding trade policy. Writing back, Lord Sydenham says it is quite simple: the Legislature of Canada, when it could do nothing itself, and could not decide which one of the parties it was going to favor and which to turn down simply sent on the demands of each. When the people of Montreal ask for exclusion of goods shipped by any other route than the St. Lawrence and the people of Toronto say they want their goods

by way of the Erie canal because it is cheaper; when the farmers of the West ask for protection on grain, and the people of Montreal want free grain, the Legislature simply backs them all in their appeal to Britain! (Laughter.) Because the Canadian administration will not be responsible for turning down any of them, all these burdens are thrown on the Home Government, and its decision is odious to some important element in Canada. Such a situation affords one of the strongest arguments for responsible government, thus throwing the burden of settling these things on Canadians themselves. When they were thrown back on them, how did it work? Lord Sydenham and others arranged that the majority of the Legislature must decide how things were to be done. The Canadian Government decided, for instance, in one of these cases that they would impose a differential duty on goods coming by any other route than by way of the St. Lawrence; pretty nearly the solid vote of Quebec favoured this, as well as the Eastern section of Upper Canada, but the other part was not in favor of it. The minority finding itself turned down did not accept the decision but wrote off in haste to the British Government about a "most alarming development" that was taking place, a "most unheard-of infringement of the Navigation Acts, and the British foreign policy" with which Canada had no right to interfere. They appealed to the old colonial system, the old Navigation Acts, insisting that everything should be done by Britain, but they were told that Canada must now settle its domestic difficulties. To disallow the provincial act would be simply to favor the western part of Canada. The ordinary idea was that in such matters Britain should take one or the other side, as in previous times she frankly did. But this was considered British domination, trying to stamp out freedom in the British Empire. Canada's past history has been framed by regarding only the high lights and overlooking the underlying conditions. Thus there has grown up what I consider a very unfair conception of the attitude of the mother country. (Applause.)

A proper understanding of that will have various effects. I think one striking lesson taught is the wisdom of having Canada settle as much as she can, as much as she ought to of her own affairs, (applause) rather than have too many things thrown back upon the British Government. And you will observe, we never ask the British Government to take any responsibility if we can arrive at any kind of unanimity among ourselves. We have always gone to them with an appeal to help out one or other Canadian party.

Another of the features in criticism of Britain has reference to the boundary questions. This has relation chiefly to our neighbors to the south, the Americans. I might pass in review the boundary treaties in general, but the one most talked of, and in which Britain is regarded most continuously as having "sold us out," or words to that effect, is the affair of the Maine boundary, settled by the Ashburton Treaty in 1842. It is urged that Britain was more anxious to please the United States than her own people, and consented to give away a good slice of Canadian territory in order to please the United States. What are the facts? It is a long and voluminous subject; I presume I have read a thousand documents on it if I have read one. The foundation of the whole matter is laid in that part of America which was owned and settled by the French in Canada. Britain, in fighting for her own people, shoved the boundary far north, right into the midst of the French. Especially after the Treaty of Utrecht which so greatly enlarged the British dominions they set up claim after claim, map after map, showing the south bank of the St. Lawrence as the northern boundary. That was one of the items for which they were fighting, the south bank of the St. Lawrence as the boundary between the French dominions and the British. When she ultimately conquered Canada Britain held the North American continent entirely under her supervision until the American Revolution. Britain outlines the subdivisions of her jurisdiction in that territory in the Proclamation of 1763 which included in the Province of Quebec part of the territory south of the St. Lawrence. Yet the south bank was claimed as part of the original British territory. In case the French should recover Canada Britain could say "there is what you get back, that is all you own." (Laughter.) But for the sake of administration they put into Quebec or Canada a portion south of the St. Lawrence. Though the true line was very indefinite, it followed the height of land separating the St. Lawrence from the American rivers. Similar remarks might be made about the Nova Scotia or Acadia boundary also.

The next point is that in the boundary of Quebec fixed by the Quebec Act of 1774, the description of the Proclamation of 1763 was repeated, except that when you get to Lake Erie it takes a dip to the Ohio, in order to get behind the American colonies and prevent them from extending in that direction. The result was to put that part of the continent under French law and French institutions, which, as Lord Hillsborough said, "will keep them out better than any boundary." (Laughter.)

In the Treaty of 1783 recognising the independence of the United States, the boundary is described again and on the same basis as far as the St. Lawrence at Cornwall as in 1763 and 1774. As that was laid down, Britain was putting more over into the purely Canadian line than she ever admitted as against France or up to that time. Thus Canada as a province was enlarged to a very great extent. Then came numerous demands for the actual survey of the boundary. Meantime Britain wanted a military road between Quebec and New Brunswick and wanted to get across the upper angle of Maine on much the same principle as when we tried to get an all-Canadian route into the Klondyke by shoving back the American line. When that was finally settled in the Ashburton Treaty, what we find as a simple matter of fact is, that Britain got somewhat more than she was entitled to under the first award or under her own showing as against France. Her chief difficulties were in fighting her own documents during previous conditions. Lord Ashburton certainly achieved a singular success. Governor Bagot congratulated him most heartily, and Mr. Featherstonhaugh, the British Agent, wrote a pamphlet showing that the settlement was most favorable to Canada, and to British interests. Mr. Webster, on the other hand, had a hard time of it with the American Congress. (Laughter, and applause.)

Two or three points incidental to the settlement are worth referring to as partly accounting for subsequent false impressions in Canada. In order to get the boundary settled at all, it was necessary for the Federal Government to persuade the State of Maine to hand over the territory in dispute to the United States under the assurance that it would do everything possible to protect their interests. In order to persuade the people of Maine to transfer the territory it was hinted that a certain map had been discovered in the French Archives on which Franklin had drawn a line giving color to the British claim and the matter should be settled before the British discovered it. Subsequently the Maine people said they were hoodwinked, and made trouble in Congress. This map was the famous "red line map," the discovery of which induced Mr. Featherstonhaugh to write a second pamphlet claiming that Webster had deceived the British representatives including Lord Ashburton and the others.

It turned out that the Franklin map in the northern section indicated a line which no one in Britain or elsewhere had ever contended for. When this question was brought up in the British House of Commons and it was asked, "How

were the Americans allowed to get away with this?" the answer of Sir Robert Peel was, "We knew all about that; our Agent in Paris had mentioned the map but it was not considered worth while. But," he added, "there was another map that we didn't say anything about. It was a map sent by our Agent, Mr. Oswald, to the King himself, and was placed in the King's library. This shows what was his conception of the boundary at that time, and that map gives the Americans their claim." He said, "Of course, we didn't say anything about that." Nevertheless Mr. Featherstonhaugh's second pamphlet has been accepted as the justification of popular belief in this country.

Lastly, there was this wind-up to the matter. When later it came to a question of settlement of the boundary between Quebec province and New Brunswick, the British claim would have given the disputed territory to Quebec while the American claim would have given a good deal to New Brunswick. Now, though New Brunswick was the province which stoutly supported the British claim against the Americans, yet in this new boundary dispute with Quebec they maintained that the proper boundary was what the Americans had claimed and not that defined by the British documents and arguments. Quebec thought she was absolutely secure and left the matter to the British experts. But the boundary was decided in favour of New Brunswick, thus supporting the previous contentions of the Americans.

If that was so then we got many hundred square miles more than we were entitled to, and all the congratulations offered to Lord Ashburton were amply due to him. Well, that is one of the instances in which, we are told by people high in authority, Britain "sold us out." Britain, of course, did nothing of the kind! She was supporting us, and we got quite all that we were entitled to! (Applause.)

But my time is up. I simply wished to give one or two examples which could be duplicated and reduplicated to any extent to show you that in dealing with these matters you have to find the primary situation, to consider the developments, the change in point of view, the surrounding facts and conditions; you have to regard the sweep from the original founding of colonies, on the basis of emissaries sent out to bring home wealth, to the present system of self-governing colonies. The toleration of the British Government, no less than the enterprise of the colonial leaders, has been essential to the realization of the Empire. All the first statesmen of Britain are on one side. Chatham, Fox, Burke, Shelburne and

Pitt the Younger were all on the one side in advocating toleration with the progressive colonies. They believed in finding out the actual situation, easing off the strain and retaining the American colonies.

The last word I have is this: When you find from time to time in the development of colonial relations, that British statesmen and others have given expression to the view that "We can't hold the Canadians very much longer, they are bound to break off," what is the basis for that very pessimistic sentiment? Always the extreme demands of Canada, involving concessions which would disrupt the domestic and foreign policy of Britain. When these demands were not promptly met there has been talk of rebellion or annexation. It matters not whether they were Liberals or Conservatives, who were making the claims, they all tell the same story. Take the Rebellion of 1837 or the Annexation Manifesto of 1848. My point is this: before you condemn Britain—she has her faults, and we have ours—before you make up your minds that we have been hoodwinked or sold out by her and before you settle what must be the immediate future of our relations to her, look into the matter closely, study it up carefully and you will commonly find the matter somewhat different from the popular conception of it. (Applause.)

(November 17, 1913.)

The Relations between the Public and the Railways.

BY SIR WILLIAM CORNELIUS VAN HORNE, K.C.M.G.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 17th November, Sir William C. Van Horne said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—While I deeply appreciate and am very much flattered by the words of your Chairman concerning myself, they are somewhat embarrassing to me, for I know how far short I am of deserving them. I want to take but a minute of your time to call your attention to the fact that the real men in the Canadian Pacific Railway were the men who found the money; my part of it was the very simple one which consisted only in spending that money, wisely or not. (Laughter.) And as to that I frequently think of the many mistakes I made in doing it, and how much more cheaply we could have done things if I had only known enough. However, I thank you for your kind words. I would mention Lord Mountstephen, Lord Strathcona, Mr. Angus, and in the early days that doughty Scotchman, Duncan McIntyre, as among those who had to do with the original financing of the Company, not forgetting our friend, Sir Edmund Osler. (Applause.)

Your Honorary Secretary has warned me and put upon me a maximum of time limit of thirty minutes; fortunately for me, and no doubt for you also, he has not fixed any minimum. (Laughter.) And therefore I shall keep you away from your business just as little time as possible.

I had thought of speaking to you here to-day on what I regard as an exceedingly important subject, the drift of the farm population of Canada towards the towns, which has, as you know, been going on so long in the United States, and with, I think, unhappy results. But when I arrived here this morning and saw your imposing Union Passenger Station (laughter) with all its lightness and grace—an extraordinary contribution to the architecture of the Dominion of Canada, (laughter)—and when I walked out through the beautiful

*Sir William Van Horne after many years of railway experience in the United States entered the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway at one of the most critical periods in its history. When it commenced operation there were few who thought it could be made a financial success, but under Sir William's management the foundation was laid for the wonderful system which we now know.

walks of your Waterfront Park along the Windmill Line,—another contribution to the beauties of Canada (laughter) the landscape gardening of Canada, and to the healthfulness of your city, I changed my mind. (Laughter.) For it came to me that there was something of very much greater and more immediate importance than the farm movement. That can be deferred a few weeks. I refer to the relations between the public and the railways.

I don't think the railways have always been very well treated by some of the people of Toronto, not nearly so well as they deserve. And I think it would have been better long ago if there had been more sympathy, if all had worked more in accord. (Hear, hear.) For I think the Park would have been a little more attractive, and the Union Station perhaps a little lighter, and various other things would have been better.

You all know, I am sure, that the railways of the United States have for a long time back been under attack; that at every session of the State Legislatures a great number of adverse laws are launched against them, laws which I believe to have originated in political stock jobbing or other similar motives. At all events, the public generally has supported these laws without giving them, I am sure, very much thought. And to-day the railways of the United States are struggling almost for their existence; they are struggling, many of them, against bankruptcy. I am quite unable to account for the spirit of hostility shown towards the railways there, because I am sure there are many among you who will bear me out in this statement, because the service by the railways in the United States is far above that of those in any other country in the world,—save perhaps the railways of Canada, we must never forget. (Laughter.) Their rates are very much lower than those of any other country in the world, saving again Canada. (Laughter.) They are operated with an intelligence and public spirit that you don't find in any other country in the world. They have greater regard for the public interest and the rights of the individuals, as usually shown, than in any other country I have visited,—save Canada always. (Laughter.) I don't know the reason, as I have said, for this hostility, but it has created a situation, a deplorable situation, that is really a great cloud, and the great danger of the situation of the American railways is that it overshadows the business of the United States to-day so that all other dangers are trivial compared with it.

We have seen recently the New York Central Railway compelled, through the false statement of an employee to the effect that he could not see a red light on a particular occa-

sion, which every railway man knows to have been false,—we have seen the New York Central Railway compelled to expend untold millions, fifty or sixty million dollars, I don't know how much, on changing its New York terminals. And we have seen the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railway hounded by ignorant public sentiment to the very verge of bankruptcy, hounded to the point where its very financial existence was threatened.

Now all these things are catching, and sometimes,—too frequently, I think,—Canada has shown a disposition to follow the example of the United States, as along labor laws and others I might mention. I am only afraid they may follow in laws against railways. However, up to the present time, there has been comparatively little illiberal, unintelligent legislation affecting railways in Canada. I will mention one case, that where ten years ago the foundations were cut into of that splendid grain elevator system in the Northwest, which had been built up by the Canadian Pacific Railway after many years' effort, with the result that the farmers from that time on have not received nearly as much for their grain as before. There was an exception on that occasion, and the effect of that legislation, I am afraid, will continue forever. We have had some legislation of that kind, but not very much to complain of.

I want to plead to-day for a more liberal, intelligent, and friendly consideration of the railway interests of Canada, and against any attempt on the part of "blatherskites" to put through ignorant legislation such as has been the curse of most of the States among our neighbors on the south.

I have now passed my fifty-sixth railway year, and in that time I have known hardly one executive or managing officer of a railway, either in the United States or Canada, who did not take the deepest possible interest in the welfare of the property entrusted to his administration, who did not feel the deepest possible interest in the welfare of the communities served by his railway, who did not heartily desire the good will and friendship of every patron of the road and of everybody living along the line. I cannot recall one single exception to this. It has been my lot or fortune to have been a director, of one railway at a time, of a good many lines in the last forty years, and I can truthfully say that in all that time I have never heard a suggestion of an illiberal character. (Applause.) In any question, any matter of policy, or any other case, where there has been the least doubt, the question has been decided on the liberal side and in favor of the public.

There are many who think, perhaps most people think, that the first efforts of the managing directors and managing officers of the railways are directed to squeezing out dividends. I can say that that is absolutely false! It is the very last consideration. I don't know one single exception in Canada, or any exception on any railways I have ever been connected with in the United States.

Railway men are extraordinarily busy men; they have all that they can possibly do within the twenty-four hours, and perhaps they have failed in making sufficient explanations to the public; but that is a very difficult thing to do; and that may perhaps be nullified quite by the statement of some ignorant "blatherskite" who has the gift of the "gab." (Laughter.) But the hearts of the railway men of Canada are in the right place. There is not a man among them who is not interested intensely in the welfare of the public. And again I plead, when there are any questions between the public and the railways, they should be talked over in a friendly way. (Hear, hear.)

Somebody some time ago said something about corporations having no souls. I say, as a result of sitting in a vast number of Board meetings, not only of railway directors but of manufacturers and others, for many years, that a corporation has a soul, and it has a bigger, cleaner, finer soul, than any individual on the face of the earth! I don't pretend to say that there are not ignorant men and simple men sitting on some Boards, but those men never have the hardihood to show their bad side. I have never known it, and at present sitting here there are many men who will bear me out in this statement.

I thank you again, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. (Applause.)

In moving a vote of thanks to Sir William C. Van Horne, Sir John S. Willison said:

Mr. President, Sir William Van Horne, and Gentlemen,— I always make a much better impromptu speech when I have had time to prepare it. I have the same qualities, not of an intellectual type, which belonged to Sir Robert Peel. Disraeli, he said, drew on his imagination for his facts, and on his memory for his jokes. To-day I have had no adequate opportunity to draw on either.

It is, however, an extreme pleasure, unexpected as it is, to be asked to move a vote of thanks to Sir William Van Horne. I suppose we are not absolutely agreed as to the eternal unfailing benevolence of railways. I don't think, however,

in the final judgment of history it will be said that the founders of the Canadian Pacific Railway have not been pre-eminently makers of this Dominion of Canada. Sir, I altogether refuse to believe that the men who control this great corporation, who develop, extend and carry on this great public enterprise, are actuated only by selfish and mercenary considerations. I have lived long enough also to know that there is a public spirit of patriotism in every class of the population. (Hear, hear.) And I am profoundly convinced that the men who made the Canadian Pacific Railway, and who made the other great transportation companies of Canada, were actuated by as profound patriotism as we men on the newspapers and in other offices, who misunderstand what they are doing, and speak with exceptional authority on subjects which we do not quite understand.

Just in closing, may I say a thing I have said elsewhere, although not in the form of a public address? Anyone who crossed the Canadian West in the early days of the Canadian Pacific Railway must have been absolutely amazed to find that with a road trailing across such enormous territory, with only a few straggling villages and with only small stretches of scattered settlements—I was one of those who must have been absolutely amazed to learn that the road could be successfully operated. It is a great miracle in the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not that it was built, because generous subsidies were provided towards its construction, but that when the money was expended and the road constructed men with the genius of Sir William Van Horne were found to operate it, and to operate it successfully under these onerous conditions.

So I say in closing and in moving a vote of thanks to Sir William Van Horne that we in this growing commercial city hold for him great admiration and regard; (hear, hear and applause); that we believe he is a great and unselfish Canadian patriot, and that in the pages of the history of our Dominion no name will shine with greater radiance than that of our guest to-day. I move a vote of thanks to Sir William Van Horne for his address. (Applause.)

Mr. D. R. Wilkie, seconding the vote, said:

Mr. Chairman, Sir William and Gentlemen,—This honor is quite unexpected, but I can assure you I take advantage of it to-day with the greatest pleasure. I have looked upon Sir William Van Horne ever since he came to this country as

a leader in the industrial progress of the country and of the finer class of gentlemen who make up the nation. The only thing we regret is that the Canadian Pacific Directors are not oftener in Toronto. We are not as much in touch with them as we would like to be. I only hope this is the first of many addresses from Sir William; there are many subjects on which he could give us valuable information. I hope it will be the pleasure of Sir William to come again. No man has greater admiration for him than myself. I have very much pleasure in seconding Sir John Willison's motion. (Applause.)

(November 24, 1913.)

The British Consular Service and its Relation to Canada.

BY MR. J. JOYCE-BRODERICK.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 24th November, Mr. Joyce-Broderick said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I assure you that it gives me very great pleasure indeed, and that I esteem it a high honor as well, to have the opportunity of appearing before this magnificent gathering and of telling you something about the Imperial Service to which I belong. If it be agreed, and I believe it will be, that the subject upon which I propose to speak to you to-day, namely, the British Consular Service, is one which has a practical interest for industrial Canada, then I count it an advantage as well that I should be able to appear before a representative audience in the city of Toronto, which has taken a leading part in the industrial development of this Dominion.

I understand that at the present time you have over one thousand factories working in this city; the capital you have invested here is close to \$150,000,000. It is, therefore, an exceptional advantage that I should be able to speak to you on this practical subject.

I only wish that all that the Chairman has said about me were true, not alone for your sakes at this present moment, but for my own sake permanently. Usually Irishmen are supposed to have the gift of facility of expression and fluency of language—a gift which has unfortunately been denied me. I told a story which took so well, and especially tickled the fancy, as it seemed, of the representatives of the press, that I think, since it has succeeded in Hamilton (laughter) and elsewhere, I will tell it here. (Laughter.) I believe that it is now ripe for presentation in Toronto—not because of its subject, however. It tells of two criminals (laughter), inhabitants of the city of New York, of unknown nationality. One of them had inside knowledge of the conditions in the New York State prison at Sing Sing, and the other lived in the happy anticipation that his unconventional mode of life and the force of circumstances and the vigilance of the New York Police force,

*Mr. Broderick was for many years British Vice-Consul at New York, and was recently promoted to be Consul at Amsterdam. He was chosen by the British Ambassador to make a tour through Canada, and explain the British Consular Service and its relation to Canada.

which is most renowned (laughter) would finally result in his being compelled to make an extended stay in that same institution. And he desired to have some information concerning the daily routine of the place, so he asked his companion to describe to him what was done there every day. And his companion out of the fulness of his knowledge told him every detail of the routine—what time the bell rang for them to get up in the morning, when breakfast was served, and so on. The other said, "I think now I have a very good idea of what happens in Sing Sing, and what to do when I go there; but I wish you would tell me how they put people to death." The other man had not yet had actual experience in this respect, so what he replied was from hearsay: "Oh, they just sits them comfortably in chairs and they turns on the elocution." (Laughter.) I guessed it would succeed in Toronto too. (Hear, hear.) Now, incidentally, I believe Sir Edmund Walker will agree with me—that is really an abominable libel on New York elocution—it is not quite so deadly. At present you are all comfortably seated in chairs and would like a speedy release, but unfortunately there is no supply of elocution to be turned on. (Laughter.)

I have been nearly five years as Consular Representative of the British Government in New York City. During that period I have been greatly struck with the fact that the inquiries for commercial information, and for other assistance to commerce, received from Canada came at very rare intervals. And it occurred to myself and to a number of my colleagues that possibly for some reason or another Canadians might have the notion that the British Consular Service, so far as its commercial activities were concerned, existed exclusively and entirely for the benefit and advantage of manufacturers and exporters of the United Kingdom. Some short time since, I had the good fortune to meet the distinguished founder of Canadian Clubs, Mr. C. R. McCullough, of Hamilton, and he suggested to me that, if that notion really existed, it might be very largely dispelled if one of His Majesty's consular representatives in your immediate neighbourhood should visit the Dominion and explain to as many people as possible who would be interested, not only that no barrier existed which would prevent the British consular service from giving its services to Canada, but that the British Government and the consuls themselves were eager and anxious that they should have very frequent opportunities of doing so.

About a year ago, the desire of the British Government in this respect was repeated and emphasized in a circular despatch which was issued by the Foreign Office to British

consuls all over the world, in which they were enjoined to neglect no opportunity of corresponding with the Canadian Government and Canadian firms with a view to furnishing to Canadian firms information on commercial matters whenever the need arose. I believe that this circular was the immediate result of correspondence and conversation between the Canadian Government and Sir Edward Grey. On many occasions the Consul-General at New York and I myself have had the pleasure of making the position as clear as we could to Canadian audiences in New York City. And some of you may remember that towards the close of last August I was invited to speak before the Association of Canadian Clubs at their annual meeting at Niagara Falls, and that I there briefly covered the ground over which I would like to go just now. Shortly after that meeting it was very gratifying to me to receive from Canadian sources several inquiries which, according to the writers, were the immediate result of the observations I had the pleasure of making on that occasion.

Now at the present I am here with the object of placing that same message before a wider public, and of endeavoring to arouse in Canadians, and especially Canadian business people, greater interest than they have hitherto evinced in the possible service which the British consular service may be able to render to the trade and commerce of the Dominion.

I am well aware that, as the chairman has just said, the main reason why you do not more frequently look to the foreign field for an outlet for your goods is that your domestic demand for manufactured goods greatly exceeds your domestic production. There are many who have made a close study of the subject who claim that it will be a long time before your factories and mills will be in a position to cope with home requirements and overtake home demand, a demand which is rendered annually more voluminous and more varied by the rapid development of the West and Northwest, and by increasing population devoting its labor and energy to the extraction of wealth from your forests, your mines and your rivers.

At the same time the Department of Trade and Commerce at Ottawa has issued statistics which show rather another side of the picture, and indicate an absolutely unexampled rapidity of industrial growth. For example: I find that the output of manufactured products of the Dominion last year reached a value of almost \$1,165,000,000. During the past ten years the capital invested in your industries has increased by 180 per cent. approximately. And in the same period, as a result

of the application of that capital, the value of your industrial production has increased by about 144 per cent. Within the short space of ten years, the total volume of your commerce has almost doubled itself. Since 1868 your population has doubled itself: in 1868 it stood at about 4,000,000; to-day I believe it stands at about 8,000,000. And the immigrants who flock constantly to your shores are being drawn from the most alert and progressive and thrifty element of the populations of the Old World and the New. Incidentally I may be permitted to congratulate you on the care with which you filter this inrushing stream of immigration, and, if I may say so, it might be desirable to increase your caution and thus save yourselves in the future from many problems of assimilation which are being keenly felt in your immediate neighbourhood. The value of your exports of manufactured goods, which was only a little over \$2,000,000 in 1868 and which had reached \$16,000,000 in 1901, more than doubled itself in the succeeding ten years and reached a total of almost \$42,000,000 in 1912. The vast water power at Niagara and elsewhere all over the Dominion is being rapidly chained, and is being made the handmaiden of your industry by transformation into electrical energy to drive your mills.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to give so many figures in illustration of a progress and a growth with which you yourselves are more familiar than I; but I do so in order to base upon them this claim, that they are significant enough to justify, certainly in the more sanguine amongst us, the expectation that in the near future Canada, while not losing her eminence as an agricultural country, will be mainly a manufacturing country. They show, I think, that even at the present time Canada is not, and cannot be, indifferent to foreign markets; and that she will probably outrun the cautious predictions of experts, and shortly enter the arena with the other great industrial countries of the world and compete with them in the struggle for the world's trade.

Now when she does so, when the time comes for her to enter into this competition, she will find other countries equipped with the most efficient and most up-to-date weapons: if they did not have these weapons they would be forced out of the race, for the keenness of modern competition, as you know, is such as to give swift victory to the best equipped machinery. And amongst the weapons that they will use will be the Consular Services, which I might describe as the antennae or feelers of their commerce, very sensitive and keenly alert to discover outlets for their surplus products. And

when that time comes, I believe it will be a fortunate circumstance for Canada that the rivalry between British and foreign trade will have served to develop the British Consular Service, that that Service will have been engaged in the struggle and in the thick of the fight from the outset, and that, without any period of preliminary training or initial mistakes, it will be ready to place any powers and facilities it possesses at the disposal of Canada to help her material expansion. (Applause)

The question now naturally arises as to what the British Consular Service is, what its duties and equipments are, and what is the exact nature of the information and assistance it can afford you as you enter more and more into the foreign field. To answer these questions even cursorily it will be useful to take a brief glance at the history of Consular establishments in general, to see what role they have hitherto played in the economy of nations, what their traditions are, and how these traditions affect their standing and influence at the present time.

The office of Consul, although not the name, is coeval with commerce itself. In ancient times just as much as to-day—but perhaps I should put it in the reverse way—men were anxious to obtain as much of their neighbour's goods as they could at the sacrifice of as few as possible of their own. (Laughter.) Some amongst them who had reduced this process to a fine art and who were unwise enough to operate on a retail basis, have always been dubbed as thieves and placed in penitentiaries; others with greater prudence operate on a wholesale basis and are hailed as financial geniuses and placed on pedestals. (Laughter.) From the very beginning barter and exchange of any kind have been attended by all sorts of disputes and quarrels, which rendered it necessary for some person to be appointed abroad, who would be fortified by the authority of a powerful nation and whose decisions would be accepted without question by the parties to the dispute.

Demosthenes tells us of certain functionaries called "Proxeni," appointed by the Grecian cities who held court on board foreign vessels and decided differences between sailors and merchants according to their own confessions and to the testimony of witnesses. That is exactly what I try to do every other day. The ancient Egyptians had special high priests consecrated for the peculiar purpose of settling mercantile disputes, and they also had special temples solemnly dedicated to the Gods in which these high priests held court,

and in which they handed down their decisions; the object probably being to take advantage of the religious feeling of the people and thus to make the decision all the more binding. I fear that, with the exception of Toronto, religion has not such a tight hold on the world to-day as would make people chary of criticising an adverse decision even if it were handed down in the church (laughter); and from the rather extensive knowledge which I possess of the character of seamen I feel quite convinced that it would render them distinctly uncomfortable if the holy nature of their surroundings should deprive them of that wonderful vocabulary which assists them so marvellously to accept compromise. (Laughter.)

These functionaries of Greece and Egypt to whom I have referred, appear to be the earliest consuls recorded in history. I am not convinced, however, that they were the earliest in fact, although it is quite plain that had a consul been on the spot to intervene between Cain and Abel the latter would not have suffered so sad a fate whatever might have been the fate of the Consul. These Grecian and Egyptian functionaries you will notice were citizens of the countries in which the disputes arose, and the system was consequently liable to many abuses. Their power was derived from laws which were alien to the merchants and seamen between whom they intervened, and I presume that they were not exactly moderate in their charges. (Laughter.) Maritime nations such as the Rhodians and Phoenicians—the Rhodians were the most famous maritime people of antiquity and possessed a wonderful nautical code, some of the principles of which derived through fragments of Roman law are embodied in the maritime statutes of modern nations—were quick to see that if they were to provide adequate protection to their commerce against injury and forfeiture, they would be obliged to appoint at the foreign ports frequented by their vessels men of their own race, of upright and moral character, whose decisions would be impartial, and who would act for their country and government not merely in matters relating to the trifling disputes of seamen, but also in larger questions upon which might depend the friendship or hostility of nations.

In a form somewhat similar to the present Consular establishments began after the decay of the Eastern Empire, when the Venetians and other Italian cities commenced their trade with the East. From the East the institution came back to the mercantile cities of Southern Europe whose merchants early adopted the practice of appointing one of their own number to act as arbitrator in their disputes, the principal

object of this being—and I hope there are not too many lawyers present—to avoid the tedious formalities of the regular courts of law. (Laughter.) These functionaries were called “Juges Consuls,” consular judges, the object being to endow them and their tribunals with dignity and inspire a respect for them in others, by bestowing upon them the name borne by the Chief Magistrates of the Roman Empire.

England was slow to follow the lead of the Italian cities and the towns of the Hanseatic League in appointing Consuls, probably owing to the late development of her trade. And it was only in 1485 that the first British Consul was appointed. The first British Consul was an Italian. (Laughter.) His name was Lorenzo Strozzi, and he was appointed by King Richard III a few months before the king was slain at the battle of Bosworth Field. He was appointed English Consul at Pisa in Italy, where English merchants were at that time intending to trade. His commission is still preserved in the archives of the Foreign Office in London and is a most interesting old document: it is the oldest original copy of a consular commission in existence; it does not differ very seriously from the commission which I hold myself, although it is much more prolix. There is one rather striking passage in it, of which I take the liberty of giving you a modern version. We read that the king observing “that whereas certain merchants and others from England intend to frequent foreign ports and chiefly Italy with their ships and merchandise and being desirous to consult their peace and advantage as much as possible and observing from the practice of other nations the necessity of their having a *peculiar magistrate* amongst them for determining of all disputes between merchants and others, natives of England; moreover we, understanding that the city of Pisa is a very proper place for the residence of our merchants, and being assured of the fidelity and probity of Lorenzo Strozzi, a merchant of Florence, have and do appoint him to be *Consul and President* of all our merchants at Pisa and parts adjacent allowing him for his trouble herein the fourth of one per cent. of all goods of Englishmen either imported to or exported from thence.” I have many times lamented that this excellent system of remuneration is not in vogue at the present time. (Laughter.) The consuls appointed for some time after Strozzi were also foreigners: the first Englishman to be appointed consul was sent abroad about the year 1530 as Consul for Canada. His name was Dionysius Harris—no relation of the lady of the same name since he did actually exist. (Laughter.) After him con-

suls were appointed more rapidly as the expansion of English trade demanded. In 1825 the service was reorganized and at the present time we have consular representatives of the British Empire at every place of importance on the habitable globe, and at some places of absolutely no importance at all. (Laughter.)

After the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in the year 1453 the Turkish rulers were so entirely ignorant of Christian usage that they found it convenient to give to their newly-acquired Christian subjects certain rights and privileges of self-government. Genoa and other mercantile cities of Italy who had at that period establishments on the Bosphorus, succeeded in obtaining similar privileges for themselves and their representatives from the Sultan, and other maritime nations followed their example in due course. The treaties under which these privileges were accorded by the Sultan were known as "capitulations"—not in the modern sense of the term, but rather as heads or articles of a treaty—and they gave the official representatives of the nations concerned civil and criminal jurisdiction within Turkish territory in matters affecting their nationalities. The practice extended to other non-Christian countries which include China, and—until recently—Japan. The treaty upon which our British rights in Turkey are based was entered into between Charles II. and the then Sultan of Turkey, and gives to our consuls the civil and criminal jurisdiction of which I have spoken.

During recent years commercial nations have more and more encouraged their trade interests to seek active aid from consuls in protecting and extending their foreign commerce, and this watchfulness now forms one of the chief duties of our consuls in Christian countries. By international law and special treaties they are granted certain peculiar privileges—such, for instance, as freedom from arrest—a most useful thing. (laughter), inviolability of consular archives, exemption from taxation, exemption from the performance of military service, and from the obligation to appear as witness. When the testimony of a consul is desired the usual procedure is for the court to appoint a commissioner to go to his office and take his evidence, which is subsequently read in court. Usually, however, the consul prefers to appear in court and I think that this privilege will soon become obsolete since it is so unbusinesslike.

The duties of consuls are of a public character and they enjoy the special protection of the law of nations. Owing to this protection and to the dignity and importance of their

calling, as well as to their quasi-representative character, they enjoy a prestige which enables them to procure information on trade matters which would be afforded with reluctance—or not afforded at all—to private representatives of individual firms or even to government representatives who go abroad under any other title. Other countries take every advantage of these special facilities possessed by their consuls and British business men all over the Empire cannot afford to neglect them if they are to obtain and retain a firm footing in the markets of the world.

From Canada you export vast quantities of raw materials and food stuffs. Now raw materials and food stuffs as you are aware practically compel their own market. The foreign purchaser comes in search of them because upon them depends his subsistence and his ability to create wealth for himself. But producers of manufactured goods are obliged to use every resource at their disposal to find markets for their surplus. Consuls cannot take the place of individual representatives of private firms. A consul cannot, of course, bring negotiations to a conclusion. He has no definite proposal to make; he has no bargain to offer, and you are well aware that no sale is ever made unless a bargain is offered. A consul cannot *create* trade, but he can indicate the manner in which trade might be created. He can give invaluable information, especially in remote countries regarding local styles and prejudices. To give you a trifling example, he could tell you, for instance, that it would be wise to place a dragon on the trade-marks of goods exported to China since dragons are popular in that country. For the same reason a rampant leopard should be placed on goods sent to India, the Star of Bethlehem on goods sent to Uruguay. He could tell you that it would be useless to export washtubs to Singapore, because they wash their clothes there in mid stream. (Laughter.) I remember a story of a very energetic citizen of the U.S. who went abroad to represent a certain firm of clock manufacturers—Waterbury. He went to South Africa with the object of extending the trade of his firm in that country, and in his journeyings found that nearly all the Kaffirs possessed clocks. He got a sample clock and discovered that it was made in Birmingham, but that it was of such inferior quality that his firm could easily place upon the market a better article at a lower price. He reported this to his firm and a special rush order was put through and the consignment of clocks came to South Africa for the Kaffirs. To the vast astonishment of himself and his firm the Kaffirs would have

nothing to do with them, and the firm sent a special man to find out why the natives were so stupid as to refuse the purchase of a better article at a smaller price. The investigator very soon discovered that amongst the Kaffirs the possession of a clock indicated a certain standard of prestige, and the reason the English clocks were preferred was because they had a louder tick. (Laughter.)

A famous German anthropologist went to South Africa also to do some research work amongst the Zulus and found that they possessed a great variety of assegais or spears. He made a collection of these, packed them up in a bag and took them up to Cape Town to take them home to Germany; and as he went on board the steamer at Capetown, preceded by a small boy stumbling under the weight of the bag, the Captain, who was standing by the gangway, asked him what the bag contained. He replied that it was a most interesting collection of spearheads which he had made among the Zulus and upon which he intended to write a most interesting pamphlet concerning the artistic development of the Zulus as indicated by the work on the spearheads. When the Captain saw the collection he said to the very much disgusted scientist, "Why, God bless you! Professor! They're made in Birmingham." (Laughter.) Most of you know, I suppose, that a considerable population of that same city of Birmingham make a living by the manufacture of Gods for the Hindus to worship.

A consul can furnish you with reports; for example, on shortage of crops, general difficulties of trade, harbour improvements and the extension abroad of railroad facilities and other means of transportation which open up new districts for commerce. He can give you information on movements of trade, the increasing or declining demand for certain kinds of goods, changes in taste or habits of life as affecting demand for imported articles.

Mr. Whelpley, an American writer, tells a story of an American who, when travelling in Central America, went into the dark shop of the principal or perhaps the only general merchant in the place; and there he was astonished to find a number of young women busily engaged in taking candles out of yellow wrappers and wrapping them up in blue ones. He enquired what was the cause of this waste of energy and time, and the merchant dolefully informed him that formerly he did a roaring trade in candles wrapped in blue paper. His people in the U.S. had sent his last consignment wrapped in yellow paper, and to his disgust his customers refused to accept them; he was therefore obliged to have them wrapped

in blue wrappers, after which they sold like hot cakes. The American firm of candlemakers are to this day at a loss to understand what is the difference between the same candle wrapped in yellow paper and wrapped in blue paper. This and the others which I have given are simply trifling examples of this important fact: that you must pander to the prejudices of your customers, however absurd they may be, or else surrender the trade to firms who will do so.

Consuls can and constantly do save their merchants from exasperating exactions and delays by giving them full information regarding local regulations governing the import of goods especially in countries where tariffs often change. The U.S. Customs have been credited with classifying a mare's colt as household furniture, and frogs' legs as poultry! And in England snails imported from France for the purpose of educating the taste of the English people, were classified by a bright Customs Officer as "wild animals unenumerated." (Laughter.) I myself had a lady friend who had a pet dog which she desired to bring with her to England for a short time. She found, however, that under the very strict regulations of the Board of Agriculture that she would have to have a special permit signed by the Secretary of the Board, and that this permit would only be issued on condition that her pet should remain in quarantine for six months. It would have broken her heart to part with it for so long, and he would probably not survive the experience; so to my certain knowledge she fraudulently entered that harmless little animal as a wolf. (Laughter.) I have many times tried in vain to convince her that she will not go straight to heaven when she dies. (Laughter.)

I might go on for a long time enumerating the services—some small, some great, all important,—which a vigilant consul can and does daily give. His duties are endless and indefinable, and are as manifold as your legitimate interests are manifold. I might sum up his duties by saying that he is the ambassador of trade, to see that its way is made as smooth and easy as possible.

To repeat what I said before, the victory in the struggle for the world's markets will be to the strong and well-equipped. Canada has been described by one of her statesmen as "The Land of the Twentieth Century"; her development will proceed, I think, with greater acceleration than that of the U.S. The development of the U.S. has been the marvel of the nineteenth century. Canada's will be the greater marvel of the twentieth. It will proceed with greater acceleration be-

cause it comes at a later time when mechanical invention has made greater progress. Canada will be able (and she ought) to take advantage not only of the successes, but of the mistakes made in the course of the industrial development of the Republic to the South. She has vast water powers which the U.S. did not possess, and I am convinced that her advancement will be more rapid. This is a century in which all progress proceeds at an astounding pace; I think it was Gladstone who compiled figures showing that the wealth accumulated in the first half of the nineteenth century was equal to the total amount of wealth accumulated in the eighteen hundred years which preceded it; and the wealth amassed in the twenty years between 1850 and 1870 was equal again to that amassed in the preceding fifty years. What does this mean? It means that in the short space of seventy years—the lifetime of one man—in an age of applied invention the energy of man has extracted from the earth more wealth—one hundred per cent. more wealth—than was amassed in all the centuries which have rolled by since the coins of the world bore the image and the superscription of Caesar. I think that this example strikingly shows the rapidity of development in modern times; and of this Canada will be an outstanding instance.

Here Canadian business men have in their hands the threads of a vast organization, extending all over the world, improving yearly in quality and capacity, for notwithstanding certain criticisms which are only very occasionally justified, I think that I may fairly claim that the British Consular Service is at least equal in efficiency to that of any of the great industrial rivals of the British Empire. Of course in every large organization you must expect to find inequalities in the personnel. Which of you who has a large business does not find it so? Which of you can claim that his business organization is absolutely without flaw? Some men are good and others are bad; some are vigilant and others negligent; some are careless and others keen; but the greater and closer direction given in recent years to consular activity has greatly increased its efficiency, and I think it is also true to say that since the negotiations of about a year ago between the Canadian Government and the British Foreign Office, British Consuls have evinced greater interest in matters relating to Canada.

A consul cannot, of course, be a specialist in every line. If he were a specialist in any line it is highly probable that he would devote himself to it and amass great riches thereby. What is needed is that the Service should be recruited from

men of versatility and common sense who can readily grasp the essentials of any given subject. If this is done, and I believe it is done, their efficiency will be enhanced in proportion as they are bombarded with letters and requests for information of all kinds by Canadian and British firms; the consular system is a machine which will work with greater efficiency the higher the speed at which it is driven.

But in order that you should not be under any false impression I should hasten to add that the great majority of British Consuls need no outside stimulation at all to render eager and useful service to Canada. (Applause.) And I am authorized to state to you to-day, not only on behalf of the British Government, but also on behalf of everyone of my colleagues with whom I have come in contact in recent times, that you should make use of us and all our resources and facilities whenever and wherever you think it would be to your advantage to do so. (Applause.)

For my own part, let me assure you that I consider there is no higher service I could render to the British Service, and no greater work I could do, than to contribute, in however slight a degree, to the wonderful expansion which is now beginning in this great Dominion. And I hope that in whatever part of the world I may be, whether in civilization or as a consular Crusoe in some far-off island to be discovered only on the map, you will recall something of what I have told you to-day, and that you will not fail to give me the opportunity of rendering you whatever service it may be in my personal power to give. (Applause.)

(November 29, 1913.)

The Street Railway Situation in Toronto

BY MR. BION J. ARNOLD.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club on the 29th of November, Mr. Arnold said:

Mr. President, Your Worship the Mayor, Members of the Canadian Club and Guests.—Making a public speech is something I always avoid, if I possibly can. It seems to be one of the things that my calling requires me to do, so when the various situations warrant or seem to require it, the responsibility is not actually shirked. For that reason, when your President, or Honorary Secretary, rather, asked me to address this Club, I demurred, and tried to get out of it, but finally consented to do so at some future time. That is my way of getting out of it, but as in this case I always get nailed. (Laughter.)

Recently my time has been occupied with matters of this kind in Chicago, so much so that there has been absolutely no time for preparation, as I have been working for the last sixty days practically day and night. I have not had sufficient time to get the necessary amount of sleep, although I think I am awake now. That is my excuse. Consequently I shall have to speak extemporaneously, using such notes as my assistant and I have made dealing with the transportation question in Toronto, and later will answer such questions as you may put.

Briefly, on the general facts of the situation in this country and the States, I think what I may say may apply to this country as well as to the United States. The traction situation in almost every large city is more or less of a political question, or rather the conditions arising out of the traction situation are political, consequently when I am put into a situation to analyze it, I analyze it to the best of my ability as a disinterested engineer, having in my analyses absolutely no politics, no axes to grind; but I try to find the truth and tell it, always aiming to do that regardless of the side it hits; some-

*Mr. Bion J. Arnold is one of the foremost transportation experts in the United States. He has specialized in electric railway systems, being Chairman of the Chicago Traction Board. His visit to Toronto was particularly timely in as much as the proposal that the City should purchase the Toronto Street Railway then occupied the people's attention.

times it may be my own friends, but what I mean to do is to go down the middle of the road, and I have endeavored to do this in Canada. (Applause.) Unfortunately there are always political questions involved, but I want you to feel that what figures I have prepared in connection with the Toronto situation have been sincerely prepared. I believe there are those who construe figures their own way for political effect; this is one of the things I sometimes have to suffer for, but I generally am charitable enough to try to believe that adverse criticism is by those who do not understand my figures.

I want to make this point quite clear. The traction situation, especially in my own country, (and as I said, this applies to yours also), is in the condition at present in many of our larger cities of having certain amounts of money invested in the business, for which there seems to be no real property in existence. I mean no tangible property, physical property, something you can go out and find, but the fact remains that much more value exists than is represented by the physical property found,—it is the difference between what you can see and the value of the company, which difference is sometimes termed intangible value,—it may have been spent on tracks, cars, etc., which have worn out, and which have become obsolete,—it may be partly due to the fact that the capitalization is often over and above what the property ever was worth. Consequently when you speak of intangible value, it is necessary to define exactly what you mean. In a good many cases companies have banked too heavily on the expected future profits of horse car lines after being electrified. They figured that the receipts in the future would be about what they proved to be but they had not correctly estimated the increase in the operating expenses as they failed to include a proper amount for maintenance and depreciation or the depreciation proved to be greater than the owners at that time believed it would be, consequently the net profits of the business have not been as great as the operators or proprietors then believed they would be. The increased gross receipts have almost invariably been realized, these increased gross receipts being due to the electrification of the properties, to the increased population, and also the increased riding habit of the people. For the past eleven years I have been engaged in endeavoring to get the railway and the municipalities together upon some reasonable basis of compromise so as to eliminate on some fair basis the “intangible value” above referred to, no matter how it happened to accrue. Those

that were in the electrical business years ago (and I was one of them), as well as city officials and citizens of municipalities are just as guilty for creating this situation as the railway companies themselves, because they caused franchises to be granted on very easy terms, and acquiesced in expecting that the net profits would be extensive. They permitted the issuance of securities to cover not only franchise values but often far in excess of the value of the properties and allowed these securities to be sold to the public; therefore many of us should not now too severely criticise these companies for we are partially guilty.

I am making no local application; but when you are trying to get a basis of relieving the situation, you must take into consideration the fact that you yourself are, or at any rate I myself am, partly guilty, because I was in those days engaged as an engineer in examining and building properties. The gross receipts came along all right, but none of us understood depreciation, and consequently none of us then prepared to take care of that depreciation. We ran along a number of years, allowing the properties to run down, and did not set aside a fund with which to renew them. Consequently many companies find that they have depleted properties today, and no cash with which to renew them, insufficient capitalization to pay for the renewals, and a state of public sentiment that does not allow of its increase. The result is that a number of traction companies are practically in a state of bankruptcy if required to give adequate service. That, however, is not the situation in Toronto exactly. It is for the purpose of relieving such situations as I have described that for eleven years I have been trying to work out some medium or fair ground upon which the municipalities and the companies could meet.

I want to be quite clearly understood; I have no prepared scheme of settlement to advocate here, I am not here to advocate the purchase of the Toronto Railway Company, or any other scheme, I am here simply to explain things that may not be understood in my reports. I am just as open to new suggestions as any other man. I have not made up my mind. With respect to the purchase of the Toronto Railway Company when his Worship the Mayor asked me if I recommended it, I replied that when I took into consideration the probable earnings, the present situation, the urgent necessity for some sort of a clean up, I thought, looking at it from the most pessimistic standpoint of the public, that the difference between the present actual value and the price asked for the property was not sufficiently great to warrant not

making the arrangement, provided certain contingencies were completely cleared up, so that the city could acquire a clear right of way, both physical and legal. (Applause.)

I have just been shown this morning the plan submitted by the Harbour Commission. I could not go into it thoroughly enough to formulate a definite opinion; I may say, however, that it appears to have some very excellent points. I believe that it should be thoroughly considered before taking action, (hear, hear)—how meritorious it is I am not prepared just now to say. It is possible that a co-ordination of that scheme with the present plan may work out something to suit all in the long run. (Applause.)

Your Honorary Secretary, Mr. Wilson, was kind enough to write me a letter, which reached me just as I was starting for the train, containing five questions, suggesting that if I spoke to these five questions, I would probably satisfy you to-day, so that I will confine myself as closely as I can to them.

The first question is,—

“On what do you base your estimate of the population in 1921. Please explain how you arrived at that figure, 705,000?”

Now in general I want to say that I have had quite an extensive experience in determining the probable future population of various cities. In 1902 the duty was placed upon me of making an exhaustive study of the traction situation in Chicago. I did the best I could with respect to this situation and wrote a book of 250 pages, analyzing many things, among others the probable future population of Chicago for fifty years in the future from that date. I want to say, that while the city had increased from 1837, the date of its incorporation, to 1902 at a rate averaging 8 per cent. per annum, my estimate for the future growth was somewhat lower than that. Since that date for a period of 11 years, the population increase has followed the curve based upon my estimates so closely that no material difference is discernible when based upon the Federal Census, and I estimated the gross receipts of the street railway company also so closely that the same has been the result. In like manner I have estimated the population and future earnings of several other cities, and the increases in population and receipts have followed my predictions with sufficient accuracy to warrant me in saying that I believe I exercised reasonably sound judgment. That may appear a little conceited, but it perhaps justifies my own belief in my reasoning for Toronto especially when my estimates

are substantiated by two or three other men, whose judgment is admittedly sound, and I believe that my reports should receive at least careful consideration before being turned down.

In Toronto I estimated the future increase in population and consequently the gross receipts of the street railway property, if owned by the city or by the company, in either case somewhat higher than I would in the case of other cities. If I recollect correctly, the population increase was estimated at 6 per cent. per annum, and the gross receipts of the street railway company were estimated to increase at the rate of 11 per cent. per annum. On that point I want to say that in the general analysis of the increase in population of probably twenty cities of the United States with which I have had to do (possibly not quite twenty but quite a number), analysis of the gross receipts of these companies shows that the increase of the street railway receipts is about as the square of the population, that is, if the population doubles, the traction gross receipts will quadruple. I have estimated your gross receipts in Toronto on a slightly lower basis than that.

Recently I made an analysis of the steam railway terminals at Chicago, where there are twenty-five railroads entering. It was necessary to estimate the future passenger growth of the city. I found that the increase of train movement and consequently the necessity for the increase of passenger terminal facilities would be practically the same as in the street railway business, i.e., as the square; and that the increase in passengers carried would be as the cube of the population increase. That is, while there would be four times the number of passenger trains when the population doubled, there would be eight times the people carried. This statement is merely an incidental thing so far as the Toronto situation is concerned but is based upon train capacity and passenger carrying capacity of principal cities in all the states of the United States, and then narrowed down to the Northern and Central States around Chicago.

Now the reason I think Toronto is going to go ahead is this,—and it is also the reason why you should not base the estimated increase in population of Toronto upon the increase in certain other cities of like population in the United States, i.e., with respect to their increase in population during the last ten or fifteen years; the reason is this: you have a great empire here before you; you are increasing at a very rapid rate, therefore you should compare yourself not with the United States as it exists to-day, with a population of ap-

proximately one hundred million, but with the United States of fifty years ago with a population of fifty million.*

Now then, I think you will find my estimate for the growth of the population of Toronto very conservative, and I will give you a few figures to substantiate that reason.

In Philadelphia, from 1800 to 1900, the average increase was 3 1-2 per cent. per year; in New York, within the same period, 3.9 per cent.; in Chicago, from 1837 to 1892, the rate was 8.6 per cent.; from 1892 to 1902, 4.9 per cent. Now, considering the growth of the above three cities, when they were approximately the same size as Toronto now is, the following are found to be the facts. New York grew at an average annual rate of 6 per cent. between the time when it had 400,000 and when it had 700,000 population, that is, approximately the basis on which I have estimated the growth

* The following statistics which were not used by Mr. Arnold when speaking are here given in order to amplify this statement.

The density of the population of Canada is very small in comparison with that of the United States and the population of the country as a whole is increasing at a very much more rapid rate. The population of Canada in 1911 was approximately eight million, while the total population of the continental United States is nearing the one hundred million mark. The density of population in the United States for the year 1910, was 30.9 per square mile, whereas in the same area in 1860 the density was 10.6 per square mile; in Canada the density of population for all the provinces in the year 1911, was 1.93 per square mile and that of the province of Ontario was 9.67 per square mile. In other words, the density of population in Ontario at the present time is approximately that of the United States in 1860.

A proper test, therefore, of the reasonableness of the rate of growth taken for Toronto during the next eight years as compared with the growth of American cities of approximately the same population requires a reference not to the rate of growth of American cities of the present day, but to the rate of growth of American cities of the United States, of fifty years ago, when the States were at substantially the same stage of development as Canada now is.

The development of the arts since that time, however, particularly those of transportation and inter-communication of different kinds tend to bring about a more rapid increase of what are at this time sparsely settled districts than was the case fifty years ago. The economic attraction of large cities like Philadelphia, Chicago and New York, with populations running from one and one half million to nearly five million interferes with the rate of growth of smaller cities; a condition to which there is no parallel in Canada so far as the magnitude of the city is concerned, for the reason that the city of Toronto, the largest English speaking city in Canada, has a population to-day of less than one half million, but if such a parallel should exist in Canada the city of Toronto would be benefited by it (if such is not already the case) for according to the 1911 Canadian Census the increase in population of all cities of the province of Ontario of over 1,000 population during the decade 1901 to 1911 was 41.93% whereas the increase in population of Toronto according to the same census is found to be approximately 82%.

of Toronto during the next eight years. Philadelphia grew at the rate of 16 per cent. between the time when its population was 200,000 and when it was 700,000. With respect to Chicago, between 1870 and 1880 the population increased 69 per cent. or an average of 6.9 per cent. per year. From 1880 to 1890, when the numerical increase was from 500,000 to 1,000,000, the increase was 218 per cent. or 21.8 per cent. per year. So when I say Toronto is likely to increase at the rate of 6 per cent. per year, I don't think I am very much over-estimating the future of this city. (Applause.)

One other point which bears upon this subject is that the movement towards the cities at the present time is much greater and much more rapid now than in the period for which the statistics I have quoted apply.

The United States census bulletin for 1910 shows that of fifty cities with a population of more than 100,000 thirty-four show a greater absolute increase in population in the decade 1900 to 1910 than in the preceding decade, and twenty-five show also a greater percentage of increase.

Now, take the increase in the cities of the United States, during the last decade Detroit increased 69 per cent., Los Angeles increased 211 per cent., Seattle 194 per cent., Portland 129 per cent., Kansas City 52 per cent. Taking all these things into consideration, and having in mind the great country filling up behind you, I think that my figures are reasonably conservative as to your future population.

With these figures I think I can leave this subject for it seems to me that I am safe in my prediction for Toronto's growth.

My assistant calls my attention to my report on page 38, where I show my estimate of the population of the city of Toronto, both in a table and by a curve, which indicates that during the last five years the average growth of Toronto has been 8.88 per cent. while during the preceding decade it had been 7.55 per cent. per annum. During the last five years, however, you have materially increased the area of the city by annexing outlying districts, in which districts there was considerable population. However, by assuming that all the population has been accumulated in the last twenty years, and that in 1891 the population of the outlying districts was practically negligible, the average increase has been 4.35 per cent. without this additional growth.

Bearing on that point, and assuming that I have been conservative in my estimate of the increase in population, I want to go back to the increase in earnings. As I said a while ago,

while this estimate of growth applies in general, it may not apply in every case because of local circumstances. But these would likely make an increase, rather than decrease, in the city of Toronto. With the vast water powers that exist near here, and consequently cheap power, having in mind the splendid location of this city, its tremendous harbour development, and the settling up of the western country, also the fact that its industries are only beginning to be established, everything would appear to be in your favor for the continuation of the rapid growth of Toronto.

But there is one further point: the increase in gross receipts and consequently in rides per capita does not alone depend upon the increase in population, but comes partly from the increased riding habit of the people. As cities increase, the riding habit of the people increases, so that as your communities grow up, you have a little community here and another here, another ~~one~~ over there; the actual exchange of business between these communities grows, so that the riding habit increases in greater proportion than the population. That is what makes what is known as the "law of the squares" hold with respect to traction earnings. In other words, if the population doubles, and the riding habit doubles, necessarily the gross receipts are four times as many. The increase in the gross receipts of the Toronto Railway Company has been remarkably constant, for the said increase has not been less than 11 per cent. per annum during the past fifteen years with two exceptions,—during the years 1907 and 1908, the years when our cities were affected by a panic, and in which years the increase over the previous year was in excess of 10 1-2 per cent. In other words, in the past seventeen years, the receipts of the Toronto Railway Company have increased 11 per cent. per annum in fifteen of them, and it should be further stated that the increase in the gross earnings was 11 per cent. in one year when the increase in population of the city during the same year was but 3 per cent. So when I say I think that the gross earnings of the Toronto Railway Company, which have been increased approximately 11 per cent. per annum for the past seventeen years, will continue to increase at that rate for the next seven and one-half years, especially when the entire mileage of the system is more than doubled, I think I am still conservative. (Applause.)

Referring now to the increase in traction earnings in other cities, particularly as to the increase in per capita earnings, the following statistics are given:

Take San Francisco: in 1900 it had a population of 342,700, and the receipts per capita were \$13.67; in 1912 with a population of 431,738 the receipts per capita were \$18.93; that is, with an increase in population of less than 100,000 or approximately 26 per cent., the receipts per capita have increased from \$13.67 to \$18.93 or 39 per cent. In Kansas City in 1897 the population was 197,516, the population in 1912 was approximately 353,820; the per capita earnings were \$9.02, in 1897, and in 1912 they were approximately \$16.50. In Chicago, when my report was made in 1902, the receipts per capita, were about \$10; to-day they are \$17.44. In Buffalo in 1900 the population was 352,387, the receipts per capita were \$7.84; in 1912 with a population of 437,981, the per capita receipts were \$14.23, that is, with an increase in population of less than 100,000 or approximately 24 per cent., the per capita receipts have increased approximately 82 per cent. In St. Louis in 1900, with a population of approximately 500,000, the per capita receipts were \$7.77; in 1912 with a population of 709,387, an increase of 209,000 or 41 per cent. the receipts were \$17.27 per capita, an increase of \$9.50 or 122 per cent. In Boston, with a population of 560,000 in 1900, the receipts per capita were \$18.20; in 1912 with a population of approximately 700,000, an increase of approximately 140,000 or 25 per cent., the receipts per capita were found to be \$23.60, an increase of \$5.40 or 30 per cent. In Toronto the population in 1900 was 205,887, and the receipts per capita were \$7.71; the population in 1913 is estimated at 442,550, an increase of 237,000 or 115 per cent. and the receipts per capita are now approximately \$13.66, an increase of \$5.95 or 77 per cent. This is exclusive of the receipts of the Radial lines inside the city limits and of the Civic lines, which receipts when added to the gross earnings of the Toronto Railway Company will be found to give an earnings of approximately \$14 per capita in Toronto at this time. This matter of per capita receipts is the substance of the second question. I hope that I have fully explained.

The third question regards extension to the system. "Your report covers this point to a considerable extent, but it does not seem to have been grasped by the public. Will you, therefore, let us know what provision you have made for the extension of the system, and how it is to be financed."

In my report of this year we made provision in estimated future receipts for the extension of the traction system from 147 miles, the present length, including the Radials inside the city limits, and the Civic lines, to 283 miles in 1921,

necessitating an increase in capitalization or the investment of approximately \$14,000,000 in new money. The exact locations of those lines which I thought should be built up to and including 1918 are all given in my report of 1912, together with specific reasons for them. I hope that answers the questions as to what provision is made for extensions.

I have gone into this in the valuation report although not to the same extent. I have made provisions for extensions throughout the period we are analyzing, not only for the surface lines, but on the assumption that the present owners ought to give the service I thought the population should have. (Applause.) Also in my report of 1912 I went into considerable detail as to a competitive system involving a line on Yonge street, including the civic system, on a plan showing how you could construct a system independent of the Toronto Railway Company in case you could not get together with that company.

As to how the new money necessary to build the extensions, or \$14,000,000 is to be financed, I did not make any attempt to tell the city how to finance its own affairs. I was not asked to tell the city anything as to its policy in handling this phase of the street railway situation. I simply estimated what amount would be necessary, where it should be spent, and about what year each line should be built, but did not attempt to tell you how to raise the money.

If I had been asked as to how to finance the extensions, I would probably have said that you would have to issue securities upon the property, if the laws allow you, or some sort of city bond or debentures at a low rate of interest, so as to enable you to build this property for less cost than it would take under a private corporation, because presumably you can borrow money at a lower rate of interest than a private corporation could (hear, hear); that is probably what I would have said had I been asked at the time. I do not think I am called upon nor should I attempt to tell you how to finance your own affairs. If you acquire the traction property, you will be able to work it, but you will have to worry out as to how to finance and build the city lines.

Coming back to the receipts per capita, my attention has just now been called to statistics from seventeen cities as given in the *Electric Railway Journal* of October 25, 1913, with their street railway receipts per capita per annum.

They are given as follows:—

Boston (Boston Elevated)	\$23.73
Winnipeg	21.51

San Francisco (United Railroads)	\$20.32
Detroit (Detroit United Railway) (estimated) ..	19.49
Los Angeles (Los Angeles Railway)	19.44
Mexico City (1911)	18.73
Omaha and Council Bluffs	18.55
St. Louis	17.82
Chicago (combined companies)	17.44
New York City (combined companies)	17.39
Denver	16.03
Minneapolis and St. Paul	15.59
Baltimore (United Railway and Electric)	15.35
Pittsburgh (Pittsburgh Railways) (estimated)....	15.24
Brooklyn (Brooklyn Rapid Transit, Coney Island & Brooklyn)	15.07
Memphis	14.77
Toronto	14.72

The receipts, you will note, run from \$23.73 down to \$14.72, the average being \$17.71 per capita for the seventeen cities.*

* Regarding these figures Mr. Arnold, in a speech to the Members of the Board of Trade later in the day, said:

"It should be stated with respect to these figures that most of the reports from which the statistics are compiled, are for the calendar year 1912, but a number of companies reported for the fiscal year June 30, 1912, whereas the population figures by which the gross receipts were divided in order to obtain the receipts per capita above given are those of the 1910 or 1911 census. This fact would tend to reduce the figures from five to ten per cent. The figures may contain other minor errors as the statistics were only called to my attention this morning and I have not had time to verify them."

Subsequent Note: After Mr. Arnold had had time to make a closer analysis of these data it developed that the per capita receipts for the city of Winnipeg, as given, include not only Street Railway fares but also revenue from Electric Light and Power, and that this complication also applies to some of the other cities listed; further, that in a number of cases, notably Boston, the population of the city proper has been taken rather than that of the Metropolitan District served by these companies. Obviously the latter is the correct basis for such comparisons. In the following table some of these have been re-computed:

EARNINGS PER CAPITA AMERICAN STREET RAILWAY SYSTEMS.

Based on Metropolitan Districts Served and 1910 Population and Earnings.

	Year ending.	Authority.	
San Francisco:			
U. R. R.	12-31-10	(Arnold Report)	\$18.35
All Companies.....	1911		20.00
Omaha.....	12-31-10	(McGraw)	17.21
Greater New York:			
Excl. Hudson and Manhattan	6-30-11	(P. S. Comm. 1st District Report)	16.98

Now, as to the question of franchises, the question asked is, "Is the agreement which you have seen a real clean-up of all of the franchises or are the radials to continue to have rights of any kind within the present city or future extensions of the city resulting from increase of population and annexation. In other words, what will be the position of the radials under the agreement with Mackenzie and Mann?"

When Mr. Moyes and I were called upon to value the property of the Toronto Railway Company, we did so to the best of our ability. In our report we placed the value of the physical property at approximately \$10,000,000, and what we called the intangible assets at approximately \$12,000,000. That was the valuation which I desire to go into a little later on. Accompanying this valuation we wrote a letter to his Worship the Mayor, which we shaped up just as a sort of general guide, stating that there were several weaknesses in the tentative agreement which would have to be cleared up, as we pointed out in detail in the letter which we laid before him. It was our duty as experts, if we found anything in the tentative draft of the agreement between the Mayor and Sir William Mackenzie or in the whole proposition that was not clear, or did not seem right to us, that we should point it

	Year Ending.	Authority.	
St. Louis.....	12-31-10	(McGraw)	\$18.86
Denver	12-31-10	(McGraw)	16.84
Kansas City.....	1912	(Arnold Report)	16.53
Chicago.....	12-31-10	(Board Sup. Engrs.)	16.36
Los Angeles:			
(Excl. Pac. El. Ry.).....	1912	(Pub. Service Comm.)	16.20
Minneapolis-St. Paul.....	12-31-10	(McGraw)	14.30
Cincinnati*.....	6-30-11	(McGraw)	14.13
Memphis*.....	12-31-10	(McGraw)	13.75
Oakland:			
(Excl. Key Route and Pacific			
Local).....	12-31-10	(McGraw)	13.55
Brooklyn-Queens	6-30-10	(McGraw)	13.09
Philadelphia..	12-31-10	(Transit Report)	13.03
Boston (Metropolitan).....	12-31-10	(B. T. Comm. Report)	12.91
Pittsburg (District).....	12-31-10	(Arnold Report)	10.00
Cleveland*.....	12-31-10	(McGraw)	10.92

Average, 15 cities..... \$14.55

NOTE.—Based on Gross Income.

From the above it appears that the average receipts per capita for the districts listed is considerably lower than for the cities proper, but that in general the newer metropolitan centres show the highest riding habit, especially the Western cities. Toronto appears to advantage in comparison with Brooklyn, Philadelphia and Boston, although below San Francisco, Omaha and Kansas City:

* Not entirely authoritative, insufficient data.

out, and as his Worship the Mayor said, he would expect to have it pointed out. In our letter of September 20, 1913, we pointed out certain things we thought should be agreed upon and reduced to absolute language before any agreement was entered into. These points, as I understand, were placed before Sir William Mackenzie by his Worship the Mayor, and may be put in a few words as follows: That the absolute possession and right to all existing lines in the present city limits, both local street railway lines and radial lines, together with all franchises which they might carry with them, would become absolutely the property of the city of Toronto with no strings to them. (Hear, hear.) I am sure the language is strict, if not, it must be made so. If it did not mean that, I do not know how to use the English language. I am very certain that, if the arrangement should be made, his Worship the Mayor, and the attorneys of the city, would see that the language is sufficiently strict to be sure that the city acquired these rights with no strings on them. Mr. Moyes and I saw that, unless that point was to be guarded, a question might be left, so that the radials would have the right to run into the heart of the city over the city tracks and the city would be powerless to prevent them, and, therefore, would not get all the receipts it should, and it would not be the clean-up which I understand is the fundamental question here. (Hear, hear.) Our language is this: "The position taken in this report is that, if the Railway Company is paid an amount of money not less than the value of its property and intangible assets, in return the Railway Company shall turn over the property in its entirety, including all physical and intangible assets, granted to or possessed or held by or used in the prosecution of the street railway business, and all similar assets as may be the property of the radial lines used in operating under the light, heat, and power franchises." That is our language. I think it is broad enough to cover the point. We concluded by saying, "We earnestly advise you that these conditions be carefully considered."

The object was to place the city in such a position that the radials and any other company now operating railways in the city of Toronto would have no rights whatever; therefore in coming into the city they would have to take the matter up *de novo* with the city and negotiate the terms for coming into the city, and these terms should be absolutely just to the railways and to the city. (Hear, hear.)

As to the question of intangible values. Perhaps I used an unfortunate term when I said I would place the "intangible

value" at \$12,000,000. The term means many things; in Toronto we figured it to be simply the amount of money the Toronto Railway Company would make between now and 1921, if it continue to operate as it now operates. (Laughter.) Consequently also the value which we estimated in our recent figures is what we believe the city of Toronto, if it acquires the property and operates the property as efficiently as the present Toronto Street Railway is operating it (laughter), will make out of the same property during the same period.

Now, as to whether the city will operate it as efficiently, that question is entirely in your hands. I understand that if the property is acquired it is to be placed under a Commission, which will endeavor to operate it as efficiently as it is being now operated, in which case the figures I have given will, I think, absolutely hold because I have tried to present figures of results that ought to be realized.

"Intangible value" in the Toronto case means simply "swapping dollars" as one of your bright newspaper men made me say in an interview. In other words, you are paying the Railway Company for the dollars it will make during the remaining life of its franchise, as you are assuming you will be able to make the same number of dollars.

I want to tell you that street railways operated under proper commissions do make money. I do not want to blow my own horn too much, but we have had a similar commission in Chicago for the past seven years, of which it has been my good fortune to be chairman. It is absolutely non-political. I know the politics of but few of the board force of ninety or one hundred men. The properties so managed are operated under an agreement or franchise with the city, which provides that after 8 per cent. of the gross receipts have been set aside for depreciation, and not less than 6 per cent. have been spent on maintenance, and after an accident fund and operating expenses have likewise been paid, the companies shall receive 5 per cent. on their actual investment. The rest is divided into two parts, 55 per cent. of the remaining net profits going to the city, and 45 per cent. to the companies. As a result of this arrangement, the companies have made 7 per cent. on their capital; the city has had \$14,500,000 in cold cash paid into its treasury in seven years. (Applause.) A commission can run a railway.

My assistant asks me to call your attention to this fact,—that our present board is composed of three men, one appointed by the city, one by the companies, and the third a dis-

interested party, absolutely independent. The city and the companies have delegated broad authority to the board. We do not entirely manage the operation of the properties, but we have supervision over them, and we have the final say so on every question. So far as the supervision of investment, auditing of accounts and construction matters go, we are absolutely in control. Under that arrangement we have spent \$84,000,000 in seven years; we have put \$14,500,000 into the city treasury, and the companies have made 7 per cent. profit. I think that shows fairly satisfactory management. (Applause.)

The last question is that of tubes.

“Will you discuss the practicability of tubes in Toronto?” We believe you are especially qualified to discuss this question, and in view of the proposal which was submitted to the City Hall to-day by the Harbour Commissioners, do you think that the combination of a tube and surface lines proposed by them will be an adequate solution of the transportation problem?”

I can say offhand that I do not think the proposition as submitted by the Harbour Commission will be an adequate solution. I do think it is a very valuable suggestion. (Hear! hear!) It could be co-ordinated with the existing lines, and when that plan is analyzed thoroughly by competent authority, and you have had a chance to thoroughly digest the question, you will then have formulated, in my judgment, a system for the city of Toronto such as I think it ought to have, and one which I think you can support. I thank you. (Prolonged applause.)

At this point, as the hour of 2 o'clock had been reached, an opportunity was given for any who had engagements to withdraw, and after a few had done so, the opportunity was given of asking Mr. Arnold questions, which, with his replies, follow.

Mr. N. Ferrar Davidson, K.C.: “May we ask Mr. Arnold whether he was advised, as a matter of law, that the Toronto Railway Company would be entitled to the same sort of valuation at the expiration of the company's franchise as he is making now? I ask this, because there is a very wide impression among the people of Toronto that the Toronto Railway Company would be only paid on a scrap iron basis.”

Mr. Arnold: “As I understand the franchise, the Railway Company would have to accept the valuation of its physical property then in existence, not necessarily as scrap iron, but valued as physical property then in existence. That would

not include any of these intangible values of \$12,000,000, for they would have earned them; but it would include whatever physical property it would have then."

Mr. W. F. Maclean, M.P.: "What it would cost to reproduce the property in its then state."

Mr. Arnold: "Exactly."

Mr. T. Stewart Lyon: "You said in the table you gave of seventeen cities in the United States, that the gross earnings per capita ranged from \$14.70 to \$23; were these cities on all fours with the city of Toronto, or were they what we know as nickel-fare cities? It seems to me that the estimate of the gross earnings should be given of cities with 3 1-8 and 4 1-6 cent fares, and not those with 5 cent fares. I know that Chicago, Boston, Buffalo, and one or two others are nickel cities. How many cities have fares approximately the same as in Toronto?"

Mr. Arnold: "It does not make much difference so long as Toronto is earning a higher rate. In other words, the riding habit of the people increases as the rate of fare decreases, so that the receipts per capita, or rather the gross receipts, are not so changed as it might seem. The rate of increase will be the same as in other cities."

Mr. Lyon: "Would it not be true that in Toronto, with a 3 1/8 cent fare, we would have to greatly increase the riding habits of the people to produce anything like as much as the nickel fare in these other cities?"

Mr. Arnold: "You can't say yes or no to that question. It depends upon the local situation. I am assuming that the fare would not be reduced below what it now is."

"Would that be true if you increase your system so as to give the people the service the city should have?"

"That would increase the riding habit, I think, so as to make up in value."

Dr. Thos. R. Millman: "What is your opinion as to municipal ownership of properties such as street railways, where they are managed by the municipality, managing them by a changing class every year, such as a Mayor, Controllers or Aldermen? If after your statement made about Chicago, have you a Commission that is entirely independent of the Mayor and Aldermen so that they can't interfere with you?"

Mr. Arnold: "I will answer the last question first. Our Commission in Chicago is absolutely independent of any city official or other political official of any kind. I mean that so far as the balance of power is concerned, we are independent. The city representative on the Commission is subject

to the Mayor and Council; he is appointed by the Mayor and approved by the City Council. The railway company's representative is appointed by and removable by the company. But the third man, the Chairman, was elected at the time the ordinance creating the Commission was passed; his name is written in the ordinance; he therefore holds office for twenty years, unless he gets crooked or does something else for which he should be removed. I have been busy at times keeping the board non-political, but we are purely a technical board, comprised of men who especially understand the business. When you get a Commission like that and allow it to do as it wants to do, you get results, because we think we have got them in Chicago. Usually a new administration attempts to antagonize the board, thinking probably it is very similar to other bodies created by law which are political. We usually have two years of trouble with a new administration; they think we should be amenable—when they are reasonable, we are amenable, but when they are not, we are not. (Laughter.) We have trouble like that for the first one or two years; then they realize that we are trying to do our duty, and they turn around and are our friends for the rest of their term. As indicative of the present feeling I might state that the council passed two weeks ago a merger ordinance, which put all the street railways under one management, under one head, by a vote of 57 to 7 in that council. Under that ordinance greater powers are given to this board."

Mr. N. F. Davidson: "Have you made any deduction for paying for these physical assets now, instead of paying for them eight years hence? Ought there not to be a discount on the physical assets because you pay the money now, and allow for the profits during the eight years?"

Mr. Arnold: "That is what we do exactly."

Mr. W. H. Orr: "Our trouble is here: we have too much difficulty in getting home between 5 and 6 o'clock. You are well acquainted with the transportation here in this city; what would you suggest in the way of immediate relief, so that within six or twelve months all that difficulty may be remedied?"

Mr. Arnold: "I would make some extensions, according to my 1912 report, right away, as quick as you can, more cars and more tracks." (Applause.)

A written question: "When you speak of gross receipts from railway traffic in Chicago as being \$18 per capita, does this include local steam railway traffic?"

Mr. Arnold: "It does not include steam railway traffic, simply surface and elevated, proper intramural traffic. It has no reference to steam or suburban railways."

Another written question: "When Mr. Arnold said the railway should be operated as efficiently as it is by the company, does this mean operated with the higher standard contemplated under civic control, or merely under the profit-producing system now in force?" (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. Arnold: "I think that was Mr. Fleming's question. (Laughter.) Our figures are based upon a proper service to the people. (Hear! hear!) An adequate system, adequate tracks, and adequate service. Now, as to how profitable it would be is for you to say. (Laughter.) Mr. Fleming is a good railway manager, I'll tell you that. (Applause.)

A voice: "He'll come, too."

Mr. Arnold: "Our scheme, as I have laid it down, is based on service first, profit second, and a proper operating ratio to get that. At the same time, so far as profit to the company or the city is concerned, I have not assumed that you are going to squeeze any company until you strangle it, or yourselves until you die." (Hear! hear!)

Another question: "Do you consider that 70 per cent. of the gross earnings provides a comfortable, convenient service in American cities, such as Toronto?"

Mr. Arnold: "I will read from the memorandum I recently sent to Mr. John McKay.

"I think it appears in his interim report; I am betraying no confidence, therefore, but I am perfectly willing to have anything I have written to him or any other man on earth made public.

"On Table II. there is given the operating cost in cents per car mile. The figures on this table have been obtained by dividing the various gross amounts shown on Table I. by the number of car miles operated by the traction systems in question during the year in which the given receipts or expenses were realized or incurred. From this table it will be noted that the gross receipts per mile in Toronto are comparable with cities having a five cent fare, rather than those in which a reduced fare is now prevailing, i.e., Cleveland. It will be noted from this table that the decreased cost of operation of the Toronto Railway Company is due primarily, in fact, almost entirely, to those items of expense which are fixed by franchise conditions, rather than by those dependent upon the efficiency of the management. The items to which this observation is applicable are those of Maintenance of

Roadway and Structures, and taxes. The Maintenance of Roadway is considerably less, as will be noted from Table II. in the case of the Toronto Railway Company, because of the fact that the track substructure and paving surface is installed and maintained by the city of Toronto. This constitutes the largest item of expense in the maintenance of the roadway of a traction company. Just what saving it means in the operation of the property is well shown by Table II., for it will be noted that the average cost of maintenance on all of the systems shown in this table is 4.15 cents per car mile, whereas the cost in Toronto is 2.92 cents per car mile, or a saving of 1.23 cents by 18,543,297 car miles, or approximately \$236,000 per year. That the saving in maintenance by the Toronto Railway Company is due to this provision is further brought out by the fact, as will be noted from Table II., that the Toronto Railway Company expends more per car mile on the maintenance of its car equipment than any of the other companies therein shown. The other large savings in the cost of operating the Toronto Railway due to ordinance provisions is that in the payment of taxes, for as will be noted from Table II. the payments of the Toronto Railway Company equal .31 cents per car mile, whereas the payment of the other companies herein given vary from 1.17 to 1.62 cents per car mile, the average for the four companies being 1.35 cents. Since the average payment of all the companies whose statistics therein given is 1.35 cents, and the Toronto Railway Company expends but .31 cents for taxes, its operating expense is therefore reduced 1.04 cents per car mile due to certain conditions of the particular franchise under which it operates, which reduction when taken with the reduction because of other franchise conditions affecting the expense of maintenance (or 1.23 cents) gives a total reduction of 2.27 cents per car mile. This additional charge would give a corrected operating ratio for the Toronto Railway Company comparable with all companies operating in the States under similar conditions of 61.8 per cent., or approximately the same operating ratio (as will be noted from Table I.) as exists in Kansas City, Pittsburgh and Buffalo.

"In other words, if you put 70 per cent. of the gross receipts into the operation of a street railway such as you have in Toronto, including maintenance, depreciation, and taxes, that would give you, in my judgment, an adequate service. That exceeds the actual amount we put in in most of our cities. But that is the position I have always taken, that 70 per cent. should include all operating expenses, and that is all that

should be asked of a company in order to give adequate service. In Chicago we do not put so much, for the reason that we have not sufficient tracks. That is the reason why for sixty days I have been studying the subway problem, and also the question of additional railroad terminals."

Mr. J. E. Atkinson: "As to the 70 per cent., did you estimate that before you estimated the intangible assets?"

Mr. Arnold: "That was estimated before I ever heard of this situation. We assumed that the city of Toronto is now spending—we took the same ratio as now, 56 per cent.; but you are furnishing part of that now. You would have to furnish it then; you add what you are now furnishing to the 56, and that would bring it up to 69 per cent."

"As we understand it then, whereas, in cities in the United States, usually the operating expenses are about 66 per cent., you have estimated them here at 69 per cent.?"

"Yes, for the figures I have given you."

Mr. W. F. Maclean: "I think you said that in the division of profits, in Chicago, 45 per cent. went to the city and the balance to the company?"

Mr. Arnold: "It is the other way round, 45 per cent. to the company, 55 to the city."

"Then, if Chicago had public ownership, it would give you the whole 100 per cent.?"

"Yes, sir, it would." (Applause.)

Mr. Mark H. Irish: "Would you be willing to prepare, and I think probably in pamphlet form, to hand out for distribution to the people, a synopsis of the appointment and the powers of the Chicago Commission?"

Mr. Arnold: "I should be very glad to. I can send the Mayor the complete ordinance. Could I give it to you now briefly?"

Mr. J. E. Atkinson: "Could any commission, such as you have in Chicago, operate our railway?"

Mr. Arnold: "I am sure it could, but I want to say that there has been considerable pleasant criticism of our actions, and some unpleasant criticism of the salaries paid us, therefore I can't tell whether you would stand by such a commission or not."

Mr. W. D. Gregory: "As I understand, the tangible assets are the profits the company would make. Do you think it would be in the interests of the city to incorporate in the agreement the provision that we should run this railway by an expert board if we took it over, and that instead of paying that \$11,000,000 now, we pay them annually through that term the profits we make?" (Laughter.)

Mr. Arnold: "I am not sure that I understand the question. I might say I have heard of public ownership and private management, but I never heard of private ownership and public management exactly."

Mr. Gregory: "Let me make myself clear. Some of us are doubtful as to whether the population and the earnings of the railway will increase as we have heard. In order to take no chances, but to make sure of all the profits the railway could get, all the profits that an expert board would get out of the system, do you not think it would be in the interests of the city to make such an arrangement, to pay an annual sum equal to what the railway would get out of it?"

Mr. Arnold: "If you put them in charge of it, all right."

Mr. Gregory: "But if you put it under an expert board?"

Mr. Arnold: "No, it would not be fair, for this reason: all my figures are based upon the definite proposition or assumption that you take the railway as it is, that you put so much money year by year into operating it efficiently and properly. I do not think that any railway company should be asked to have no voice in the management of its property and take a chance with any other body managing the system."

Mr. Gregory: "Is it right for the city to take the chance?"

Mr. Arnold: "It is all right; if you want to take the proposition, then take it, but don't make it a jug-handled affair. If you are going to make the deal, face the proposition; if not, then say so." (Hear! hear!)

A question: "Why does Mr. Arnold use the term 'intangible assets' rather than good will or franchise?"

Mr. Arnold: "It has nothing at all to do with good will. I don't regard a street railway company as having any good will. (Laughter.) I want to answer the question fairly,—I did not mean to be witty. I don't regard a railway company which has been granted a public right to operate in the streets has any good will except what the public gave it. But it does have a legal right to operate on those streets so long as its franchise permits, to its certain earning power. It is that legal right that gives it the chance to earn what I will call intangible assets.

"Our Chicago franchise has been practically adopted by Kansas City, where I have also been adviser for the Federal Court now in charge of the property, having prepared a valuation of the property and outlined a policy to lay before the people. We used such means as have occurred to me and others to make the ordinance an improvement on the Chicago ordinance, and it looks probable and likely that the ordinance

will be adopted. I gave a valuation of \$35,000,000 on the property. It was a large property to value, but the newspapers and others, including the Mayor, thought that there was not more than \$14,000,000 worth. The sum determined by me was considered honestly arrived at; they did not want to say that any dollar honestly invested should be lost, and at the same time said that, if shown that the value was there, they would recognize it. Well, they have recognized my valuation, for they have practically found vouchers for every dollar expended. They were surprised; they thought it could not be so high but the proof was there. The settlement, however, was finally based upon an allowed capitalization of \$30,000,000 at 6 per cent., instead of \$35,000,000 at 5 per cent., which amounts to the same net return to the company. They have a Board of Control there similar to the Chicago Board of Control, with a city representative, appointed by the city, and a company representative, appointed by the companies, while the third man, when needed, is to be selected by the State Public Utilities Commission.

"In conclusion I want to say that they were appreciative enough to choose my friend here (Mr. Philip J. Kealy) as one of the board. (Applause.)

"Now, gentlemen, I came unprepared, but I have endeavored to answer your questions, and I thank you for your attention." (Applause.)

(December 4, 1913.)

The Financial Outlook in Canada.

BY SIR GEORGE PAISH.*

AT a special meeting of the Club held on the 4th December, Sir George Paish said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I have very great pleasure in speaking to you to-day, for several reasons, one of which undoubtedly is my great admiration for Canada, and my admiration also for the financial ability of the business men of Toronto. And I chose "The Financial Outlook in Canada" as the subject of my address as I thought you particularly would be interested in it. I think you will agree with me that the subject selected is not without a certain amount of importance at the present time. It is indeed of interest not merely to you business men of Toronto, and not merely to every citizen of Canada, but is one that is in the minds of business men all over the world, and especially it is in the minds of the bankers of the world. People are asking what is the financial outlook of Canada?

Of course, no one acquainted with the natural wealth, the potential wealth, of Canada has any doubt about its future. Indeed, most people who have given thought to the matter expect that the course of affairs here will resemble very closely the course of affairs in the United States over the last century. You will remember that that country made enormous progress from decade to decade, but usually after periods of expansion lasting about ten years reactions occurred, in order to give the country time to recuperate. In a somewhat similar manner Canada moves on. You made very considerable expansion in the 60's and early 70's; then in common with the rest of the world you made a halt and there was very little progress in the late 70's; in the 80's you went ahead again, building the Canadian Pacific Railway and developing your western country; in the 90's again you halted and made very little headway; now in the last ten years you have made a great leap forward. Your progress in the last

*Sir George Paish is editor of the London "Statist," probably the most eminent financial paper in the world. His clear and sane analysis of Canadian business conditions attracted world-wide attention, and was a real service to Canadians in the business world generally.

decade has indeed been of a most remarkable character. You have built here, in a comparatively short time, two great systems of railway, at enormous cost; you have extended the Canadian Pacific Railway in every direction; you have added a great deal of second track; and beyond this, the old Grand Trunk Company has greatly improved its system. In doing this, you have spent a great sum of money,—I think the amount is not far short of £175,000,000 (175 millions sterling), a very great sum to spend in a short time on railway construction.

The expenditures are now nearly over. I am told that the Grand Trunk Pacific has only a few miles to construct in order to have the roadbed completed from one end of the country to the other; it has still several hundred miles of rails to lay, but that is comparatively inexpensive work. For all practical purposes the financing of the Transcontinental Railway is finished. The money has been raised. It is obvious that after building so great a railway the company will be obliged to proceed slowly with capital expenditures, will have to make productive the vast amount of money now sunk in the undertaking. That, of course, will involve a certain amount of trade diminution; capital will not come in so fast. The Canadian Northern is not as far advanced as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, but not much more money is needed to complete all your great roads. In short, you are approaching the time when your great railway systems will be completed for the time being, and, when consequently the influx of capital for their construction will greatly diminish.

Beyond the capital that has been invested here in your railways, great quantities have been coming for your municipalities and for all kinds of enterprises. The amount is so great that very few people realize or appreciate it. The Mother Country in the last few years has provided Canada with a sum of no less than 250 million pounds, a sum which you will admit is a very large one. I am told that the United States has also provided a very large sum of money. The result is, that at the present moment the Canadian people owe to Great Britain and the United States, a sum of upwards of £600,000,000, or \$3,000,000,000; over £500,000,000 to Great Britain, and over £100,000,000 to the United States, and it is now up to Canada to provide the interest on this great sum of money.

Even those of us who are optimistic about the future of Canada recognize that with such a great influx of capital it is necessary for the country to go rather slow in capital ex-

penditure for some time in order that the interest on the capital already expended may be provided, and in order also that Canada may not borrow beyond its power to pay interest. For myself, I am convinced that Canada is able to bear its present interest burden. (Applause.)

Canada is in a very privileged position. We in England greatly admire the Canadian people; we have a great sentiment of friendship for you; and the result of this sentimental attachment is of important material advantage to Canada. We have loaned this great sum of 500 millions sterling to Canada at a rate of interest only slightly over 4 per cent; we should have charged any other country, at any rate any foreign country, over 5 per cent. (Applause.) That means, that although you owe us 500 millions sterling, the cost of the loan to you is not more than 400 millions sterling would be to a foreign country; in other words, you have got the advantage of borrowing an extra hundred millions for nothing. (Laughter.) On the capital you have borrowed from the United States you are paying a higher rate of interest, because most of that capital has come in for industrial operations, giving relatively higher returns. But when one adds the whole amount, I think the interest paid by Canada for capital obtained from abroad is not much more than $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; in other words, you have incurred a yearly burden of £27,000,000 for interest, and it is that sum that you have to provide.

Now, how are you going to provide it? What is the result of this expenditure of money? Well, in the first place, you will have extended your railway system from about 18,000 miles to about 35,000 miles in eleven or twelve years. Your railway mileage in operation last year was nearly 27,000, but beyond this nearly 9,000 miles were under construction, and most of this will be completed and opened for traffic within the next two years. In your railways you have got a great machine which will help you enormously to increase your wealth production, and will enable you, I hope and believe, to provide the great sum of £27,000,000 for interest without great or serious difficulty.

For the time being, however, those trades which have gained advantage from this great influx of capital will be slack; on the other hand, those natural industries, such as farming and mining, which will largely benefit from the extension of railway mileage, should make more rapid progress. We shall all be greatly disappointed if they do not. When one marks the great expansion that has taken place in the

past few years in these industries, one gets some notion of the enormous expansion that should come in the next decade or so. You will realize that a farmer when he starts in business has necessarily to put under cultivation a relatively small acreage, but as the years pass, his acreage increases, and we expect that your wealth production will rapidly increase, that in a short time your productions of wheat, oats and the other agricultural products for which you are famous, will immensely expand; and that consequently the burden of interest, which now may be rather heavy, will in a short time become light, so light indeed that you will be warranted in going ahead again in railway construction and in spending still greater sums of money on capital account.

Sir, with regard to the outlook, I am very confident. (Hear, hear.) There is only one matter upon which I am in any way disturbed, and that is the transition from what I may term the existing condition of things, or rather the condition of things a few months ago, to the condition of things when capital will come in less freely. I want you to realize that in the current year the influx of capital shows no diminution. The contraction noticed in one or two directions is due to other causes. The amount of capital provided by British investors has continued to grow, and for the year will reach nearly £60,000,000, and a sum far greater than we have ever previously lent to Canada in a single year. So the reaction is not due to any diminution of the influx of capital from England. You have yet to experience the effect of a really serious diminution in the influx of capital into Canada. I am positive that in a year in which you are most cautious in your borrowings the amount of capital received will still be large; I shall be disappointed indeed if it ever falls £20,000,000 a year. Nevertheless, it is important for business men and traders to realize that the first effect of a period of small borrowings is an export of gold. The gold goes out to countries that continue to sell goods, because traders in the borrowing country, not knowing that it is desirable to buy in a conservative manner, go on buying, expecting the public to buy as freely as usual. I would urge the traders of Canada to act in a conservative manner at the present time. If they do, no avoidable consequence will result from the diminished influx of capital. If stocks of goods are not allowed to accumulate on the hands of manufacturers and traders, there will be no outflow of gold, but just a gentle and gradual lessening of activity till you are in a position to borrow freely again and to take another big step forward.

In reviewing these matters, I have dealt purely with Canada. I have given you the views held by a large number of people on the other side. Some of them are much less optimistic about Canada than I am. I have been here, and I feel, therefore, that my optimism is warranted. (Hear! hear! and applause.)

But I want you to realize that the influx of capital into Canada has only been part of a world movement; that during the period you have been getting wealthy other countries have also been going forward, and the amount of capital required to keep the world's trade on its present level is enormous, indeed the demand now exceeds the supply. You in Canada fortunately have held a favorable position, and while some countries of the world have had to do with much less capital you have got a greater quantity. In recent years England has been supplying foreign and colonial countries with capital at the rate on the average of 160 millions sterling a year—in the current year nearly 200 million pounds; but the supply is not equal to the world's demand. The recent Balkan war has disturbed the world's affairs. The outbreak of the war caused great uneasiness. On the continent of Europe cash was hoarded to the extent of fifty or sixty million pounds. This frightened investors. The result is that the amount of capital available to transact the world's affairs is smaller than usual, though we in England have done our level best to make good the deficiency. Hence, the reaction from the recent activity will not be confined to Canada, but will be more or less general. Already the reaction in some of the South American countries is quite pronounced. If you go down to Brazil, you will find there conditions not nearly as favorable as here. We are hoping that Brazil will get through without a worse situation than she is now experiencing. We in England will do our best to help. Her coffee has fallen in price, her rubber has fallen in price, and she is unable to borrow as much as usual. In making this statement to you, the business men of Canada, I hope you will not take any alarm: there is no cause for alarm; but I trust you will act as the captain of a ship would do when the weather is uncertain—take in sail. (Applause.)

I think the period of reaction will be a short one. For one thing, education in the old countries and all over the world has made remarkable strides in recent times; people are not content, in Europe at any rate, with the small incomes they used to enjoy; and they will not be content for long with low rates of interest, when they can send it to this country and get higher rates.

Then there is another matter affecting the future which I think is very important, the question of the gold supply. I was mentioning a short time ago, that you must see your gold ebb away unless you take in sail in time. Well, already gold is ebbing from Brazil, and already, in the current year, 10 millions of gold has left that country. And it is probable that other borrowing countries will lose some of their supplies. You will realize, that while gold is coming back to us from the borrowing countries, the world's gold supplies are still as large as ever; so that the amount of gold in the international markets will become so great, and money so easy, that the spirit of enterprise will be restored, and not very much time will be occupied in the work of restoring confidence to investors. In brief, while I have referred to contraction, to a halt in things here in certain directions, yet your farmers and those engaged in developing your natural resources will go ahead. In a very short time you will again start on the upward course, and the expansion will doubtless be nearly as great as in recent years. In other words, whereas the expansion during the past ten years has been 150 per cent., I think you can rely on the expansion of Canada in the future being at least at the rate of 100 per cent. every decade. (Applause.)

In moving a vote of thanks to Sir George Paish, Sir Edmund Walker said:

Mr. President, and Gentlemen,—It is a very great pleasure to me to rise to move a vote of thanks to Sir George Paish. It has been a very great pleasure and a very great instruction to me to be here to-day to listen to him. When I spent three months in England during the past year in what was practically a pretty trying time for a Canadian banker, when about every kind of thing was said about Canada, and all sorts of questions were fired at him, one of the most pleasant and instructive interviews I had was with Sir George Paish. I regard him as one of the sanest men writing on financial matters in England. It is a very easy thing indeed to criticize; indeed a British financial writer has no easier task than to find fault—finding fault seems to indicate wisdom; but to be cheerful, to see the bright sides of things, to see the result as a unity, is one of the greatest qualities. I am glad that this speech has been made to Canadian business and financial men here, because of my admiration for the Canadian Clubs. I was very glad to hear Sir George say so emphatically what some of us have been saying, that beyond a doubt we have come through a trial, but beyond a doubt I am hopeful that we have come through it. If the people are wise and will be

content at this time of halting till we get another great crop, then undoubtedly we shall be safe and shall be in the position Sir George has spoken of, in a position to undertake great expansion again. But we are on trial for awhile, but I should say that it will be for only six months or another year. It is for you to take what Sir George has said home with you. (Applause.)

Mr. W. K. George, seconding the vote, said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—There is really very little I can add to what has been so well said by Sir Edmund, except to express my personal pleasure at hearing such a sane statement on the Canadian financial position from one who is looked upon in Great Britain and in Canada also as the foremost financial diagnostician, I am sure, of the Empire. It is certainly most encouraging to hear such a careful, deliberate, sane presentation of our conditions, and must have gone home to every one of us as absolutely true. And it is indeed, most delightful to hear a man in Sir George's position say, that with the possibilities we have in Canada, our halting stage should be short. I am sure it will carry conviction to everyone, and what he said must be of material service in giving the men of this country knowledge as to how best to direct their affairs in the coming years. (Applause.)

(December 8, 1913.)

Why Newfoundland has not Entered Confederation.

BY HON. P. T. McGRATH.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 8th December, Hon. P. T. McGrath said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I thank you, Sir, personally, for the all too flattering introductory remarks you have made, and the company for their presence in such numbers and for their cordial welcome. I recognize, of course, that it is not the speaker that has attracted this auditory here to-day, but the subject, for I feel sure, from my knowledge of the views of many Canadians on the matter, that it is by no means the least interesting of the questions that concern the Canadian public to-day.

Usually when I meet a Canadian and am introduced to him as a man from Newfoundland, he asks, either, "When are you going to come in with us?" or, "Why don't you come in with us?" (Laughter.) It is to answer this question that I am here to-day.

When a Past President of this Club, Mr. Dunstan, visited St. John's eighteen months ago, he bore me an invitation to address the Canadian Club. I asked him to kindly defer the matter until after our next election, because it would be most inadvisable for anyone from Newfoundland to come up here, even to tell about why we don't come into Confederation, with an appeal to the country in prospect. I have a lively recollection of a gentleman who some years ago, came here to tell why we should federate and what befell him and his party. But now the elections are over, and the political sea will be untroubled for four years, so I have come to explain why we have not entered into Confederation.

Newfoundland has an area of about 42,000 square miles, rather more than that of the three Maritime Provinces; and a population of about 250,000 or about one-fourth of that of those Provinces. But a different significance will attach

*Hon. Mr. McGrath, a journalist by profession, is one of Newfoundland's best known public men. He has contributed to numerous periodicals on subjects relating to Newfoundland, and has occupied several positions in the Government.

to the latter fact, when I tell you that while they have increased only 14 per cent. in forty years, we have in the same period increased 50 per cent.

Another fact is that in our country the people are entirely of British stock, of English, Irish and Scotch ancestry. We have no aboriginal population, the last of the Beothics having been wiped out nearly a hundred years ago. Our population to-day is 99 per cent. native born. This fact, as the Chairman said, makes me doubly proud to call myself a Newfoundlander. Our fathers and grandfathers came originally from the British Isles; but there has been no immigration, practically, for forty or fifty years, so that virtually all of the Terranovans of to-day first saw the light in our Island home.

Our population should be much larger, but the repressive policy pursued towards the Colony in bygone days at the instance of the West-of-England merchant adventurers who controlled the fisheries and wished to retain this control undisputedly, prevented the country from being settled. In fact laws were specially framed to forbid settlement and in at least one instance a Star Chamber Ukase was issued directing the deportation of the whole of those living in the country in defiance of previous regulations, while even at a later period after this monstrous policy had been abandoned, the Island was ruled by fishing admirals created by this rough and ready method—the captain of the first fishing schooner entering a harbor was Admiral for the season; the second was Vice Admiral; and the third was Rear-Admiral. (Laughter.) You can imagine the kind of justice they administered. (Laughter.) It was only just a century ago that the holding of land was permitted to our people and less than that since the first road was built. Last summer I had the pleasure of being present when the Duke of Connaught dedicated the memorial tower at Halifax to celebrate the granting of Representative Government to Nova Scotia one hundred and fifty years previously. You will hardly believe that the same boon was denied to Newfoundland until seventy years later, and that it was not until 1855 that we secured Responsible Government or the autonomy, with full control of our own affairs, such as the Dominion of Canada enjoys to-day.

In 1867, when proposals were brought forward for the Confederation of this country, Newfoundland was invited to participate. Our Government sent two delegates to Quebec, two gentlemen who have now passed to the better land, Frederick Carter and Ambrose Shea—subsequently knighted—and there was a ditty composed on their going to Quebec for this purpose, which ran:

“Remember the day
 When Carter and Shea
 Crossed over the “say,”
 To barter away
 The rights of Terra Nova.” (Laughter.)

At a general election in Newfoundland in the fall of 1869 the party in favor of Confederation was obliterated. It may be of interest to you to know the arguments that were used by their opponents: they were that the people of Newfoundland would see their children used as gun wads for Canadian cannon; (that was shortly after the Fenian invasion of your country); that their bones would bleach on the desert sands of Canada; that there would be taxes on everything, even on the panes of glass in the windows; and in a country where coal was not mined and wood the sole fuel supply, they were told that no man would be allowed to cut wood, so many people went out, fearing this dreadful thing would befall them, and cut enough wood to last for years. (Laughter.) Men dressed up in soldier's coats were sent about to represent Canadian press gangs. The result of all this was that the pro-Confederation candidates were simply snowed under. I might observe that this form of political warfare is still in vogue. (Laughter.) You anticipated me—I was about to say, still in vogue in Canada. (Renewed laughter and applause.) I was struck with this fact three years ago when in the famous by-election in Drummond-Arthabaska, the French-Canadian women were urged not to let their sons join the proposed Dominion navy to be slaughtered in foreign wars.

After the defeat of Confederation, the cause languished till 1887, when Sir Charles Tupper, on his way to England, from Halifax via St. John's, informally opened negotiations with the Newfoundland Government of the day, led by Sir Robert Thorburn, which decided to send delegates to Ottawa, but this provoked such popular hostility, that the delegates, who were actually on the way, had to be recalled from Halifax, and negotiations abandoned.

The next attempt was in 1895, following the disastrous bank failures which occurred two years after the fire that devastated St. John's in 1892. The Whiteway Government was then in power and the delegates were Premier Whiteway being too ill to go,—Sir Robert Bond, the late Premier, Sir Edward Morris, the present premier, Sir William Horwood, now Chief Justice, and Executive Councillor Emerson, now senior assistant Judge of the Supreme Court. The Canadian conferees were Sir Mackenzie Bowell, then Premier of

Canada, Hon. George Foster, then Finance Minister, the late Sir Adolphe Caron, then Postmaster-General, and the late Hon. John Haggart, then Minister of Railways. After fruitless negotiations, they were unable to reach an agreement. The Canadian delegates were unwilling to advance the further sum of \$54,000 a year to Newfoundland which our delegates considered indispensable to maintain our local administration; and the proposals fell through. Had that been granted, Newfoundland would have been likely a Province of the Dominion to-day, and judging by her prosperity since then not the least prosperous of the territories that make up this great appanage of the British Crown. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

By those who have not studied the subject fully, and it has of course not been much in the public mind since,—there has been a disposition to severely criticize the Canadian delegates for their failure to give this additional sum, but it should be remembered that, first, \$54,000 a year looked to Canada in those days very much more than it does now; second, that the Canadian delegates feared that if they gave Newfoundland this additional \$54,000, they would have a demand from all the other Canadian Provinces to be levelled up in the same ratio; third, that there was some concern as to Quebec's attitude towards the inclusion of another English-speaking Province; fourth, that there had been no opportunity to elicit the sentiment of Canada as a whole towards Newfoundland or the readiness of the Canadian people to give exceptional terms to our country; and fifth, that the Bowell Government was a dying one at this time and those who controlled it were naturally unwilling to take the risks which an administration fresh from the country or in its vigorous maturity would be willing to embark upon. It was only after the negotiations had fallen through and a virtually unanimous chorus of protests from the newspapers of every shade of politics, public men, and civic organizations against the loss of this opportunity, caused the powers that be at Ottawa to realize what a mistake they had made; but it was too late then; their action could not be undone, and if Canada feels that she has cause to regret the opportunity, there is no regret on Newfoundland's part, as she has progressed at least as fully as, if not more so, than she could have done had she united with you at that time.

Since that time Confederation has not been officially before the constituencies at any election either in this country or in ours. At the same time, however, it has figured prominently as a side issue in every election with us and if I had

time and did not try your patience too much, I might speak at some length in describing how this question has come to figure so prominently every four years in our political controversies. (Cries of "Go ahead!") I thank you, but I know that at this lunch hour, in the middle of the day, with a gathering of business men before me, I ought not to unduly delay them.

When in 1867 proposals for Confederation were advanced to us, there was not much in the way of argument in favor of Union that could be put forward except what was embodied in the phrase "Union is strength." The idea of federating the North American Colonies was new, the project was simply an experiment and no man could tell how it was going to work out. Certain offers were made to us, such as that railways would be built in our country, that taxation would be reduced, and that such a stimulus in trade and otherwise would be incurred as we would not get in any other way, but it was argued effectively among us that we had better wait and see how the scheme worked out among the mainland colonies before we ventured in, even if we were to venture at all, and it was pointed out, which was very true, that as we had but one industry, fishing, we had virtually nothing in common with our neighbors and that little advantage could follow to us from combining with them. Influenced by this reasoning and by the cries quoted above, we rejected it with such positiveness that, as I say, it has never been officially submitted to our electorate since, and I now propose to show the reasons why union is not advisable at the present time. Before doing so, however, I might briefly summarize the arguments which are presented in favor of Confederation. They are five, namely:

First, that it will round off the Dominion. In other words, that the Dominion is incomplete without Newfoundland and that especially in these days, when the Federal principle is predominant, as has been shown by the Australian and South African Federacies, it is an anomaly for Newfoundland to be outside, but to this there is, of course, the retort that we are in precisely the same position with respect to Canada that New Zealand is to Australia.

Second, is the strategic reason, the importance of Newfoundland as the sentinel of the St. Lawrence, since, by virtue of its geographical position, it would be possible for an enemy holding St. John's to bottle up Canada's whole water-borne commerce. Access to the Gulf is obtained either through Belle Isle Strait on the north of Newfoundland, or Cabot

Strait on the south, and commerce destroyers could devastate these waters if Newfoundland were in hostile hands.

Third, is the naval value of the Island. If Canada is to go in for the naval policy—and here I realize that I am treading on dangerous ground—Newfoundland is vitally important. I might point out that whether you are to have a navy of your own or to maintain a flotilla as part of the Imperial Navy, if your ships are to be manned from this side of the water you will have, in my humble judgment, to get much of your material from us, because the Canadians in the Maritime Provinces, just as the Americans in the Down East States, are abandoning the fisheries as being too dangerous and unremunerative. We find that from our experience in the North Atlantic fishery situation that the Gloucester fleet, the backbone of the Massachusetts fisheries, is crewed very largely with Newfoundlanders, and it is equally certain that the fleet from Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, which operates on the Grand Banks every year, is not increasing because of inability to get your own people to keep in the business. Hence, if you are to obtain blue-jackets for your warships, you will have to get most of them from us. The British Admiralty has already recognized the value of Newfoundland fisherfolk in this connection by establishing a naval reserve amongst our fishermen and maintaining a disclassed cruiser at St. John's as a training ship.

The fourth reason why Canada might desire Newfoundland is because of its political importance. We have a population of 250,000 English-speaking people in a Province that would have at least ten members at Ottawa, who could be relied upon at all times to advocate purely British aspects of this country's progress (applause) against any possibilities of trouble that foreign races in the West might give rise to. In regard to this matter I might say that Canadian public men of both parties would do well to recognize the fact that if Confederation ever became a live issue in the future it will be considered by us only if we are guaranteed an irreducible minimum in our representation at Ottawa. It may be ten or it may be twelve members, but we would not put ourselves in the position of the Maritime Provinces who are seeing their representation whittled away after every census, and would take the precaution to see that we had a fixed number of members assured to us.

The fifth reason for Union would be the commercial value of Newfoundland, in that it would afford Canada a market for several millions of dollars' worth of products annually.

At the present time we buy from Canada about five and a quarter million dollars' worth of her products out of fifteen million dollars' worth, and from the United States about as much more, taking about four and a half million dollars' worth from the Mother Country, and the remainder from the rest of the world. Under Confederation a great deal of the commodities now obtained from the United States would be procured from Canada, and, of course, to Canadian manufacturers, millers and business men this would appeal strongly.

On the other hand, the reasons why Newfoundland does not desire Confederation are many and varied. To begin with, we were promised in 1867 a railway like the Intercolonial. We have, however, provided our own railway, of which we have now about 1,000 miles, 800 miles completed and 200 more that will be finished in a year or two, as large a railway mileage per head as you had in Canada until very recently. We have two 1,500-ton steamers plying across Cabot Strait every night, giving us daily connection with the Intercolonial and the whole outside world, steamers with accommodation for 100 first and 200 second class passengers each, making 16 knots, and superior beyond all dispute to anything you have in Canada east of Montreal. The same is true of ten or twelve other coastwise and in-bay steamers plying all round our seaboard connecting with the railway at convenient points, and making up one transportation system that touches virtually every settlement in the country, and besides that we have two steamers plying weekly to Labrador in the summer months when some 20,000 of our fisherfolk are located there engaged in their industry. All these steamers are new and of the most modern type, built, some of them, by the same Companies as built the *Mauretania* and *Lusitania* and others by firms scarcely less noted, and you have no shipping in Canada, except of the larger class, to compare with them at all. We have financed the railway and provided subsidies for these steamers, as our circumstances have permitted, and when it has suited ourselves, whereas had we entered Confederation in 1867 on a promise of railways, we might have had to wait until now for them. You will remember that British Columbia, though promised a railway as a condition of entry, had virtually to revolt some years later in order to secure it and that Lord Dufferin crossed "the sea of mountains" as a pacificator; and you will remember, too, that although Prince Edward Island was promised better winter communication, she is only now, after forty years, seeing this promise implemented.

Another inducement held out to us at that time was that under Confederation we would have a free breakfast table. Well, we have been able to provide that for ourselves also. We have wiped out the taxation on tea, sugar, pork, flour, molasses, kerosene oil, lines, twines, fishing implements and farming implements, so that the working classes now will be practically tax free so far as the necessities of life are concerned. To secure a revenue we levy duties on our imports, but, as you will note, these articles are the staples and come in free, and the balance of the taxation is borne by the classes best able to carry the same. The Customs Revenue obtained from the import duties provided for all the public services of every character whatever, even the upkeep of the roads and the maintenance of schools. In other words, every form of public service you have in Canada, either under the Dominion, Provincial, County, or Municipal Governments, is provided for the people of Newfoundland out of the general revenue, and the Newfoundlander knows nothing of direct taxation such as the people of Canada have to face in the various Provinces. In addition the Newfoundlander gets all the land he wants for nothing. (Hear, hear.) Our country, I might say, has an interior practically unsettled. The people live almost altogether around the seaboard. Fishing is their first occupation, but there is scarcely a man now who does not raise his own vegetables and garden stuff and provender for his horse, cow, sheep and pigs, and land for this purpose is procurable practically without cost. The distinguished ecclesiastic who sits on my right, Archbishop McNeil, when Bishop of St. George's on our West Coast for many years, having come from Cape Breton where agriculture is largely practised, did much to induce the people of the West Coast to cultivate the land on a larger scale and his efforts were highly successful. Another of our Bishops, the late Dr. McDonald, of Harbor Grace, also a Cape Bretoner, was equally active in this direction. (Applause.) Having abundant fish in the waters beside his door; being able to raise much, if not all, his own garden produce; able also to stock his larder with caribou, rabbits, and game birds, unrestricted in his access to the forests to cut wood for fuel, for house building and for boat building, all of which work he does himself, he is as well off as the farmer, the miner, or the working man anywhere in the Dominion.

In our trade we are practically self-contained. Conditions such as disturb you to-day and described as due to a "money stringency," affect us little if at all. We are not worried over

tight money, the collapse of real estate booms, or over-speculation. The noise of financial panics finds no echo in our Island. Last year there was not an insolvency in our country of sufficient importance for Dun's or Bradstreet's to record. (Applause.) We live in the fortunate case of having the one tariff applying to the outside world and of selling in the highest and buying in the cheapest market. As an instance, we can purchase flour in St. John's cheaper than it can be got at Halifax, for Canadian and American millers compete for our trade, whereas in Canada the import duty on American wheat and flour enables the Canadian trader to raise the price substantially above what we pay, and what is true of flour is true of many other commodities as well. In view of these facts, then, you will not find it surprising that Newfoundland has kept pace in population with your country until the past decade. In the previous ten years Canada's net gain in population was about $10\frac{1}{4}$ per cent., while Newfoundland's was nearly 10 per cent., and this, moreover, though on our part we had no immigration whatever, whereas you had a substantial immigration, though, of course, nothing like what you have had during the past decade. This big inrush from Europe and from the United States to your Northwest has upset the balance, but by comparison with Ontario and the Maritime Provinces we are holding our own in point of numbers. In prosperity, too, our condition is highly gratifying. The reductions in taxation we have made the past ten or twelve years represent a sum of about \$750,000 less paid now by our people into the Treasury than was paid then, and during that time, in addition to providing the funds for all our public services on a substantially increased scale every year, we had surpluses in this period aggregating about a million and a quarter dollars, of which we spent \$750,000 in extra public works and put the other \$500,000 away in the Bank of Montreal as a cash reserve against the proverbial rainy day for which it still remains.

In view of this record, then, and of our enjoying a prosperity so long continued, so widespread and with such prospects of permanence, it is difficult to see where any advantage could accrue from Union. Moreover, every element amongst us sees in Confederation a menace to its individual betterment. Thus Confederation is opposed by our merchants and general dealers because they believe that if it was ever brought about large Canadian concerns would establish branch houses in St. John's and put them out of business. It is also opposed by our manufacturers, (for we have manufactories, producing

many articles of common use amongst us, such as cordage, tobacco, biscuits, boots and shoes, etc.) and the owners of these factories claim that the larger Canadian concerns of the same class would flood our market with the surplus product and not alone destroy the capital invested in the local concerns, but also throw out of employment the operative forces therein, and it is estimated that \$35,000 per week is paid out by the factory owners in labor in our country, this, of course, not including such enterprises as the iron mines and the pulp and paper mills up country. Our farmers, in their turn, claim that their industry would be destroyed if the produce of the Maritime Provinces and Upper Canada were to obtain free entry into our Island. At the present time, we help to stimulate a farming industry by a protective duty, which, of course, would be removed if under Confederation.

It is to the fishermen, however, that the proposal for Confederation seems the most serious. They claim, to begin with, that the administration of our fisheries would be transferred from the Government at St. John's to that at Ottawa, as under the British North America Act the sea fisheries are a Federal subject. They contend that there would then be no guarantee that the future of this industry might not be jeopardized by an Ottawa administration, which might use it to secure the advantage of the rest of Canada to the detriment of Newfoundland in some trade compact with the United States. Moreover, our fishermen feel that they would not have anything like as sympathetic and responsive a carrying out of the fishery laws through the agency of a bureau at Ottawa that they would have with the center in St. John's and regulations inimical to their interests might be framed and enforced. In the next place our fishermen argue that every man in Canada engaged in sea fishing has to take out a license and pay a fee therefor, which in the case of large cod traps, the most costly and modern method of fishing, amounts to \$50 or \$75 a year. In Newfoundland we have no licenses, no fees, and such regulations as are made for the conduct of the fisheries, are made for virtually every locality in response to the wishes of the people therein.

I have heard it argued that under Confederation the Dominion would provide us with better coast facilities, light-houses, fish hatcheries, etc., but with regard to this I would simply say that we tried fish hatching ourselves some years ago and abandoned it; we are making as generous provision for coast aids as our finances will allow, and perhaps as generous as we would get under Confederation, and that Canada

is at the present time maintaining a number of important light-houses on our seaboard, not for our advantage but for the benefit of her own shipping that uses the St. Lawrence route, so we would stand to gain very little in this way.

In addition to the merchant, the manufacturer, the farmer and the fisherman, the economist amongst us opposes Confederation because it would mean that in addition to the one Government, with one set of politicians, as we have to maintain at present, we would find this condition duplicated under Confederation (laughter), and while there does not seem to be much difficulty to maintain two sets of politicians and two Governments in this country, and allow your Federal politicians, Parliament after Parliament, to increase their stipends, I tremble for the man who would advise a similar policy with us. (Laughter.)

Every element, therefore, opposes Confederation because of individual and general interests, and the consensus of agreement among all classes is that Canada has nothing to offer us. Our total trade last year was nearly thirty-one million dollars. Of this sixteen millions consisted of imports and nearly fifteen millions of exports. Our imports increased a million dollars during the year and our exports a million and a quarter. The apparent balance of trade against us is due to the import of large quantities of materials in connection with the operating of the mining and paper-making plants. The former are producing 1,300,000 tons of ore annually now, and the latter are putting out 240 tons of newsprint paper and about half as much sulphite and ground wood pulp every day, providing articles of export valued the past year at two and a half million dollars. The value of our fishery products for the last fiscal year was about ten million dollars. Thus, of itself, at the present figures, Confederation would not give us any better assurance in this respect in regard to our fisheries. It would not benefit us as to agriculture, mining, or paper making, and the only substantial argument in favor of Union would be that the articles we import from Canada at present would then go in duty free, but it is optional to us at any time we may choose, to bring about this by removing the duties from Canadian products if we saw fit to do so, but it would leave a hiatus now or under Confederation, which would have to be met by direct taxation in order to satisfy the needs of a provincial administration. Direct taxation would be extremely unpopular in our country, and the fear of it forms one of the strongest reasons why our people oppose Confederation.

I have heard and read of criticisms on our colonial public debt, which is now about twenty-five million dollars or, say \$100 per head of our population. Your Federal debt is about half that amount, and if you add to that the provincial, county and municipal debts, and the direct taxes and charges your people have to pay in other respects, I think it will be found that the Canadian taxpayer is more heavily burdened than the Newfoundlander.

Two or three years ago, a Federal M.P. from the Maritime Provinces told me he thought we were wise to keep out of Confederation, and that these Provinces very much regretted that they did not do so as well. However, that may be, the people of Newfoundland, for the reasons I have already given, and for the further reasons that they are not prepared to merge their independence and the proud prestige of their country as the oldest oversea possession of the Empire, into the Dominion, are decidedly opposed to Union in any form.

Moreover, Newfoundland controls the bait supply of the North Atlantic. On this supply Canadian, American and French fishermen, as well as our own, rely almost wholly. For nearly thirty years we have excluded the French by our Bait Act. For twenty years we were at war with the Americans in the same connection. In 1892 and 1893 we were compelled to prove to your authorities that we were paramount in this matter. While we remain as we are, our control of this weapon is undisputed, but under Confederation we would transfer it into your hands, and knowing its value and potency we are reluctant to do this.

In my humble opinion, if Confederation should ever be brought about in the future, it must be through the influence of one of two circumstances: either a complete transformation of conditions in the eastern part of British America, which we cannot see in prospect at the present time, so that Newfoundland would consider it to be of advantage for financial or other reasons to come in; or the menace of foreign domination might force her to do so. But at the present time our country is too prosperous, our people are too contented, the outlook is too promising, for us to consider any proposal for union on the part of the Dominion, even if the Dominion were disposed at this time to make one. (Applause.)

(January 5, 1914.)

The Navy Question.

BY MR. Z. A. LASH, K.C., LL.D.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club, held on the 5th January, Mr. Lash said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I found the subject upon which I had promised to address you to-day was so wide a one, and the time within which the address was limited so short a one, that it was impossible for me to attempt to speak from notes in order to condense properly and give you what I want to say at the one time. I found it absolutely necessary to place what I was going to say in writing, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I will read what I intend to say.

The Navy Question in Canada in 1913.

Stripped of the fireworks which have been let off very freely by speakers and writers on both sides of this question since it unfortunately got into the domain of very fierce party politics, and confined to the admitted or readily established facts, the material issues which up to the present time lie between the Government and the Opposition are comparatively easy to define, though they are not so easy to solve. I shall endeavor to strip away the fireworks and present to you the material issues.

I regard as fireworks all charges of disloyalty or bad faith or ulterior motives, no matter by which side made. I regard as fireworks all charges of inconsistency between views and opinions previously expressed and subsequently expressed, no matter by or against whom the charges are made. I regard as fireworks all charges that the Government or the Opposition has been coerced to take its position, or any position upon this question, to gain support or avoid opposition, or because it has made any alliance, holy or unholy, with any faction or interest. I regard as fireworks all charges that either party is or is not willing to deal with this great question in the way

*Mr. Z. A. Lash, a lawyer by profession, is Vice-President of the Canadian Bank of Commerce and the Canadian Northern Railway. While he has never been active in political life, he has been a close student of public questions from boyhood. Any pronouncement he makes on a question of the day is sure to be the result of careful study and investigation.

best suited, in its sincere opinion, to the welfare of Canada and the Empire.

All these charges are not material to the real issues involved. I shall assume that the great bulk of the people of Canada and of their representatives in Parliament, being Canadians, are sincere Canadians, and are loyal to Canada and the Empire, and are taking their stand and expressing their views honestly and with conviction, and not under compulsion.

The question is a national and not a party one, and it is not too much to hope and believe that the reasonable-minded and thoughtful men on both sides (and they, holding the balance, can create the majority) will consider the real issues involved, strip them of all irrelevancy, and exercise upon them a calm, sincere and non-partizan judgment. (Applause.)

As the question has been debated by the political parties I shall, in endeavoring to reach the real issues, refer freely to the deliberate utterances of the responsible leaders on both sides, and to their action in Parliament, and to the official records and documents of the House. To make either party responsible for the utterances of each of its supporters, or supposed or alleged supporters, and to introduce these utterances into the discussion, would be but a waste of time. If such utterances support the position of the leaders, reference to them is unnecessary. If they differ from that position, it would be unfair to make the party responsible.

Fortunately there was a time when both sides rose above party and came to a unanimous decision as to the prime duty of Canada and the principles involved in performing that duty. This decision affords me a good starting point.

Years ago but few people in Canada gave much thought to the fact that Great Britain was bearing alone the burden of securing, from attack by sea, our ships and our country, and was alone bearing the great expense involved. As we grew in numbers and wealth and began to realize more clearly our position in the Empire, a feeling arose that we should not go on indefinitely allowing the mother country to bear all the expense. This feeling grew stronger and wider as time went on. The Press began to reflect and support it; public speakers took occasion to promote it, but it was not until it had taken hold of the masses that any one in Parliament had courage to propose a specific resolution there in its support.

On the 29th of March, 1909, the Hon. George E. Foster, a member of the Opposition, moved in the House of Commons a short resolution expressing the opinion of the House that

Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

This resolution was supported by him in a speech commencing with the wish that the subject of national defence should be "kept as far outside of party politics and party contentions" as it is in England, and with the statement that it was in that spirit and with that intent that he made the motion.

Mr. Foster was followed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Premier, in a speech commencing with congratulations for the temperate and moderate manner in which Mr. Foster had approached a difficult and very important subject. Sir Wilfrid continued on the same high plane. These two speeches gave a superior tone to the debate, in which about a dozen leading members of the House took part, and the subject was kept out of party politics. As a result, a unanimous resolution was passed.

The debate, though earnest, was not acrimonious; the speakers expressed fair minded and sincere views, and for this reason it affords unusually satisfactory evidence of the real attitude of both parties, stripped of that which I have termed "fireworks."

The Government offered a much longer resolution in substitution for that moved by Mr. Foster, and Sir Wilfrid hoped that it would meet with his concurrence.

Mr. Borden, then Leader of the Opposition, now Premier, followed with a speech on the same high, non-partizan plane, in which he offered suggestions for changes in Sir Wilfrid's resolution, and gave his reasons.

At the conclusion of the debate Sir Wilfrid accepted Mr. Borden's suggestions, and the following resolution was passed unanimously. I quote it in full because of its importance.

"This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

"The House is of the opinion that, under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

"The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the admiralty at the last imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire and the peace of the world.

"The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the empire."

The Imperial Conference referred to took place in 1907.

Each party claims that it desires to carry out the terms of this resolution, but each party has charged the other with departing from the true meaning and spirit of it. This charge was made against the Laurier Government during the debate upon the Naval Bill introduced by that Government in February, 1910. The same charge was made against the Borden Government during the debate upon the Bill, to provide \$35,000,000 with which to build battleships, introduced by that Government in December, 1912.

We can clear the air a little by considering what the resolution meant, and what the House meant when adopting it.

A glance at its form when first proposed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier will help. The words then used in the second clause were that "the payment of *any stated* contributions to the Imperial treasury" would not be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The words of the clause as passed are "the payment of *regular and periodical* contributions"—an important difference in substance, made at Mr. Borden's instance. When speaking upon this clause he said,—“It seems to me that this is a little inconsistent with the last paragraph of the resolution. The day might come—I do not know that it will come—the day might come—it might come to-morrow, it might come next week, it might come next month, when the only thing we could do in the absence of preparation in this country would be to make some kind of contribution.”

At the conclusion of the debate Sir Wilfrid Laurier said,—“The suggestions which have been made by my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, are such as can be accepted by

this side of the House." He then moved the resolution with the changes made, and it was passed in the form quoted.

The distinction between a gift of money for a special purpose and on special terms, and gifts of regular and periodical contributions, is too clear for argument. That a special gift could not be, and could not be honestly claimed to be, a *solution* of the question of defence within the meaning of the resolution, is also clear. What might be called the permanent policy or solution of the question is that aimed at by the third clause, viz., the organization of a Canadian Naval Service of the kind outlined in the clause. There would be nothing inconsistent with the resolution in a measure or in measures providing for the organization of a Canadian Naval Service or for a special contribution, or for both, and it would be immaterial which was provided for first or whether both were provided for simultaneously.

The Laurier Government in January, 1910, determined to make a beginning in the organization of a Canadian Naval Service, and on the 12th of January introduced their Naval Bill for that purpose, but did not ask for a special contribution. This was entirely consistent with the resolution. Whether they should have asked more for the new navy, or should have asked for a contribution as well, was a matter for debate. They decided to submit to the House the Bill as introduced.

The Opposition did not agree with the Government policy or with the measure in detail, but the Bill was passed and became law. It is called "The Naval Service Act" (being Cap. 43, Statutes of 1910).

The most serious difference between the parties as to the meaning and effect of the resolution, and the main question upon which the people of Canada must ultimately pass, is involved in the words "a Canadian Naval Service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial Navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the Naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire and the peace of the world."

The Naval Service Act of 1910 makes detailed provisions for the creation of a Canadian Naval Service under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The crux of this Act, so far as it relates to the Imperial Navy, is contained in sections 22 and 23, which are as follows:

"22. The Governor in Council may place the Naval forces or any part thereof on active service at any time when it appears advisable to do so by reason of an emergency.

"23. In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal Navy, the Naval Service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the Naval Service, and the officers and seamen serving on such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the Naval Service."

The Act makes it the duty of the Government to call a meeting of Parliament within fifteen days after the Navy has been placed on active service.

"Emergency" is defined by the Act to mean "war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended."

When introducing his Bill Sir Wilfrid Laurier was asked whether the "war" referred to was war in any part of the Empire or in Canada only, and he replied, "War everywhere. When Britain is at war Canada is at war; there is no distinction. If Great Britain, to which we are subject, is at war with any nation, Canada becomes liable to invasion, and so Canada is at war."

During the same debate Sir Wilfrid defined more clearly the effect of his Naval Service Act. He was asked by Mr. Borden, "Suppose a Canadian ship meets a ship of similar armament and power belonging to an enemy, meets her on the high seas, what is she to do? I do not ask now what she will do if attacked; but will she attack, will she fight?" Sir Wilfrid replied, "I do not know that she would fight. I do not know that she should fight either. She should not fight until the Government by which she is commissioned have determined whether she should go into the war." Mr. Borden replied, "I understood the Prime Minister to say that our ships would not fight until they were ordered to do so, and therefore they would in effect be neutral until the Governor-in-Council had made an order that they should participate in the war. Have I misstated my hon. friend's position?" To which Sir Wilfrid answered "No."

The serious difference referred to arises here. By the Act as it stands, the Canadian Navy would form part of the Imperial Navy *only* if the Governor-in-Council thought fit to place it at His Majesty's disposal for that purpose. The present Opposition claim that this conforms to the terms of the resolution. The Government claim that the reservation to the Governor-in-Council of the power to place, and consequently of the power to withhold, is not "co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference,"

within the meaning of the resolution; and in support of this they quote the following statement of the Admiralty from the Notes of Proceedings at the Conference of 1907,—

I quote: "The only reservation that the Admiralty desire to make is that they claim to have the charge of the strategical questions which are necessarily involved in naval defence, to hold the command of the naval forces of the country, and to arrange the distribution of ships in the best possible manner, to resist attacks and to defend the Empire at large, whether it be our own islands or the dominions beyond the seas,"

and they contend that the resolution contemplated the control and command of the Canadian Naval Service, in time of war, in some central authority, such as the Admiralty, in order that the whole forces of the Empire may be concentrated effectively for the purpose of a great battle, whether on our coasts or elsewhere.

If the meaning of the resolution and of the lines laid down by the Admiralty were material to the main question involved and had to be decided, it might be difficult to resist the conclusion that the reservation of the power to place or withhold is not consistent with the resolution, but the main question is not "what is the intention of the resolution of 1909"; it is "what do the people of Canada intend shall be the permanent relations of Canada with Great Britain and the Empire on the great question of naval defence."

To prove that the policy of one party in 1913 was inconsistent with the terms of a resolution passed in 1909 may give the other party a tactical or party advantage, but it leaves unsolved the man question, which is a National and not a party issue.

I now come to the action of the present Government.

On November 24th, 1910, during the debate on the address, Mr. Borden, referring to the question of the Naval Defence, said:—"It may be fairly asked what we would do if we were in power to-day with regard to a great question of this kind. So far as I am concerned our plain course and duty would be this: The government of this country are able to understand and know, if they take the proper action for that purpose, whether the conditions which face the Empire at this time in respect of naval defence are grave or not. If we were in power we would endeavor to find that out, to get a plain, unvarnished answer to that question, and if the answer to that question, based upon the report of the government of the mother country and of the naval experts of the Admiralty,

were such—and I think it would be such—as to demand instant and effective action by this country, then I would appeal to Parliament for immediate and effective aid, and if Parliament did not give immediate and effective aid I would appeal to the people of the country. Then, sir, as to the permanent policy, I think the people have a right to be asked about that.”

In considering the main question it must be remembered that the people of Canada have not yet been consulted about it. The Naval Service Act of 1910 was passed without being submitted to the people, and without a mandate from the people with respect to any permanent solution of the question. Mr. Borden and some of the speakers during the general election of 1911 did refer to it, and, so far as it could have been considered an issue in that election, the verdict did not support the Laurier Government's position, but the main question decided by that election was upon the reciprocity agreement with the United States of America; the Navy question was not decided, and the position taken upon it by the then Opposition is important only in considering whether their attitude then is consistent with their attitude now.

No one can truthfully say that up to the time the present Government assumed office much effective progress had been made by Canada in carrying out the substance of the unanimous resolution. It certainly devolved upon the incoming Government to take some action. They assumed office in October, 1911. Parliament met in November, 1911, and was prorogued in April, 1912. Mr. Borden then followed the course indicated by him in 1910. He went to England, consulted the Government and Admiralty there, and brought back their statement.

In this remarkable document the Admiralty refer to the self-evident fact, that the power of the British Empire to maintain the superiority on the sea which is essential to its security must obviously be measured from time to time by reference to the other naval forces of the world. They give the facts relating to the increase of the German fleet from 1898 onwards, and compare it with the British fleet and its increase during the same period. I shall not weary you with details and figures, or with a confusing comparison between the strength and numbers of the different kinds of ships, but a short allusion to the increase in numbers of officers and men of the German fleet will be illuminating. The Admiralty state that in 1898 the number was 25,000; in 1912 it was 66,000, and in 1920, under the new law, it will be 101,500. They call attention to the explicit declaration of the tactical objects for

which the German fleet exists, as set forth in the preamble to the German Naval Law of 1900, as follows:

I quote: "In order to protect German trade and commerce under existing conditions, only one thing will suffice, namely, Germany must possess a battle fleet of such a strength that even for the most powerful naval adversary a war would involve such risks as to make that Power's own supremacy doubtful. For this purpose it is not absolutely necessary that the German Fleet should be as strong as that of the greatest Naval Power, for, as a rule, a great Naval Power will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us."

The Admiralty point out the rapid and increasing expansion of Canadian sea-borne trade, and truthfully say, "For the whole of this trade, wherever it may be about the distant waters of the world, as well as for the maintenance of her communications both with Europe and Asia, Canada is dependent and has always depended upon the Imperial navy, without corresponding contribution or cost." They emphasize the fact that Great Britain's present naval power must be diminished with the growth, not only of the German navy, but by the simultaneous building by many powers of great modern ships of war, and that the existence of a number of navies comprising ships of high quality must be considered in so far as it affects the possibilities of adverse combinations being suddenly formed, and that anything which increases the margin in the newest ships diminishes the strain and augments the security and the chances of being unmolested. They state that, whatever may be the decision of Canada at the present juncture, Great Britain will not in any circumstances fail in her duty to the Overseas Dominions of the Crown; that the aid which Canada could give at the present time is not to be measured only in ships or money, and that any action on her part to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy would be recognized everywhere as a most significant witness to the united strength of the Empire and to the renewed resolve of the Overseas Dominions to take their part in maintaining its integrity. The memorandum concludes with the following now historic words:

"The Prime Minister of the Dominion having enquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and

strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply."

With the promise made by Mr. Borden in opposition, with the information obtained in England, with the statement of the Government and Admiralty of Great Britain, with the people of Canada clamouring for some effective action, what was the duty of the Government? Was it to give no aid until the years had elapsed which it would take, first to establish ship yards in Canada, and then to build the ships in them? Was it their duty to solve permanently, without consulting the people, this great question of Naval Defence, involving as it must in case of war the status of Canada with respect to Foreign Countries and with respect to Great Britain and the Empire? Or was it to make provision for the building at the earliest possible date of "a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply," and in the meantime to consider carefully the permanent policy and submit it to the people for their verdict?

The Government conceived it to be their duty to adopt the latter of these alternatives, and when presenting to the House the statement of the Admiralty the Prime Minister presented also a Bill to authorize (a) the expenditure of \$35,000,000 "for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire . . . (b) under the direction of the Governor-in-Council, in the construction and equipment of battle ships or armoured cruisers of the most modern and powerful type, (c) the ships when constructed and equipped to be placed by the Governor-in-Council at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire," the whole (d) "subject to such terms, conditions and arrangement as may be agreed upon between the Governor-in-Council and His Majesty's Government."

In his speech when introducing this Bill, Mr. Borden indicated one of the terms of the arrangement which would be made. He said, "We have the assurance that if at any time in the future it should be the will of the Canadian people to establish a Canadian unit of the British Navy these vessels can be recalled by the Canadian Government to form part of that Navy."

It would not be possible within the time limit for this address to refer in detail to the reasons given by the Prime Minister in support of this measure. They may be summed up in the short statement that Great Britain needed the aid and support of Canada before it might be too late to give it, and that such aid and support could now best be given in the

way pointed out by the Admiralty, and that years would have to elapse, with greatly increased expenditure, before Canada could give the aid and support by a navy of her own, and that during the construction of the ships in Great Britain with the money granted the permanent solution of the question of our part in naval defence would be sought for and submitted to our people for approval or disapproval.

The position of the Opposition was crystallized into a resolution offered by their leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and from this resolution the real issues between the parties can be gathered.

During the debate a number of imaginary issues were set up, and time was wasted in discussing them. For instance, it was stoutly asserted that this special contribution was but the beginning of the regular and periodical contributions which the unanimous resolution had declared would not be a satisfactory solution of the question, and much time was consumed in debating this, notwithstanding that in presenting the Government proposals Mr. Borden expressly stated: "We are not undertaking or beginning a system of regular and periodical contributions. I agree with the resolution of this House in 1909, that the payment of such contributions would not be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence." Because Mr. Borden, after having satisfied himself by enquiries that immediate aid was requisite, asked the Admiralty in what form it would be most effective, it was stoutly asserted that before he went to England he had abandoned the policy of a Canadian Navy, and much time was consumed in debating this imaginary issue. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that Mr. Borden "went to England to ask what England would accept in case of an emergency, although there was no emergency." Much time was consumed in debating the meaning of this word, which was not used by the Admiralty or by Mr. Borden in introducing his Bill.

The questions involved cannot be described by the dictionary meaning of one word, though one hon. member read a dictionary definition and made a speech upon it. (Laughter.)

Other imaginary issues were raised and debated, and many fireworks let off on both sides, and much smoke created, which clouded the real position. Let me try to clear away this smoke.

The proposal of the Government was simply to contribute \$35,000,000 for a specific purpose. No announcement of their intentions with reference to the permanent solution of the question, or as to the extension or modification of the Laurier

Naval Act, was made. On the contrary, Mr. Borden had affirmed and reaffirmed (I quote his words) that "a permanent policy would have to be worked out, and when that permanent policy has been worked out and explained to the people of Canada, to every citizen in this country, then it would be the duty of any government to go to the people of Canada to receive their mandate, and accept and act upon their approval or disapproval of that policy."

He had also affirmed and reaffirmed his approval of the unanimous resolution, and his adherence to its terms and spirit.

I now come to the amendment offered by the Opposition. It is as follows:

"This House declines to concur in the said resolution, and orders that the same be referred back to the committee with instructions to amend the same in the following particulars, namely, to strike out all the words after clause (a) (This is the clause granting the \$35,000,000.) and substitute therefor the following:

"The memorandum prepared by the Board of Admiralty on the general naval situation of the Empire and communicated to this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister on December 5th shows that several of the most important of the foreign powers have adopted a definite policy of rapidly increasing their naval strength.

"That this condition has compelled the United Kingdom to concentrate its naval forces in home waters, involving the withdrawal of ships from the outlying portions of the Empire.

"That such withdrawal renders it necessary that Canada without further delay should enter actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence.

"That any measure of Canadian aid to Imperial naval defence which does not embody a permanent policy of participation by ships owned, manned and maintained by Canada and contemplating construction as soon as possible in Canada, is not an adequate or satisfactory expression of the aspirations of the Canadian people in regard to naval defence, and is not an assumption by Canada of her fair share in the maintenance of the naval strength of the Empire.

"This House regrets to learn the intention of the Government to indefinitely postpone the carrying out by Canada of a permanent naval policy.

"It is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken *at the present session* to give effect *actively and speedily* to the permanent naval policy embodied in the Naval Service Act of 1910, passed pursuant to the resolution unanimously approved by this House in March, 1909.

"This House is further of the opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy by the addition by Canada under the above Act of two fleet units, to be stationed on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada, respectively, rather than by a contribution of money or ships, is the policy best calculated to afford relief to the United Kingdom in respect to the burden of Imperial naval defence, and, in the words of the Admiralty memorandum, to restore greater freedom to the movements of the British squadrons in every sea and directly promote the security of the dominions; and that the Government of Canada should take such steps as shall lead to the accomplishment of this purpose as speedily as possible."

What issues did the resolution raise? The grant of \$35,000,000 was not opposed. The Opposition wanted a much larger sum (probably double) spent on naval defence, but they wanted the money expended under the Naval Service Act of 1910, and they wanted the permanent policy to be the taking of measures at the then session to give effect to that Act. They wanted such policy to embrace aid to Imperial naval defence by ships owned, manned and maintained by Canada and constructed in Canada. These are the issues raised by the Opposition resolution. The other parts are argumentative only.

In the debate it was said that there was no "emergency" calling for immediate action by Canada. The resolution does not raise any issue on this question; it expressly calls for action by Canada "without further delay" and "at the present session."

After a long debate the Government measure was carried in the House of Commons. In the Senate the Bill was defeated on the motion of the leader of the Liberal Party there, in the following words:

"This House is not justified in giving its assent to this Bill until it is submitted to the judgment of the country."

From what I have said you will see that there are four material issues between the parties, which may be stated shortly as follows:

(1) The Government wanted \$35,000,000 expended now for the purpose of increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire in the construction and equipment of battleships to be placed at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire.

The Opposition did not object to the expenditure of even a larger sum for the same purpose, but they wanted the expenditure to be made upon two fleet units, one to be stationed on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, neither of which would be placed at the disposal of His Majesty unless the Governor-in-Council saw fit so to place them.

(2) The Government wanted to provide for aid at this time by the construction of battleships in Great Britain, where the necessary shipyards and plant already exist, and where the construction could be made with the least delay.

The Opposition wanted the aid to be given by the construction of ships in Canada, where there are at present no shipyards or plant fit for the purpose.

(3) The Government wanted to submit for the approval or disapproval of the people of Canada their permanent policy or solution of the question of naval defence.

The Opposition wanted the Naval Service Act of 1910 accepted as the solution of this question, without its being referred to the people, and they wanted any expenditure by Canada upon ships of war to be made under the provisions of that Act.

(4) The Government wanted the people of Canada to pass upon the question whether the command and control of the Canadian Naval Service in time of war should as of right be in some central authority such as the Admiralty.

The Opposition wanted the decision of this question left to the Governor-in-Council from time to time.

I have endeavored to state frankly and as clearly as I can the issues between the parties. It would not be possible to argue their cases now.

Before closing I wish to refer to some of the matters which seem to me to require consideration in connection with any permanent solution of the problem of Canada's part in the naval defence of the Empire. I shall do so by asking questions.

Can such defence be best accomplished by having the movement of all ships intended therefor subject as of right to some central control, or by having this control depend upon the consent from time to time of those who own the ships?

If there is to be a central control, how is it to be constituted, and what part is to be taken in it by Great Britain and by her Dominions and Colonies?

On what conditions and in what events is this control to be exercised (a) in case of war; (b) during peace?

By what authority is war to be declared?

What part is each member of the Empire to have in the decision upon the question of declaring war?

What part is each member of the Empire to have with respect to the Foreign Policy of Great Britain?

What control over its own Foreign Policy is each member to have?

If the control by the central authority of the movements of ships owned by a Dominion or Colony be made to depend upon the consent from time to time of the Dominion or Colony, then if such consent be withheld—Great Britain being at war—what effect would the withholding of such consent have (a) upon the status of that Dominion or Colony with respect to Great Britain and to the Empire; (b) upon its status or position with respect to the enemy?

These are some of the main questions which must, sooner or later be answered. They are not easy of solution. All can not be answered at the same time. They can only be solved gradually and after mature consideration and discussion with the interests involved. This will take time, but the solution will surely be found; it will not come all at once, but, like the development of the Empire itself, it will be gradually unfolded.

The question is a great National question, far above and beyond party, and every Canadian, as a Canadian, and not as a party man, should form his own opinion upon it. (Applause.) I shall defer any expression of my opinion until I hear what the Government, whose duty it is to act, may propose. Meantime, as a Canadian addressing this Canadian Club, I am entitled to express an opinion upon the present position.

I think the Government should outline their permanent policy during the coming session of Parliament, (Hear, hear.) and have it discussed in the House and in the Press and country.

They should treat the subject as a National one, outside of party politics, and they should be free to consider impartially all suggestions which may be made, whether by the Opposition or their own supporters, having in view only the lasting interests of Canada and the Empire.

They should then mature their policy as soon as possible and in such way that it can be submitted clearly and succinctly, and apart from any other question, for the approval or disapproval of the people, but not at a general election. (Hear, hear.)

Meantime the building of battleships with money supplied by Canada should be gone on with (hear, hear, and applause) in Great Britain, where the construction can be completed without delay, in order that Canada may at the earliest date have ships ready to take part in the Empire's naval defence, and ready to form part of the Canadian Navy under any plan which the people may sanction.

I am among those who regret that the majority in control of the Senate saw fit to refuse the aid asked for.

I hope that the Government will ask for it again during the session now approaching, and that it will be granted, (hear, hear) and that Canada will be saved from the humiliating position, upon this great question, which she now must occupy in the eyes of Great Britain and of the other self-governing Dominions. (Applause.)

(January 12, 1914.)

The Quebec Act.

BY HON. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, K.C., M.P.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 12th January, Hon. Mr. Lemieux said:

Mr. Chairman, and fellow Canadians of the Canadian Club,—With the expression of my best wishes for a Happy New Year, let me thank you from the bottom of my heart for your most cordial welcome to-day. My good friend, the President, has been kind enough to wish that I might be spared for thirty years so as to come back to office. (Laughter.) There is an old saying, I think it is in Shakespeare, a line of which runs as follows:

“If France you must win,
By Scotland you must begin.”

Well, as a Liberal—don't mention it, please (Laughter)—if Ottawa we must win—and we will—by Toronto we will begin. (Laughter and applause.) And there is hope: since the stern and unbending citizens of Toronto have just elected a Socialist! We don't stand for Socialism; we are against extremes: if you join my friend, Mr. Rowell, we will be satisfied. (Laughter.)

Will you allow me, speaking in the name of my fellow countrymen of Quebec, to express the hope that your esteemed and revered Premier, Sir James Whitney, may yet recover. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Three years ago, upon my return from South Africa, I was privileged in giving you a few glimpses of the newly-born Union—I then spoke of the new King's subjects, the Boers, and of their hopes and aspirations under British self-government. I then stated that there was *some similarity* in the conditions existing in South Africa with those existing in Canada, after the Conquest. 1910 in South Africa, 1774 in Canada, witnessed epoch-making events. *In both cases British statesmanship won a signal victory.*

Under the benign influence of the Crown, our traditions have been preserved—our customs—our laws have been main-

* The Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux has been a member of Parliament for many years, and was Postmaster General in the Laurier Government. He is an authority on Canadian and Constitutional History, and is one of the most eloquent debaters in the House of Commons, speaking English fluently as well as his native tongue.

tained. Religious liberty we fully enjoy. The French language is officially recognized. It is freely used in the courts of the land and in Parliament.

Indeed, if we did not cling to the memories of the past, we should be unworthy of the great nation which gave us life. If we did not proclaim our loyalty, we should be ungrateful to the great nation which gave us liberty. French by descent and affection, we are British by allegiance and conviction.

May I now crave your indulgence for thirty minutes so as to give you as concise and as faithful an account as possible of the circumstances which brought about the Quebec Act, of its immediate causes and effects.

It is a page of history, certainly the most remarkable since the treaty of Paris (1763). The Quebec Act is considered as the Magna Charta of especially the French Catholic subjects of Great Britain in North America. And by all Canadians, in my humble judgment, it should be looked upon as one of the foundation stones of that greatest of human fabrics—the modern British Empire.

History is not only the record of events as events themselves. Experience is also history, and it is by sketching briefly some of the events which took place after the cession that I intend to draw a lesson.

Before proceeding any further, let me ask the following question: Could France have maintained her supremacy in North America?

The French policy was an Imperial policy—it was clear, consistent, far-reaching. The object aimed at was a French dominion in North America; the lines of communication being the two great rivers, the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi. Canada and Louisiana were to be joined; the English were to be kept between the Alleghany and the Atlantic; the French king was to be lord of all; the Catholic religion was to be supreme; the Indians were to be converted and made French in sympathies and interests. The scheme was brilliant but impossible.

The American colonists, thirteen times as numerous as the French, held the base of a gigantic triangle—the base being the seaboard.

The French made, in the great conflict, a heroic resistance. On the Plains of Abraham both victors and vanquished gave the world a lesson of valour and of true heroism.

With the capitulation of Montreal, war in North America came to an end. The surrender of Montreal included all Canada.

Vaudreuil and his subordinates went back to France to be brought severely to account for their shortcomings. Amherst himself left Canada almost immediately but remained in America as Commander-in-Chief, with headquarters at New York. There were three governors subordinate to him: Governor Murray at Quebec, Colonel Burton at Three Rivers, and General Gage at Montreal.

Matters at first went on smoothly. Canadians worn with war desired only rest and fair dealing. Fair dealing they received at the hands of British commanders, among whom Murray was a conspicuously human example.

The status was one of military occupation, but on the whole, there was a nearer approach to freedom and more even-handed justice than in the days when Bigot and his confederates robbed the peasantry in the name of the French King.

With the treaty of Paris (1763) we pass from military to civil government. By that treaty, signed February the 10th, France besides renouncing all her pretensions to Nova Scotia ceded and guaranteed to Great Britain Canada and all its dependencies, including Cape Breton.

The liberty of the Catholic religion was guaranteed to the people of Canada; the understanding being that the most effectual orders would be given to secure to the new Roman Catholic subjects the exercise of their religion "*as far as the laws of Great Britain allowed.*" Mark these words. No mention was made of the civil or criminal laws in the treaty.

The first act of the British Government following peace was to issue a Proclamation, October 7th, 1763, dividing the new American acquisitions in four separate provinces: Quebec, East Florida, West Florida and Grenada.

Three outstanding facts must be remembered in connection with this proclamation:

First, the boundaries of Quebec, which I need not recite; but it will be noticed that no mention is made of the Indian reserves West of the American provinces. Later on, this will be one of the grievances of the American colonists.

Second, the introduction of the English law in the province.

Third, the power to "summon and call general assemblies of the freeholders and planters" of the new province as soon as its situation and circumstances would admit of so doing.

The boundary question, as regards the western territory, irritated the American colonists. They considered that

immense territory as their own; they were anxious to trade with the Indians.

The proposed assembly never was summoned, and the reason is very obvious.

The promise of an Assembly had been made with the idea of inducing British settlers to come; but immigration had made but slow progress, and the French still were in a very large majority. How could a minority of some 400 lord it over a population of some 70,000—because no Catholic was eligible. Yet the minority claimed its right to an Assembly, and even petitioned for the recall of Murray because, forsooth, he did not view the project with favor.

Murray seems to have been very hostile to the early British settlers. "Nothing," he asserted, "would content the licentious fanatics trading in Canada but the expulsion of the Canadians." Murray was recalled in 1766, and was succeeded by Guy Carleton.

The latter (afterwards Lord Dorchester) deserves the everlasting gratitude of every true Canadian. He was endowed with a heroic temperament, military genius and ability for statesmanship which enabled him to render exceptionally important service to the Empire. But we must not anticipate.

The introduction of English laws and forms of procedure created quite a commotion. With regard to one point, however, there was general agreement. The English criminal law was recognized to have the advantage both in certainty and lenity, and there was practically no opposition to its enforcement. But with regard to *Civil Law* it was quite different. The French Canadians felt that they were entitled to their usages and customs. True, an effort was made to blend the English and the French laws, but without success.

Right here, perhaps, it would not be amiss to recall succinctly the propositions laid down by that great English jurist Lord Mansfield on the effect of the conquest:

1—"A country conquered by the British arms becomes a Dominion of the King in the right of his Crown and, therefore, necessarily comes under the legislative power of the Parliament of Great Britain.

2—"The conquered inhabitants once received into the conquerors' protection become subjects, and are universally to be considered in that light, not as *enemies or aliens*.

3—"Articles of capitulation upon which the country is surrendered, and treaties of peace by which it is ceded, are sacred and inviolate, according to their true intent and meaning.

4—"The laws and legislation of every dominion equally affects all persons and property within the limits thereof, and is the true rule for the decision of all questions which arise there

5—"The laws of a conquered country continue in force until they are altered by the conqueror," and Lord Mansfield here explains that if the King has power to alter the old and make new laws for a conquered country, he can make none contrary to fundamental principles.

Though Murray seems to have acted with discretion and to have devised a *modus vivendi* as regards the administration of Justice, yet the proclamation of 1763 created, as I have already stated, a great commotion and also a great confusion. Notwithstanding the proclamation, lands continued to be divided as formerly and the estate of intestates to be distributed according to French law. At the same time, when it worked in their favour, Canadians were acute enough to take advantage of the English law.

Apart from the question of the establishment of a popular assembly and the system of laws to be finally adopted, there also remained the question of the future status of the Catholic Church. True, the liberty of practising their religion had been given to the Canadians both by the Capitulation and the Treaty of Peace. Nothing, however, had been said with regard to what provision would be made for the Roman Catholics in the future.

On the whole, therefore, a note of uncertainty still prevailed with regard to the future of Canada. Indeed, the proclamation issued in 1763 was a mere temporary expedient to give time for considering the whole situation in the colony. If maintained, it was calculated to do infinite harm, as it attempted to establish English civil law, and at the same time required oaths which effectively prevented the French Canadians from serving in the very assembly which it professed a desire on the part of the King to establish.

As already stated, the English-speaking people in the colony did not number more than 400. Yet, all power was to be placed in their hands and the 70,000 French-Canadians had to be ignored.

I have already explained how Murray contrived by his high sense of duty to do justice to the new subjects of the King committed to his care. His difficulties were lessened by the fact that the French, having at that time no conception of representative institutions, were quite content with any system of government which left them their language, religion and civil laws without interference.

It is only fair to state that in 1766 Mgr. Briand was chosen, with the approval of the Governor, to be Roman Catholic bishop at Quebec. He was consecrated at Paris after his election by the Chapter of Quebec, and it does not appear that his recognition ever became the subject of parliamentary discussion.

But, surveying the whole situation, the condition of things became practically chaotic, and it might have been much worse had not General Murray at first, and Sir Guy Carleton at a later time, endeavored so far as lay in their power to mitigate the hardships to which the people were subjected by being forced to observe laws of which they were utterly ignorant.

The Governor-General was advised by an Executive Council composed of officers and some other persons chosen from the small Protestant minority of the Province.

During the years which elapsed between 1763 and 1774 the British Government was anxious to show every justice to French Canada, and to adopt a system of government most conducive to its best interests. From time to time the points at issue were referred to the Law Officers of the Crown for their opinion, so anxious was the Home Government to come to a just conclusion. Attorney-General Yorke and Solicitor-General de Grey, in 1766, severely condemned any system that would impose new, unnecessary and arbitrary rules, especially as to the titles of land and the mode of descent, alienation and settlement; which would tend to confound and subvert rights instead of supporting them.

In 1772 and 1773 Attorney General Thurlow and Solicitor General Wedderburne dwelt on the necessity of dealing on principles of justice in the Province of Quebec. The Advocate General Marriott, in 1773, also made a number of valuable suggestions, though not exactly in the same spirit, and at the same time expressed the opinion that under existing conditions it was not possible or expedient to call an assembly.

Murray had been recalled in 1776⁶⁶ and succeeded by Guy Carleton, who later on became Lord Dorchester. He was indeed a great colonial governor. The Imperial Government had the advantage of his wise experience during the long and protracted investigation which took place before the passing of the Quebec Act.

The Act was brought before the House of Lords by the Earl of Dartmouth on May 2nd, 1774, and passed without any opposition on May 17th. From May 26th until June

13th it was discussed in the House of Commons. The principle of the Act fixed no territory limits for the province. It comprised not only the country affected by the proclamation of 1763, but also all the eastern territory which had previously been annexed to Newfoundland. In the west and southwest the province was extended to the Ohio and the Mississippi, and, in fact, enclosed all the lands beyond the Alleghany's coveted and claimed by the old English colonies now hemmed in between the Atlantic and the Appalachian Range.

It was now expressly enacted that the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Canada should thenceforth "enjoy the free exercise" of their religion "subject to the King's supremacy declared and established" by law, and on condition of taking an oath of allegiance set forth in the Act. The Roman Catholic clergy were allowed "to hold, receive and enjoy their accustomed dues and rights, with respect to such persons only as shall confess the said religion"—that is, one-twenty-sixth part of the produce of the land, Protestants being specially exempted. The French Canadians were allowed to enjoy all their property, together with all customs and usages incident thereto, "in as large, ample and beneficial manner" as if the proclamation or other acts of the Crown "had not been made;" but the religious orders and communities were accepted in accordance with the terms of the capitulation of Montreal. In "all matters of controversy relative to property and civil rights" resort was to be had to the old civil law of French Canada "as the rule for the decision of the same;" but the criminal law of England was extended to the province on the indisputable ground that its "certainty and lenity" were already "sensibly felt by the inhabitants from an experience of more than nine years." The government of the province was entrusted to a Governor and a Legislative Council appointed by the Crown "inasmuch as it was inexpedient to call the assembly." The council was to be composed of not more than twenty-three residents of the province. At the same time the British Parliament made special enactments for the imposition of certain customs duties "towards defraying the charges of the administration of justice and the support of the civil government of the province." All deficiencies in the revenues derived from these and other sources had to be supplied by the Imperial treasury.

Let us now, for a few moments, consider the political situation in England and in the thirteen colonies at that time.

In 1763 England was the most powerful nation in the world. London was the administrative centre of a vast Colonial Empire. Besides the thirteen colonies and Canada, England had a foothold in Africa and had laid the foundation of the present Indian Empire. Outposts scattered over many seas provided naval stations and points of defence. England was not unlike Athens at the close of the Persian wars: a trading nation, a naval power, a governing race, a successful military people. The English completed the parallel by tightening the reins upon their colonies until they revolted. Great Britain had not only gained territory and prestige from the war. She had risen rich and prosperous, and a national debt of 140 million pounds was borne without serious difficulty.

It was also a period of political development; great names are those of Burke, Chatham and Fox.

The long Jacobite period had come to an end. George the Third was accepted by all classes as the legitimate sovereign. The great Tory families which for many generations had been excluded from office now came forward. George the Third had his personal adherents—the King's friends. The King's prerogative was also strongly advocated. This could not but affect the English colonial policy. The Whigs generally made the cause of the colonies their own.

Briefly stated, the grievances of the colonies were these:

In their Declaration of Rights they declared that they were entitled to life, liberty, property and immunities of free and natural born subjects within the realm of England. They denied the right of the British Parliament to legislate in cases of taxation and internal polity, but cheerfully consented to the operation of such Acts of the British Parliament as were bona fide restrained to the regulations of their external commerce. They protested against "the keeping up in these colonies of a standing army in times of peace." They enumerated a long list of illegal acts, including the coercive statutes and the Quebec Act.

The patriots were well organized—the Loyalists were not. Another influence which hastened the revolution was a desire to supplant the men highest in official life.

The grievance, however, most strenuously put forward was that of *taxation without representation*.

On this point the Colonists were supported by the powerful authority of Pitt, of Burke, of Fox and of many other English statesmen. This cry had great popular effect. It was simple, it was universal, it sounded like tyranny. Yet,

one must remember that the taxes had not taken 400 thousand pounds out of their pockets in ten years. The armies had cost them nothing, and except in Boston had not interfered with the government. The acts of trade were still systematically evaded, and the battle of Lexington came just in time to relieve John Hancock from the necessity of appearing before the Court to answer to a charge of smuggling.

Without going any deeper into the causes of the American revolution, one can state, however, that the passing of the Quebec Act by the Imperial government was very keenly felt by the leaders of public opinion in the thirteen colonies.

In the Imperial Parliament, strangely, my friends, the Whigs opposed it most strenuously. If I had time I would quote Fox, who said the Bill did not go far enough—which happens sometimes with an Opposition: it blames the Government because it does not go far enough. (Laughter.) Fox blamed the Government: he said this was no Bill; where was the sparkle of liberty in the Bill? Burke was against the Bill, which gave no government to the new colony; he said, "In establishing any government, you had better say to the House and the country, 'We will govern by the government of necessity.'" And Lord Chatham, with his imperative and choleric character, was much more outspoken. Addressing the bench of Bishops, he said the Bill was a child of inordinate strength, and asked if any of that bench would hold it out for baptism. He said, "I have ten thousand reasons to be opposed to that Bill, and I will heartily vote in the negative."

Lord North, if you read his speech, was most generous and most liberal. He gave the Bill his blessing. And the French Canadians of to-day, nay more, the Protestants of to-day, owe him a debt of gratitude for having introduced that Bill in the House of Commons and having got it passed by Parliament. He was considerably helped by Guy Carleton, whose evidence given in committee was supported by Chief Justice Hay, by Baron Masères, and Mr. de Lotbinière, ancestor of Sir Henri Joly Lotbinière.

In French Canada the Act was received without any popular demonstration, but the men to whom the great body of people always looked for advice and guidance, the priests, curés and seigneurs naturally regarded these concessions to their nationality as giving most unquestionable evidence of the consideration and liberal spirit in which the British Government was determined to rule the Province. They had had ever since the conquest satisfactory proof that their

religion was secure from all interference, and now the British Parliament itself came forward with legal guarantees not only for the free exercise of that religion, with all its incidents and tithes, but also for the permanent establishment of the civil law, to which they attached so much importance.

The fact that no provision was made for a popular assembly could not possibly offend the people to whom local self-government in any form was entirely unknown. It was not a measure primarily intended to check the growth of popular institutions, but solely framed to meet the actual conditions of a people unaccustomed to the working of representative institutions. It was a preliminary step in the development of self-government. Such as it was, the Quebec Act was the first real bond of friendship between Canada and Great Britain.

The new Council had hardly been convened by Guy Carleton when the Americans invaded Canadian territory.

With no British troops available, unable to count upon any organized militia, Carleton's position was indeed desperate. Nevertheless, he wrote home cheerfully that the importance of the Province would make him obstinate in its defence.

And this is where my little lesson comes. I hope that closure will not yet be applied. The Americans tried hard to secure the help of French Canada, and sought to win the Quebec citadel for the second time. But at Quebec, Guy Carleton with the French habitants, with their Bishop, Mgr. Briand, at their head, when surrounded in the citadel, defended it successfully against General Montgomery. This was the first result of the passing of the Quebec Act. It showed the loyalty of the French Canadian towards the British Crown, and you will remember that later on, in 1812 the French Canadians, headed by their clergy, led by the leaders of public opinion in their districts, fought and died nobly for the British flag against the invaders at Chateauguay. (Applause.)

Just two minutes more and I am done. A few considerations: The strength of British statesmanship throughout the history of Canada, and the history of the Empire—the strength of British diplomacy lay in its wisdom. I may say: its wisdom is its strength; its strength is its wisdom. (Applause.) Reviewing the constitutional growth of Canada, there are three outstanding stages of development, each marking a large, a very large, measure of liberty.

First, England gave us a representative government—it educated the French Canadians to the notion of popular government; second, it gave us responsible government; third, it gave us federal government. And at each stage, I am proud to say, Great Britain made secure for the French Canadians, the minority, its religion, its laws and customs, and its language. The traditional policy of Great Britain, for the student of history, is that England trusts her own people. (Applause.) She made the French Canadians loyal in 1774, because she trusted the French Canadians. (Applause.)

May I say, might I suggest to this audience in Toronto, that in these days of monopoly and trusts and mergers, there must not be any such monopoly as a monopoly of loyalty? (Hear, hear and applause.) Loyalty is not in the trade; it is not even patented; it is in the heart of every man. (Hear, hear.) We may differ as to the methods of how best to serve the British Empire, but our aims are all the same. We may disagree on details, but we are all agreed on essentials. And I don't see the object of advertising, say, one half of this country as disloyal. We are all loyal. The great bond of union of all is, not the Grit party nor the Tory party—the great bond of union for every Canadian, after all, is His Majesty the King and the Crown. (Applause.) And the great instrument of freedom, which belongs to me as well as it belongs to you, is the British Constitution, an unwritten instrument, which is as dear to me as it is to you. We may speak different languages, profess different creeds, but the French Canadian in Quebec, the Scotch in the Highlands, the Manxman, the Irishman, the Welshman, is as loyal, as patriotic, as the Englishman from Lancashire—or even from Toronto. (Laughter and applause.)

Then, if you ask me why I am a British subject, and why I wish to remain one? (applause) I reply, that I honor the flag that honors its obligations; that I prize most those institutions that secure me most strongly in my rights and liberties; and am proud to be a sharer in that great work of advancing peace and progress throughout the world, for which the British Empire stands; gratitude for what has been done for them in the past, contentment in the liberties which they to-day enjoy; pride in the greatness of England and her dominions scattered throughout the whole of the globe; this, and much more, warms the hearts of the French Canadians to the Motherland, and makes of them loyal subjects second to none under the British Crown. By the vastness of the

Empire their imagination is stirred; by the self-government it insures, their confidence is secured.

Talk not of annexation of French Canada!—(applause)—outside of election time, of course. (Laughter.) Because all that there is of charm in monarchy is retained in our constitution, and all that there is of democracy in a republic is retained.

Therefore, gentlemen, it being two o'clock, I resume my seat. God save the King, and God bless Canada and the Empire. (Long applause.)

(January 19, 1914.)

Self-Government in Canada.

BY G. G. S. LINDSEY, K.C., of Toronto.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club, held on 19th January, Mr. Lindsey said:

Mr. President and Fellow Canadians,—I want to say to you at once that I feel very deeply honored in being asked to address the Canadian Club, and with a word of thanks for the far too generous sentiments which your distinguished President has bestowed upon me, and of sincere, very sincere, thanks to you for your kindly reception of me, I will dip into my subject, because it is going to take all of the thirty minutes placed at my disposal.

You had last week from the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux an admirable address on the Quebec Act, in which he explained why the Statute of 1774, passed after nine years of British Military rule, contained no provision for an elective legislative body. He left you with a Governor and Crown nominated Council governing the Province of Canada, for there was then only one Province, and largely French. And he pointed out how closely the American Revolution followed on the passing of this Act, its influence on the revolution and its effect in saving Canada to the British Crown. The population of Canada then was estimated at 69,000 souls, of whom 7,600 were converted Indians. We have now to deal with the history of Parliaments.

During and after that revolution people poured into Canada from the thirteen colonies, Loyalists and discharged soldiers. They colonized, too, the continental part of Nova Scotia, part of which in 1784 was created the Province of New Brunswick and given a legislative assembly. Free grants of land were made to all. In nine years the population had increased to 125,000, of whom 12,000 had settled in Canada West. The American residents soon began to petition for an elective Parliament such as they had previously lived under. Their unwillingness to be subjected to

* Mr. G. G. S. Lindsey is a grandson of William Lyon Mackenzie, and by virtue of natural inclination and ability, as well as of ancestry, he is recognized as an authority on Canadian History, particularly that portion of it relating to the development of self-government. He is a prominent member of the Bar in Toronto.

French civil law and their demand for an elective Assembly brought about the enactment of the Constitutional Act of 1791, at the instance of the younger Pitt.

Under this Act the former Province of Quebec was divided into the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. The division line was practically the river Ottawa, which separated roughly the French and English settlements. A Legislative Council and a Legislative Assembly were constituted within each Province, by whose advice and consent the Sovereign, represented by the Governor, and appointed by him, should have power to make laws for the peace, welfare and good government of the separate Provinces. In Upper Canada the Legislative Council was to consist of "a sufficient number of discreet and proper persons, being not fewer than seven," to be appointed by the governor, each person to hold his seat for life. The Legislative Assembly was to consist of not less than sixteen members, who were to be chosen by electoral districts. One other element of the provincial constitution was the Executive Council, appointed by the Governor within such Province for the affairs thereof. Practically the same provision was made for Lower Canada.

Thus, as the machinery of government, was provided, a Governor with an Executive Council selected by himself, a Legislative Council selected by the same Governor, and a Legislative Assembly elected by the people.

The debate on the Bill in the House of Commons was conducted in the main by three of the most famous men in parliamentary history—Pitt the younger, Burke and Fox. Pitt said that the question was, whether Parliament should agree to establish two Legislatures. The principle was to give a Legislature to Quebec in accord, as nearly as possible, with the British constitution. Fox was on the whole rather against the division of the province. But, in discussing the policy of the Act, he laid down a principle which was destined, after half a century, under the Union Act of 1840, to become the rule of colonial administration. "I am convinced," said he, "that the only means of retaining distant colonies with advantage, is to enable them to govern themselves." (Applause.) It was during this debate on the Constitutional Act that the memorable quarrel took place between Burke and Fox which severed their long private friendship.

John Graves Simcoe was the first Governor of Upper Canada, and was entrusted with the duty of putting the new Act into operation, and in his speech at the close of the first

session of the Legislature on October 15, 1792, congratulated his yeomen Commoners on possessing what, to him at any rate, seemed "not a mutilated constitution, but a constitution which has stood the test of experience, and is the very image and transcript of that of Great Britain." This was his theory. How far it was to be made, in practice, to differ from its prototype is well expressed by a great writer:

"Though it might be the express image in form, it was far from being the express image in reality, of parliamentary government as it exists in Great Britain, or even as it existed in Great Britain at that time. The Lieutenant-Governor, representing the Crown, not only reigned but governed with a Ministry not assigned to him by the vote of the Assembly but chosen by himself, and acting as his advisers, not as his masters. The Assembly could not effectually control his policy by withholding supplies, because the Crown, with very limited needs, had revenues, territorial and casual, of its own. Thus the imitation was somewhat like the Chinese imitation of the steam vessel, exact in everything except the steam." (Laughter.)

The position of the House of Commons in the Government of Great Britain, at this time, the manner in which the King selected his Executive Council, and the conditions on which they continued in office are well described by a great historian, who says:

"The struggle of the House of Lords, under Marlborough's guidance, against Harley and the Peers marks the close of the constitutional Revolution which has been silently going on since the restoration of the Stuarts. The defeat of the Peers and the fall of Marlborough which followed it announced that the transfer of political power to the House of Commons was complete. . . . The Ministers of the Crown ceased in all but name to be the King's servants. They became simply an Executive Committee representing the will of the majority of the House of Commons, and capable of being easily set aside by it and replaced by a similar committee whenever the balance of power shifted from one side of the House to the other. Such was the origin of that system of representative government which has gone on from the time of the first English Ministry at the close of the Seventeenth Century (1693) down to our own day."

Had the various military governors interpreted this constitution as the British interpreted theirs, responsible government would then have been established. If from the new Parliament of the people the Governors had selected as

Executive Councillors those who could and did command a majority of the popular house, and in all things took and acted on their advice, dismissing them only when their control of the Assembly was gone, then would the British practice under the constitution have been introduced into Canada. It was the refusal of the Governors, backed up by the Imperial authorities, to so interpret the constitution, that ultimately split the people into two great parties, one contending against and the other for responsible government as practised in Great Britain. The Governors, instead of being advised by the representatives elected by the people, took their advice, if they took any, from the Executive Councils appointed by themselves, and to whose influence they were always subject. Against this the Assembly protested, but in vain.

From the date of the Constitutional Act to the time of the war of 1812 the people were busy making homes for themselves. New comers were numerous. All were then called on to resist invasion, and, when the war was over, the next few years were devoted to recovery from its effects.

It would take too long here to discuss the various grievances of the people which grew up under the system of government which, entrenched behind irresponsible power, left the people powerless, which provoked the most bitter animosities and ended in the struggle for independence in the two Canadas. For our purpose it is enough to trace the movement for responsible government from its inception to its culmination. For the reasons which necessitated and brought about this change it is better to quote the judgment rendered by the great English statesman who investigated on the spot the conditions prevailing at the time, and who endorsed those who were asking for the change. What they asked for, and when they asked it, may be briefly stated.

It was in 1817 that we see the birth of parliamentary opposition to the Government party in the popular Assembly of Upper Canada. When a Committee of the Whole House discussed several subjects highly displeasing to the Governor and Executive, the Governor promptly prorogued the House.

In 1828 the people of Upper Canada set forth in a petition to His Majesty King George III. their grievances as they saw them and pointing out the inability of the Legislative Assembly to effect any remedy, they prayed for Responsible Government. From this time the demand was steadily made and as persistently refused. In the celebrated Grievances Report of 1834 they said: "This country is now principally

inhabited by loyalists and their descendants, and by an accession of population from the Mother Country, where is now enjoyed the principles of a free and responsible government, and we feel the practical enjoyment of the same system in this part of the Empire to be equally our right; without which it is vain to assume that we do or can possess in reality or in effect 'the very image and transcript of the British Constitution.'" "The House of Assembly has, at all times, made satisfactory provision for the civil government, out of the revenues raised from the people by taxation, and while there is cherished an unimpaired and continued disposition to do so, it is a reasonable request that His Majesty's adviser in the Province and those about him should possess and be entitled to the confidence of the people and their representatives, and that all their reasonable wishes respecting their domestic institutions and affairs should be attended to and complied with."

In Lower Canada the House was at this time refusing the supplies.

A Royal Commission was appointed by the British Government in 1835 to enquire into the affairs of Lower Canada. This Commission reported against the demand for an Elective Legislative Council and against a responsible Executive. When the Report of the Commissioners came before the Imperial Government Lord John Russell, in the debate on the Canadian Resolutions, on March 8th, 1836, contended that the demand for an Executive Council, similar to the Cabinet which existed in Great Britain, set up a claim for what was incompatible with the relations which ought to exist between the colony and the mother country. "These relations," he said, "required that His Majesty should be represented in the colony not by Ministers, but by a Governor sent out by the King, and responsible to the Parliament of Great Britain." A Colonial Ministry, he contended, would impose on England all the inconveniences and none of the advantages of colonies. This simply meant that there was no hope from England of responsible government for either Province. The Colonial Secretary advised the Governor that this determination was to apply as well to Upper as to Lower Canada.

These and other events led to the struggle for independence in both the Canadas in 1837. It arose out of the abandonment of all hope that the Home Government would concede the only remedy of any use, and the one which time proved to be inevitable. Sir Robert Peel, in the debate on

the Canada Resolution, charged the Ministry with want of foresight in not sending out an army to Canada with the Resolutions. (Laughter.)

The rebellions in the two Provinces, however unfortunate in the field, commanded the attention of the British Government, brought the Earl of Durham to Canada to straighten out the tangle, and Durham brought responsible government, though not just at once. (Applause.)

This great English statesman had been one of Earl Grey's famous Administration of 1830, holding the office of Lord Privy Seal, and he had with Lord John Russell, assisted by Sir James Graham and Lord Duncannon, been entrusted with the preparation of the Reform Bill, and he had been one of its most powerful defenders in the House of Lords.

Canada was indeed fortunate in the selection of so capable a Governor. He came here in 1838 with plenipotentiary powers as Governor-General of all the North American Provinces, and his famous Report of the next year is one of the greatest of British State papers. On many of the questions raised and on the one under consideration it is best to let him speak for himself. He recommended the Union of the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada under one Legislature, to which he advocated should be entrusted responsible government. On surveying the weakness of the whole Colonial policy in the American colonies he wrote:

"It is impossible to observe the great similarity of the constitutions established in all our North American Provinces, and the striking tendency of all to terminate in pretty nearly the same result, without entertaining a belief that some defect in the form of government, and some erroneous principle of administration, have been common to all. . . . It is but too evident that Lower Canada, or the two Canadas, have not alone exhibited repeated conflicts between the Executive and the popular branches of the Legislature. The representative body of Upper Canada was, before the late election, hostile to the policy of the Government; the most serious discontents have only recently been calmed in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick; the Government is still, I believe, in a minority in the Lower House in Nova Scotia; and the dissensions of Newfoundland are hardly less violent than those of the Canadas. It may fairly be said that the natural state of government in all these Colonies is that of collision between the executive and the representative body. In all of them the administration of public affairs is habitually confided to those who do not co-operate harmoniously with the popular

branch of the legislature; and the Government is constantly proposing measures which the majority of the Assembly reject, and refusing its assent to bills which that body has passed." And on review of the existing conditions he could find but one remedy: "When I look," he said, "on the various and deep-rooted causes of mischief which the past inquiry has pointed out as existing in every institution, in the constitutions, and in the very composition of society throughout a greater part of these Provinces, I almost shrink from the apparent presumption of grappling with these gigantic difficulties. If a system can be devised which shall lay in these countries the foundation of an efficient and popular government, ensure harmony, in place of collision, between the various powers of the State, and bring the influence of a vigorous public opinion to bear on every detail of public affairs, we may rely on sufficient remedies being found for the present vices of the administrative system."

Dealing with the struggle for responsible government he says:

"The powers for which the assembly contended appear to be such as it was perfectly justified in demanding. It is difficult to conceive what could have been their theory of government who imagined that, in any colony of England, a body invested with the name and character of a representative Assembly could be deprived of any of those powers which, in the opinion of Englishmen, are inherent in a popular Legislature. It was a vain delusion to imagine that, by mere limitations in the Constitutional Act, or an exclusive system of government, a body, strong in the consciousness of wielding the public opinion of the majority, could regard certain portions of the Provincial revenues as sacred from its control, could confine itself to the mere business of making laws, and look on as a passive and indifferent spectator, while those laws were carried into effect or evaded, and the whole business of the country was conducted by men in whose intentions or capacity it had not the slightest confidence."

Lord Durham points out two things: First, that "The reformers, however, at last discovered that success in the elections ensured them very little practical benefit. For the official party, not being removed when it failed to command a majority in the Assembly, still continued to wield all the powers of the executive government, to strengthen itself by its patronage, and to influence the policy of the Colonial Governor and of the Colonial Department at home. By its secure majority in the Legislative Council, it could effectually

control the legislative powers of the Assembly. It could choose its own moment for dissolving hostile Assemblies, and could always ensure, for those that were favorable to itself, the tenure of their seats for the full term of four years allowed by the law. Thus the reformers found that their triumph at elections could not in any way facilitate the progress of their views, while the executive government remained constantly in the hands of their opponents. They rightly judged that, if the higher offices and the Executive Council were always held by those who could command a majority in the Assembly, the constitution of the Legislative Council was a matter of very little moment, inasmuch as the advisers of the Governor could always take care that its composition should be modified so as to suit their own purposes. They concentrated their powers, therefore, for the purpose of obtaining the responsibility of the Executive Council; and I cannot help contrasting the practical good sense of the English reformers of Upper Canada with the less prudent course of the French majority in the Assembly of Lower Canada as exhibited in the different demands of constitutional change, most earnestly pressed by each."

And second, that:

"It was upon this question of the responsibility of the Executive Council that the great struggle has for a long time been carried on between the official party and the reformers; for the official party, like all parties long in power, was naturally unwilling to submit itself to any such responsibility as would abridge its tenure, or cramp its exercise of authority. Reluctant to acknowledge any responsibility to the people of the Colony, this party appears to have paid a somewhat refractory and nominal submission to the Imperial Government, relying in fact on securing a virtual independence by this nominal submission to the distant authority of the Colonial Department, or to the powers of a Governor, over whose policy they were certain, by their facilities of access, to obtain a paramount influence."

The views of the great body of the Reformers appear to have been limited, according to their favorite expression, to the making the Colonial Constitution 'an exact transcript' of that of Great Britain; and they only desired that the Crown should in Upper Canada, as at home, entrust the administration of affairs to men possessing the confidence of the Assembly."

Lord Durham then proceeds to acquiesce in this view of dealing with the manner of effecting a remedy. It is inter-

esting to note that he deems no new legislation essential. He says:

“Every purpose of popular control might be combined with every advantage of vesting the immediate choice of advisers in the Crown, were the Colonial Governor to be instructed to secure the co-operation of the Assembly in his policy, by entrusting its administration to such men as could command a majority; and if he were given to understand that he need count on no aid from home in any difference with the Assembly, that should not directly involve the relations between the mother country and the colony. This change might be effected by a single despatch containing such instructions.

“It is not by weakening, but strengthening the influence of the people on its Government; by confining within much narrower bounds than those hitherto allotted to it, and not by extending the interference of the Imperial authorities in the details of colonial affairs that I believe that harmony is to be restored, where dissension has so long prevailed; and a regularity and vigor hitherto unknown introduced into the administration of these Provinces. It needs no change in the principles of government, no invention of a new constitutional theory, to supply the remedy which would, in my opinion, completely remove the existing political disorders. It needs but to follow out consistently the principles of the British constitution, and introduce into the Government of these great Colonies those wise provisions, by which alone the working of the representative system can in any country be rendered harmonious and efficient. We are not now to consider the policy of establishing representative government in the North American Colonies. That has been irrevocably done; and the experiment of depriving the people of their present constitutional power is not to be thought of. To conduct their Government harmoniously, in accordance with its established principles, is now the business of its rulers; and I know not how it is possible to secure that harmony in any other way than by administering the Government on those principles which have been found perfectly efficacious in Great Britain.” And he deprecates the action of the Governors in referring so many questions for settlement to Downing Street. “Almost every question,” he says, “on which it was possible to avoid, even with great inconvenience, an immediate decision has been habitually the subject of reference” . . . and “the real vigor of the Executive has been essentially impaired; distance and delay have weakened the force of its decisions; and the Colony has, in every crisis of danger, and almost every detail

of local management, felt the mischief of having its executive authority exercised on the other side of the Atlantic."

I have said that self-government in the Canadas did not follow immediately on the making of the Earl of Durham's report, though before ten years it was well established in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the United Canadas. Having thrown up his Commission in consequence of his Government's unwillingness to back up his banishment of several rebels to Bermuda, Durham returned to England, and not long after died.

Poulette Thompson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, who had also been a member of the British Government, succeeded Durham as Governor of the Canadas, and came here with instructions to bring about the Union of the two Canadas, which he skilfully did. But his instructions on the question of responsible government were in no case to allow it. Lord John Russell, the Colonial Minister, in a despatch to the new Governor as late as October, 1839, points out to him that in the debate on the Lower Canadian Commissioner's Report two years before "The Crown and the Houses of Lords and Commons having thus decisively pronounced a judgment upon the question, you will consider yourself precluded from entertaining any proposition on the subject."

Sydenham's real view was expressed in a letter to Lord John Russell since published: "I have told the people plainly, that as I cannot get rid of my responsibility to the Home Government, I will place no responsibility on the Council; that they are a Council for their Governor to consult, but no more."

His view, however, on the condition of Government is worth noting. In a letter written from Toronto on November 20th, 1839, to a friend in England, and published by his biographer, he said: "When I look to the state of government, and to the departmental administration of the Province, instead of being surprised at the condition in which I find it, I am only astonished it has endured so long. I know that, much as I dislike Yankee institutions and rule, I would not have fought against them, which thousands of these poor fellows, whom the Compact call 'rebels,' did, if it was only to keep up such a government as they got." (Hear, hear, and laughter.)

But in the first Session of the first Parliament of Canada under the Union Act, and during Lord Sydenham's administration, the House of Assembly took the matter into its own hands, and the celebrated Responsible Government Resolution was passed. It in part read: "That in order to preserve between the different branches of the provincial parliament

that harmony which is essential to the peace, welfare and good government of the Province, the chief advisers of the representative of the Sovereign, constituting a provincial administration under him, ought to be men possessed of the confidence of the representatives of the people, thus affording a guarantee that the well-understood wishes and interests of the people, which Our Gracious Sovereign has declared shall be the rule of the Provincial Government, will, on all occasions, be faithfully represented and advocated."

What Sydenham would have done when asked to live up to these resolutions we do not know. Two days after they were passed he was thrown from his horse at Kingston, the then seat of government, and died after a brief illness, September, 1841.

It is interesting to add that in Nova Scotia at this time, on the request of the House of Assembly, Sir Colin Campbell, the Governor, was recalled and a Governor asked for who "would establish harmony between the Executive and the Legislature of this Province."

Sir Charles Bagot followed as Governor. He refused to depart from the rules laid down by the resolutions for his guidance and acted quite consistently on the advice of his Ministers, till serious illness forced him to resign after little more than a year of office. For the first time, new Ministers on selection went back to their constituencies for re-election.

He in turn was succeeded by Sir Charles, afterwards Lord Metcalf. This Governor resolutely refused to recognize the doctrine of responsible government, and quarrelled with his Ministers, who resigned. He was, says Sir Francis Hincks, one of his Executive Councillors, "selected as the best available statesman to crush responsible government in Canada." But he only suspended its operation, and wore himself out in the struggle, and retired in 1846.

It is interesting to note the career of Metcalf, because he was a well-meaning and able man, who could have governed Canada under the plan of refusing responsible government if anybody could.

Too much praise cannot be given to those members of the House, and notably to Robert Baldwin, who from 1841 to 1849 steadily pressed on the necessity for government by a responsible Ministry. Sir Charles Metcalf's position was that although the Governor ought to choose his Councillors "from among those supposed to have the confidence of the people," nevertheless "each member of the administration

ought to be responsible only for the acts of his own Department, and consequently that he ought to have the liberty of voting with or against his colleagues whenever he judged fit, that by this means an Administration composed of the principal members of each party might exist advantageously for all parties, and would furnish the Governor the means of better understanding the views and opinions of each party, and would not fail under the auspices of the Governor to lead to the reconciliation of all." He tried the experiment and it failed lamentably; but perhaps it is as well the experiment was tried, for fail it must. He failed lamentably, not because of inability, but because he tried to do the impossible. Baldwin and his friends watched the working of the experiment calmly, and wisely refrained from violence, knowing that the experiment must fail, and that theirs was the only practical way of governing the country. So it turned out. (Applause.) Lord Falkland tried the same policy in Nova Scotia, with the same results.

At the beginning of 1847 the Earl of Elgin and Kincardine came to Canada as Governor. By his marriage with Lady Mary Louise Lambton, Lord Elgin was the son-in-law of Lord Durham. In a letter addressed to Lady Elgin he wrote: "I shall adhere to my opinion that the real and effectual vindication of Lord Durham's memory and proceedings will be the success of a Governor-General of Canada who works out his views of government fairly."

This he did nobly. When his Ministers advised his assent to the Rebellion Losses Bill, he freely gave it. As a consequence the mob, which contained many persons of the highest reputed respectability, rotten-egged and stoned him, and set fire to and destroyed the Parliament Buildings in Montreal. But here the struggle ended, and soon all parties recognized the virtue and necessity of responsible government. The principle of government insisted on has become as much the guiding star of one great political party in Canada as of the other; both have been from that time resolute in its defence. The only question asked nowadays is, how could it ever have been otherwise? An Elective Legislative Council or Upper House was voted by the Legislative Assembly with but one dissentient voice in 1856 under a Coalition Government. In Nova Scotia Sir John Harvey recognized Responsible Government in 1848.

What that means is well explained by Erskine May in his *Constitutional History of England* (1871):

“By the adoption of this principle,” he says, “a colonial constitution has become the very image and reflection of parliamentary government in England. The Governor, like the Sovereign whom he represents, holds himself aloof from and superior to parties, and governs through constitutional advisers, who have acquired an ascendancy in the Legislature. He leaves contending parties to fight out their own battles, and, by admitting the stronger party to his counsels, brings the executive authority into harmony with popular sentiments. And as the recognition of this doctrine, in England, has practically transferred the supreme authority of the State from the Crown to parliament and the people, so, in the colonies, has it wrested from the Governor and from the parent state the direction of colonial affairs. And again, as the Crown has gained in ease and popularity what it has lost in power, so has the mother country, in accepting to the full the principles of local self-government, established the closest relations of amity and confidence between herself and her colonies.” (Applause.)

No better confirmation of the changed attitude of parties can be given than the one afforded by the writings of Sir Alexander Galt in 1859, then the Honorable A. T. Galt, a Conservative Finance Minister of Canada. He was defending an increase in the Canadian tariff against the complaints of the Sheffield manufacturers, that Canada had no right to take this course. He wrote a pamphlet reviewing the previous ten years of expansion under self-government, as to which the following extracts explain his attitude and that of the Government to which he belonged:

“The history and progress of the Colonies of Great Britain must naturally be a subject of deep interest to the people of England, especially since the experiment has been fairly tried of entrusting these dependencies of the Empire with local self-government.

“On the one hand, it was contended that constitutional government could not be safely entrusted to colonists; while on the other, it was as strongly urged that the institutions under which Great Britain had herself attained a position of such power and eminence were capable of being worked by her subjects everywhere; and that the vast resources of her colonial possessions would be far more usefully developed by giving their people the entire control of their own affairs.

“In no part of the colonial empire has the experiment received a fuller or fairer trial than in Canada; and it cannot

but be interesting to review the progress of that country, and to mark how far its inhabitants have worthily exercised the power conceded to them. . . . For some years succeeding the Union an unsettled state of things continued, marked, however, by gradual concession to the demand of self-government, until 1846, when Lord John Russell, then Secretary for the Colonies, first fully admitted the principle of what is termed responsible government, and required that the affairs of the country should be administered by advisers of the Crown, possessing the confidence of the people, and in harmony with their well-understood wishes. The system thus fairly inaugurated in 1849 may be said to have received its final and conclusive acceptance, both by the mother country and the colony, as from that date no attempt has ever been made to interfere with its free and legitimate operation. The political differences and difficulties of Canada have been dealt with by her own people and Legislature, and Great Britain has never been required to take part in any local question whatever, except to give effect, by Imperial legislation, to the express desire of the Provincial Legislature."

Up to the time of Confederation there were several further important modifications of Imperial policy. The first was the cession to the Crown of Canada of complete control of its revenues derived from land sales and of its ungranted lands and the full right to the Colonies to administer them. In 1847 to the United Parliament was given full control over all the revenues of the Province.

In 1846 Imperial statesmen made the admission that Canada ought to possess the exclusive right to frame her own tariff and regulate her own trade and commerce at her discretion. In 1859 Sir Alexander Galt insisted on this right in his reply to a memorandum of the Duke of Newcastle voicing the protest of the manufacturers of Sheffield against the new Canadian Customs tariff, and he added: "Her Majesty cannot be advised to disallow such an Act unless her advisers are prepared to assume the administration of the affairs of the colony irrespective of the views of its inhabitants." (Hear, hear.) And again the right was conceded to Canada to enter into reciprocal trade relations with the United States.

These were great advances. "What," says a great writer, "would George III. have thought of an Empire which not only takes away the right of taxation from the central power, but abolishes that right of regulating commerce which was held even by Chatham to be essential?"

The British North America Act of 1867 embodies a wide measure of self-government for Canada, and by it the Imperial Parliament, it has been construed, has forever relinquished its right to interfere with provincial legislation under any possible circumstances. Sir John Macdonald, speaking in the debate on the British North America Bill, said of its effect on the status of Canada: "England, instead of looking on us as merely a dependent colony, will have in us a friendly *nation*." (Applause.)

Since then, on representation of one Minister of Justice, the exercise of the prerogative of mercy and other prerogative rights by the Governor-General has been considerably altered in favor of the Governor accepting more completely the advice of his Ministers in all matters affecting the interests of Canada.

Again, we have obtained the right to be consulted in the making of treaties—Canada's interests were represented in 1871 by Sir John Macdonald in the Treaty of Washington, and by Sir Alexander Galt in 1879 in conducting negotiations for free commercial intercourse between this country and France and Spain. In 1881 it was promised that Canada should be thereafter relieved from the obligations of any new treaties with foreign powers to which objection was taken and be given the option of refusing or accepting them and be associated in the negotiations of all foreign treaties in which Canada was interested.

In 1897, at the instance of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the German and Belgian treaties were denounced, and any British colonies may now without restriction grant preferences to each other and to the mother country in respect of tariffs. (Applause.)

As a result of the Confederation Act, British troops were withdrawn from Canada shortly after 1867, and we were left to protect our own country at our own cost and with our own land forces.

The policy of withdrawing Imperial troops from Canada was discussed by a Committee of the Imperial House. Gladstone's opinion as to the wisdom of withdrawal before that Committee was remarkable. "No community," he said, "that is not primarily charged with its own defence is really, or can be, in the true sense of the word, a free community. The burdens of freedom and the privileges of freedom are absolutely associated together. To bear the burdens is as necessary as to enjoy the privileges in order to form that character which is the highest ornament of freedom." Gladstone's view prevailed. (Applause.)

This glimpse at a century of Canadian history makes it abundantly clear that on Canada's insistence, and always after Imperial resistance, we have been permitted to do things our own way. It has been a long journey into this land of self-government, beset with many difficulties and obstructions, but taken always along one straight path. There has never been any deviation or circuitousness, and we have now arrived inevitably at that stage of our journey which finds Canada left not only without a British fleet on either the Atlantic or Pacific oceans, but left also to devise its own defence for its own seaboard. The ships that did protect us are now released to Britain's other obligations, and Canada is left to assume her own naval burden.

Many English statesmen, among them Huskisson, Benjamin Disraeli, Sir George Lewis, Mr. Leslie Stephen, Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston have thought that the concession of this right to govern their own affairs could not be granted without the colonies ultimately becoming absolutely and completely independent of the Mother Country. Disraeli in 1872 said, speaking of the granting of self-government to the colonies: "There had been no effort so continuous, so subtle, supported by so much energy and carried on with so much ability and acumen, as the attempt of Liberalism to effect the disintegration of the British Empire. (Laughter.) Those subtle views," he said, "were adopted by the country under the plausible idea of granting self-government."

But, as the present Canadian Prime Minister said in an admirable address in 1902, dealing with such prophecies:

"When we look at the present relations of Canada with the Mother Country, how vain do all these prophecies appear. There has never been a time since the granting of responsible government to the colonies, or indeed before that time, when the attachment of the colonies to the Mother Country was warmer or closer than it is at the present time. (Applause.) That attachment may differ in its nature from that which was formerly felt, but it is none the less warm and none the less real. It is the attachment which Canada, as a great Dominion forming part of a great Empire, feels for the country which founded that Empire and which still controls its destinies. It is the attachment, not of a dependent and helpless child, but of a matured and emancipated child towards the parent who is now its ally, confidant and adviser.

"The colonies having the right of self-government exercise that right in their own way, and have no cause for com-

plaint against the Mother Country if misgovernment exists. If Great Britain today controlled the public lands, the mines, the fiscal policy and the commercial relations of Canada, the view which is now directed by those dissatisfied with the policy of the party in power against that party would in that case be directed against the supposed misgovernment of the Mother Country, and ultimately against the continuance of further relations with the mother land." These are the Rt. Hon. Mr. Borden's views.

In a Short History of the Expansion of the British Empire William Harrison Woodward, of Christ Church, Oxford, speaking of Durham's Report, says: "Based upon this Report the Reunion Act was passed in 1840, and under it Canada won, though not at once, that full measure of "responsible government" which is the characteristic feature of the greater English colonies of today. It is possibly the most important service which Canada has rendered to the Empire that from her constitutional struggles arose that form of complete self-government under which the unity of the Empire is reconciled with the practical independence of its daughter communities." (Applause.)

For myself, I pray Canada will always remain within the Empire. (Hear, hear and applause.)

Self-government was denied the thirteen American colonies; they revolted. It was granted to the Canadas, and they became enthusiastic supporters of the Empire. The principle was carried from the far North down under the Southern Cross, and Australia, too, became a great Imperialist. No sooner was South Africa subdued, than the people were entrusted with free parliamentary government. They were for the most part a conquered race: in a night they became Imperialists. These three great self-governing entities are the chief partners in the Empire.

The British Empire is built up on the foundation rock of self-government, and lives. The Roman Empire was built upon the basis of centralization, and, though it ruled the whole world it died. Gone, too, are all the older Empires of the world, and for the same reason.

Canada blazed the trail. Durham's doctrine was "a recognition based on knowledge, inspired by sympathy, that the authority of the Mother Country rested on other than material ascendancy. He appealed to the sentiments and ideals of men, and laid four square to all the winds that blow the foundations not only of a great Dominion, which he did not live to see, but

also of that passionate loyalty which served England well in recent years of warfare and peril."

"That government alone is strong which has the hearts of the people," said Fox. "Canada will one day do justice to my memory," were the dying words of Durham. The day has surely come, and the hearts of Canadians, strong in his faith, will ever keep his memory green. Bold and large as were his plans, he builded better than he knew: he built an Empire.

(Jan. 29, 1914.)

The Taft Banquet.*

AT a special banquet in the King Edward Hotel, at which the guests of honor were ex-President William H Taft, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Sir John Willison, and Dr. James A. Macdonald, the President, Mr. John R. Bone, in his introductory speech, said:

Your Honor, Mr. Taft and Gentlemen: We are assembled here to-night to do honor to a man distinguished in politics and a man of great personal charm—(hear, hear)—who has enjoyed about all of honor and power that this world has to offer. When he comes to us in his private capacity, we welcome him not only for his individual merits but as the representative of a great nation—our neighbors. (Applause.) There have been many occasions when Canadian public men have appeared at functions of this character in United States, but the occasions when Canadians have had the opportunity of welcoming and entertaining distinguished American statesmen have been rare. We hope that to-day marks a new era in that respect. (Hear, hear.) Let us have, at least in social intercourse, shall I say, reciprocity. (Laughter.)

The reins of the office which our guest has recently laid down is probably the most remarkable office in the world. (Hear, hear.) As President of the United States he had no crown, he had no titles of nobility to distribute, he had no titles even for himself, he had no official dress, no insignia of office, no guards, no chamberlain, no gentlemen-in-waiting. His features do not even grace a coin or a postage stamp—

* The Hon. W. H. Taft, former President of United States, made his first visit to Toronto on this date. The Club tendered him a public banquet as a tribute to the distinguished place he occupied in the United States, to his standing as a jurist and to those remarkable personal characteristics which endeared him to all who heard him.

Sir John Willison is one of Canada's best known newspaper men. The high place he occupies in the profession he has followed all his life was recognized by His Majesty the King, who conferred Knighthood upon him two years ago.

Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is one of Canada's most distinguished Irish Canadians. After many years of service in the House of Commons, and as Minister of Justice in the Laurier administration he was appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, which position he now fills with honour and ability.

Dr. J. A. Macdonald is widely known as the editor of the Toronto "Globe," and has an international reputation as a speaker. He has been prominent in the Peace Movement both in the old and new world.

(applause)—and yet he enjoyed a greater authority than any European king. (Hear, hear.) He had vested in his person the central executive power of ninety millions of people. If unhappily his country had been at war, he would as Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy have become a virtual dictator. It is said that Lincoln exercised a more absolute authority than any Englishman from the days of Oliver Cromwell. And in these days the contrast is scarcely less striking. While it has become the undoubted duty of the English King to assent, as a matter of form, to every measure passed by the British parliament—Home Rule included—(laughter)—it is none the less the undoubted duty of the American President to exercise his independent judgment on every measure which comes before him; and it is recorded that one President exercised the veto power no less than three hundred and one separate occasions. It ought to be added, and our friend the American consul will pardon me for reminding him, that this President was a democrat. (Laughter.)

In the words of an authority competent to judge, the office of President is the greatest in the world if we except the Pope, to which a man can rise by his own merits. We are here to welcome a man who has held this glittering prize, and if he had a tinge of cynicism in his disposition he could tell us how great or how small is this greatest prize. I am sure we all welcome this opportunity, which is a unique opportunity, of emphasizing the cordial relations that exist between Canada and the United States—(hear, hear)—between the British Empire and the United States, the world's greatest Empire and the world's greatest republic, with Canada as the point of contact between the two. There may have been occasions when we have been disposed to be critical of our neighbors, when we were disposed to question their good judgment. Perhaps our guest can recall an occasion when he was even inclined to their good judgment. Perhaps we were in the wrong sometimes when they have objected. But in any case, as Sir Edward Grey recently so happily expressed it, when we disagree with Americans we disagree in the same language. (Applause.) We do not need to call on any foreign interpreter to tell us what we are trying to say to each other. There have been occasions when the relations between the two countries were disturbed by political propaganda. It took a few of our people a long time to learn that Providence intended us to be two nations on this North American continent, that Providence had a definite purpose in setting down these Great Lakes where they are—although I do not know that Providence had anything to do with the 49th parallel or the Maine

boundary. (Laughter.) But happily these times are long since past, and we can now give expression to sentiments of warmest friendship without the danger of being misunderstood.

There have been occasions when Canada felt that her interests did not receive proper consideration at Washington, occasions when she thought they did not receive proper consideration in England; and in this connection I would say, I would remind you, if I may do so without presumption, that nations, like individuals, are masters of their own destinies, and that Canada will have just that standing and that influence at Washington or London or elsewhere, her interests will receive just that consideration to which Canada is entitled by reason not only of her physical strength, but of those finer qualities of mind and heart and soul which are growing more and more worth while.

A great fellow-countryman of our guest has said: "There is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance, that imitation is suicide." I would apply the words of the philosopher of Concord to nations, and say that for every nation "envy is ignorance, imitation is suicide," and that the quicker a nation scorns imitation, smothering all baser feelings and developing a sane, confident self-reliance, meeting other nations with a level eye, neither boastful nor timorous, shirking no responsibilities, seeking no favors,—the quicker will that nation command the general respect which the possession of similar qualities commands for the individual.

One hundred years ago to-night there clustered not far from this spot where we are now gathered a little colony of log cabins nestling in the forest. They gave shelter and rude comforts of the frontier to about one thousand souls all told. That little centre of population was even then the capital of Upper Canada, but it was a capital of equivocal standing. Some of its public buildings lay in ashes. Its very existence was threatened. The country was in a state of war. It is our boast from that time until this peace has prevailed. But I do not know that it is anything we need boast about. If at any time there had been in that period anything else but peace, it would have been to the lasting disgrace of the parties responsible. Two neighbors are not worthy of particular praise because they are able to live side by side without flying at each others' throats every time they meet, without lying in wait every dark night to sandbag each other. Good-neighborliness requires some more positive manifestation than the mere abstention from these things. And the object lesson which

Canada and the United States can give and are giving to the world is not merely an object lesson in peace. It is an object lesson in friendship and amity, showing how two neighboring states may live side by side, each recognizing the other's individuality with whatever of quirks and crotchets it may contain, each recognizing the common interests that bind them together, the problems that are common to both, recognizing not merely their common heritage of laws and ideals and religion, not merely the community of interest they have in certain matters of high politics, but recognizing also and rejoicing in our community of interest in the transcendent problem of life, the problem of making this world a better place to live in, the problem of distributing a little more sunshine to the masses of mankind.

Now, gentlemen, I have been transgressing——

Sir John Willison: Go ahead.

Mr Bone: We are honored by having with us to-night in addition to Mr. Taft, three fellow-Canadians, each of whom representing a particular department of thought and activity, adds distinction and significance to this occasion. First, I have to announce that Hon. W. T. White, whose name appears on the program, has been detained at his home through illness. When he accepted our invitation he told us of the anticipated pleasure he had in expecting to be with us as an old friend of the Canadian Club of Toronto and as a representative of the Dominion Government, to assist us in welcoming our distinguished visitor from across the border. He assured us that no cares of office, no duties of the session, no tactics of an unscrupulous opposition——(hear, hear and laughter)——would prevent him from being with us. Unfortunately, we did not foresee the possibility of illness, but we can rejoice in reports from Ottawa that he is making progress towards recovery. I will not apologize for the gentleman who is going to take his place, although I might describe him as an added attraction. I have to introduce Sir John Willison.

Sir John Willison said: *Your Honor, Mr. President, Mr. Taft and Gentlemen*: I have listened with interest to the Chairman's references to myself, and I have only this to say that if it be true, as I was taught in my youth, that we have to give account for every idle word we say, I am sorry for him. (Laughter.)

Now, a word in explanation is necessary at the outset. I appear tonight, as the Chairman has said, as an unworthy substitute for the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Bone: I did not say that.

Sir John Willison: Owing to a passing illness he could not come to Toronto to bear tribute to a man who has had almost every human experience that a man may have, and he has kept himself unspoiled, unembittered and untouched by the pomp and pride which surround those who occupy high places. (Applause.) Unfortunately it was not possible that the Prime Minister could assume the duty which the Minister of Finance was expected to discharge. Not only is he at the threshold of an arduous parliamentary session, but he is similarly afflicted as was Job, and as have been other good men whom the gods love. (Laughter.) But I have no doubt, judging from the record, they did not include the management of Congress or of an imaginative House of Commons and an intractable Senate. (Laughter.) And probably our guest will agree that there are greater worries in the world than any that Job experienced. It is all right to say in justice to myself that I have no responsibility for the temporary indisposition of Ministers. Although I have just returned from Ottawa, I did nothing to add to their trials and difficulties in order that I might have this very brief moment of glory and you this long moment of martyrdom. There was a vacant seat in the Senate, there was a High Commissionership unfilled, there was a prospective Lieutenant-Governorship, and who should be nearer the succession than I am at this moment? (Laughter.)

Mr. Bone: Carried.

Sir John Willison: I said nothing. (Laughter.) I sent out no runners. I dug no trenches. On the contrary, I actually beamed with goodwill in order that the Ministers might not fear approaching me. (Laughter.) While I thought I saw the trail of those who were seeking office, I could not discover any office that was seeking the man. Unfortunately, Sir, it was not even recognized that the man was there, so I came back to Toronto. (Laughter.)

Mr. President and Gentlemen, in fitting myself for this duty I had to do some hard labor. I found I had nothing available for this emergency. (Laughter.) Looking back for two or three years over the files of the irreproachable journal I am connected with, I found many references to our distinguished guest, but nothing that was absolutely suitable for this occasion. (Laughter.) I found an extraordinary amount of black type, and occasionally a line of brilliant red type across the page. I do not quite know why red type is so much more impetuous and aggressive than black type. I suppose it suggests the thin red line and raises the suspicion

that Colonel Sam. Hughes may be in the offing. But, as the poet has said, "We may rise on our 'red' selves to higher things." It didn't take me long to discover when I got into these files that this prodigal display of type indicated a general election, and it took me even less time to discover that I would never get the material for a speech for tonight in that atmosphere.

During the last Presidential election I crossed the United States from Detroit to San Francisco, and while I want to be cautious, it did seem to me that I occasionally read statements in the American press and utterances from the platform which suggested just a shade of feeling, having a suspicion of partisanship. But, Sir, in Canada, as we approach a general election our opponents sink to unexpected depths of depravity, and large type and a more exuberant rhetoric are required to save the common country. (Laughter.)

Perhaps our distinguished guest discovered long ago that we English-speaking Canadians were the Scotch of the New World, and for a long time we have invaded the United States as the Scots for centuries invaded England, sitting unobtrusively in the desirable places with emoluments, acquiring positions in a lowly spirit of Christian resignation and so combining thrift with foresight and so adjusting morality to truth (laughter and applause) as to regard alike the maxims of the moralists with the practices of the malefactors. I have no doubt that if the secret should be disclosed, the provision in the Constitution reserving the Presidency to native born Americans was adopted as a precaution against Canadians. Nothing perhaps so clearly reveals the prophetic insight of the authors of the American constitution, whose idea was not to mar the only safeguard against ultimate Canadian ascendancy, and the substitution of a monarchy. Which they feared most they are too wise and prudent to reveal.

Mr. President and gentlemen, the attitude of many Canadians towards the United States provides a curious study in human emotions. We are filled with veiled enjoyment when American policies excite the resentment of other nations. But if our great neighbor, and I am sure we are all conscious of the fact, if our great neighbor should ever be in real trouble, we would go with filled hearts and filled hands for any service that we could render. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We agree, Sir, that Old Glory often flies with just a little too much complacency over summer cottages in Canada, but we feel a thrill of common pride and common kinship when it is carried through our streets in these fraternal celebrations

which are becoming so common in both countries. In short we have all the foolishness and all the fondness which give interest and variety to family relationships. So should we ever reflect that in so far as there is misunderstanding between these two countries, the faults lie back in history, and there is nothing so fatuous and foolish as stirring the ashes of dead fires and cherishing the grievances of other centuries. (Hear, hear.) The truth of history is always slowly revealed. Almost always the judgments of the passing generations are obscured with prejudices, but if you will permit a prophecy, I venture to say this, that in the final judgment of history it will be established that there was nothing in the policy of Great Britain to justify the American revolution. (Laughter.) And I do not think faults of British policy lie behind the war of 1812. They were connected with the struggle of Great Britain to preserve the peace and to preserve the freedom of Europe, but for the estranging anger and bitterness which followed the civil war of the 60's, the great responsibility rests upon British journals and upon British statesmen. We all have something to forgive and something to forget, or better still to remember for discipline and for warning.

It is inevitable, Sir, that our attention should centre upon the faults rather than upon the virtues of free institutions. In that way we blaze the path of human progress. Knowledge comes and wisdom lingers. But wisdom is on the way. Is it not true that most of those who despair of democratic government have never set their hands to the task? They are content to sneer at those who sweat out their lives in the public service (hear, hear), but even they are the beneficiaries of the weaknesses and the rascalities which they deplore. But democratic government still has this: it is true that the great mass of the people desire the good of the state, and that the great majority of public men of one party or the other party, or of no party, are actuated by high motives, and apply their best knowledge and judgment to the problems they have to consider. I offer you as the best fruit of free government in North America the long roll of Presidents of the United States and Prime Ministers of Canada, and if it be true, as I believe, that no man of mean character can rise to either office, then it is the people who fix the standard and determine that only such men as these shall occupy these high places. (Applause.)

We have here tonight one who has exercised authority over nearly one hundred millions of people; who has held high judicial positions; who has administered a great de-

pendency, but who has kept his hands clean and his life sweet, (loud applause), and whose ultimate place in history will shame the minor judgments of his own time. (Applause.) I do not suggest, Sir, that he holds a poor place in the estimation of his contemporaries, for it becomes abundantly manifest, more manifest with every week and every month that passes, as his character becomes more clearly understood, his purposes become more clearly revealed, his wisdom is more signally demonstrated, that he holds and deserves a secure place in the affections and confidence of his fellow countrymen. I offer you as the product and triumph of free institutions our guest of tonight. We rejoice that he has come to Canada with a message of good will (applause), and because he has come among us there will be keener sympathies and warmer attachments between ourselves and our neighbors.

Gentlemen, for the privilege of speaking to you just for these moments I am grateful. I am grateful for your attention. I rejoice in the occasion which has brought us together, and I feel that the welfare, position and security of this continent to which we belong, and—whether upon one side of the boundary or the other—in which we have an immense and just pride, I feel that all good things and all good purposes will be advanced and strengthened by the visit of Mr. Taft. May he come to us often again, and many other representative American statesmen follow with him. (Loud applause.)

Right Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, said: *Your Honor, Mr. Taft, Mr. President and Gentlemen*,—I wish to express my thanks to you all for the opportunity to be present at this reception to one of the foremost citizens of the United States, to a man who, having stood long in the fierce light that beats upon the Throne, commands the esteem, confidence and respect of those who have the privilege of his acquaintance or who are at all familiar with the history of his country in the making of which he has, in recent years, taken such a very large and important part.

There are many things one would like to say about your guest, if he were absent, which, for obvious reasons, I hesitate to repeat to his face. I do not know that he is a very ardent admirer of that policy which is usually associated with a free use of the big stick, but I have seen him swing a club on the golf links at Murray Bay and I know what happens to the ball when he does not by chance miss it. (Laughter.)

As a lawyer, a judge of the Circuit Court, a member of the Executive, a governor of the Philippines and as President of the United States, Mr. Taft's name must forever remain inseparably associated with some of the most important phases in the development of the national life of the Great Republic. Joseph De Maistre, the well known French writer, speaking many years ago of the United States and of the perils incident to a Republican form of Government, said: "Laissez grandir cet enfant encore au berceau." If the child has successfully traversed the early stages of its development, has emerged, so to speak, from the nursery and the school room, has successfully weathered the storm and stress of civil war, and now stands forth, in the full glory of its splendid manhood "four square to all the winds that blow," it is due in large measure to the patient toil, to the far-seeing statesmanship, to the self-sacrificing spirit of such men as Mr. Taft. I am well within the limits of historical truth when I add that not only the citizens of the United States, but the people of the world owe him a debt of gratitude deep and lasting, not only for his work of constructive statesmanship, but above all for the splendid example he has given us of fortitude in adverse circumstances and of the highest courage of which man is capable that of giving testimony even to his own undoing for the honest convictions of his soul.

Your guest, in conditions to which it would not now be proper to refer, came down from the highest position to which a citizen of any country may to-day aspire to take his place in the ranks of those who earn their daily bread in useful occupations, and this without an audible sigh, an uttered regret or a word of reproach to those from whom he was entitled to expect different treatment. His useful life is not, however, at an end; having laid down the sceptre, he has taken up the torch to light up to others the path of duty in which he has stood so long. (Hear, hear.)

Realizing all the truth of Webster's saying "that the greatest abiding interest of any nation is the law, the settled honest administration of the law," Mr. Taft has gone to one of America's great Law Schools where, by precept and example, he is giving himself up to the noblest of all occupations, that of teaching the youth of his country how to acquire knowledge and develop courage and above all, to practise it, to realize all the nobility of the beautiful sentiment expressed in Schiller's line "Life itself is not the highest good." Mr. Taft is no longer the Chief Executive of the United States, but he is President of the American Bar Association, and he

must find comfort and solace in the thought that those who know him best appreciate and love him most, as was recently said of another. The good opinion of those with whom we have worked and against whom we have contended from the first early struggles of youth on through the best years of life is an incomparably more precious possession than the estimate formed of us by the world outside—a world which knows our virtues and our faults only by repute and at second hand, and which judges men as a rule, not over the whole course of their conduct, but on some particular incident which, at a dramatic moment, has happened to come within the circle of the lime light.

Coming now to the topic which seems to be the subject of thought uppermost in the minds of all at such functions as this, viz., the relations of the British Empire and the American Republic, I fear that I must strike a somewhat discordant note. Although I concede to no man a greater desire to maintain the most harmonious relations between the two countries—many of my relations owe allegiance to the United States and some of my dearest friends are citizens of that country,—but I am not of those who believe “*que tout est pour le mieux dans le meilleur des mondes.*” Our apparently friendly relations do not seem to stand the test of everyday experience. Occasionally, as in Manilla Bay, if a fight is on, a gun is trained or a British cheer is heard to make manifest the good feeling for the United States that lies dormant in the breast of every Britisher “just as mechanism sleeps in silence till the touch comes that wakens it into sound.” But in our daily intercourse, there seems to be something lacking. I am of opinion that much that is said about the presumed friendly relations which are alleged to exist between the people of the two countries is predicated upon false ideas. We talk about celebrating a century of peace between the two countries as if the millennium had arrived. “Let us not be blinded by visions of ‘Golden Ages’ or by delusions of the future and the past.” To talk of peace, of universal peace, in the abstract, is to ignore the lessons of history. Please do not attribute this sentiment to that pugnacity which is presumed to be the characteristic of every Irishman. The cry for peace is an old world cry, but how often has it been heard, and when was there peace in the world? Think of the Temple of Janus at Rome. How often were its doors closed? De Maistre says: “*Depuis le jour où Cain tua Abel, il y a toujours eu ça et là, sur la surface de la terre, des mares de sang que ne peuvent dessécher ni les vents avec leurs brûlantes haleines*

ni le soleil avec tous ses feux." It is a fact in nature: the life of man is a constant conflict, a continuous fight. From the cradle to the grave, man is engaged in a ceaseless, never ending struggle—against disease, for subsistence; against his passions, for virtue. Peace, perfect peace can only be had when conflict ends at the approach of death. The graveyard is the only place when one ceases from conflict and, therefore, enters into perfect peace.

The history of the individual is the history of the community and of the nation. I am not a militarist, although I believe with Tacitus "*miseram pacem vel bello bene mutari*" that a miserable peace may well be exchanged even for war, I never fired a shot in anger, the trappings of war do not appeal to me, the sight of human blood sends a shudder through my veins—but man with his passions, his avarice, his ambition, his lust, must be taken for what he is, and nations are men in the aggregate. I recall the impression made on me by the picture which I saw on the cover of a French magazine at the time the Palace of Peace was inaugurated at the Hague. On one side, was the Palace in all its barbaric splendor and on the other, the smoking ruins of an Albanian village during the recent Balkan war. The contrast was suggestive and instructive.

If you can stand a further shock, there is another myth to which perhaps you will pardon a brief reference. I constantly hear that a war between the two countries is unthinkable, because it would be fratricidal, for it is said, the United States and our Empire are two Anglo-Saxon countries, bound together by ties of blood, language, literature, traditions. Was there ever a greater fallacy? Of the 90 or 100 millions of people in the United States how many are of Anglo-Saxon ancestry? Am I well within the limits when I answer: only a relatively small percentage. It is quite true that, for the moment, English is the dominant language in both countries and, to a large extent, we have a common literature, but the traditions and historical background of the United States vary with different communities. To the great majority, traditions go back to the Revolutionary period with its legacy of ill-feeling and misunderstanding. The Declaration of Independence was inspired, to a larger extent, by the "Rights of Man" and the "Contrat Social" than by Magna Charta and the monarchical principle of the English Constitution. I have no doubt that many of you are shocked by this plain speaking, but did time permit, I could make good all that I have said and deliberately said. I do not use this language be-

cause I have anything in common with the Jingoës, Heaven forbid!—but because I honestly love my country as I sincerely respect the United States, and I know how important it is, not only from the narrow standpoint of the selfish interest of those two nations, but from the broader point of view of the interest of mankind, that there should be peace between them. But no good or great object was ever attained by loose and inaccurate thinking and speaking. We have much in common, in addition to language and literature. We have the bond of the English Common Law based, as it is, upon the sound foundation of Divine Justice applied to the affairs of men with a leaven of the logical system inherited from old France. We have many mutual interests and ties of kindred, but there is only one enduring foundation upon which Peace can rest, and that is the foundation of mutual respect and confidence. We must respect our neighbor's vineyard and be tolerant even of his prejudices. We must guarantee equal rights to unequal possessions, equal justice to the strong and the weak. (Hear, hear.) The old Roman maxim "*Audi alteram partem*" coupled with the rule "to stop, look and listen" applicable in railway crossing cases has a special place in international relations. I discovered this on two occasions: first at the Hague, when I sat as a member of the Tribunal which heard the Newfoundland Fisheries Reference. After listening to Sir Robert Finlay, I thought there was only one side to the question, but when Mr. Root sat down, I fully realized how men may differ in the construction of our international treaties. Recently I had another experience which drove the same truth forcibly home: I was present at the Canadian Club, Ottawa, when a distinguished member of the American Bar was the speaker. He chose for his subject the Panama Canal Tolls, and let me assure you that when he finished his calm logical exposition of that question from the United States side, there was not a man present who did not feel satisfied that there were two sides to it.

No one has done more to promote the cause of International Arbitration than your honored guest, and no man can do more to promote and foster a feeling of mutual respect and forbearance between our two countries. You, on your side, Gentlemen of the Canadian Club, have a duty to perform. Two nations with 3,000 miles of frontier and inland oceans and rivers held practically in common, must necessarily rub elbows at many points: under such conditions, friction is inevitable, controversies must arise, and when they do, remember the maxims "Hear the other side," "stop, look

and listen," before indulging in harsh language or unfair criticism. Teach our people that, as there are two sides to every controversy, we cannot expect both parties to look at the question in dispute from the same angle. This holds good, let me say, not only in international, but also in interprovincial relations. No one element in this country and no one country among the nations of the earth has a monopoly of intelligence, learning, patriotism and honesty. Let us always remember that if wisdom and justice in policy are a stronger security than weight of armament, the language of passion, the language of sarcasm, the language of satire serves merely to arouse mischievous passions—holding in mind, however, that armaments are a necessary evil. (Applause.)

Reverting again to our relations with the United States, let me say this final word: our proximity may have its disadvantages, but there are compensations. Living within the shadow of a country with a population of 90 or 100 millions, we must not be surprised if occasionally the rays of the sun which shines for all are shut out from us. We have this compensating advantage that there is no place in the world in which more is attempted to better the political, social and industrial conditions under which men, women and children live, and these conditions are so much alike in the two countries that we must largely benefit by their success and their failures. Gentlemen, all is not profligacy and corruption in the political, municipal and social life of the United States any more than with ourselves. Those of us who go to New York, for instance, may see the seamy side of things crudely exposed—perhaps we find what we are looking for—on the other hand, there are the hospitals, the schools, the improved tenement houses, the libraries, the museums, the picture galleries, all making for the uplifting of man and his physical and moral improvement.

I recall some years ago when in Italy I visited the aquarium at Naples and in conversation with another tourist asked if there was anywhere a finer collection of specimens from the deep.

"There is only one better," I was told.

"In New York there is an aquarium which is second to none in the world." And yet how little do we know of what is being actually accomplished almost in our midst.

As making also for better and closer relation between our two countries, we have the ceaseless ebb and flow of population south and north—north and south—thousands each year bring the new land memories of their old home and friends.

Let me conclude with this quotation from Russell's speech on International Law at Saratoga:

"Mr. President, I began by speaking of the two great divisions—American and British—of that English speaking world which you and I represent to-day, and with one more reference to them I end."

"Who can doubt the influence they possess for ensuring the healthy progress and the peace of mankind? But if this influence is to be fully felt, they must work together in cordial friendship, each people in its own sphere of action. If they have great power, they have also great responsibility. No cause they espouse can fail; no cause they oppose can triumph. The future is, in large part, theirs. They have the making of history in the times that are to come. The greatest calamity that could befall would be strife which should divide them.

"Let us pray that this shall never be. Let us pray that they, always self-respecting, each in honour upholding its own flag, safeguarding its own heritage of right and respecting the rights of others, each in its own way fulfilling its high national destiny, shall yet work in harmony for the progress and the peace of the world." (Loud applause.)

Dr. J. A. Macdonald said: *Mr. President, Your Honor, Mr. Taft and Gentlemen*,—The time allotted to me I would gladly surrender to our guest of the evening. But I recall that ever since two o'clock this afternoon Mr. Taft has been on his feet almost continuously making speeches. A chance at "tired nature's sweet restorer" would no doubt be grateful to him. As it is not my intention to express any personal opinions about him, good, bad or indifferent, the next twenty minutes would be for him a perfectly safe opportunity for "balmy sleep." I feel under no obligation, such as pressed upon Sir Charles Fitzpatrick and Sir John Willison, either to defend Mr. Taft's record or to justify my own. No recorded words of mine would be out of tune with the genial courtesies of this occasion. I turn, rather, to the duty assigned to me as a member of this Canadian Club: the duty of speaking some words in the presence of our distinguished guest on the Significance of Canada's Imperial Relations.

We may not all agree as to Canada's Imperial relations, or as to their significance. Were Imperial relations mechanical and artificial, and were Canada a dead thing without will or power, a mere pawn on the board, there would be no room for difference of opinion. But in a situation of life and growth and constant change, and dealing with matters and movements that have absolutely no precedent or example in

all history, it is inevitable that differences should arise, alike as to the relative importance of facts and as to their real significance. There are, however, some few things which seem to be pertinent and which one may venture to express on this occasion.

I. Canada's Imperial relations have been and still are of Canada's own choosing. I have sometimes been asked by Americans if Canada is not ready to join the United States in one great continental republic. Not long ago the question was put in all seriousness in this form: How long before Canadians will demand their freedom?

People who so think do not know that the world has moved since the Declaration of American Independence. They do not understand what changes the past century wrought—changes in Britain, changes in America, changes in the world, changes in the whole conception of national freedom and in the ideals of national life. They have not measured the real significance, the world significance, of the movement that led to the independence of the American Colonies in the 18th century. Least of all do they appreciate the thing done by Canada, the unique thing, the original thing, the world-changing thing done by Canada in the 19th century.

We are sometimes told that Canada has nothing to her credit in the political history of the world: that everything Canadian is due to Britain: that this Dominion has been a non-productive beneficiary of Imperial advantages. My answer to all that humiliating talk is this: were it not for what was done by a former generation of Canadians, Canada might not to-day be a part of the Empire. And this must be added: Had Canada made the other choice, the British Empire as the world to-day knows it could not have been.

Looked back upon from our vantage point of clearer vision those were crisis-days when the struggle for self-government was on in Canada. That struggle had to come to these Provinces as it came to the American Colonias a century earlier. Men of the British breed gathered into communities overseas in which they made their homes could not but feel the throb of the Anglo-Saxon impulse. With all due respect to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, and with respect, too, for the grateful fact that in my own blood, as in his, there is no Sassenach strain, I use deliberately the words "Anglo-Saxon." Sir Charles warned us that "a relatively small percentage of the people of the United States are of Anglo-Saxon ancestry." What matter? That percentage in numbers may be small, and in other respects its influence

may be insignificant, but my observation, in all parts of the American Republic, is that the United States to this day, even as Canada, is directed and dominated, in all controlling ideals and movements of government, by that subtle something which through the centuries has stirred in the Anglo-Saxon blood, and which I venture to call the Anglo-Saxon impulse. (Hear, hear.)

That impulse everywhere and forever makes for personal liberty and for the community rights of self-government. For the American Colonies, liberty and the rights of self-government meant separation from the Mother Country and the loss of that national background running back through a thousand years. There was no other way known to history. Never in all history did any colony of any empire come to national self-government except by cutting the painter and striking for independence. Washington, Franklin and the rest took the only way at that time known to statesmen.

Then in the 19th century came Canada's day of decision. It was a long and stormy day. No man saw clearly. There was no blazed trail. No people had ever gone from colonial subjection to national self-government except by one road—the road of separation. There were those in Canada who believed that self-government must take that one road of separation, and they fought against it. These were those who even at that cost were ready to take it. In Britain statesmen, in both parties, thought the separation of Canada inevitable. They were prepared to grant, not Confederation, but Independence. Beaconsfield and Gladstone both thought what was called confederation and autonomy would lead straight to the independence of Canada.

But in Britain and especially in Canada were statesmen of the farther vision. They saw, dimly, fitfully saw, the rise of a new Canada—a new Canada leading the way for a new Empire. Lyon Mackenzie and Louis Papineau, Baldwin and Lafontaine, George Brown and John A. Macdonald; men of vision, men of courage, men of faith: they went out not knowing whither they went; and by the trails they blazed the people of Canada have come to their own, to their rights of free citizenship, to their responsibilities of national self-government, to their obligations and dignities in Canada's Imperial relations. (Applause.)

And so it has come about that, not by constraint, not by compulsion, but by the free and deliberate choice of Canadians themselves, Canada's Imperial relations are what they are, and in the great days to come shall be what Canadians choose to

make them. (Hear, hear.) Not in tariff and trade merely, not in immigration and citizenship merely, not in defence merely, but in all the great choices of Canadian nationhood the law of the nation stands:

“The gates are mine to open
And the gates are mine to close.”

2. Upon that first point this second follows: Canada's achievement in Imperial relations made for the transformation of Britain's Imperial idea, and for the prestige and the Permanence of the British Empire. On the old lines the Empire could not endure. The old idea of “imperium,” with its centralized sovereignty and its subject states, had no future for sons of the British blood. Its day was done. Unless there came a new idea disintegration was inevitable. The coming of Canada brought that new idea—the idea of national freedom and national autonomy not without but within the Imperial circle. Canada achieved it. After Canada came Australia, then New Zealand, then, only yesterday, South Africa. The four overseas dominions, with self-governing Newfoundland, constitute, with the Mother Country, the great strong right hand of the world-empire of Britain. Those five fingers are bound to that great palm, not by bandages of dependence, not by bonds of compulsion, but by the vital ties of a common blood, a common purpose and a common Imperial will; and, not in the mailed fist of threatening or oppression, but in the handclasp of world friendship, those five fingers all close toward the palm.

3. Canada's Imperial relations give special significance to Canada's American position. On this continent and in relation to the power of English-speaking civilization in North America, Canada stands for more than Canada alone. This Dominion has indeed a part of its own to play, a part which can be played only by Canadian citizens. That part is important to the American Republic and to North American life. But as an integral and constituent factor in the life and power of the British Empire Canada plays a part in America, unmatched by any other nation.

As an expression of what I mean, and as an adequate statement of the significance of international relations in North America, I venture to quote in the presence of our guest a statement made to me in the White House at Washington by the Hon. P. C. Knox, when he was Secretary of State in Mr. Taft's Government. Mr. Taft may remember

the occasion, and perhaps also the words. It was at a time when opinions were being expressed as to the political effect of trade relations between Canada and the United States. Mr. Knox's words were these:

"Instead of us desiring the political union of these two countries it is to our advantage that Canada remain out of the Republic and remain in the Empire. If there were no Canada it would be in the interest of the United States that one should be created and should be made a self-governing nation in the British Empire."

I asked him why? and this was his answer:

"The power of North America to-day is the power of the United States, and the power of Canada, plus the power of Britain. If Canada were separated from the Mother Country, and made either a distinct and independent sovereignty or States in this Republic, there would then be for North America no 'Plus the power of Britain.'"

Sir, for myself as a Canadian I accept that philosophy. I accept that doctrine of American internationalism. And Mr. Taft himself, as I recall his words, made this pertinent comment:

"The situation on the Pacific, which is the large concern of both countries, is a much simpler and much safer proposition for this whole continent because two flags, representing English-speaking civilization, ideals and power are afloat on the Pacific from the Mexican boundary to the North Pole."

It is indeed the Pacific, not the Atlantic, that gives this English-speaking fraternity of North America their chief concern. And to the United States as well as to Canada it is of prime importance that far across the Southern Pacific the Commonwealth of Australia and the Dominion of New Zealand rise up, in the freedom of their young national life, flying aloft the Union Jack of Britain. The Atlantic for us has no secrets, no surprises, but who can tell what mysteries lie hid in the darkness of the Pacific. For this reason, in the days now emerging, the four English-speaking nations fronting on the Pacific, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, under their flags of the Red, White and Blue, must accept their full share of responsibility for preserving the interest of English-speaking citizenship on the Pacific, as through the long centuries Britain has preserved it over the Seven Seas. (Loud applause.)

4. The international relations between Canada and the United States and our common boundary line, unbarbarized by forts or battleships or guns, are of significance, not for these nations alone, but for all the world. That unprecedented and unparalleled fact of 4,000 miles of civilized internationalism is a message to all continents, the supreme message of North America to all the world. What has been done by these proud and ambitious Anglo-Saxon peoples ought not to be impossible in Europe or elsewhere in the civilized world. What does this thing mean? It means this: In this new civilization national rights are respected and national aspirations are given free course. To illustrate and to justify that new doctrine Canada stands up in North America with less than 8,000,000 of people over against the United States with nearly 100,000,000, and for a hundred years has been free and unmolested; and to-day, without a standing army or a "visible" navy, Canada is more secure from war and from war scares than any war nation of Europe. And why? For this reason: the United States and Canada have both learned the meaning of that saying of Canning when he conceived the Monroe doctrine—"every nation for itself and God for us all."

Great Britain and the United States have both illustrated in history, as Mr. Taft so splendidly declared to the Empire Club to-day, that any people that desires to be free and is fit to be free must be given freedom's unfettered chance. That principle is the guiding star of Britain in her dependencies. It guides the United States in relation to the Philippines, to Cuba and to Mexico. Canada stands up to prove it true for all the world. (Applause.)

5. One thing more and I have done. Canada and the United States, facing their responsibility for the development and the defence of English-speaking civilization in North America have need of something more than great armies on shore and huge navies on sea. The supreme question is not: Shall the Oriental nations open their doors to our trade, to our civilization and to our Christian missionaries? Those doors are open now—wide open. Within ten years an absolutely new world situation has been created. In that new situation this is for us the serious question: In the impact of North American life on the nations beyond the Pacific shall our civilization stand? The Armageddon of the Pacific will not be in the clash of brute force but in the clash of vital ideas. The last arbitrament is not the sword of war but the life of the nation. It is ideas against ideas, character against char-

acter, life against life. In that conflict the United States and Canada shall stand or shall fall together. It is our supreme and sacred obligation, men of Canada, men of the United States, Americans all, so to live and so to lead that in the inevitable testing of our nations the ideals of our North American civilization shall stand. (Hear, hear.)

Sir, it is because Mr. Taft believes in the supremacy, not of brute force but of ideas, because he is concerned supremely for the supreme things in our civilization, and because he has done a man's full share in making the civilization of the United States and of Canada a civilized unit, vital, virile, Christian, as North America faces the older civilizations of the world, that you and I and all true Canadians would join in doing him honor to-night. (Cheers and loud applause.)

Mr. Bone: *Your Honor and Gentlemen*,—It is now my pleasure to propose the second and the last toast to-night. I am sure no words of mine can add to the heartiness with which you will respond. It is a toast to a man whose name, even if his career were ended, which it is not—(hear, hear)—because I am sure there are still fresh honors in store for him, is assured of a high place in the pages of history when the smoke of party conflict has passed away. History is generally fair, and history will record that the twenty-seventh President of the United States was a man of rare attainments, who as lawyer, judge, diplomat, governor and President served his country well—(hear, hear)—who left behind him a record of distinct achievement, who very materially increased the prestige of the United States in his relations with foreign countries, Canada included. He was actuated by a desire not only to serve his own people, but by sentiments of friendship and good will to all to improve her connection with other powers. He is a man of likeable personality, filled with human sympathy, and a sincere gentleman, and in asking you to drink his health I beg to assure him that we do it, not as absolute strangers, but as friends.

Hon. William Howard Taft: *Mr. Chairman, Your Honor and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of Toronto*,—I feel as though what I were about to say was anti-climax from the great speeches which we have heard. I feel as though you were entitled to a personal explanation—(laughter)—as though I ought to offer some excuse for the very strenuous life that my presence in your midst has brought to some very worthy men.

I begin with that delightful gentleman, that fine lawyer, that father and that host, who has made my stay in Toronto

full of the utmost pleasure, His Honor Sir John Gibson, Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. (Applause.) They have taken me into Government House, and if all Government Houses and all families in Government Houses are as this one, I intend to solicit invitations to all Government Houses. (Laughter.)

I do not know how I have got into this. My recollection is that it was the President of Toronto University who took the first step. He seemed to think that he had a society on his hands. I do not know whether it was altogether a wise step of inviting somebody from beyond the border to talk to the boys and girls. But after that came the Empire Club, and after that the Canadian Club, and then the Women's Canadian Club, and I do not know how many other clubs I would have had the opportunity of speaking to if there had been forty-eight hours rather than twenty-four. (Laughter.) But I have enjoyed every minute of it, and the only thing that had detracted from that pleasure is the consciousness that my being here has interfered with the proper administration of the Provincial Government and that proper attention on the part of the University officials to the duties they ought to discharge, and in addition to have the pleasure of these various Ministers of the Government who have honored me by their presence at some of the numerous entertainments where I have had to inflict a few observations on the victims that were gathered before me.

Now there are a great many things that I will contemplate in this visit. One of them is brought up by the kindly remarks of Sir John Willison. In the first place, Sir John pictured himself in the capital of the Dominion with a number of vacant offices there seeking the men. He reminded me of a story that I heard in Kentucky when I was in the respectable business of being a judge. (Laughter.) They once elected a Republican governor in Kentucky. There is part of Kentucky that has always been Republican, the mountain part, and where they have been voting for Republican candidates for years and years and years, and finally Providence intervened and gave them a Republican governor. Then there started down from the mountains an old man called Zeke Carter, who had been a thorough Republican and had voted and voted and voted but all to no purpose, and finally the kingdom had come. He mounted his old mare and drove down to Franklin, and intimated to the authorities that having been a supporter of the Republican party they ought to recognize that with an office. He put up at the Capital Hotel

for about ten days. Then looking at his vanishing bank roll he moved to a boarding house. He spent some ten days there, and then he took to sleeping where he could, and pursuing what we call in our country—I do not believe you have it in yours—the free lunch route. But finally, after he had had a number of conferences with a great many leading Republicans, he heard from them that they did not propose to maintain the spoils policy of the Democratic party. They were introducing a reform in which the office was seeking the man. Well, his free lunch route gave out and he had to give up. He mounted his old mare, and as he went through the town he passed before the Capital Hotel, where he saw seated a good many people with whom he had made acquaintance during his stay, and they called out to him, asking where he was going. He said, "I am going home. My money has run out and I cannot stay. I have heard a good deal of talk about the office seeking the man here, but I have not seen any office seeking the man. If any of you fellows see any office seeking the man I wish you would tell it that you just saw old Zeke Carter on the Versailles Turnpike mounted on his old mare, and he is going damn slow." (Laughter.) Some of us who have been in political life know how Zeke felt.

I had occasion to make a few remarks in Montreal at the meeting of the American Bar Association, and perhaps I can repeat a sentiment that I there expressed. You never get quite close to a man as a friend until you have had a row with him. Until he calls you names and until you call him names, and you get filled with that frank expression in a controversy that develops heat, and after that you can come to the most pleasant and loving terms. I got so used in my own country to that sort of friendship (laughter) that when I encountered the same kindly treatment in Canada I was at home.

The Chairman in his very pleasantly and ably conceived speech in the opening to-night referred to the Presidency and the power of that office. That is what met me everywhere I went in the United States. I was told it was the most powerful office in the world, and I suppose it is. But when you hold it you do not realize it. (Laughter.) You are always thinking about its limitations and not about its powers. It is an office that I would not advise any man to hold unless his epidermis is fairly thick. It is an office that makes you consider at some length the truthfulness of the public press (laughter) and I may add, its accuracy. (Laughter.) But

one of the things you learn is that most of the things that seem hard, most of the things that you think you will never forget are not worth in any degree the worry you give them. (Hear, hear.) The lessons—and there are many lessons—that those of us who have gotten along even as far as I have gone would like to introduce in the heads and into the consciences of every man so that they might learn the truth in the pursuit of happiness and contentment in life. But they have got to have their lessons just as you have and you cannot ever make them conscious of the fact respecting many truths that time spent in thinking how you are going to get even with some man who has done something that you think is worthy of very severe treatment by you is time wasted. (Applause.) Life has so many pleasures, and there is so little time to enjoy them, that there is no use depriving ourselves of comfort and contentment by worrying ourselves over an opportunity to get even with somebody, because you always find, if you are a man that has ever made response to real manly sentiments, that when the opportunity comes to get even you are too much of a man to take advantage of it. And therefore I look back upon my Presidency now, full as it was of worries with the utmost gratitude for the opportunity it gave me and without the slightest feeling toward anybody that had anything to do with making it a trial. (Bravo.)

I do not claim any credit for that. I only claim that it is a discovery that helps to make life in the future a great deal pleasanter, and I hope to make life more useful not only to myself but to other people with whom Providence enables me to live, and in the same degree to contribute to their happiness. (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir John Willison said something about democratic government. I agree with him. What kind of government should we live under if it was not democratic government. How would we feel under a government that we did not have some voice in. I have been told that I did not believe in democratic government, that I am really not in favor of popular government. While time was that I would get excited about that charge, when I would say that a man who said so was a liar, now I would smile and say he was not correct in his statement. I have got along far enough now to be able to say just what I think about popular government and to introduce some slight qualifications with reference to its usefulness, and the necessity of placing restraint upon the majority instead of the minority. That I have said and am going to say right along, no matter whether they think I am reac-

tionary or a man that does not believe in popular government or not, because I know differently. I think and believe that those of us who understand popular government and know what will work out for the permanent good of humanity and insist upon having these elements in it are the real friends of popular government and are those who are anxious to make it beneficial to the human race.

Now, at the Empire Club I talked about the Empire. Tonight I would talk about democratic government. Canada and the United States have much in common in that regard. We in making government more responsible for the happiness of the people are going to make government more democratic and are introducing two elements that make success more difficult.

We have dropped the laissez faire idea that the only good government is that which governs the least, and we have come to think that there is much that a government can do, and ought to do to help along all the people and thereby to make life lighter and easier for those who are unfortunate in the race—an object we must have if we are going to make progress in the human race; and therefore we are imposing on government a greater and greater burden. It is more expensive and it requires greater and greater ability to administer a government on that plan successfully. It requires efficiency, and it requires experience. You do not employ a lawyer to build a bridge; you do not employ a doctor to construct a railway. You employ in your private business the men who are trained by their experience to do the things you wish done. We cannot get on in government unless we proceed in the same way with reference to those tasks that require expert knowledge.

Now, on the other hand, the democratic spirit at first seems to veer in the direction of assuming that everybody in the community is able to do everything, and do it just as well as everybody else, and perhaps a little better, and we have to curb these two tendencies and bring them together, and it is no easy thing to do, gentlemen.

Encountering now those strong tendencies it seems to me that the cure for those difficulties pressing on democracy is a spirit that tends towards not only equality of opportunity, not only equality of right before the law, but equality of experience, equality of character, and even equality of common sense. (Hear, hear.)

Now, we have been struggling in the United States to introduce a merit system into the civil service. We have got-

ten along fairly well in the Federal government. Of course after one party has been in office fifteen years, the civil service, while theoretically it seems a wonderful thing to speak of, but practically it brings a tremendous strain, and patriots who have been out and fought for fifteen years think a civil service rule is all right, if you will only just give them six months in which to make the necessary changes. I am not complaining of that, Sir. There is something very trying when a party comes into power, finding all the offices filled. But I am hoping that if the good Lord shall arrange it that the Republican party should come back in four years it would not have the same temptation to strain the civil service law as a party that has been out for fifteen years. So that after a while by action and reaction we will get a system such as they have in England, and such as I hope you have here. (Laughter.) Well, I did not mean to trespass on any local prejudice. But in England I think they have it in perfect form. They have permanent Under-Secretaries and from that clear down to the tide waiter everything is governed by merit. (Hear, hear.) There is a solid body of civil servants who go on every day discharging their duties. They are experts in the work they have to do, and the only changes are in the political Under Secretaries and Secretaries, and they, of course, ought to change when the party goes out in order that the policy of the Government may agree with the verdict of the electors.

Now, that is essential not only in the national government, but it is even more essential in municipal government. One thing that has tried our faith in popular government is the failure that we have made in the United States in our municipal government. But I am glad to say there is a new spirit there now, and those who advocate the merit system in local matters are now given a very much better hearing than they were. Now, then in municipal government you need experts quite as much, and indeed a little more than you do in national government. It is the municipal government that looks after our health; it is the municipal government that gives us our transportation; it is the municipal government that gives us our water, our light and everything that goes into the comfort of life. Therefore we should have experts in the government to make it what it ought to be, because every day we are putting greater and greater burdens on that government, and the only way we can do it is by retaining a body of civil servants in the employ of that government who will learn by experience how to discharge their duty. But the positions

must be permanent, and you must pay good salaries, because if you create such positions they will attract the best men in the community towards them. How can you expect to get good officers if you only give them a year, or two years or three years, and then a change takes place and they go out. Of course you are not going to get the best men under such a system. It is a wonder that we ever get good men at all. But the capacity of the Anglo-Saxon for government is such that we have been able to adapt ourselves to some very poor machinery.

There are other problems, too, in a different direction. We can go too far in this matter of adding to the functions of government. The government can do a good deal, but it cannot do everything, and one of the things we have to learn is that legislation cannot make a man over. They are going ahead to do a great many things to-day that they are going to regret they ever attempted to do. They are going into a wave of municipal ownership and operation. I do not object to municipal ownership, but I think municipal operation is a very dangerous experiment. I think we shall find it to be so. We have so many interests, and so many municipalities we can try them on some and then the wiser people can wait and see how it works out, but those who rush ahead can pay the bill. Men can get on the hustings and get into office by offering all sorts of improvements, that the government is going to run everything, and everybody is going to enjoy the millennium of comfort, and they will project some plan to borrow on the bonds of the municipality, but they will find that the interest charged on that wicked Wall Street or elsewhere becomes so high that it increases the taxes, and they learn that high taxes are not just the best platform to go to the people on. (Laughter.) The change that is coming about is an economic change that the government cannot go into an excessive use of public funds and public credit for a lot of things that men would like to do because the government is not fit to carry on a great many enterprises profitably, and the government is not going to be able to convince many people that it can.

It has been a great pleasure for me to hear Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, even if he did cast aspersions at my golf. (Laughter.) That is one of the easiest things to do. Golf is a game that everybody can enjoy, no matter how much of a novice he is, therefore a jest at a man's game is nothing to the purpose because it does not drive him from the game. "Hope springs eternal in the human breast." (Laughter.)

Now, we are getting along very well as between the United States and Canada, and as between the United States and England. It is true that the relations between these two countries and our own country are different from other international relations in this that it is true that the suggestion of war brings a feeling of revulsion in both countries. (Applause.) Of course we have our differences. While we went ahead we were not looking around to see what everybody else was doing. We expanded, and our heads were swelled. Well, we have come to a halt in our expansion, and many of our people are now thinking that money is not everything, and expansion is not everything. There are a good many other things to attend to, and we have got to have a halt to look around and help those who are not so successful in the race, and that feeling has come over the entire country. It is not going to stop us in business, but I am quite sure it has affected the attitude of society towards material growth and material expansion. That there are other things higher and better to look after that ought to command the attention of the people, and the people are going to do it.

Now, on your side it is but natural that as you are in your era of expansion and growth that you should look at us askance, and that you should reason sometimes that we are not paying as much attention to you as you are entitled to—and very often we do not. There is no doubt about that. You have inherited from your Anglo-Saxon ancestors as we did that certain sense of national self-consciousness that might be improved upon. (Laughter.)

I went to the Philippines and came in touch with the Spanish civilization there. There are some difficulties about that civilization which we all recognize and which we are only too willing to point out, and then there are some very striking truths in their system of philosophy. They believe that contentment and happiness is largely made up of small things in life, largely made up by the lubrication of society in manner, and in bearing and in courtesy.

Now, as between the United States and Canada, we have had in times past a good many strains. I am not going back with Sir John Willison to argue over the righteousness of the American Revolution. I am a little bit afraid to do that, because this afternoon when I submitted a few observations of admiration for the British Empire I was told that if I had been living at the time of the revolution, I would have been a United Empire Loyalist. Then I expressed the opinion that I had rather overdone it in what I said about the British Em-

pire. (Laughter.) I am entirely willing to let that revolution stand just where it is. (Laughter.) I am not going back either to discuss the righteousness of the War of 1812 which was conducted for the purpose of freedom of all the world. And my friend Macdonald is wrong about Canning. If he is to bring Canning back he should not do it at the time of the War of 1812. His day did not come until 1820. (Laughter and applause.) I am not going to enter into that discussion either. I am entirely willing to admit that Canning was the first to suggest the principle of the Monroe doctrine, and I beg you to remember, gentlemen, that it came from England, and you can make it mean anything. But we have had a good many strains during that one hundred years of peace. There is the Oregon and Maine boundary business, that was settled by two great statesmen—Daniel Webster and Lord Ashburton. There were a lot of people in the United States who said “fifty-four forty” or fight. Well, they did not fight, and it was not “fifty-four forty” either. Then we come to the Civil War, and that was a great strain, and never as long as I am able to express my view shall I fail to express the gratitude, the deep gratitude that as an American I feel to Her Majesty Queen Victoria for her personal interposition to save the breach between England and the United States in the dark days of the Civil War. (Applause.) Then we had the French ready with their troublous times, and then we had Venezuela, and there we heard some views as to what the Monroe doctrine meant, that we were virtually the sovereign power of this hemisphere, and that our fiat was law. While we do not believe that now (laughter) it was not so then. It was an unfortunate expression. The Monroe doctrine is a very useful doctrine. There are those in the United States who call it an obsolete Shibboleth, and think it ought to be done away with. Well, it has kept our troubles in this hemisphere to ourselves, and it has become a permanent, accepted doctrine not as part of International law, but as something that European powers respect. It is better that we should settle in this country, if we can, our own difficulties. I know some of them seem to be insoluble. I could mention one now. I do not believe you know. You do not always appreciate the benefits that the United States gives Canada. You do not seem to appreciate the great advantage that we offer you in being the buffer between you and some other country. (Laughter.)

Now it takes a lot of different people to make up a nation and a populace. And you cannot make the whole people responsible for the heat of extreme declarations of a part of

the populace. I do not know of any people that does not have a large foreign assortment of—I do not like to call them by an invidious description—but I must say a large and varied assortment of asses, who say a great many things, that, if they were called upon to say if they really meant it would take the hint lest others in the intoxication of the moment might feel it necessary to give prominence to an undoubted use of superlatives, and we are not going to get into a breach on account of these people. (Hear, hear.)

I really believe that there is not any reason, not only that there is no good reason (of course there is no good reason) for any trouble between us or any breach between us. We have settled a great many differences by arbitration, and we are going to settle a lot more. About arbitration, there are some gentlemen in our country that have this view of arbitration. They are strongly in favor of arbitration when they are certain that the arbitration is going to result in their favor. That is not arbitration at all. If you play the game you have to be willing to lose (hear, hear), and there is no use talking of making an agreement to submit an issue to a tribunal if you are not going to take your medicine when you get it, and that is what we are coming to.

Now, there is the question of the Panama tolls. We do not agree among ourselves. Mr. Root and Mr. Choate don't think we have the right, and Mr. Knox and I think we have the right. Now, all I object to is this: I do not mind you saying you have the right; what I object to is that you should say because you have the right you should not be willing to have the issue decided. Now, we do not want to argue what the treaty means. If the treaty means what you think it means, and the issue ever comes (I do not know what the present administration is going to do) but if the issue ever arises, of course it will go to arbitration, and the place I would be glad to leave it, as Sir Charles said to-night, I would be glad to leave it to a tribunal consisting of three Supreme Court Judges of the United States and three members of your Privy Council, and have the lawyers sit as judges. There are those who would fear that a tribunal of this character would be hampered by allegiance to one's country. But I believe the administration of justice should be higher than allegiance to any country. I believe that the judges under our system have a higher appreciation, and come nearer to the highest ideal than that in any other judicial system that I know of. I won't say anything about those who are talking of our building the canal and

managing it, and therefore won't arbitrate anything about it. They are talking through their hats. It is quite true if the issue comes we are going to arbitrate it, and we are going to arbitrate it because we made a treaty in which you are entitled to certain rights in the management of the canal, and whether you are entitled to these rights is not to be determined by whether we built the canal, but because the treaty binds us, and if it does, we are going to live up to it, that is all. But do not be too confident about the treaty. There used to be a lawyer with us who had a great reputation for jury trials, and he said he never was certain of but one case in his life, and that one he lost. (Laughter.)

But I am glad to be here with you, and with the Club. I am glad to meet my friends here. Brother Macdonald and I went down in "one red burial," and I am not going to revive that struggle here. I am not here for that purpose. I do not want to bring back those things into this atmosphere. That is past history. It is one of the things that men who examine details later on will wonder over, that is all. It is a delight to me to be able to come here and greet you gentlemen who in the partisan controversy, if I may call it such, thought it necessary to paint certain pictures that were I won't say, incorrect, but were a little shaded. But now we have forgotten all that, and later on will come again—probably in other controversies. These are the things that are practically, I presume, a federal controversy. Those happy days we all have, and after awhile the common sense of the people prevails when they learn the facts.

That is how my friend Willison and my friend Macdonald do, and those of us who are filling offices have to stand it. But it is not a very bad thing after all.

I am grateful to you all in Toronto for the very cordial reception that you have given me. I have one word more to say, and I am done. I do not represent anybody. That is one great pleasure I have in coming here. I have no responsibility. Perhaps you have discovered that, but I do bring you what I know to exist, the good will of my fellow countrymen, their respect and their hope, and anticipation that this century of peace that we have enjoyed will continue forever. I thank you. (Cheers and applause.)

(February 3, 1914.)

Toronto's Financial Administration.

BY FREDERICK A. CLEVELAND, PH.D.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 3rd February, Mr. John A. Macdonald, speaking preliminary to the address by the guest of the day, Dr. F. A. Cleveland, said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—What I have to say will be as brief as possible, for I know that you are waiting to hear Dr. Cleveland; and I will put a few facts before you which will be new, possibly to some of those who are present.

One day last winter Mr. John I. Sutcliffe and myself were discussing the necessity of a better understanding of civic problems before much needed reforms could be hoped for, and we decided to write to the New York Bureau of Municipal Research for advice, which we received in the shape of some very interesting literature on the subject of Municipal Research.

Mr. John Firstbrook and others joined in this inquiry, and some fifteen or twenty of us united in an invitation to Mr. Henry Bruere, a Director of the New York Bureau, to address a meeting. This meeting was held at the National Club one day last July, and it was then decided to form a Committee of One Hundred Citizens—each pledged to pay one-hundredth part of the expense of a preliminary Survey of Toronto's Civic Administration, which was estimated to cost about \$5,000. As a matter of fact the Survey has cost much more than that, and a Civic Survey Committee of about 130 members has subscribed over \$6,000.

On September 28th, a deputation headed by Sir Edmund Osler waited upon the city council and received permission to make the survey.

Mr. Fred. W. Linders, accompanied by several municipal specialists in various departments, made the survey during November and December.

During January, Messrs. Driscoll and Holton, two of these specialists, presented the sections of the Survey Report

* Dr. Cleveland is one of the principals in the Bureau of Municipal Research of New York City, who were retained by the Civic Survey Committee of Toronto to make a special report on Toronto's Civic Administration. Dr. Cleveland was Chairman of ex-President Taft's Commission on Economy and Efficiency, which made a special study of the United States Civil Service. He is one of the leading authorities on civic finance on this continent.

dealing with the Fire Department and Works Department. The section of the Property Department was published last week. The section on the Assessment Department will come later.

Dr. Frederick A. Cleveland, Managing-Director of the Bureau of Municipal Research of New York, has come from that city to present to the Civic Survey Committee the section of the report dealing with the City Treasurer's Department. This was done yesterday when the Committee met at the National Club.

Through the courtesy of the Canadian Club, this meeting has been arranged so that the *public* may hear Dr. Cleveland on the Financial Administration of Toronto.

Dr. Cleveland is a national figure in the United States, and is fast becoming an international figure in North America. Accountancy and Finance are his specialties. When ex-President Taft, whom you heard last week, formed his famous Commission on Economy and Efficiency in the great Spending Departments of the United States Federal Government, Dr. Cleveland was chosen as the chairman of that committee.

At first some few, and they were very few, were sceptical as to the value of this Survey. If there are still any unbelievers, which I doubt, I have this to say in answer. Last November the Survey staff found such conditions in some of the theatres in Toronto that they felt it a duty to make a special Preliminary Report to the Mayor. As the result of that report thousands of dollars have been spent by the theatres in better methods of fire prevention. Every man on the Executive Committee of the Survey feels that this result alone has been worth all the time and trouble he has given to this undertaking, and that the whole cost of the entire Survey has been well repaid by this one achievement in itself.

We have been asked repeatedly—How do you expect to get practical results from this inquiry? What prospect is there of the many valuable suggestions made in the Survey Report being carried out?

The answer is that civic governments everywhere, and Toronto is no exception, respond freely and quickly to any interest manifested by the citizens in their own government. Toronto city officials have already shown their willingness to respond to such interest, and to consider our recommendations and to carry them out.

That citizen support of this Municipal Research Movement is of pressing interest is unquestionable, not only to

Toronto but to all Canadian cities. The success of the movement in the United States has demonstrated conclusively how vital a force it is in securing efficient municipal government. Toronto should be awake to this and reaping the benefits of the experience of the New York Bureau by at once establishing a local Bureau of Municipal Research, which will have at its back the results of eight years' practical application of these methods in thirty-five United States cities—the principal ones of which are New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Dayton, etc.

The formation of a local Bureau in Toronto, we feel sure, will eventuate in the spread of this work throughout the Dominion.

We can hope for no better achievement than first to demonstrate practically in Toronto what can be done, and then nothing can prevent our being called upon to lead the way, or to perform services for the municipalities throughout Canada. Dr. Allen, another doctor of the N. Y. B., will be here to talk about this Tuesday next.

The financial support necessary to the success of this undertaking must emanate from interested citizens. That there are such citizens in Toronto the Survey has proved. That their interest will be continuous will soon be demonstrated by their subscribing a total of not less than \$20,000.00 per annum for five years. The local Bureau will be started at once. You will all have an opportunity to give it your support, and I have no doubts as to the outcome.

Gentlemen, in conclusion, I have just one word to say. I think there are very few of those here, and possibly not all the members of the Civic Survey Committee, who are aware of the wonderful services and the immense benefits that our Honorary Secretary, Mr. John I. Sutcliffe, has rendered to us. He has been twice in New York, and has worked at it day and night, and I would ask you to remember, whenever you hear of the good this Survey is doing and is going to do,—please remember the name of John I. Sutcliffe. (Applause.)

Dr. Cleveland was then introduced, and said:

Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club and the Civic Survey Committee,—In the States we have looked to English institutions and English experience as a boy looks to his tutor for ideals and leadership. England and her colonies have given to the world her most important lessons in democracy—in responsible government—government as an organized trusteeship administered for the welfare of the gov-

erned. The greatest contribution of England has been a parliamentary system in which provision is made for responsible leadership. The greatest contribution of the English colonies has been in the development of the functions of the electorate. From England we took our constitution. From the colonies we have taken many of our best methods of popular control. From the colonies we have also taken many of our ideals of public service. We speak of our Australian ballot; of our Initiative, Referendum and Recall; of our Torrens system; of our methods of administering public works, and other community enterprises. In speaking of them as ours, however, we do not forget that nearly all of our highest ideals and practical solutions in government, in adapting our institutions to the fulfilment of the hopes of the people have come from our British ancestors and our British brothers. (Applause.)

Toronto has been before us for years as an example of civic interest and civic accomplishment, which we have sought to emulate. We have not only been struck with the unwritten law in this community that has demanded the retention in public service of men who have proved their fitness without regard to party, but we have also looked to Toronto for some of the best pioneer work that has been done in marking out the way for rendering public service through government enterprise. When asked to come to Toronto, therefore, we approached the subject of its institutions and practices with much of the same feeling that a student of political science goes to the House of Parliament.

The reason for our being here, as we understand it, is that both citizens and officers in the city of Toronto have been conscious of the fact that the city has been growing at a marvellous rate—during the last nine years it has doubled its population—that its Civic needs have far outstripped the provisions made for meeting them. Since our organization has been engaged in specializing for a number of years in the cities of the States in finding how cities are adapting their institutions to meet their growing needs (in the consideration of practices that have been found to be useful in one part of the world or another) we were asked to come here and make a survey—to apply methods of independent research as an aid to both citizens and officers in thinking about the civic problems with which they are confronted.

With this in view we have undertaken to make a careful study of conditions and practices; to submit our statements of fact to officers who are in charge of administrative details;

and having reached an agreement with respect to what the facts are, to submit our conclusions:

1. Pointing out what are deemed to be the defects in present methods.

2. The changes which should be made in order to adapt government methods to the necessity for administering to the wants of a much larger and more complex community.

As has been pointed out by Mr. Macdonald the results of our survey have been submitted to the Civic Survey Committee in reports on the following departments, viz., fire, property, works, finance and assessment. We are happy to say that with respect to none of these has there been any question raised on statements of facts. The only differences have been differences of opinion. These are to be expected, and discussion of such differences cannot do harm.

In taking up the subject of finance yesterday with officers discussing statements of fact, criticism of methods and recommendations, there were many points reviewed. Most of these would be of little interest to you at the time. But there are a few recommendations which are so close to the citizenship of Toronto that I am venturing elaboration to-day.

Among the constructive suggestions is one pertaining to the budget.

The budget, as conceived by English people—for they are the ones who have most successfully developed and used a system of budgetary control—is employed as an instrument by means of which a large community of citizens, a Dominion, a Nation, an Empire may have laid before them each year a definite program for the next year's business. Recognizing that public opinion is the great force, the controlling factor to be relied on to support the activities of government, it was found to be in every way desirable to get before the people what it is their government is doing, and what it proposes to do. This was the fundamental concept of a budget. This has been the theory of the constitutional inhibitions attached to money bills running back to the days of Magna Charta. This idea, however, did not become fully developed in the British system until within the last hundred years. It was not until the last fifty years that one of its most salient features was firmly established, namely, the provisions which fixed executive responsibility, by requiring that the Prime Minister become a leader before the Nation. In formulating our recommendations we have thought that the city of Toronto should take the steps necessary to develop just this kind of leadership, a leadership which will assume responsibility before the people for what

the administration is doing, and what it proposes to do, and to do this through the submission of a budget before each annual election.

Concretely, our budget proposals are these: To utilize your annual election as a referendum on questions of administration policy. Your elections of Mayor and Board of Control come just at the beginning of the fiscal year. In order to get a clear expression of views issues must be clearly defined. Instead of waiting until the new administration has been installed, instead of waiting for the new administration (which has only a year of official life) to take up the subject of what it proposes to do, and how it proposes to finance its projects after it has been seated, instead of waiting until after the first of January to begin consideration of what it will undertake for the city within the next twelve months, our first proposal is that the city shall require of its officers who are in responsible positions to begin in the autumn to make plans for the next year to let the people know what has been done, and what is proposed by the administration and by the opposition before the election. (Hear, hear, and applause.) As a means to this end we suggest that the departmental heads be required to submit their estimates—their detail statements telling about what service is being rendered, and the cost of what has been done by them, what additional work they are proposing to do, with an estimate of the cost of these proposals—that these business statements of cost and estimate be prepared by the heads of the departments and be placed in the hands of the Board of Control not later than October. (Hear, hear.) That when these cost data and estimates go to the Board of Control, the Mayor as the chairman (or prime minister) shall be required to assume responsibility for preparing and submitting a budget, which will clearly lay before the Aldermanic Council, as the appropriating body, what it is that the administration through its Board of Control recommends for the next year, that in order to inject the element of personal responsibility, and give definiteness to your discussion in municipal campaign, in order that you may have before you as an electorate well-defined issues when you determine by ballot who shall exercise the functions of government during the next year, each member of the Board of Control shall be required either to concur in the budget submitted by the Mayor or, in case he does not, to state specifically the items in which he does not concur and his reasons for disagreement. (Hear, hear.)

Here in Toronto the Board of Control is the Administration and the Mayor is its head. Having required that the administration clearly define its position, having utilized the experience gained by officers during their incumbency, and the experts of the Government in the various departments to formulate an administration platform, one which very directly and concretely relates the business of the government to the welfare of the city, and to lay this before the Aldermanic Council as a proposal, then each member of the Council would also be placed in such position that he would be held responsible for the manner in which he acted or failed to act on the budget proposal. So that before the day of election the city of Toronto, its citizens, its voters, would have before them an administrative program and the counter proposals of an opposition—a statement of issues joined, which would be just as clearly defined as would be required in a Court of Justice when parties litigant come before it to have their rights adjusted. (Hear, hear.)

If there is one thing in the English governmental system that both the people and their political agents have carefully guarded, it is its judicial procedure. By most carefully elaborated rules parties litigant are required to define clearly their issues by employment of counsel, or otherwise, before they are permitted the court will take testimony and admit argument of them before it. Our proposal is that the mayor shall be the leader—the advocate for the people—the attorney for the plaintiff in the formulation and submission of the complaint for social service; that the Aldermanic Council shall be regarded as a Court of First Instance in the matter of city administration against the opposition on all issues presented by the budget; the electorate shall act as a Court of Last Resort. That in these proceedings and during the campaign both the Aldermanic Council and the electorate should have the benefit of the same clarity of presentation of issues as a court of justice has when it is called upon to act on a subject of litigation. (Hear, hear.)

Now, let us suppose that the council, the aldermanic body, fails to agree, or fails to reach a decision before the 31st of December, and let us assume that the time has come when the case of the administration or the opposition is taken before the electorate without any act of appropriation having been passed. Notwithstanding the failure to act on the part of the board of aldermen there would be a month of deliberation in council during which members must assume responsibility for action or inaction, and the attitude of each representa-

tive or council would be before the city. The issues would be first presented in the form of a budget, the proposal of the mayor and of members of the opposition members on the Board of Control; this would be submitted to council in administration and opposition proposals. Following this the people would have the benefit of the discussion in council before action would be required by the electorate. With such a system instead of having our political campaign waged on personal lines,—instead of having the question as to whether Bill Smith is a good fellow the question before constituents in the campaign, would be “What has Bill Smith done, and what does he propose to do for this town?” and is the position of the mayor sound? Is he standing for or against public welfare? (Applause.) In other words, a procedure would be established that would insure that before January 1st you as citizens would have mapped out a public service program, and a financial program; every man in the Government would have to take sides—to assume definite responsibility and let the people know where he stands on a platform that could not be accepted or rejected as the act of an irresponsible unofficial partisan body.

Think of the advantage which this would have for the citizen; think also of the advantage such a procedure would give to officers who are trying to render efficient service. When the new administration comes in, if it is a continuation of the old one, (*i.e.*, if the proposals of the mayor are sanctioned by the electorate), the mayor, as head of the new administration, would have a clear sailing chart before him from the first day of the new fiscal year. The mayor would also have about him controllers as members of a board committed to the support of his policies. But let us assume that the mayor fails to receive a vote of confidence, that his program is not approved by the electorate. Then the opposition would become the new administration, and since the issues had been clearly defined before the campaign, the new mayor would have just as clear a sailing chart. Both the board of control and the Council would know just where the acts of appropriation would require change. So that by leaving the tax levy to be made after January 1, any modification in the appropriations could be covered by revenue provisions.

Fixing responsibility for leadership would give to the elected officers the added advantage, at the beginning of the new administration, of knowing what amount they could spend. This is very important. At the present time, no one knows what will be available for carrying on the city's govern-

ment till near the middle of the fiscal year. Last year, it was some time in May that the appropriations were passed. Each administration is handicapped; the city as a corporation is handicapped; citizens who are looking for service are disappointed. You cannot make the tax levy till the rate is fixed, and you cannot fix the rate till you know what is needed. Following present procedure, usually it is the first of July before you can make the tax levy for the fiscal year which begins January 1st. Meanwhile, the Government has no revenues, except what comes from miscellaneous sources. It must depend on borrowing. (Hear, hear.)

I could spend much more time than we have to-day on the subject of the budget. We know that the city of Toronto will spend many days considering it. Within the short time available I have tried to get before you one of the recommendations of our report. There will doubtless be differences of opinion on this matter. But it is of such commanding importance, and has so many bearings on the welfare of the city as we see it, that this occasion was welcomed, to get before you our reasons for recommending the submission of an annual budget, by the mayor as the chairman of your board of control—the responsible head of your government before the annual election.

We are submitting another matter, the need for a business statement such as we think the citizens ought to have before them. To-day none is submitted except in the annual report. Usually this is ancient history when it reaches you, and is then in a form which makes it almost useless. That is, it serves but poorly to give you an idea of your city's business. In the report just submitted we have pointed out the character of the annual statement and its defects.

One of the primary defects of the annual report which is now issued to citizens is that it is not so framed as to help either the people or the officer to understand what is going on, or what are the results obtained—to get a picture of the problem, that the government has before it, and how the administration has handled it. We think that citizens as the beneficiaries of this great corporation, organized for welfare purposes, are entitled to the same clarity of statement, as are the shareholders of Mr. Macdonald's company. We think the city is entitled to know what it owns and what it owes. It does not to-day. (Applause.) We think that citizens are entitled to know what are the different kinds of activity which the government is conducting, the cost of each and the amount and

sources of revenue. These facts are not available to-day. We think the citizens should be told how the city is being financed, and what is the condition of each of the funds through which it is being financed. This information is not available to-day. In calling attention to this lack of information we do not charge officers with neglect. We think present conditions are an inheritance of bad methods, and lack of system—an inheritance which is quite as much of an injustice to officers as it is to you. In other words, the official has a day's work to do every day. He comes to office and finds it equipped with inferior tools. He as our servant is not given the ordinary facilities for rendering efficient service. Nor is he given the facilities for improving methods and equipment. You are calling for more information. The processes through which information must be obtained if at all remain the same as they were years ago in the city's years of infancy. It is still in its swaddling clothes. Unless someone is given time and opportunity to go into the whole subject of its administrative methods systematically, unless time and opportunity is given to devise ways of making new adaptations, unless officers can then have the opportunity to bring about the co-operation required between the officers to enable them to adopt improved methods, the old methods must remain. This can't be done by a man who must sit at his desk and do his routine day's work every day, meet the public, attend public dinners, and do other things that public officials are called upon to do.

We are suggesting, therefore, that some provision be made for what in the German Government is called "staff" as distinct from the "line organization." The "staff" organization would be employed by the Board of Control to collect information and advise with the mayor and other officers who are correcting defects—those who are responsible for making decisions but who now are quite fully occupied with the day's work of the busy official. In other words, you have now a well organized line for the conduct of government, but you have no staff to speak of—persons relieved from the line duties to give attention to problems of planning and observing the manner in which plans are executed with a view of advising officers of the line. This is a weakness of nearly every government on this continent. We have to go to Germany, France and England to find well equipped staff organizations, except in military affairs. In the United States there are well organized staffs in the military departments but absolutely no staff for civil departments. The President has no staff; the cabinet officers are simply men

of the line. To study and deliberate on problems of administration requires time for the acquisition of scientific information. This our busy executives have not. This statement is quite as true of our municipalities. It is quite true also, so far as we are able to learn, of your Canadian municipalities.

Perhaps I may say a word about one other matter of primary importance in the few minutes which remain—the necessity for citizen co-operation with officers. In Toronto this is an element of great strength. We have found here the facilities for intelligent citizen co-operation in the city of Toronto developed to a much higher degree than in any of our American cities. We have been working toward this end in recent years. We believe that a government which has not the co-operation of its citizens cannot do good work (hear, hear, and applause)—that intelligent citizen support and intelligent citizen opposition is essential to democratic institutions. When we found that one of the principal organizations of this city, one of the large organizations was devoted to non-partisan inquiry and action; that this organization was sub-organized by wards and precincts (the manner usually employed by us in the United States to control the electorate through misinformation in the interest of those who live by patronage, and to support what is called the “pork barrel” legislation (laughter)); when we found a citizen’s organization in Toronto organized in this manner for the purpose of keeping out of politics, and for getting efficient and trustworthy men to run for office, no matter to what party they belong; when we found that this organization, with its many centres and points of contact was attempting to understand problems of government and through knowledge of facts know how to act, and that feeling itself handicapped for obtaining information about the more complex and technical aspect of city business, it had organized this Civic Survey Committee with a view of getting information for the use of citizens and officials, we had a new emotion! It was the first time we had found a community which is thoroughly alive to citizen opportunity and citizen responsibility in any municipality. (Applause.) Here is a great urban community interested in having a civic survey made, a survey through the agency of a keenly alert citizenship. A survey made by an agency of government may be made equally valuable, if through responsible official leadership its results are dramatized for the people, and can be made to reach them in a manner to inspire confidence. But where men through the agencies of citizenship undertake to act in a broadly organized movement for the welfare of the community, as is being done here, it

seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the city of Toronto has every reason to congratulate herself.* (Applause.)

Dr. Cleveland.—Mr. Macdonald has asked me to say a word about this balance sheet, this financial statement. The balance sheet, using the term as understood in business circles, is nothing more or less than a statement on a single page (so that it can be apprehended at a glance)—a summary statement of what the city owns, and what it owes. In determining what shall be the form or arrangement of items on the balance sheet, it is clear that the facts should be so arranged and displayed as to give all interested readers the answers to their questions. What are the questions which citizens and officers ask? What are the answers you want? In the first place, you as a citizen, as a taxpayer, an officer, want to know about the present or pressing financial needs of the city. To answer questions about pressing financial needs we have arranged the items in the first section of the statement before you under the caption "Current Assets and Liabilities." This gives the picture of what the city owns and what it owes, that may be used for its immediate purposes; what arrangements have been made for meeting current obligations, for protecting the city's trading credit. This section deals with the present.

The second section deals with the future: what is owned by the city acquired for continuous use, and what is the indebtedness incurred in acquiring these properties. In other words, the section of the balance sheet under the caption "Capital Assets and Liabilities" is an account with the next generation. The items are the inheritance which this generation is passing down to its children—an inheritance of property on the one hand, and of indebtedness on the other. Closely related to this group is the sinking fund—its assets, liabilities and reserves, shown under a third general caption. In other words, the funds which have been accumulated and made available for meeting the indebtedness that has been left to the next generation, when due. The sinking fund is a part of this inheritance.

These three groups of acts presented in a single summary put you in a position to think about and know conditions—to know something about the financial and property affairs of Toronto. This is presented as an alternative to having as a regular diet of intellectual hash, information all mixed up in

*At this point the speaker took his seat, the hour of two having arrived. He was urged to continue, and Mr. Macdonald requested an explanation of the form of balance sheet that had been handed to each person present.

the annual report. Let us look at the statement a little more closely.

For example, with regard to "current assets and liabilities," what are the main facts shown. On one side is set up the amount of cash, the amounts due the city (uncollected taxes, etc.), the advances that are to be repaid as for local improvements, the stores and reserves that might have been available for future expenses. On the other side is shown the amount of the city's current liabilities such as bank overdrafts, three million dollars; loan by R. McCollum, sixteen thousand; interest due but not paid, \$946,000; these are in the nature of immediate demands, amounting to over five million dollars. The total cash available to meet these immediate demands on the day shown is only \$488,000. The total of amounts receivable, such as uncollected taxes and other amounts receivable, are less than \$2,000,000; in other words, the statement shows that the city has about half as much in hand and available in the form of collectibles as there are immediate demands to be met. This it is assumed is desirable information. It is a picture that can be caught at a glance while it helps you to answer questions about current finances.

Has the city \$3,000,000 more of immediate demands than it has current assets available to meet them? We find that on this day advances amounted to more than the uncollected taxes and accounts receivable. In the statement it is shown by the indented figures that about two and a half million of these advances are for local improvements. What does this mean? You have been using money collected from taxes to finance these improvements until they are completed at which time you will be able to float debenture issues, or, if you do not do this, until you can collect the assessments. In other words, it shows that you have not provided for financing your permanent improvements, except through advances from collections of taxes, and that by doing so you are unable to meet current demands for which taxes are levied. This we think raises an important question. How it shall be answered is for you to determine. Will you continue to use money collected from taxes for local improvements and then meet current bills through overdrafts on your London banks? This is one of the questions of policy clearly presented by a balance sheet on the form suggested.

In relation to capital assets and liabilities. I may say we don't assume that this balance sheet represents facts—only figures. You will see that the picture is taken as of more than a year ago. It is presented merely as a way of getting at the

problem. As to the capital assets, the stars on this balance sheet show that we are unable to get any satisfactory information whatever about the cost or present worth of lands, buildings, street and sewer improvements, municipal enterprises, many of these great classes of corporate properties and equipment that are necessary to the successful handling of your business. A total figure is shown opposite one of the items, but this means nothing except the accumulation of a lot of old book balances, which we have put down here in toto. The statement simply shows what should be listed as items of capital assets on the one side. On the other side we have attempted to represent the amounts that the city owes in the nature of capital obligations—the city debt, and the amount which may be deducted from the city debt as cash and increments to the sinking fund. This gets before you the capital indebtedness. It also should inform you about the relation of indebtedness to the cost and present worth of properties owned.

There are many relations of property and debt that require consideration, but the purpose of this balance sheet is not only to give the picture of inheritance but also to enable citizens and officers to consider questions of administration—property administration on the one hand and debt administration on the other. The property items lead into supporting statements and details having to do with repairs, replacements, physical deterioration, obsolescence, and funding provisions for upkeep. The debt items lead into considerations having to do with borrowing, sinking funds, etc.

The sinking fund statement, I think, needs no further explanation than this: the balancing figure here shown means nothing. Instead of the item "Sinking fund requirements" being arbitrarily established as an amount equal to sinking fund assets it should be determined by actuarial calculations. This is necessary to enable one to know whether the assets are sufficient to meet actual requirements. In that event, the balancing figures would be significant in that they would show a surplus or deficiency.

You will find on the back of the sheet before you what is called "fund statement." This is also a one-page summary. The facts are not combined with the balance sheet for the reason that they speak of a new and entirely different set of relations. As has been said the purpose of a balance sheet is to show what the city owns and what it owes—the corporation's financial condition, its assets, its liabilities, and the conclusion reached by its comparison,—its surplus or deficit; the laws which govern the balance sheet are the laws of property, and

the laws controlling relations of debtor and creditor. But the purpose of the fund statement is to show what are the conditions of the authorizations to spend that have been given to officials. It deals not with corporate conditions but with limitations placed upon the officers as agents of the corporation; the laws which govern those relations expressed by the "fund statement" are laws of trusteeship.

While these data are often confused with balance sheet items, there is nothing lost and much gained by way of clarity by separating them. The only reason that there are any such relations and facts to express is to be found in constitutional and statute law enacted for purposes of control.

In order that there may be a definite limitation placed upon the spending power of officials, funds are created. One of these, we will say, is created to ear mark the resources that are available for appropriation for current expenses; another fund is created to ear mark the resources which officers may use for capital improvements, and a third class of resources is ear-marked for special and trust use. In the statement before you each of these funding relations is distinguished.

In this statement under the caption "general fund" are summarized the resources available to meet appropriations, and on the other hand the authorizations to spend, and the incumbrances on these authorizations. You will notice that nearly every item is in red ink. Red ink means something unusual—something to excite immediate attention. That a condition is present which is not normal or the reverse of that has been intended. Instead of there being resources in the fund there is a deficiency. Taking the figures from the books as of the date represented, the red ink entries on the resource side indicate that the general fund is in what would be called in vernacular a "busted condition." (Laughter.) I am not saying that this is a true representation (laughter) but it gives an illustration of what would have been reflected from the books if a statement of this kind had been made at a particular moment something over a year ago.

In this picture we have something novel in municipal financing. (Laughter.) We found on the assets side only \$67,000 of reputed assets which is an unrealized estimate of what was thought would be accrued as revenue. The second item that stands in place of a fund resource is a current deficit amounting to \$583,000, which as the figure shows in the balance sheet is the shortage in current assets available to meet current liabilities. In other words, the current liabilities are larger than the current assets by an amount exceeding \$583,-

000, and there is no balance available for appropriation. The fund deficiency is again increased by a third condition, namely, expenditures which are unauthorized amounting to \$938,000, shown on the other side of the account. What are marked "additional resources" would be additional if they were not deficiencies. (Laughter.) But these are in red ink also, you will notice.

Much the same condition is found in the "debenture fund." The principal resources are bonds authorized but not issued, and a reserve of cash that should be but is not in the general fund. Against these are set up the unexpended balances of authorizations to spend debenture funds. To this amount is added a further item novel in fund accounts, viz., expenditures for local improvement purposes not authorized. In other words, that there has been expended on capital account as well as for current purposes public moneys, without authority given in money bills, sums amounting in this case to \$4,245,000.

I wish to call your attention also to certain blank spaces, lines both in the "general fund" and "debenture fund" accounts. Indented under the item unexpended balance of appropriations will be found blank spaces for showing what part of the unexpended balances are unencumbered. To illustrate, let us assume that the appropriation for running public works were \$10,000,000, and that \$5,000,000 contracts have been let without a dollar having been paid out. In this event \$5,000,000 should be shown as in reserve for contracts, and \$5,000,000 as unencumbered. This information is not now available. We could not get it from the book. Responding to the request of your chairman I have pointed to some of the uses of the statements before you, and some of the relations that should excite your attention. If information of this kind were put in your hands each month, if this were supplemented with an operation account, and if early in the autumn of each year the citizens had before them estimates and requests for appropriations that would enable them to think about the municipal problem; if in addition the mayor were required to submit and assume responsibility for a definite budget, I venture to suggest that the municipal campaign of Toronto would be a very lively and animated parliament in which the whole electorate would take sides and executive responsibility, and leadership would be something real and vital. (Applause.)

(February 6, 1914.)

Imperial Federation: The Lesson of the American Colonies.

BY MR. A. MAURICE LOW, M.A., OF WASHINGTON, D.C.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 6th February, Mr. Low said:

When your Secretary honored me with an invitation to appear before your Club, he suggested a topic fitting for the occasion, and I countered with the suggestion that if he did not object I should prefer to talk on "Imperial Federation: The Lesson of the American Colonies." I do not have to tell the members of this Club what a diplomat their secretary is. He delicately intimated that itinerant Englishmen of high and low degree had inflicted their views on Imperial Federation on the defenseless members of this Club without having got any "for'ader" (laughter), but if I had something practical to say he supposed the Club would listen. I need hardly assure you that his letter was couched much more gracefully than the crude way I have expressed it, but between the lines I could see the warning finger.

Remembering that, I shall talk as a practical man to practical men. This is a Club, I understand, composed of men actively engaged in large affairs (hear, hear, and laughter), not men who theorize but men who do, the men who in the last decade or so have put Canada on the map, who have developed its marvellous resources, who have built its railways and its cities, who have reclaimed the wilderness and subdued barren places, who have made the Dominion the wonder and admiration of the world. To such men the practical appeals, as it appeals to me. And Imperial Federation, gentlemen, is essentially a business question. (Hear, hear.) It is a question properly to be dealt with by business men and not by politicians or doctrinaires. If the Empire is federated, and I hope it will be for the reasons I shall later give, it will be because the men who made the Empire and gave it vitality, our great traders and merchants and bankers, see that it is necessary as a matter of business.

* Mr. A. Maurice Low is a veteran journalist, having been stationed at Washington as permanent representative of various British papers since 1886. For many years he has been giving special attention to the subject of "Imperial Federation."

Some years ago I began a study of American history as a preliminary to writing a book on the psychology of the American people. I wanted to ascertain the reasons for the Americans having departed from the original stock and developed a race that, while showing English characteristics, is unlike the parent stem. That study involved greater research than I contemplated at the time. Among other things it made me see that if the work was to be properly done I must have a thorough knowledge of American history, especially that phase of it leading to the rupture between the colonies and the Mother Country.

If I had the power I should make every Britisher learn American history; and when I use the term Britisher I mean not only those of us who were born in Great Britain, but the sons of the Empire wherever accident caused them to be born, the sons of Canada, as proud of their native country as they are loyal to the Empire; the children of Australia as well as those of the Union of South Africa. It would not be time wasted, I assure you. If that study were made philosophically and impartially, with an open mind and a desire to profit by the mistakes of the past, and to apply that lesson to the problems of the present, then the follies of our ancestors would not have been in vain, and there would be less danger of their descendants repeating the same blunders.

We lost the colonies not because the ministers of King George put a tax on tea or made the colonists pay stamp duties, which is the belief common to the average Englishman and American, but because the old bond between the colonies and the Mother Country had become attenuated. The seeds of independence were sewn long before dependence had ceased. To the men of Massachusetts and Virginia, and the other colonies their own colonies had become the first consideration, and were to them more important than the affairs of England. Their own continent was now the seat of their thoughts, a historian has said. The more powerful England became, and the less the colonies had to fear attack of European nations, the more the colonists were persuaded that they were able to take care of themselves, and were no longer dependent upon the Mother Country for protection. Heretofore they had leaned on England, now they were able to stand alone. In fact, some of the colonists believed that they were giving assistance to England and fighting England's battles because the colonies furnished men in the wars against France. The colonists ought to have realized that it was to the Mother Country they owed their security; it was her genius that made them masters in their new home.

Here, I think, is one lesson that we may heed. The American colonists had been made secure on their own continent because England had made them so, and not through their own efforts. I believe in peace, and cultivating the most friendly relations between all nations; friction between nations is as stupid as the senseless quarrels between individuals, and I shall say nothing to wound the sensibilities of even the most sensitive neighbor and friend, but I have no sympathy with the man who is too lazy or too cowardly to look facts squarely in the face. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

These days we hear much about the unbroken years of peace; idealists are fond of pointing to a border three thousand miles long on neither side of which are forts, nor great armies watching each other, ready always for the feared attack; and we are told that two nations at least have beaten the sword into a typewriter. (Laughter.) No man rejoices more than I in the fact that the border is not walled by forts but connected by bridges, that two great countries can live side by side in amity, that its people are free to come and go as they please, that a Canadian feels as much at home in the United States as an American does in Canada; but in our enthusiasm let us not lose sight of realities. War between the United States and the British Empire, of which Canada is such an important part, is of course unthinkable and impossible, but would Canada feel that she had no necessity for forts or ships were it not that she is fortified by the armies and fleets of the Empire? (Hear, hear, and applause.) No part of the Empire is weak, no part need fear attack, so long as the whole is strong, and its defences are true.

We have at the present moment an impressive object lesson of what may happen when two nations, the one more powerful than the other, live side by side. No forts mark the border between the United States and Mexico. No steel sheathed ships guard the shores of Mexico. And yet, all is not well with Mexico.

Let us return again to the American colonies, and draw from them another lesson. One of the great men of the revolutionary period, James Otis, of English descent, as all great Americans of that time were, was wiser than the Britisher statesmen of his day, wiser even than statesmen, with few exceptions, of the present day. He not only saw the danger, but he was wise enough to propose the remedy to avert it. He saw the colonies breaking away because there was no nexus to hold them. He was the first man of whom I have been able to find any mention who used

a word that should make his name very dear to this audience, the first man in speaking of the Colonies to term them "Dominions." (Applause.) He anticipated by more than a hundred years—marvellous as the fact is—the passage of the British North America Act, which has given to Canada the control of her own affairs. "The Colonies," this man of far seeing vision wrote, "are subordinate dominions," and it was "best for the good of the whole" that they should "be continued in the enjoyment of the subordinate legislation, not only for their own benefit but for the good of the whole."

But Otis did not stop there. He was the pioneer among Imperial Federalists. Not only should these "subordinate dominions" be given autonomous powers but—mark how he blazed the trail for us to follow—they were to be "represented in some proportion to their number and estates in the grand legislative of the nation: that this would firmly unite all parts of the British Empire in the greatest peace and prosperity; and render it invulnerable and perpetual."

"Invulnerable and perpetual!" How those words thrill. How they stir the blood of patriotism, at times to run sluggish. The British Empire invulnerable and perpetual, facing with lofty serenity its envious rivals and jealous foes; in its strength without fear; an Empire to endure. (Applause.) Otis saw that the colonies could be held to the Empire so long as they were bound by a political tie; that they were not represented in the "grand legislative of the nation," that is, in the Imperial Parliament in Westminster, was the centrifugal force to tear the Empire asunder.

This then is the grand lesson. We lost our American colonies because there was not wisdom enough in the statesmanship of that day to grasp the salient fact that an Empire must be legislated for as a whole and not in detached parts; that politics is as necessary to hold an Empire intact as affection is to keep a family united. Shall we turn that lesson to account or remain deaf to its teachings?

I should be careless of the injunction of your secretary to be practical if I was content merely to recount history without trying to make it serve a useful purpose. When I read what Otis wrote, and other men of his time said it was plain to me that the danger Otis foresaw, but which he was powerless to avert, because in an age of folly he was the one man of wisdom, is a danger as real to-day as it was in the eighteenth century, a calamity that will come upon us now as it did then unless we are wise enough to forestall it.

It rests with Canada and the other self-governing Dominions whether the Empire shall be federated for the advantage of all its parts, to be invulnerable and continue perpetual, or whether it shall remain loosely knit, vulnerable and in danger of passing as have other Empires that in their day ruled the world. (Applause.) The United Kingdom is the predominant partner, but the United Kingdom can put no coercion upon the other members of the firm. The Dominions can have federation if they desire it, and see that it is for their advantage. Federation will continue to be discussed as an academic abstract unless they take the initiative. It is a question Canadians must answer for themselves. Will they gain or lose by federation?

Canada is in truth as well as poetic fancy daughter in her mother's house and mistress of her own. The old theory that a colony was to be exploited for the benefit of the Mother Country has long since been discarded; it was an immoral and vicious doctrine, and it had to go down before progress. Canada controls her own affairs, as properly she should. Politically and economically she is independent of the home government. In effect she makes her own treaties, political and fiscal. No arrangement would be entered into by the British Government that affected the interests of Canada without first consulting the responsible governors of the Dominion. This is a happy and correct relation, but can it last, does it not have the germ of dissolution, is it not taking us on the path that leads to destruction?

It will perhaps be said that the interests of Canada, and those of the rest of the Empire are not in all respects identical. Canada has certain material interests that not only are not identical with those of the rest of the Empire but distinctly clash with it. I was told by a Canadian statesman a few years ago when I discussed with him a certain proposed policy, which I ventured to think would be of doubtful advantage to Canada, and of distinct disadvantage to the rest of the Empire, that I spoke as an Englishman, and he thought as a Canadian, and the duty of a Canadian, he added, was first to consider the interests of Canada, even though they conflicted with those of the United Kingdom. That, I confess, came as a shock to me. It convinced me what I had long feared, that the component parts of the Empire thought locally and not imperially. (Hear, hear.)

It was local thinking in the time of the third George that cost us the American Colonies. (Applause.) Englishmen in England were able to think no further than the water's edge.

Englishmen in America thought in terms of their own continent. Between them the ocean rolled. It drowned a common understanding as it drowned so many of those hardy adventurers who were the first and truest imperialists, who set forth not to weaken the mother, but to make her strong through her children; not to set up a kingdom of their own, but to perpetuate and make invulnerable the Empire bought in the price of blood. Unfortunately the old habit remains. We are still, thinking locally, we in England as much as you in Canada, if I may be permitted to say so; we are still too prone to think that our own interests are paramount, and are too little willing to subordinate them for the general good. I do not believe this is selfishness or indifference, at least I hope not; rather it is ignorance and the stunting effect of localism. We of the English strain are not given to emotion. When the emergency demands it we show our passionate devotion to the Empire, and all that it stands for; no sacrifice is too great; the appeal to patriotism is not in vain. Should the call to arms sound we shall stand shoulder to shoulder as in the past. The bugle will thrill the men of your far west as it will electrify those of the east; Australia will hear and respond; to India, to Africa, to the far corners of the earth its notes will penetrate; English and Scotch, Irish and Welsh will fall into line; from the far flung Empire its legions will be massed in battle array; the roll of county and province, and dependency and colony will be called, and their sons will answer "present," ready to die to protect the mother of all. (Applause.)

I have no fear that in a crisis we shall forget our traditions or be traitors to our heritage. What I fear is that when the crisis comes it will be too late; and it would be as foolish for us not to keep the future in mind, as it is for a man to waste his strength in youth and take no heed of the day to come when he can no longer labor. An emergency in the life of a nation is very similar to death-bed repentance; it is then too late either to do good or to regret evil. (Applause.)

It is in time of peace that we must be prepared for war, it is before emergency arises that we must take steps to be able to meet it with serenity. What I propose, to bind the loose strands of Empire into a rope of steel that neither the sword in the hand of our foe nor our own folly can sever, is federation in the widest use of that term; but realizing that there are prejudices to be overcome and difficulties to be met, I would proceed slowly, always, however, with a definite end in view. My end, I venture to claim, is logical, practical and beneficial. It is an experiment for which warrant exists. It

is easily tried. It can be abandoned without injury if it is found not to be workable, although I believe that danger need not be apprehended. It cannot do harm, it may be anticipated that it will do much good. It involves no surrender of rights now enjoyed by any autonomous Dominion; it necessitates no change in any constitution or organic act; it does not take from the people the control of their own affairs. In a word, my hope is to bring the Empire into one room. Is not that an appeal to imagination? (Applause.)

How can that best be done? By the creation of an Imperial Council. That Council would consist of delegates representing the Empire. Without going too much into detail, let us take Canada as showing the working of the plan. Each Colony or Dominion represented in the Council would elect or appoint delegates in the manner it saw fit. Personally I believe that the wisest course would be for each province to elect say two delegates and the Prime Minister to have the appointment of two, thus the delegation of Canada in the Imperial Council would consist of twenty members. The delegates elected by the Province at large would fairly represent the sentiment of its majority, and they would be elected for a fixed term; those appointed by the Premier would be removable at his pleasure. The council would be a permanent body sitting in London, its sessions probably lasting about six months in the year, so that there would be plenty of time every year for delegates to return to their own countries, and by personal contact test the sentiment of their constituents and the people as a whole on any controversial subject. In addition to the delegates representing the United Kingdom the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, War and the Colonies, and the First Lord of the Admiralty would be *ex officio* members of the Council. Prime Ministers of self governing colonies, and members of their cabinets, while in London would automatically become *ex officio* members.

Delegations would vote as units, consequently it would make no difference that Canada was represented in the Council by twenty delegates, and the Commonwealth of Australia by fourteen (on the same basis as that suggested for Canada, namely, two delegates representing each State, and two appointed by the Premier), the United Kingdom by thirty, and so on. Each delegation would in private decide whether to support or to oppose a proposition, the majority of that delegation would control, and in the Council the delegation, through its chairman, would cast a single vote.

The object in treating each Dominion as a whole in voting is fundamental. The Council is the voice of the Empire. A question arises, let us say, of vital interest only to Canada, of slight interest to Australia, of no interest to South Africa, and of interest only to the United Kingdom because of the political considerations involved. What the Council desires is the opinion of the Empire. Canada being the party most in interest it is necessary for the Council to know what Canada feels and thinks, not what Alberta or Ontario thinks, but the Dominion as a whole. Every delegate of course would be accorded the freest opportunity for debate, so that the diverse views of Canadians themselves would be known, then the position of Canada as a whole would be stated, then it would be for the Empire to determine how far it could go; whether it must yield or will resist; whether sacrifices must be made by a part for the good of the whole, or the whole is prepared to make sacrifices to sustain one of its members.

Statesmanship would give the Council plenary powers, but I am aware this would arouse too much opposition at the beginning, and therefore I am forced to compromise, although compromise is a word I very much dislike, as it is usually only a politer term for cowardice or surrender. The Council would be limited to conference, discussion and recommendation, but it would have no power to impose its will upon the Empire, or to enforce a decree. The Council would have advisory powers only. It would be for the Empire, through its responsible ministers, to say whether that advice should be accepted or disregarded.

Would anything be gained by the creation of such a Council? Would any practical results follow? Would the Empire be strengthened? Would we be able to feel more confident of its invulnerability and perpetuity? To me these questions answer themselves.

If the Council did nothing else than to bring the Empire into one room it would have justified its existence. At present no arrangement exists by which that can be done. It is true that at long intervals delegates representing the Empire meet and discuss imperial questions, but that is a very different thing from a permanent Council whose members are brought in daily intimate contact, who can understand not only each other but the people they represent and learn that although we are all Britishers the Canadian does not always see eye to eye with the Englishman, nor the Englishman with the Australian. That is knowledge not to be acquired in a few days. And think how it would enlarge the vision of men naturally inclined to be self-

centred, by inclination and education believers in their own superiority, for let us be frank with ourselves and admit that self satisfaction is a national vice. I do not hesitate to say that it would be immensely for the benefit of the English delegates to be able to look at England from the outside, that is through the eyes of Canadians and Australians, perhaps they might hear some truths that would be salutary ; for

What can they know of England

Who only England know?

And it would be equally for the advantage of their Canadian colleagues to get an English perspective, and thus be brought to realize the burden of Empire. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Can anyone doubt that this would help enormously to break down that pernicious habit of local thinking, and cultivate the habit of thinking imperially? To nearly every man that which he knows best is of greatest importance. To the average man his city is of higher consequence than his province, his province than his country. Let him understand that great as his province is, and great as his country is they are small compared with the Empire, that his present welfare and his future safety depend not upon what his neighbors do, or the provincial authorities decree, or his country's lawmakers enact, but upon something so remote that he neither sees it, nor does it touch him at the moment.

It will perhaps be said that the Dominions and Colonies are now represented in London by High Commissioners and Agents General, who, in a sense, constitute an Imperial Council. But these men are virtually ambassadors, and the first duty of an ambassador is to his own country. That is the very thing I am aiming to break down: the conception of the Empire legislated for separately instead of as a whole. That is our danger. The Empire no more than a family can endure whose members have antagonistic interests. The bond is perpetual only when the interests of the family or nation are considered as a whole, when the common good is the policy of statesmen as well as of peoples.

I think if we made a beginning with the creation of an Imperial Council we should eventually extend the powers of the Council so that, to use the memorable words of Otis, it would come to be "the grand legislative of the nation," and be clothed with the power to legislate for the entire Empire. Let us pause for a minute on that striking word used by Otis. He spoke of a "nation." We know well enough what that word connotes. It means a people united in a common cause, and ani-

mated by a common purpose. To Otis, although Englishmen in England and Englishmen in America were separated by tumbling seas—and that separation was much greater in his day than in ours, because steam was undiscovered and electricity undreamed—it was still possible to unite them in the bonds of nationality. Was that fancy of a dreamer or wisdom of a statesman? Is the genius of the twentieth century incapable of doing what the eighteenth saw so true? Can we live and endure unless we are, in fact, as well as in name a nation—not Englishmen or Canadians or Australians, but the great British nation.

The “grand legislative,” then, would concern itself not with matters of local interest but only with national questions. It would carry out on a grander scale the system now existing in Canada. It would recognize the principle of autonomy, and the subordination of autonomy to nationality. Each of your provinces is sovereign, and yet subject; each possesses wide powers, and yet cheerfully yields some of them for the good of all. A system that is no longer an experiment, that has been tried and worked well in Canada, can surely be extended and made to work well in a larger field.

The “grand legislative” would, as I have already indicated, concern itself solely with the affairs of the Empire, and not with those of its component parts. The common defence, the common progress and welfare, the relations of the Empire with the rest of the world, the means whereby the great British Nation can keep in the van—these would be the problems to be discussed and solved.

Objections of course will be raised. Will England, it will be asked, consent to be outvoted by Canada or Australia, will Canada willingly risk the danger of finding herself in a minority? If selfish considerations prevail, if we are British in name only, and not in nationality, what has been proposed here to-day is impossible, but if we are willing to yield for the general good, to make sacrifices even if necessary, the scheme does not offer any insurmountable difficulties. As I have already said, it is a business rather than a political question. Reduced to its lowest terms what we have to ask ourselves is this: Will it pay? Will it pay in the broadest sense? not Will it pay England at the expense of Canada or Canada at the expense of Australia, but shall we all profit by it? And that is not lowering a high ideal or making statesmanship sordid. Statesmanship, statesmanship of the highest order, concerns itself with the practical, for this is a practical age, and all the progress and advancement that have been made, all the improvement

which we see around us, and in which we share, everything that makes man better and happier, and more humane is the work of the practical mind and not the visionary, the mind able to envisage the future, forecast great movements, understand the drift of forces, and either turn them in the right direction or be by them engulfed. This is the lesson that is offered to us, this is the lesson by which we shall profit or ignore at our peril. This is my message. Shall we strive by every means in our power to make the British Nation, and the British Empire invulnerable and perpetual, regarding ourselves as trustees for our children, or spend our substance foolishly, cursed by our children for our folly?" (Applause.)

(February 16, 1914.)

Two Years Among Wild Men and Wild Beasts in England's Newest Colony.

BY REV. DR. W. S. RAINSFORD, OF NEW YORK.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Canadian Club, held on the 16th February, Dr. Rainsford said:

Mr. President, and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—I may be allowed, perhaps, to begin what I have to say to you with a personal reference, and it shall be brief. It is this: In the splendid opportunity my own friends and the city gave me yesterday to address as stimulating an audience as any man could hope to address, I said nothing that to my mind could possibly be twisted into offering the suggestion of whether I approved or did not approve of what is known as Imperialism. I was speaking of what I believe to be the need of reformation that is on us in religion, and I said, and say, that the lines are drawn, and men must choose their standards, must choose between the religious movement that is imperialistic and the religious movement that is democratic. That is all, gentlemen. (Applause.)

I can only hope this afternoon, in trying, as I shall to deal with the land of East Africa,—to give you a brief sketch of a land at present scarcely known, and of the peoples among whom I dwelt for two years who are practically unknown, some tribes with whom I was last year having never seen any white man until they saw me and my hunter. It is impossible to speak of Africa intelligently unless you can by some legerdemain succeed in imparting to Western people something of the atmosphere of the land. We cannot without imagination understand conditions hopelessly barbarous, where customs are so different, where science and progress stops, a land where there are no roads, and no path wider than that narrow 12-inch path trodden by the naked feet of the black natives, a land where famine may rage, where a lion

* Dr. W. S. Rainsford came to St. James Cathedral, Toronto, from England in 1876. After a remarkable career in Toronto he became Rector of St. George's, New York, in 1883. He left St. George's in 1905, and since then has achieved great distinction as a lecturer, author, traveler and naturalist.

may stop the way, where as you wander down the veldt where for two thousand years the chain gang has made its desolate way to the sea, as you step into the lush grass you may disturb with your foot skull after skull. Only of late years has English and German rule put a stop to throat-cutting. Desolation, misery, death, ruled supreme, and nature, uninfluenced by science and religion, held her dreadful sway.

If you lived, as I did for more than two years, among the black men themselves, you learn to love these men—very near the monkey, probably hundreds of thousand years nearer than we are. They are so true, so brave! More than once has my gun bearer hurled himself in front of me to take on his body the seemingly inevitable charge, and I almost shot him. That same man would in two years perhaps forget my name. You have there a life near the monkey, no memory, no conception of morals whatever, no conception of the spirit, yet with qualities so affectionate, so capable of development, so full of sympathy.

Now you see, gentlemen, unless you can get the atmosphere of such a land, you cannot understand its story. Men come back from Africa and tell hunting stories, but I am not going to tell you any hunting stories, I have not time for that. Most men who go to Africa are only trippers. You can take passage on a reasonably good steamer, and in five weeks from the time of leaving London be at Mombasa; if you want antelope you can be guided to their haunts, and have a cook better than you can get here. (Laughter.) I only mention some of the benefits you can get if you have money, but all this life is the tripper's life. From it a man comes back with various heads, his own often larger than before (laughter) with his rhino—a very easy thing to get—and a buffalo, if he is very lucky. Maybe he will get a lion. He comes back in two or three months to Nyrobi, and thinks he has seen Africa. But he has seen and knows nothing of Africa. You have to get farther away, and submerge yourself in the continent, to surround yourself with a hundred and fifty black carriers out of different tribes, so that you can easily open communication with the tribes you visit. You have to go month after month among them, learn to speak their language, to sit around their camp fires, and so catch the life of this land. Some of their stories are such as perhaps a hundred thousand years ago our own ancestors told around their camp fires,—you could not tell them if there were ladies present. These conditions of human life have lasted perhaps for two hundred thousand years. On real Safari life we are back in the long past of our race. Man has

not trained any beast to help him—we plod along as men toiled forward ages ago. The only mode of carriage is on the head, the only means of carrying food. After such a plunge into barbarism you come back to civilization with a larger sense of responsibility, and a deeper sense of the worth of the effort that has lifted us out of it—out of shere barbarism.

Gentlemen, I want to speak of the unknown of Africa as it thus remains. Yet though none can tell its story, for it is the land of the great, dark, dim unknown—we hear people who go there, they strive to tell us about it, but we are disappointed. No man knows Africa unless he has buried himself in the heart of that land. Africa is a land of mystery. The African in East Africa where I was, has little in common with the African as you know him in the West. Africa has no history, because it has no traditions. I lived for over a year in the midst of a semicircle of mountains looking down upon a beautiful plain, and there dwelt there seven different tribes. These seven different tribes looked down upon that plateau, and in that plateau there are traces of a forgotten unknown people, who built stone kraals,—houses or villages—so that there was a population that occupied that plateau, many thousands—perhaps it would not be exaggerating if I said tens of thousands in number, and I am absolutely certain that they occupied it a hundred years ago. How am I certain? Because in Africa, the instant you take your hand away from the land there sprouts a tree. I have cut down a tree and carefully counted the rings, and I never found more than a hundred rings in a tree in such a kraal. This is proof that it was occupied by men a hundred years ago, and that by some dread desolation—war, famine, or pestilence,—these thousands suddenly ceased to live. But in the surrounding mountains, occupied by these seven different tribes, not the faintest tradition remains of who these people were who long ago built these stone kraals. Science is baffled—these people were swept out of life—why and how, no man knows—and no tradition among surrounding tribes tells of their fate.

World powers that succeeded in other lands failed to influence Africa. We know Egypt failed because she took nothing from African fauna for the world. The hen came to Egypt from the East. So did the cow, and the dog,—and if you could only take that dog and train him he would be one of the finest dogs in the world, though left wild he is dangerous. The zebra would make an excellent beast of burden, and the eland would make a superb cow. But Egypt

failed absolutely to make any penetrative effect upon the great African continent. Though in the time of St. Augustine there were four hundred Bishops of the faith in Northern Africa, but the missionaries never crossed the Sahara, and the power of civilization has never touched the heart of Africa. Will England fail? When a man says England always succeeds, north, south, east or west, I differ with him. I don't think she has succeeded in South Africa. There is nothing but praise for the English civil servant—I take off my hat to him every time. He is the bravest, the most self-sacrificing of men, if sometimes a little stupid—(laughter)—give him a chance and he will do magnificently. He goes out there knowing absolutely nothing but what he got in an English school, and while that goes a certain way it does not go the whole way. I have seen him sitting down there with his Swahili dictionary and a couple of native interpreters before him, trying to make out what black men are jabbering,—he does his job on £200 a year—with too often an unsympathetic government, and he knows that in ten years probably he will have a rotten liver. By such men England is served, and well served, along her far-flung battle line.

There can be little question but that Uganda is one of the richest lands in the world; the western part of East Africa, and the country that surrounds the great lakes, is a natural granary, from which India could be supplied. Two crops can be reaped in a year, sometimes three. Corn grows 10 or 15 feet high in four months. You can plant sticks no bigger than your thumb, and in five years' time you will have to take an ax to save yourself from being driven out of your home by the trees. (Laughter.) I have myself measured gum trees 98 feet high grown in ten years. The land is rich volcanic soil. It can raise the best cotton in the world, and is raising to-day the best coffee in the world, fetching £2 10s. a ton more than any other.

The Uganda mutiny put all this country in jeopardy for a time. Two battalions were sent up the Nile. Now one of the shortcomings of the Nubian soldier is that it is impossible to separate him from his women. He absolutely refuses to be separated from his wives and children. The English bargained that the Nubians were not to be separated from their wives and children for more than six months. But it was found that the campaign would have to go on for eighteen months instead of six. The officers, who had passed their word of honor, and the Government which had done so—for they were representing the Government to these simple people—found themselves obliged to tell the Nubians that they

had to go on to Victoria Nyanza. After some distressful time, these officers gave in their resignations, and new men were appointed, who did not speak the Nubian language—with the result that the soldiers broke into fury, and started to take the country themselves. They were not a large band of men—only two battalions, but they were entrenched, and they had Maxims and Martinis, the best weapons in the world. There were men there, missionaries, trying to help the people, to help their bodies as well as their souls. The Waganda gathered round their missionaries and asked, "Do you think it right for these mutinous mohamedans to take all our country?" There could be but one answer—"no." Then will you lead us against them?

The mutineers entrenched themselves above the lake at Jubas Borna, and from behind the fortified position defied attack. They were armed with Martini rifles and Maxims. Led by Mr. Pilkington, the heroic missionary and their own war chief, the Waganda spearmen charged the Borna wall. Tore at the spring hedge with their hands. Charged and charged! till Pilkington, their war chief, and 900 men lay dead before the guns.

They were beaten back. But the heart of the mutiny was broken—and Uganda was saved to England and civilization. Pilkington lies buried under a rose bush on Mengo Hill—no honors were his—yet surely no braver soldier of the cross ever gave his life for his fellowmen.

I launched out into this wild land with my 100 wildmen and felt absolutely safe. Each man was carrying his sixty-five pound load on his head. You have to give him a pound and a half of that meal a day; it isn't very much, but in one month he has eaten forty-five pounds of the sixty, and what are you going to do about it? There is the crux and the quandary of African travel. That is the reason that journeying in Africa is a trouble and a toil. Hunters leaving the great rivers behind them, the easy means of travel, and going where there are no roads and no rivers, must have food. These men had to carry food, but they could not carry more than sixty pounds each, and when that food was gone they had to get food. The African has no food; he has no such thing as possession. He is a happy man because he has nothing to lose. If he has food, it is hidden in the bush, for in this country which is swept by slavers that is the only hiding place. Even Mr. Stanley, when he went to find Livingstone, could not get food. Every man holds what he has. The man who has it fights for it; and the next man who comes has to fight an enraged man from whom food has been taken! The

fact is Mr. Stanley's steps in Africa were died in blood! Livingstone wanted to be left alone! But the papers had to achieve something, and Stanley was sent!

When the question is asked, "Can a man trust the black man?" I say you certainly can trust him.

Alongside her civil servants who serve her well there stands a man whose position is even nobler, the English and American missionary, who doesn't count life dear to himself, who holds up before and points out to the black man,—who is yet going to be a man,—some adequate representation of what a man should be. The English ivory hunter lives like the black man, but the missionary—I know a man, on \$250 a year, the man and his wife together, living amongst the blacks, tending with their hands the sick, always standing for the best,—these men and a few noble women with them, these want support. People at home think they know everything about East Africa, its gadflies and sleeping sickness. I saw a man sit down to teach a Bible lesson,—he had to teach a black man the epistle to the Romans; how was he to teach the man justification by faith? "Doctor," he said, "I'd rather take St. James." I knew a man who with his dear little wife was living in a village where a man-eating leopard came. I sat up two nights to get that leopard. One night their baby was sick. The weather was hot. He was a great big Wisconsin, six feet two. The window was wide open. Presently he had that sense in the darkness of something near, and looked out of the window, when literally his nose almost touched the nose of that man-eating leopard. He reached down for his gun, which mercifully was within reach, and blew the leopard's head off! That man is living among the Masai, trying to teach them the life that should be. The Masai are the most advanced tribe, and the best organized for war of any tribe of East Africa. They are a cattle-keeping tribe, but I will tell you a terrible thing about them. No man between twenty and thirty can marry; he lives in the war kraals, places of strategic position in the country. The little girls between ten years old and puberty are the property of these great warriors, and live promiscuously with these husky blacks till they reach puberty, then they go back to their homes and are married! Against that sort of thing, men like my missionary friend are striving and fighting, trying to help the black people to better themselves! Thank you for listening to me so long!

In response to the long and hearty applause which marked the conclusion of Dr. Rainsford's address, he said: "Gentlemen, four of the happiest years of my life were spent in this city! Good luck to you!"

(February 23, 1914.)

Australia.

BY SIR THOMAS TAIT, OF MONTREAL.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 23rd February, Sir Thomas Tait said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—Thirty minutes is but a short time to pay a visit to the other side of the world, and Australia is a large subject to cover in the time at our disposal. My reasons for selecting Australia as my subject to-day are, first, that it is always well to speak on a subject that you know more about than most of your audience, and second, that I think it desirable in these days that citizens of one part of the British Empire should know something about other parts of the Empire. The time at my command being so short, I shall therefore without any further preliminary remark than to thank you for the invitation to address you to-day plunge at once into my subject, and with that optimism characteristic of the plunger trust that we shall emerge better informed about Australia.

I say advisedly "better informed," for I suppose you to-day, as I had ten years ago, have but a hazy knowledge of that country. I well remember, when the matter of an appointment in Australia was broached to me, seeking the *Encyclopædia Britannica* to find out in what part of Australia Melbourne was situated. Under these circumstances, it will, I fear, be necessary to present you with a rather dry dessert of facts and figures, but of course you are at liberty to add such liquid refreshment to this dry diet as may be at your disposal.

The figures I shall give are for the year ending the 30th of June, 1912, as those are the latest comparative figures available.

Australia has an area of approximately 3,000,000 square miles, of which you will be surprised perhaps to learn over one-third is situated within the tropics. It is the largest island and the smallest continent on the globe. Its area is greater than that of the United States exclusive of Alaska. It is four-

* Sir Thomas Tait is a son of Sir Melbourne Tait, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec. He took up railway work as a boy, and after filling many important positions in the service of Canada's two largest railways, he was appointed Chairman of the Victoria Railway Commission. After a few years he reorganized that system, putting it on a profitable basis. He resigned and returned to Canada a few years ago.

fifths the size of Canada, three-fourths that of Europe, and it constitutes more than one-fourth of the area of the Empire. East and west it runs twenty-five hundred miles, and north and south two thousand miles.

Western Australia is the largest state, constituting one-third of the whole. Queensland is about one-fifth, South Australia one-eighth, New South Wales one-tenth, then follows little Victoria, and then the island state of Tasmania. But there is a large area left which is not yet a state, known as the Northern Territory. Last, but not least, there is the new Federal Capital site Canberra, comprising about 100 square miles.

Physically, Australia is like most of the other continents, in that there are coastal ranges, and that the country slopes back from them to the great interior, a large part of which is but little above the level of the sea, and in some places below that level. Countless ages ago the interior of Australia was a great ocean, covering 1,500,000 square miles or about one-half of the present continent. There are no great rivers, although the Murray, with its tributary the Darling, is one of the longest rivers in the world; in the Spring there is a large volume of water in it, but very little water reaches the sea, and indeed during part of the year no water reaches the ocean, more being taken up by seepage and evaporation than is received.

The Australian continent extends from Lat. 11 south to 38 south. To make apparent to you what that means I may say that in the Northern Hemisphere it corresponds to the region stretching from the north end of South America to, say, Washington. But you must remember that in the Southern Hemisphere the seasons are the opposite to those in the Northern Hemisphere: January and February are the mid-summer months, July and August are midwinter; and the farther north you go the hotter it gets. The northern part of Australia is not suitable for colonization by white people. At sea level, there is no snow, and no frost in Australia proper, but on the higher mountains there is snow in the winter time.

The climate in the large cities I may describe to you by saying that Brisbane is like Florida, Sydney and Adelaide like, say, Savannah, and Melbourne like San Francisco. The heat in the great interior is intense, due to the small rainfall, and the refraction of the sun's heat from the surface of the ground. Australia, speaking generally, is one of the driest countries in the world,—I mean in the matter of rainfall. (Laughter.) There is under ten inches of rainfall over one-

third of it, and over a considerable area under five inches of rain, per annum. Over more than half of Australia the rainfall is less than 15 inches. There are of course parts of Australia in which there is an ample rainfall as for instance in Victoria, and generally speaking, the coastal districts. In the north, during the monsoon the rain is phenomenal.

The population is about 4,500,000 people; an increase during the past ten years of 700,000. In density of population Australia compares with Canada as 1.57 is to 1.93 inhabitants per square mile. One of the striking features of the population of Australia is that 95% of the people were born either in Great Britain, Australia, or New Zealand. The non-European population, including that of the half castes and aborigines, is 72,000. Australia never had a dense population of aborigines, and after the advent of the white people it rapidly disappeared. Perhaps what was said of the Pilgrim Fathers when they landed in New England might be said of Captain Cook and his companions: "First they fell upon their knees, and then they fell upon the aborigines." (Laughter.)

Just at this moment I would like to mention the restrictions placed upon immigration. They have been greatly exaggerated: the only restriction is that the immigrant must be able to write from dictation fifty words of a European language, and that of course no criminals, no people of established bad character, and no mentally or physically incapable people, are admitted.

The proportion of males in Australia and New Zealand to the total population is greater than in any other country; but notwithstanding that, or perhaps because of it, women are given the vote; so it is no longer a case of "one man, one vote," but "one adult, one vote." (Applause.) While it may bring me into dangerous waters, I may without expressing an opinion on the question of woman suffrage at least, say this—that the women of to-day are undoubtedly better qualified to exercise the franchise than the men were when they were given it; and that in all those matters that affect our homes and our personal life, that is, all matters except such as divide political parties, such as protection and free trade, women are as well qualified as men to judge, and are likely to take more interest than men—I refer to such questions as education, the liquor traffic, health, the care of the infirm and of the aged and children, the wellbeing of the working classes, and so forth. (Applause.)

A noticeable feature regarding the population is the proportion living in the cities, and the size of the cities. Sydney

has a population of 700,000, Melbourne 600,000, Adelaide 200,000, Brisbane 150,000. As to the States, New South Wales has the largest population, 1,600,000; Victoria has 1,300,000; the two together constituting two-thirds of the whole population. Queensland has about 600,000; South Australia about 400,000; Western Australia about 300,000; and Tasmania about 200,000.

On the 1st of January, 1901, the States federated, under the title of the Commonwealth of Australia. There is a Governor-General, appointed by the King from Great Britain; a Senate of thirty-six members, six from each State, three from each State retiring every three years; and a House of Representatives, of seventy-five members, elected from the States on a population basis, the minimum representative for any State being five. It was supposed that the Senate, being elected by the people of the State as a whole, would prove to be a very conservative body; but the contrary is the case.

As regards State government, each State has a Governor from Great Britain appointed by the King, and an Upper and a Lower House, the members of the Upper House being appointed by the Crown in New South Wales and Queensland, and in the others being elected; in the Lower House, needless to say, the members are elected, on a population basis in all the States.

There is left the Northern Territory, formerly belonging to South Australia, but taken over by the Federal Government on the 1st August, 1911, the Commonwealth assuming its debts, and agreeing to build a north and south transcontinental railway.

It may interest you to know that the Federation of Australia is on a different basis from that of Canada. In Canada certain specific powers were left with the Provinces, and everything else went to the Dominion; in Australia certain specific powers were given to the Federal Government, and everything else was left to the States. I think the Canadian method has proved the better. (Applause.)

The chief production of Australia, as you all know, is wool. The average annual value of the wool exported during the past five years was \$130,000,000. Australia has more sheep than any other country in the world, nearly 100,000,000. Argentina being next with Russia a close third. It may surprise you to hear that Australia grows nearly 100,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum.

Australia has been making great strides recently in the production of butter; over 200,000,000 pounds being now made there, and over \$23,000,000 worth exported annually. This is largely due to the supervision the Governments exercise

over the butter factories and over the grading of export butter. The State also supervises the cold storage warehouses at the ports and the refrigeration on the ships, so that the buyer of Australian butter knows he will get what he purchases. (Applause.)

What first made Australia prominent in the eyes of the world was its production of gold. Up to 1911 it had produced \$2,650,000,000 worth, of which little Victoria produced over half. Australia also has copper, silver, lead, tin and iron mines, and large and excellent coal deposits in New South Wales. It also exports frozen mutton, rabbits, hides, skins, and wine—good wine.

The total trade of Australia is over \$690,000,000, as compared with that of Canada, \$890,000,000 for the same year; that is, with a little over half the population, Australia had three-fourths the total trade of Canada. (Applause.) The imports per head are the same as those of Canada, \$70 per annum; but in exports Australia leads the way, with \$80 per head, as compared with \$50 for Canada. The total trade is thus \$150 per capita in Australia as compared with \$120 in Canada. Strange as it may seem in Australia and New-Zealand the wealth per capita is greater than in any other country in the world, with the exception of one or two.

The customs tariff is about the same as in Canada: on dutiable goods 28%, and on all goods including free goods 17%; the percentage of free goods, both in Canada and in Australia being 35% of the whole.

They have a preferential tariff in favor of Great Britain, a reduction of about 5% in the rate, that is, say 20% against British goods, as against 25% against the rest of the world, or a difference of about 25%.

An interesting financial feature is that the Commonwealth, which was constituted in 1901, is practically free of debt as yet. (Applause.) The issue of notes by the Commonwealth, instead of by the banks less the reserve of gold, which had to be retained gave the Commonwealth between 25 and 30 million dollars for nothing, this with an abounding revenue from customs and graduated land tax, postal and excise revenue and revenue from other sources has permitted of a large expenditure for Public Works and Defence Purposes, and for administration without incurring much, if any, public debt.

But when we turn to the States, we find a different condition. The public debt of the States amounts to the enormous sum of \$1,355,000,000, or \$300 per head. This money has been expended mainly for railways, telegraphs, telephones,

waterworks, irrigation, harbour and purchase of land for closer settlement. The net profit from the States Public Works pays interest on the whole of the State loans, which is just under 4%. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Now as to railways: the total mileage is 18,653, of which the States own about 17,000 miles, the balance being private lines, half of them being for general traffic and half for special purposes. We have a greater variety of gauge in Australia than in any other country; about half of the lines are 3 feet 6; about a quarter of them 5 ft. 3, about one-half 4 ft. 8½ in.; and a few are 2 ft. and 2 ft. 6. The State expenditure on railways amounts to \$800,000,000, on which a profit equal to 4.13 per cent. is earned or over \$5,000,000 in excess of the interest charges. The freight charges per ton per mile are higher than in Canada, but the average haul is much shorter. The rate per passenger mile is about the same as here unless suburban traffic is included, when it is lower. A transcontinental railway, about 1,000 miles in length, is being built east and west, by the Federal Government under an agreement with South Australia; and as before mentioned under an agreement with the same State, a transcontinental railway is to be built north and south. On the east and west line an interesting experiment is to be tried owing to the small rainfall and the scarcity of water, namely, the use of internal combustion locomotives.

The railways are constructed and operated largely in accordance with British practice; they are mainly owned by the States, and administered by Commissioners. Therefore the proposition was most interesting to a man brought up on Company-owned railways built and worked in accordance with American practice. My observations lead me to think that while British railwaymen have something to learn from American railwaymen, the reverse is also true, and that as traffic grows more dense in America, for instance in New England, many British practices and methods will be adopted here to cope with the conditions.

A striking feature of Victoria's railway traffic is the enormous suburban business done at Melbourne: in and out of the central suburban station at Melbourne every day pass about 200,000 people, and 1,500 trains arrive and leave that station every day. The average fare is 5 cents per passenger, and the average passenger journey is 5 miles.

Australia and New Zealand were for many years in advance of the rest of the world in social and industrial legislation. The great aim of the legislation of that character has

been to extend the reasonable comforts of a civilized community to those engaged in every branch of industry, and to care for those who are infirm and old and poor. (Applause.) While those countries were formerly in advance in this class of legislation, many of the civilized countries of the world have been following, and in some instances have even gone ahead. Australia has excellent factory laws—well observed. These, with minimum wages and regulated working hours, have done away almost entirely with sweating, and have been conducive to the prevention of injury and to the health and general welfare of the working classes. You would be pleased to see the conditions under which the working people of Australia work and live. (Applause.)

Australia has old age pensions, but not as yet compulsory insurance against sickness and unemployment. And they do not feed their school children. There is a maternity allowance, under which every woman who has a child receives, I think, £5 for each child, and under which \$3,000,000 was paid out for the year. There are minimum wages, which are almost necessary if sweating is to be prevented; but, strange to relate, one result of the minimum wage is an increase in unemployment, for if an employer has to pay a minimum wage he is only going to keep men who are worth it. (Hear, hear.) The remedy for that, to my mind, is to set up some tribunal to determine the value of such unfortunate men and to allow the employers to pay them something less than the minimum wage. (Applause.)

They have the eight-hour day in Australia. Perhaps here I might give you the creed of the Australian workingman: "Eight hours to work, eight hours to play, eight hours to sleep, and eight bob a day." (Laughter and applause.)

In no country in the world has there been more legislation to prevent industrial disputes than in Australia and New Zealand, but notwithstanding this, there are more strikes there in proportion to their industries than in any other country. It may be said, therefore, that compulsory arbitration is not a success. But I think the difficulty is, the legislation does not go far enough. The assets of the employer are get-at-able should he violate the law, but those of the employee are not. It is impossible to put a thousand men in jail, and to put the leaders in jail makes martyrs of them. New Zealand is, I understand, contemplating legislation which will go a long way, in my opinion, to overcome the difficulty and prevent industrial strife. This legislation will provide that the funds of the Unions shall be reported to the State, and that they

shall be attachable in case of violation of the law to the extent of £1,000 or more, and that each striker shall in addition be fined to the extent of £10.

Australia has been wise in not applying its industrial legislation to its primary production,—I refer to grazing, dairying and farming,—on which it relies for its prosperity. Nearly all the land was granted or taken up at small prices in the early days for sheep raising, and to-day there is, generally speaking, not much free land of good quality obtainable. A sheep station, as they call it, of thirty or forty thousand acres employs but ten or twelve men, except during shearing, when shearing gangs go around, and produces only wool and sheep. The same area under cultivation would produce grain and fodder, etc., as well as sheep and wool, and would support hundreds of families. Therefore in order to provide good land for immigrants and others desiring to settle on the land, and to have the best use made of the land, the States have passed legislation to enable them to resume land at a price fixed by arbitration in case of failure to agree. With the idea of inducing the subdivision of large landed estates the Commonwealth Labor Government has passed a graduated land tax measure under which the more valuable the estate the higher the rate of taxation. Also an absentee land tax, that is an extra tax on land owners who do not steadily reside in the Commonwealth. I may say that the policy of the subdivision and close settlement of lands has been accompanied by very satisfactory results.

The great problem of Australia, however, is the northerly part, lying within the tropics. It is unsuitable for colonization by white people, and is a constant invitation to the black, yellow and brown people who exist in millions to the north to come and take it, for there is practically no population there, and it will never be well populated by white people, for they cannot work in the fields and thrive or bring up healthy children in that country.

Australia has come to the fore lately in the matter of defence. (Applause.) First, as to the land forces. Lord Kitchener was invited to come to Australia and recommend a scheme. He sent before him General Kirkpatrick, a son of our dear old Sir George, to gather information for him. General Kirkpatrick then returned with Lord Kitchener and assisted him in writing his report, and he was then appointed to carry out Lord Kitchener's recommendations. He has done splendid work, and has now been appointed to a most important position in India, namely, Director of Military Operations.

In Australia under the Kitchener scheme, which became effective on 1st January, 1911, lads from twelve to fourteen years are Junior Cadets, who must be trained ninety hours per annum. From fourteen to eighteen years, Senior Cadets, who must train for four whole days, twelve half days, and twenty-four night drills per annum. From eighteen to twenty-five years, Citizen Forces, who must have sixteen whole days' training every year, of which eight at least must be in continuous camp. At the 30th June, 1912, including rifle clubs and cadets, the forces numbered 168,000; and there has been considerable augmentation since then.

As to the navy. In 1890 Australia and New Zealand agreed with the British Government, in consideration of certain vessels being stationed in Australian waters they would contribute \$630,000 per annum towards interest and upkeep. In 1893 the agreement was changed to provide annually \$1,000,000 from Australia and \$200,000 from New Zealand. In 1909 Australia decided to replace the squadron provided by Great Britain under the agreement just mentioned, and asked Admiral Henderson to recommend a scheme. That scheme called for a total expenditure spread over about twenty years of about \$200,000,000 with an annual outlay for upkeep of about \$24,000,000. Australia undertook to provide one unit of this scheme forthwith at an estimated cost of \$18,750,000, and an annual upkeep cost of \$3,850,000. This unit was to consist of one battle cruiser, three light cruisers, six torpedo boat destroyers and submarines. Of these, there have been built in England and are in commission the battle cruiser, two light cruisers, and three torpedo boat destroyers and submarines, leaving one light cruiser and three torpedo boat destroyers to be built or, more correctly speaking, assembled in Australia. I regret to say, that the cost of the ships to be built in Australia has been considerably greater, and the time of construction considerably longer than was expected.

The total estimated expenditure on defence for the year 1912-13 was \$27,000,000, of which the navy's proportion was \$7,500,000 or about \$1.70 per head of the population. The expenditure of Great Britain for the defence of the Empire on the seas is \$5 per head for every man, woman and child. Australia, on the same basis, would contribute \$22,500,000, and Canada \$40,000,000, per annum.

In my opinion, the provision and maintenance of a navy in Australian waters strong enough to cope with any important power is too great a burden for that country. (Hear, hear.) And in any event I question whether ships stationed

in those waters, three or four weeks distant from where the battle to determine the command of the seas will probably be fought, would be of much value in the defence of the Empire on the seas. (Applause.) I would like to make a few observations on this subject, not from the point of view of Canada and Canadians only but from that of the whole Empire and all its people. (Hear, hear.) Apart from a negligible few the people of the British Empire—no matter their ancestry or their race, irrespective of their politics, and regardless of their religion,—in my opinion, desire the maintenance of the Empire—(Hear, hear, and applause.)—if for no loftier reason, than their own individual interests and the general advantage of their respective communities. For to my mind there is much to lose, and, so far as I can see, nothing to gain, by the breaking up or dismemberment of our Empire. (Applause.) The maintenance of the Empire, with all that that implies, including freedom to make our customs tariffs, and conduct our trade as we please, depends, I submit, on the supremacy of the Empire's naval forces against any probable combination that might be arrayed against them. If my premises are correct, and I submit they are, then, if our naval forces are not in that impregnable condition, it is the duty and to the interest of all parts of the Empire and all their peoples to do their share towards placing them in that supreme position on the seas to which I have referred. (Applause.) And to do it as quickly as possible. (Hear, hear, and applause.) That is the important point—time, for it takes nearly two years to build a Dreadnought. If the naval forces of the Empire are not sufficiently strong to maintain the command of the seas, then each part of the Empire should determine what is the utmost it can do towards attaining that position, and regardless of all other considerations should endeavor to obtain the greatest possible result in that direction in the least possible time, and to continue to do so until the Empire is absolutely, beyond the peradventure of a doubt, supreme on the seas against any probable combination that may be arrayed against it. (Applause.)

Again I emphasize the importance of time, and leave this part of the subject with these words—"as much as possible, as soon as possible." (Applause.)

We have now emerged from our plunge into the subject of Australia. I trust the addition to your lunch has not proved unpleasantly dry or unpalatable. I hope that it has been the means of increasing the knowledge of at least some of you in reference to Australia. I can assure you all of a

most hearty welcome and boundless hospitality should you visit Australia. You will find there a country to be proud of and worthy of its position as one of the brightest jewels in the diadem of Dominions which form so important a part of the crown of our magnificent Empire. You will find there an intelligent, progressive, resolute, resourceful, and in every way fine people. A people who honor the same traditions, hold the same sentiments and have the same aspirations as yourselves. You will find fellow citizens who like us will not be found lacking if the call should come to rally to the defence of our great British Empire. (Applause.)

(March 12, 1914.)

English Radicalism.

BY JOSIAH C. WEDGWOOD, M.P.*

AT a special meeting of the Canadian Club held on the 12th March, Mr. Wedgwood said:

Mr. Chairman and Brothers,—(Hear, hear.)—It is all very well to be “cousins” in the south land, but we are brothers up in this:—I am indeed proud to have this opportunity of addressing such a magnificent audience on my first visit to Canada. I have found Toronto, and I expect I shall find it again. (Applause.) On this occasion I have exactly three hours in which to discover Toronto. I have discovered the Canadian Club, and I have discovered the highest building in the Empire. (Laughter.)

Now, I am a Radical, and Radicals have a habit of getting down to business. I am to tell you to-night what British Radicalism is doing, and why it is doing it, or trying to do it. In the Old Country we think that the efficiency and strength of British Liberalism lie in the fact that it stands for freedom and justice, and the great measures Liberalism is trying to carry through are all based on freedom and justice. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Every decent Liberal knows that a man would sooner govern himself, even if he does it badly, than be governed by somebody else, however well intentioned. And people have a perfect right to govern themselves, and Liberals seek to give them a chance to exercise that right.

It may be we shall have Mr. Redmond here to-night; he can tell you of the desire of the Irish to govern themselves. I believe that the Home Rule discussion in Britain, and in Canada as well, is along the lines of true Liberalism. I venture to think that the abolition of the plural voter is also along the lines of freedom and justice. (Applause.)

However, if we act only along the lines of freedom and justice, more emphatically even than what we are doing for Home Rule for Ireland or electoral machinery, yes, what we are doing for greater freedom for humanity, is what we are doing with the land question.

* Mr. Josiah C. Wedgwood, M.P., was a direct descendant of the founder of the famous Wedgwood pottery. He has had a remarkable career as a manufacturer, social worker, soldier, naval architect and member of Parliament. He is one of the most prominent and aggressive supporters of Mr. Lloyd George's reform movements.

I know quite well that in Canada it is the habit to advocate Single Tax on the lines largely of the benefit to industry. You bring forward irrefutable arguments, because every remission of local taxation upon buildings and improvements is of benefit to industry. You say, quite rightly, that a tax upon improvements reduces those improvements, checks the production of wealth, creates unemployment and social evils. What you want to do is to change the basis of local taxation, as they have done in Vancouver, and gradually remove taxation upon all buildings and improvements created by buildings upon the land, and place the taxation instead upon the land value alone. What you emphasize is freedom of taxation upon improvements; I want you also to look at that from the point of view of labor as a whole. The man who does work, and does not get the reward of his labor is a wage serf. It is only the Single Taxer who sees this, not merely from the point of view of increasing industry and wealth, and relieving the taxpayer from the burden upon improvements, but that only by basing local and general taxation upon land values can you make the wage serf a free man. (Applause.)

We are out for freedom, for the taxpayer but also for the working man. I mean, in the few minutes at my disposal, to take you through the fundamentals of our policy, and show you how it is putting the tax upon land values, how it is proposed to free the wage serf, and to show you what we are doing in England, and to ask you to consider this question for yourselves.

Wage slavery comes from one simple law, which Karl Marx called "the iron law of wages." So long as three men are after one job, and have no alternative but to take the job or starve, wages will be cut down to the subsistence level, and the workingman has simply to toil on and breed another who takes his place when he is thrown on to the scrap heap. Whatever careful, well-intentioned legislation you pass, to improve the condition of the worker, and make him more comfortable and contented, it cannot do permanent good so long as there is that "iron law of wages," so long as a man must take work on the master's terms or starve he is a wage slave. We believe in freedom, but you cannot get it under the present conditions of employment; but when you break them down, by giving the worker a new alternative, giving him the opportunity of employing his labor for himself, the feeling that he is his own master, then you have freedom for the worker.

Years ago I went through the South African war as a Captain of artillery engineers, and I worked, I am glad to say, with the 3rd Battery of Canadian Artillery. (Applause.) After the war stopped I remained as Resident Commander of a large district, sixty miles each way, and I was the autocrat of that district; it is a very pleasing position—I should recommend every one of you to be an autocrat—with sufficient salary! (Laughter.) Well, I was faced with the unemployed problem. There was no poor law there. But all around this town was a tract of four thousand acres, town lands, as they were called, and on these town lands was the town coal mine. And seeing that no individual owned these lands, I, in the exercise of my autocratic power, threw them open for the men to settle on. I gathered them together, and they put up dwellings; they borrowed barbed wire from the block house—when the sentinels were not looking—(Laughter)—and in a wonderfully short time had a little town built, as you know discharged soldiers can do. They mined the coal, grew mealies, potatoes and other things on these lands; we charged them no rent, collected no taxes; they were under no capitalist, visited by no tax collector; these men got the full reward of their labor, they lived a free life. (Laughter.) Because that door was open, of unlimited opportunity for self-employment, the people of Ormelo were free, and their wages were one pound a day. They were able to look their employers in the face; a worker was able to bargain with the man himself; he had no longer the cruel alternative of taking the work at the employer's terms or starving. It brought the working people to feel themselves free. That important alternative, by which the men could employ themselves by working a free mine or free lands as free men, served as a good example. It is not necessary for a man to take it: a man may work for a master if he chooses, but if so he works on equal terms, and the competition of the unemployed is no longer crowding him. You ask any working man whom he is afraid of in this world: he will say it is not the master, not those firms who introduce all the latest devices to get a man to do twice as much as he has been accustomed to doing,—no, it is the man outside the factory gate, only too anxious to sneak in if he gets the chance. Give this man access to natural resources, take away the dread that harasses him of being thrown out of employment by giving him the opportunity of working for himself—that is what Single Taxers are out for! (Applause.) To provide the alternative, that there shall be land of high fertility, for which there is no com-

petitive demand, open to all men to cultivate as they like, with security for all improvements, without paying rent or taxes, without the interference of any man, backed by the law and backed by the police, to turn them off that land.

The world is dark at present on this subject, but as soon as the people understand it, as soon as the land is free to all who will come and take it, they will find that Malthus was wrong, and the population of the globe is not crowding by increase. That land should be available for all men is the Single Taxers' theory. You make it impossible for a man to keep land idle, waiting for the speculative price to get up, by taking the local taxes off buildings and improvements, and putting them on land values alone. You make the position of the land speculator more unpleasant than it is at the present time.

I dare say you have taxes on unused dogs here. (Laughter.) It is no use trading them, but we pay for each such dog 7s. 6d. a year. Contemplate for one moment the effect of doubling the tax on dogs. I know in England the population of the various canals would be immediately greatly increased. (Laughter.) There would be a slump in dogs, and they would become a drug on the market. Well, it is exactly the same way with the tax falling upon unused land: it has a tendency to throw it into the market. You cannot throw your unused land into Lake Ontario, but you can thus throw it on the market, and there is a slump in land values, land becomes cheaper, and people who want it can get it cheaper. Change the taxation; remove it from buildings and improvements; make it so that people have to pay taxes on land value whether they use it or not, and they will pretty soon send around to the agent and say: "Look here, I am not going to hold this land any longer. This is a mug's game. I am not going to hold it. I don't care what price you get for it, but get rid of it." A man is able to get land then on the market more cheaply. You force the Canadian Pacific to take their mailed fist off all the blocks they have now. (Hear, hear.) Instead of having to go in Canada right under the Arctic Circle to get your free 160 acres, you can get the same nearer home. The margin of cultivation would not be the same as now. You would have all the land for productive use. By economic pressure such as this you have free land, for which there is no competitive demand.

Only under real freedom can you get co-operation. The worker would get for himself in freedom the full reward of his work, all that is his due. That, gentlemen, is my reason

for fighting for the single tax. And now let us consider what we can do in our generation to bring the single tax about. Here in Canada, your course is perfectly obvious; you must press for home rule in taxation. (Hear, hear.) I am delighted to know that you passed by a majority of 36,000 a referendum in Toronto in favor of allowing municipalities to tax improvements at a lower rate than land. A large proportion of those who voted for home rule in taxation did so because they wanted to reduce the cost of improvements. You will find this question come up with every local question; the people will become educated; they will find that so far as expediency is concerned, and the booming of trade, they will be in favor of the change. You will soon discover also that you base your political condition upon economic foundations. What more advantageous than to take into the coffers of your municipality those values created by the municipality? You will add public parks at enormous expense to the taxpayers; you will spend money on garden plots, and put up beautiful statues—or the reverse—(laughter)—and the people who get the benefit will be the whole people, not the land-owners who own the land adjacent to these improvements. Directly you put the local taxes on land values alone, it immediately reflects returns to the local treasury. You will be encouraged to make parks, to build tramways, effect street widenings, and do all those municipal things which you want to do, perhaps not so badly as we in England. If you get home rule in taxation you remove the argument such as is fighting you at every street corner, that no one can have a chance under the existing law.

True, one argument will meet you: you will be told that this is robbery, confiscation; that widows and orphans have invested their hard-earned savings in buildings and improvements, and will be deprived of their income if you take the taxes off them. In England we have been met by this argument; but the widows and orphans I think of are those of the men who have been robbed of their returns for their work in the years past! (Laughter.) There is a story told of a little girl who was taken by her mother to visit a picture gallery. They saw the picture of Prometheus, and the mother told the little girl how Prometheus brought fire down from heaven and the gods punished him by chaining him to a rock, where the vultures tore out his heart and his liver, but each day these were built up again and the next day the vultures came again—a very pleasant story! The mother explained this stragic history of Prometheus, and paused,

for the infant to comprehend this tragedy. The little girl looked at the picture a moment and then exclaimed, "Oh, mamma, the poor vultures; the same breakfast every morning." (Laughter.) That little girl suffered from what I call *inverted morality*. And these people who say we are robbers and spoliators and everything wicked, are suffering, just like that little girl from inverted morality! (Applause.)

You want home rule in taxation in every town and country district in Canada. (Hear, hear.) You have got it some places. I don't see why you should not have it everywhere. You will have a stiff fight. Vested interests think home rule most undesirable. In England we have a much more difficult task, I am afraid, because we have not so many of the middle classes in our cause as you have here and in America. The middle classes in England are naturally, I think, more conservative than you find them here; they have not had the question so long before them as you have had; they have not examples as near them as you have in Vancouver; nor is there the intense desire there for a town to have more population and to beat its rivals, which is so marked a feature of American life. (Laughter.) They say, "Let well enough alone." Therefore we have not the hold there on the middle classes that you have here. But I venture to think that we have more hold on the working classes. Among the 173 members of Parliament who signed the memorial in favor of home rule in taxation are the whole of our British Labor party. (Applause.) Moreover, we find that those advocating these reforms in England are found so often advocating them in conjunction with the Labor party. So even when we were making the demonstration against the injustice of the war in South Africa, the English and the Irish were on far more intimate terms with the Labor party than with any other. Therefore we have a strong backing of what you might call the uneducated opinion. They are beginning, however, to understand that this land question is the bottom question, and to understand our social evils; they are beginning to think how to end that land monopoly. They are thinking of that in England; and we have Mr. Lloyd George seeking to smash the land monopoly. There are many particular items of his program we do not agree with, but we are one with him on that suggestion to make it compulsory upon all local authorities to transfer 5 per cent.—only one-twentieth—of the present local taxation to land values, and *pro tanto* to relieve the buildings upon the land. That is a very thin end of the wedge, but the wedge is there. More than

that, they are proposing to go the whole way in taxation, in regard to both County and Borough Councils, and allow them to shift not more than 5 per cent. each year, so gradually making this change.

In Vancouver and in Australia and New Zealand this change has been made. In Sydney, I believe, the basis of taxation is entirely upon land value. That is of course the kernel of the Lloyd George campaign. It is bitterly opposed by the land interests and the vested interests, which are conservative. Many of our landlords are clearing out. All around me they are doing it. The Duke of Sutherland is selling off his land, and buying instead in Texas and Canada. A number of them are selling out. Watch this change, because it will not be of so much use for humanity as a whole if we get rid of our landlords in England and you in Canada get them instead. (A voice: "No, sir," and laughter.)

It is a very old question, and the fight will rage next year: somewhere about June, 1915, when it comes, the land question will be to the front. The whole of England will be ringing with the song:

"The land, the land, 'twas God who made the land;
The land, the land, the ground on which we stand;
Why should we be beggars with the ballot in our hand?
God gave the land to the people." (Applause.)

While we are fighting in England for the change of the basis of local taxation, we in England and you here in America, it is the beginning of Single Tax, the emancipation of labor. I think the struggle will be a long one. But to those who are fighting for something worth fighting for, those who do hate slavery, as every decent Englishman does, who base their whole lives on justice, there can be no more noble cause than ours. Shall we at length succeed? Ultimately, yes. But in our time, or in the memory of our time? Who shall say? Men who see oppressions and misery must right them as far as possible. There is disappointment, and bitterness. So it was in the old time, so it is now; let us not deceive ourselves. For every man the standard of justice is raised in this world. For every man there must be difficulties, sometimes very great. If weak are the forces opposed to truth, how shall error so long prevail? But for those who see truth, and who follow her, who recognize justice and stand for it, success is not the only thing! (Applause.) Success,—falsehood has even that to give; injustice has even that to give; must not truth and justice have something to give, which is their own, of proper right? That

they have! And that all those know full well who amid reaction and every kind of discouragement fight against privilege for the freedom of the people! (Long applause.)

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

BY MR. FRED BANCROFT.

Following Mr. Wedgwood's address, Mr. Fred Bancroft, Vice-President of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, gave an address on Workmen's Compensation. Mr. Bancroft said:

Mr. President, and to emulate a very worthy gentleman, brothers,—The remarks that I shall make this evening will be so far as possible non-controversial, for the simple reason that at the present time the Ontario Government is face to face with a piece of legislation which is said by some to be the most advanced piece of legislation in the world, and is recognized by everyone as probably the most important piece of legislation in the history of the Province of Ontario, a piece of legislation which will affect every worker so far as it is proposed in the Province of Ontario, and affect him in a measure which it becomes plain to see makes it one of the most fundamental problems of the workers, so that it might on that account be described as the most important piece of legislation so far as the people of Ontario are concerned that has ever been introduced anywhere.

Before I say anything else, I should say that my colleagues and myself, representing organized labor, have stated our position for the last three years not only before the Commissioner but before the workers of Ontario, both publicly and privately, and anything I may say to-night will not alter the position taken by the workers.

This legislation as proposed, if passed, is going to make a radical change in the position of the workers in regard to compensation for accidents arising in the course of employment; and let me say that it is recognized by everyone that this legislation will make a great change in Ontario. And supplementing what Mr. Wedgwood has said, you cannot make any change without affecting some interest which has grown up before that.

I propose very rapidly and briefly to speak of some of the noticeable features of this legislation. There are many aspects that cause a distinct difference of opinion between

* Mr. Fred Bancroft is Vice-President of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, and had charge of the preparation and conduct of the case for organized labor in connection with the new Workmen's Compensation Bill in Canada.

the manufacturers and the representatives of organized labor, but there are features upon which they coincide, and upon which they can march together to have placed upon the statute books of Ontario. One of the features causing trouble at the present time, yet which in the end we feel sure will be settled is the feature called compulsory State insurance. Most men, when you mention "State insurance," conjure up notions of socialism; it seems to many that to make a very modest step is very radical legislation.

I shall speak upon this subject from a business standpoint, so dissociate what I say from the thought that I am a representative of labor, for though particularly honored as spokesman before the Commissioner and since, yet I wish you to dissociate all idea that I am speaking from the particular labor standpoint, and wish to assure you that we have been dealing with this question also from the business standpoint.

There are those who try to confine all we say and preach to the arena of the labor man's position, but there are labor men to-day all over the world who can be regarded not only as statesmen on this question but as public servants and statesmen when it comes to questions affecting the whole community. (Applause.)

I want to point out one feature: the Commissioner has proposed in Part I. a plan of compulsory State insurance; the employers in different industries which he has named in the First Part shall be grouped together, and they shall be divided into different classes representing the particular industries in which they are engaged, and shall pay a tax upon their yearly wage roll into a State-managed fund, out of which compensation shall be paid to injured workers automatically by a Crown Commission, and where a worker is killed his widow shall receive compensation, and his children shall be taken care of until they are sixteen years of age.

I am not before the Canadian Club this evening to use any argument for the general uplift of the working classes, I am using arguments to business men to show why it is better for the industries of the people, for the Government of Ontario to carry out this legislation in this way than in any other way that is proposed. And I will illustrate it from the business standpoint.

Just let me lay this down as fundamental: if the Province of Ontario is going to take upon itself to care for those injured in industries by a tax, no one has attempted to defend the present position: everyone, a manufacturer and laboring

man, Grit and Tory, says it is time for a change; so when everyone speaks that way in concert, we feel right in trying to get this change made.

If the public are going to pay for this, then, from a scientific standpoint, experts say, in the last analysis the great consuming public is going to pay for this compensation. That is true, we say; that is, whatever tax you place upon a commodity, it will find its way into the cost of that commodity. Premiums are paid at the present time under the Employers' Liability law; the cost of that also finds its way to the consuming public, although the compensation does not get to the workers, except only a small sum.

Then we face this question: there are those who say that the employer should be allowed to insure any way he likes, provided he insures his workmen. The proposal is that he shall be compelled to insure in the State fund. Naturally many men balk at the idea of compulsion, or the thought of restraint by the State. What is the State? People gathered together in a city under the name of municipal government pass laws to restrain the people in such a municipality. The same applies to a State. Liberty is not license to the individual. You can have liberty as far as you agree to go under the laws we all agree are right. If there is necessary compulsion, that is exercised in the general interest.

If the Province of Ontario is going to pay for compensation, what I think I am right in saying is that it should pay it in the most economical way and at the lowest cost of administration. I submit this is a business proposition: let me give you evidence to substantiate it.

Any change in legislation must touch some vested interest somewhere; you cannot possibly remedy any injustice and leave all the vested interests. If the public can at two million dollars a year pay this compensation, is it just to compel the public to pay four million dollars, to save some private insurance company?

Let me give you some figures. We have to go to New York to get figures to substantiate our argument. It seems that most experts who use figures as to insurance draw their figures from the United States. You will easily see the reason. In the Provinces and in the States of the Union, particularly in the State of New York, liability insurance companies have to report every year to the State Insurance Department. In the Province of Ontario they do not. Fire insurance companies report, I believe, to the Provincial Insurance Department, but not so far as employers' liability

is concerned; these reports go to the Dominion. If you want to substantiate these figures that come from every country, you can do it by taking the Insurance Report for 1912, issued at Ottawa, giving the figures for employers' liability.

In New York, one of the experts said in cases of benefits paid by employers' liability insurance in New York, the best figures and the latest he could get were these: in 1909, the insurance companies that insured employers under the present Employers' Liability law, collected in all \$27,446,492 in premiums. Their expenses were \$14,102,922, or 51% of that amount. The claims paid amounted to \$9,590,779, or 35% of the premiums. It is estimated, and this is by one of the foremost actuaries in the world to-day, that in the case of the great insurance companies in New York State not more than 25% of the premiums reach the victims and their families, after deduction of lawyers' and attorneys' expenses! What does it mean? That for every dollar paid in the State of New York by an employer to insure himself under the Employers' Liability law, only 25 cents ever reaches the victims and their families for which that dollar was originally paid! That is an illustration from the State of New York.

Another illustration, from the other side of the continent, the State of Washington. They passed an Act two years ago, embodying compulsory State insurance. When it was first promulgated and presented to the Legislature, all the interests saw the approach of an era of blue ruin for the industries, as here. But after two years' operation, under the principle proposed, that is, of State compulsory insurance, or rather, to be plain, a State-managed fund for paying compensation automatically to workers and their dependents, this is the report: the total receipts in the two years, ending with September 30, 1913,—and remember I am not going back thirty years into German history to prove this,—the cash in the accident fund, amounted to \$321,217; the cash in the reserve fund to secure compensation was \$734,206; the claims paid in these two years were \$1,529,115; the total expenses, from June 1, 1911, to Sept. 30, 1913, which were paid out of the general fund of the State, totalled \$210,078. The ratio of expenses to total contribution to accident fund was 8.13 per cent. So that in the State of Washington under the compulsory State insurance plan proposed by the Commissioner in his legislation, it cost 8.13 cents out of every dollar to operate the insurance business, and 92 cents, almost, remaining, went in compensation to where it was intended, the workers, the victims, and those left or into the reserve

fund. (Applause.) The difference—in New York State, 25 cents out of every dollar reached the victims,—and mark you this, and I want to make this plain, that there are many employers in this Province, and a great proportion of those in the Province, as far as I have heard representative employers speak, who lay this down as a fundamental principle: “We want the compensation to go to the workers, and not be eaten up by intermediaries. That is what we paid it for, and that is where it does not go,”—in the State of New York 75 cents of the dollar is eaten up by intermediaries, 51% in expenses and the rest in other ways; in the State of Washington, where the employer is paying his premium to the State, representing by a Commission the common people, 92 cents of the dollar goes to the common people, and is not eaten up. That is a business proposition! (Applause.)

We have looked at this from a business standpoint, and we say absolutely that workmen’s compensation is a public matter, not a private matter. When the employer pays a premium, in the last analysis the public pays, and so the paying of insurance is a public proposition, not a private matter.

Why should there be compulsion? If it is left to the employer to choose where he shall insure, in comes the agent to offer all kinds of inducements, asking the employer to insure in his private insurance company. Also there is another danger, there may be many a manufacturer who is interested also in an insurance company, so he does not know where he stands on this proposition; if he is interested in an insurance company he does not like to give his insurance to any other, and so he hardly knows exactly where he is at,—I think the public will settle it for him.

The question is asked, of what interest is it to the common people whether an employer insures in an insurance company or in the State, so long as compensation is paid. It has been used in argument times without number, that if this kind of legislation proposed is passed, the old men in an industry will be discharged. We argue, and we have evidence, that it is not always the employer who discharges the old men. We know very well that under our present system of profits the older employee goes as a matter of course by the introduction of younger men; the consequence is that in business he has been almost driven out by the stress of dollars and cents. I have often wondered why, and have said so in church,—I could not reconcile myself to some preaching, if we are sincere, you and I should not only carry out our religion past Sunday night but our humanitarian motives

should be put into practice from Sunday night to Saturday night. (Applause.)

So when you ask what is the difference between an employer's insuring in a company or in the State, an expert who has travelled all over Europe has said, as the British Trades Congress and other organizations have pointed out, that a discrimination exists, and the meanest and most vicious kind of discrimination, against employers who retain old men in their employ. The practice under existing conditions, which throws the old man out of employment and gives his place to a younger and more vigorous man, is because the private insurance company is willing to make quite a little lower rate if the employer will do that.

We were told by some that to ask for a certain kind of legislation, and in particular this kind of legislation the result would mean that employers would discharge their old employees. We did not believe it, we did not think it true. Where workmen's compensation is dominated by private insurance companies, the insurance company goes to the employer and tells him that if he will discharge his old employees, it will make him a little lower rate because there is a little less risk. That is the evidence. While we say, and to give credit where credit is due, the employers too say it, from a different standpoint, but both together say it, that under this scheme of workmen's compensation this does not occur. The legislation should be carried out and paid for on the most economical basis in the people's interests, it must be administered by representatives of the people, by means of a Crown Commission, and thus forever wipe out from the courts of Ontario this inhuman battle as to whether a worker shall receive compensation for accidents arising out of employment.

To give an illustration of what it means to the workers, you will understand the importance of this to us who are obliged to see it. Take an example: a man is hurt in an industry; his employer pays to an insurance company, and the company says "Hands off, this is not your business, it is ours." And so it deals with the case in the courts to its own advantage. We are not advocating this legislation or speaking in this manner as an attack upon any private interest. We say the Province of Ontario in the last few years has thoroughly changed; we have great industries, great corporations, great monopolies of finance; if we would give the people of this Province a chance to be citizens, to keep away as much as possible from charity, that last insult to the common

people, we must change the old form of legislation which grew up before this, and change it to a more humane and Christian standard, suited to the present time. (Applause.)

And so in this movement we are not necessarily attacking any private interest, but want to make this point, that in the consideration of this legislation there will be many, very many details, upon which the different interests and ourselves can agree. We may have to fight them on some things, but on this point the manufacturers and ourselves coincide, upon compulsory State insurance. I present it to you without trimmings of any kind, as a business proposition: if there is going to be compensation for those in the Province of Ontario who are injured in accidents, it should be settled on a proper basis, not trying to keep any vested interests, for if, as I said, the total amount required to be paid by manufacturers or employers to afford compensation is a tax upon a wage roll of a hundred and fifty or two hundred million dollars a year, and if a tax upon that yearly wage roll to cover the cost of compensation means a tax of \$2,000,000, and if that is to be paid by an increased cost of products, then it is absolutely wrong to tax the people another 100 per cent. in order to perpetuate or for the purpose of keeping in existence a vested interest which has grown up under the old Employers' Liability Act.

One other illustration. In the development of machinery there has often been a struggle between the employer and the workmen from this standpoint,—or a controversy,—it is recognized that machines have been invented which displace a great deal of human labor. Every one of you gentlemen will recognize this argument, that when workmen criticize the introduction of machinery and the displacement of human labor they are told they are standing in the march of progress, because the invention of machinery brings down the cost of production. If the invention of a machine will do away with twenty men, you will say it is ignorance that opposes it, for it eliminates waste, and you say those who oppose it are standing in the march of progress. What shall we say to show that this is a parallel in the case of workmen's compensation legislation? Any one who looks at it from the business standpoint, not only of the workers but of the manufacturers and everybody else, can see that a State Insurance Department can operate at 8.13 per cent. of expenses, and an insurance company privately managed increases the total cost over 100 per cent.

When we say to the financial interests that it is wrong to saddle all this cost upon the public, to perpetuate a private interest in this manner, we are met with the argument touching vested interest, so we are in the exactly parallel case. Machinery invention makes for efficiency, and we say that a compulsory State Insurance Department is a modern development on a business-like basis, making for efficiency, and anybody fighting against that must be placed in the same position as those fighting against the introduction of machinery. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, it is a privilege to have had the opportunity of speaking to the Canadian Club. There are lots of things that could be said stronger, that I have not said. (Laughter.) We fight like everybody else; we are not complaining, I want to make it very clear, about the interests fighting on the other hand. We do claim, as Labor men, who have intelligence, to make this as keen a fight for the common people as the representatives of the manufacturers do for their interests. And now, gentlemen, I have the greatest honor perhaps I have ever had, to be sandwiched between Mr. Josiah Wedgwood and Mr. William Redmond, and passing on a remark from a preceptor who can always be followed, I think the meat of the sandwich is always in the middle! (Laughter.)

I wish to say in conclusion, gentlemen, we try to give credit to our opponents for sincerity; we are trying to obtain justice as far as the people of Ontario are concerned; we would like everyone here to put prejudice to one side, and consider if it is not better, with Ontario developed to be the banner Province of this Dominion, with our industries developing in a productive way, and with signs of progress in our trade every day,—whether it is not both better, and necessary to adopt this legislation. To use a phrase from the sayings of Mr. Gunsaulus, “those who sit on the safety valves of evolution are like a man who sits upon the safety valve of a boiler.” The industrial world is like the seething caldron in the centre of our earth: when the pressure gets too great, it blows off the top of some volcano. Wherever it is proposed to remedy the evils of the industrial world, you will have discontent and all kinds of trouble. Is it not better to give justice to the workers of Ontario in this regard, than continually to sit on the safety valves of evolution until there is a blow-off? (Applause.)

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

BY MR. WILLIAM REDMOND, M.P.*

Mr. William Redmond, M.P., happening to be passing through the city on his way home to Ireland, accepted the urgent invitation of the Canadian Club to give an address, and having just arrived in the late afternoon, came in while Mr. Bancroft was speaking. Mr. Redmond said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I can assure you that I am very grateful to the Canadian Club for affording me the opportunity of saying a few words here to-night. I received by wire a very kind invitation to attend the meeting of the Club, but unfortunately at that time I believed that I would not be able to be in Toronto. To-night I found myself somewhat unexpectedly here, and the invitation has been very kindly extended to me a second time to address you.

I can assure you that as a member of the Irish National party there is nothing which I esteem a higher privilege than to have an opportunity like this of saying even a few words about the great cause with which myself and my colleagues have been identified all our lives.

And perhaps at this particular juncture it may not be without special interest that you gentlemen, representing, I have no doubt, all schools of political thought, may hear something from one who is on his way home, and who expects within the limit of this month to cast his vote, as he has already done twice, in favor of the Bill which proposes once more to bestow upon the Irish people their ancient right, a right they never relinquished themselves, of governing their own domestic affairs upon the shores and soil of their own country.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the Irish cause occupies, as it undoubtedly and admittedly does, a strong and paramount position in the politics of Great Britain to-day, I think it does largely because those of us who represent the National cause of Ireland have had more frequently given to us the opportunity which you kindly give me to-night, of explaining what it really is that the Irish people are asking at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to admit, because it makes one conscious how the years pass by, I am almost one

* William Redmond, M.P., is a brother of John Redmond, M.P., the leader of the Home Rule party in the British House of Commons. Advantage was taken of Mr. Redmond's unexpected arrival in Toronto to have him address the members of the Club, which he did on short notice, on the subject nearest to his heart, "Home Rule for Ireland."

of the oldest members of the British Parliament there is in the service to-day. Thirty-one years ago I entered the House of Commons, and I have been there ever since; and how well I remember in my young days in the House of Commons, how bitter and how strong indeed was the feeling with which I saw the prejudice against the cause dear to the hearts of the Irish people.

We found it very difficult indeed, those of us who were organized by Mr. Parnell more than thirty years ago, to gain the ear of the British people; the press was almost entirely against us and our cause, and everybody knows what an immense power and influence the press is. We had the press against us, and there prevailed—I do not say it was their own fault,—all their own,—but there prevailed in the minds of the English people a grand misunderstanding as to what Ireland really asked for. Well, to-day this is all changed, and I should like every gentleman here to recognize this fact, whether they may approve of Home Rule or not, that to-day not the Irish people only, but, I make bold to say, the vast majority of the people of Britain, regard the Irish question as of supreme importance not only to our own little Island but to the interests of Great Britain, and to the interests of the British Empire in the future as well. And I know it may be hard for some of those who are still unreconciled to the idea of Irish self-government to believe, but the fact is this, that in every great centre in Great Britain to-day our representatives meet with as kind a reception, as cordial a hearing, as patient, as is given to the leaders of the British Liberal party themselves. Information has been spread. English representative men, from the Prime Minister down, have studied the Irish question day and night. They have visited our country. They have listened to us during the weary struggle of the last thirty-three years in the House of Commons. They have seen the effect upon Ireland and the national demands of the great beneficent reforms passed by one Administration after another. And the end of all this investigation and patient inquiry is to be found in the fact that to-day, even if I were to stay here in Toronto and never go home to vote in the House of Commons in favor of the Home Rule Bill, and if all my colleagues in the Nationalist party were absent, even the North of Ireland members, who are momentarily estranged from the party, if not a single member from Ireland were there to vote, a large—a considerable majority of the English, Scotch and Welsh members of Parliament would pass for

the third time the Home Rule Bill, in order to send it to His Majesty for his Royal assent.

I mention this to show that the Irish cause to-day, whether approved or disapproved, occupies a strong position in the public mind of England. However prejudiced, however reluctant men may be to admit the change, the change is there. The British people are determined to-day to settle the Irish question by applying to it Liberal principles. (Applause.)

Gentlemen, I remember the unfortunate days of the Boer War, a war which, I frankly admit to you, I opposed as unnecessary and uncalled for. (Hear, hear.) When the war was over, and the Liberals were glad to work under the leadership of that great, noble-minded man, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman,—what was the attitude of the British House of Commons to the Boer people? The Conservative party thought that to give a free constitution to the people of South Africa would be an experiment of a most dangerous kind, fraught with untold risk to Great Britain; it was placing in the hands of people who were beaten weapons to continue the struggle. The Liberals were in power, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman said, "No, the war is over; we intend to heal the wounds of the war, not by attempting to continue our ascendancy, which could only be maintained by maintaining a large force; we have trust in human nature; we believe in the honor, the common sense, and the good faith of these men who have shown themselves to be such capable opponents of ours with arms in their hands in the field; we will trust them; we will give them a free constitution." And he did so. And there is no man in Great Britain to-day, of thought, who is not bound to admit that the application of the Liberal policy of freedom and trust to South Africa has resulted to-day in the blending of the two races, going forward hand in hand, and meaning prosperity and progress to South Africa. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Gentlemen, I submit to you to-day, on behalf of Ireland, that it is at least worth while trying the application of the same principle to Ireland. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, I ask you for one moment to look at the history of our country. One hundred and fourteen years ago, as every historian admits, the Irish people had their native Parliament taken from them, against their will, by force, by corruption, by means which to-day stand condemned by every student of history, no matter what party he may belong to. And in place of our ancient Parliament, restricted

as it was to men of the Protestant faith in a Catholic country, in place of that Parliament which in point of antiquity could almost rival the Parliament of England,—for, be it remembered, we in Ireland with slight intervals were in possession of a Parliament at Dublin from the reign of King John,—we had another Government placed over us, composed of men who were always in a very small minority in Ireland, a system of government in which the people governed had no responsibility whatever, a system of government carried out from England, administered by English Ministers, men, I freely grant, many with the best intentions and good will, but still more or less foreign to the circumstances and interests of our country. Well, for a hundred and fourteen years, gentlemen, we have had experience of this government, substituted for our own Parliament, and what has been the result? There is no Englishman of any party to-day who can honestly say that he does not feel it a discredit to England, that her attempt to govern Ireland has failed. (Applause.)

Of course, there are people who say, “Well, the Irish are a difficult people to govern.” (Laughter.) Mr. Gladstone, in one of his mighty speeches introducing the Home Rule Bill in 1886, said, “Some people think that the Irish are endowed from birth with a double dose of original sin.” You will explain the undoubted failure of England to govern Ireland by saying “the Irish are so temperamentally constituted that it is impossible to govern them without having turmoil and discontent.” Gentlemen, it is not so! I do not think any man, no matter how bitterly opposed he may be to Home Rule, would deny that Irishmen, aye, and men like me who am proud to be a Catholic Irishman, can be as sensible of responsibility when it is cast upon them as any other men can be. (Applause.)

A month ago, I left the other end of the Empire. I went to every State of the Australian Commonwealth. There is not a State where a man of more than average ability, as the majority of the Irish people are, is not high in the service of the Crown and the people, and they are going forward as rapidly and as earnestly as any other race, in the extension and development of this Empire. (Applause.)

In Ireland we find that in every one of the past hundred and fourteen years there has been discontent, sometimes we have had abortive rebellion, sometimes force and agitation, but never has there been one of those years which has not seen some measure of protest in our country on the part of

the Irish people against being deprived of the right of ruling themselves. (Hear, hear.)

Of course, the Conservative party, I think about five and twenty years ago, formulated a policy which they thought would be effectual in checking Home Rule, by overwhelming the Irish people with kindness and consideration. The Unionist party, and I give credit to them for it, tried to solve the difficulty by sweeping reforms; and evictions are no longer heard of, the vast majority of the people are already in possession of the ownership of the land they till, and it is only a matter of a few years till every tenant farmer in Ireland owns the land he tills. (Applause.) We have legislation for labor,—Mr. Bancroft will be glad to hear,—we have also—and this again we owe to the Unionist Government—complete control of our local forms of taxation by County and District Councils; we have got immense improvements in the facilities for education; we have got within the last few years from the Liberals the thing we have been pining for generation after generation, a National University, to which all the young men in the country can go, feeling secure that their faith and their opinions would never be questioned. We have improvements in every direction. We have an Agricultural Department, I venture to think, that is second to none in the world, and we are adopting American and Canadian improvements too. In the thirty-one years I have been in Parliament, the whole face of Ireland has changed. It is true, our population unfortunately has decreased immensely,—we have lost between four and five million of our people, and Ireland is the only place in the Empire where that is the case. It seems incredible, that seventy years ago the population of Ireland was more than half the population of England and Wales, three or four times the population of Scotland, almost half the population of the whole of Great Britain, and now we see to-day year by year our population dwindling, and the people of every other corner and crevice of the British Empire expanding and growing. But apart from that unfortunate decrease in population, the whole face of Ireland has changed: the people are better fed, better clad, better housed; they have recovered their self-respect, because they know now that they are the owners of the land; it is better for them and their children; and no landowner can come and confiscate their land.

Ireland, thanks to this policy of beneficent and kind legislation of both parties, has prospered immensely. Much of this has been passed by the Unionist party, but the headline

of it all was set by the Liberal party, in Gladstone's land scheme in '70 and '80. But I mention all this, to show that the policy of killing the national demands for self-government by beneficial legislation, by moral improvement, has failed: the stronger they are, the better off they are, the more educated they are, so in proportion grows the resolution of the people of Ireland not to rest satisfied till they enjoy some measure of self-government. (Applause.)

I come, Mr. Chairman, from a part of Ireland in the very historic county of Wexford, in the southeast, where the great rebellion of 1798 broke out, where perhaps the last great struggle for freedom was made. In that county the people were the very first to avail themselves of the facilities to buy their land. There is hardly a farmer now on a farm that he has not bought. The people are immeasurably better off; they are not the same people; and yet there is in that county to-day the strongest possible demand on the part of the people for the restoration of national self-government.

Well, gentlemen, what is to be done about it? The Unionists say they will oppose Home Rule to the last gasp. Supposing,—I do not believe it possible, sincerely speaking,—but suppose that by some untoward chance the policy of the present Prime Minister were to be defeated, if it is justifiable for sixteen representatives, representing a minority of the representatives of one part of Ireland, to threaten civil war if their way is not taken, if that is justifiable, what is to be said of the vast majority of the Irish people? (Hear, hear.) I certainly do not indulge in any threats, and I do not believe in the language of threats in politics at all; but supposing this policy of Home Rule be overthrown, what then? Are the people of the British Empire prepared to resort to the old methods of ruling Ireland? Is the law to be suspended? Are we to have exceptional legislation? Are the prisons to be filled again? Are we to have all the mad and violent passions aroused in Ireland by a policy of coercion? Is there any Unionist who can look upon that prospect without feelings of dismay?

The Irish question is no longer purely an Irish question. (Hear, hear.) I have reasons for knowing that in every part of the Empire the Irish question is closely watched. I have visited every State in Australia, I have visited New Zealand, and I know the feeling certainly in every portion of the Empire where Irishmen are to be found: there are everywhere centres of unrest, discontent, because of the non-settlement of the Irish question. I don't believe anyone here in Canada

is prepared to deny that Irishmen have done their part as pioneers or as statesmen on the floors of the Parliaments of this great land. I have read of their actions in adventure and in defence. They must be considered, and it is not merely the few millions left as a remnant at home, but the great race throughout the world. Can any thoughtful, reasonable man contemplate without absolute dismay the substitution for a policy of good will that policy of coercion?

I listened to Mr. Bancroft with the greatest interest, when he spoke of this measure so vitally affecting the workingmen of Ontario. I could not help feeling a little glad, as one of the despised Irish race, when I reflected that there was never introduced a Bill in the British Parliament for the benefit and uplifting of the British people that was not largely moulded and carried into effect by those representing the Irish race. In the British House of Commons to-day there are no members in more cordial sympathy with the representatives of Labor than the Irish members. (Applause.) There is to-day a cordial understanding and good feeling between the mass of the British people and the Irish people, and it is that upon which we rely most of all for the settlement of the Irish question.

Gentlemen, it would give me great pleasure to detail some of the concessions which are now proposed to settle the question, but it is not in my power, being so far from the centre. But this I can say with confidence, that there is nothing which my colleagues and myself in the National Irish party are not prepared to agree to accept in order to bring our countrymen who are not in union with us into harmony with us, except those not consistent with the establishment of a National Parliament in Ireland. I do not know whether the proposals for a plebiscite in the north of Ireland with regard to Home Rule are to be carried out or not, but I do say this,—and for years I have had some knowledge of Ulster as well as of the great county in the southwest of Ireland which I represent,—I feel convinced that those who have cherished the idea that Ulster is not in favor of Home Rule will be greatly disappointed. The majority of the people of Ulster, I believe, to-day are in favor of Home Rule. What does that mean, gentlemen? It used to be that if a man were a Catholic it was taken for granted that he was a Nationalist in politics, and any man who was a Protestant was supposed to be opposed to Home Rule. That is not so to-day, and I do say without fear of contradiction that there are tens of thousands of Irish Protestants among the staunchest

friends of Home Rule. And if it ever goes to a vote, if any part of Ulster separates from the rest of Ireland in order not to be under a National Parliament, it will be an infinitesimally small part. We are told to-day that Belfast is united against Home Rule. It is not true. The great shipbuilding industry of Harland and Wolf is established there, and the men at the head of this are among the staunchest friends of Home Rule. There is an intolerance and a lack of fair play about much of the opposition to Home Rule. I see many representatives of every industry in Belfast, Protestant gentlemen every one, who are our friends.

No, gentlemen, whether with us or against us, don't, in the interests of common honesty and truth, believe that anything but a portion of the Province of Ulster is opposed to Home Rule. If you take the Parliamentary representation, we have the majority of the elected representatives in Ulster; there is no County in Ulster but we have one representative from. There is even in the strongest portion of Ulster at least one Home Ruler M.P.

I say this, not in a controversial spirit, but I can only say that whatever the settlement may be, I am convinced that the national question of Ireland is about to be settled here and now. I go farther, and I say this with confidence, as a man who entertains no bitter personal feelings against his political opponents—and by the way, I think it can be honestly said, in spite of the wordy warfare we read of in the newspapers, there is no bitter personal feeling between the Nationalist and the Unionist members,—you had a visit recently from Mr. Walter Long,—I am sure that apart from politics there is not a single Irish member of my party but in his own feeling is on terms of the best of good will and fellowship with Mr. Long. Gentlemen, I believe that even these men in their hearts must admit that the policy of coercion can never be resurrected, that the settlement of the Irish question upon lines of self-government is absolutely imperative and binding, no matter what party is in power. (Applause.)

I assure you, as one of the oldest members, we have no desire to see any separation; we value the north of Ireland, and regard its interests as a part of the whole; we believe that it only needs some arrangement whereby the people of the north shall be brought in contact with the Catholics and Nationalists, to feel that they have a common responsibility and a common work to do, in order to obliterate completely these bitter sectarian feelings which remain from the struggles in the days gone by. There is no Irishman in our party

but is prepared,—when our fight is won, and we assume responsibility for our country,—but will be glad to see our Protestant fellow countrymen assume their full share—I will go farther, and say a great share—of responsibility. When this vexed question is settled, I believe people will say, as they did after the war in South Africa, “Well, it looked a dangerous experiment for civil liberty, but the course of events has proved it justified.” I am sure the course of Home Rule will do for the Irish people what liberty has always done, and that they will be as contented and loyal subjects of the British Empire as there are to be found in any part of it. (Applause.)

Trust us in Ireland! Put on us the responsibility of managing our own affairs. Let us see our statesmen governing our country with the whole world looking on with interest. Give us a chance to show what is in us. It will be better for Ireland, better for England, and will end the oldest and bitterest quarrel in the world. (Applause.) It will further peace, general prosperity and good will between Scotchmen, Welshmen, Irishmen and Englishmen, and the men of all the races that go to make this great Empire up. (Hear, hear.)

And one more word: may I say, without impertinence, that there is the great English-speaking nation, so friendly, so well disposed at heart,—it is worth while, in the interests of peace, to have the American nation satisfied on this question; and believe me, the American nation is deeply interested: there are fifteen to twenty million people of our race in the United States of America; they are as anxious as you are here, and Irishmen in every part of the world, to have this question settled, and settled amicably, and all around the world linking these are interests making for settlement—it is certainly worth while. When Home Rule was carried the last two times, by 110 and 109 of majorities, as it will be this time, Mr. Asquith was overwhelmed with congratulations from every part of the world, from every part of the English-speaking world, from every part of the civilized world; but I remember hearing him say, that the thing which affected him most, which he valued most, which was most significant and encouraging to the Government, was that he received from no less than thirty-five States of the American Union resolutions passed by their Legislatures, sent to him under their official seals, expressing the thanks of those American States to the British Government and people for their enlightened and liberal manner of dealing with the Irish question. (Applause.)

When any people does not participate in and is not allowed to shape its own affairs, if governed by others, no matter how well intentioned, there is nothing but unhappiness. I ask you, is it better for England and the Empire that that policy shall be continued, or whether it would not be better to say, first as last, "Well, we have governed the Irish people for a hundred and fourteen years in a way they have resented; in God's name, let us try another and better way! We are strong enough, and powerful enough, to make the experiment, if experiment it be." That is the feeling of Great Britain to-day, and I feel it is the feeling even of the majority of the British Empire.

I esteem it a great privilege, on behalf of the party to which I belong, your allowing me the opportunity of addressing you. (Long applause.)

(March 16, 1914.)

The High Cost of Living, and Standardizing the Dollar.

BY DR. IRVING FISHER.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club, held on the 16th March, Dr. Fisher said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,— We are interested all over the world, not only in the cost of high living, but in the high cost of living: here is a question of fact at the outset which your Chairman has inadvertently raised: what the question really is. (Laughter.) My former master in political economy, Professor Sumner, one of the greatest men with whom I ever came in contact, said: Whenever you have any economic problem you should ask yourself four questions: first, what is it? Second, why is it? Third, what of it? And fourth, what are you going to do about it? And so I will take up these four questions with regard to this great world problem of the high cost of living: what are the facts? What are the causes? What are the evils? And what are the remedies?

Now as to the facts: is it a problem of the high cost of living, or is it a problem of the cost of high living? Mr. J. J. Hill, who I think is well known in Canada, suggested a couple of years ago that we were not suffering from the high cost of living, but from the cost of high living, and the phrase has been caught up until it is quite natural that we should confuse the two. But what are the facts?

I remember, a couple of years ago, talking with one of the directors of the Deutsche Bank in Berlin, and he said, "It is not a question of things costing more; you can buy just as much for a mark to-day as you ever could; but it is a question of extravagance." And I said, "You think, with Mr. Hill, that it is the cost of high living." He was very much delighted that some one across the sea had suggested the phrase. But phrases are not facts, and the fact is, we

* Dr. Irving Fisher is one of the most distinguished political economists on the continent, being head of the Department of Political Economy at Yale University. He was closely identified with Mr. Roosevelt, former President of United States, in the conservation work inaugurated during his presidency.

are suffering from a higher cost of living than during the last fifteen years. These facts are well authenticated; you have them in this country assembled by Mr. Coats, of Ottawa, the Statistician of the Department of Labor, we find them gathered by our Department of Labor in the United States. The Board of Trade's official statistics show the same thing there; Sauerbeck, in London, finds the same thing; so it is in Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Austria, Italy, Australia, New Zealand, India, and Japan. Everywhere where the gold standard exists we find the prices of commodities have risen during the last fifteen years, and they have risen rapidly. In the United States and Canada the two movements have been so nearly alike that if you apply the curve showing the index number of prices made by our Department of Labor and yours these two curves so nearly coincide that it almost takes a microscope to separate them.

We find also a resemblance between the upward curves of prices in countries which have the gold standard, for which we have statistics, which suggests, if it does not prove, that there is a common cause.

I would like to go into the discussion of these four subjects outlined, the facts, the causes, the evils, and the remedies; but as I would very much like to have questions asked and objections raised to my particular remedy, I would like to concentrate attention to-day on that, therefore I will run briefly over the other three.

We may assume, therefore, so far as the facts are concerned, that the rise in prices in the last fifteen years has been about fifty per cent. It has been over 50% in Canada and the United States, and somewhat less than 50% in other countries, the lowest of the large countries being Great Britain.

What are the causes? This is one of the largest subjects, and I greatly regret that there is not time to go into all the reasons for the conclusions which I have reached; but if I may take the liberty of advertising one of my books, I would refer you to my "Purchasing Power of Money" for the statistical proof of the conclusions which I am going to state somewhat dogmatically.

According to my philosophy, which is nothing more than a restatement of well known first principles as laid down by Ricardo, the general rise in prices, as distinct from a rise of particular prices, such as the price of beef, must be due proximately to one or more of five causes, and only five: you may have prices rise because of an increase in the amount of money in circulation; you may have prices rise because of an

increase in the amount of substitutes for money in circulation, or deposits subject to cheque—what we call the money in the bank, but which every banker knows is not all there. (Laughter.) In the United States, for instance, we have something like eight and a quarter billion dollars of deposits subject to cheque, but the banks only have something like one and a half billion of dollars there; that is, the deposits are a big credit, which serve the purpose of money, but which are not literally money. Therefore the expansion of deposits subject to cheque will have the same effect on general prices as the expansion of money in circulation. Thirdly, prices may rise because of an increase in the velocity of circulation of money. And fourthly, prices may rise because of an increase in the velocity of deposits subject to cheque,—that is, what the banker calls a quickening in the activity of his accounts. Fifthly, you may have prices rise because of a decrease in the volume of trade, in the actual number of tons, pounds, yards, acres, etc., of goods exchanged.

Briefly, then, we may say that a rise in prices may be explained either on the one hand through monetary inflation, that is, an inflation of money or its substitutes or in the velocity of its circulation, or on the other hand through a decrease in the volume of goods exchanged. And the great question to-day is, Is our present rise in prices due to the inflation of the means of paying for goods, or to the contraction in volume of those goods themselves? Are we suffering from a superabundance of money and its substitutes, or are we suffering from scarcity of the good things of life?

But you say, "surely, the problem is not so simple as this! Surely it is due to many other things than these five." I reply, "Yes, but only so far as these other causes affect or work through one of these five." You have the rise in prices due to droughts, or to tariffs, to the concentration of population in cities, or migration from the country. We may have it due to a great many causes, but these cannot affect the general level of prices except as they would through one or other of the five causes first mentioned. There is the task before the statistician—to study the volume of money in circulation, and its velocity, the volume of substitutes for money in circulation, and their velocity, and the volume of trade.

I have endeavored for many years to collect statistics, and relying on these I make bold to say, that the rise in prices to-day is due to money and credit expansion, or in other words, to inflation. We are not suffering from impoverishment of goods—quite the opposite. Statistics show that the volume

of trade in the United States has increased during the past fifteen years 5.3 per cent. per annum, while the population has increased only $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, showing that trade has outstripped population.

We hear a great deal of the fact of our farms being denuded of population, and that they are not producing so many bushels of wheat as formerly. These facts are misstated. Taking the last fifteen years as a whole, we find this in the United States, that the product of our farms has increased. True, during 1910 there was an exceptionally small production of the farms, compared with the exceptionally large production in the year 1900, when the former census was taken, which gives some people the impression that wheat production is falling off. But those two years were exceptional, one one way and one the other, so that there is an exaggerated contrast between the two. But take the intercensal statistics of agriculture as a whole, and the only question as to the productions of our soil—to say nothing of trade and other things entering into consumption—is as to how much they have increased.

Take the statistics of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, which has assembled the figures, so far as they are available, for all the agricultural countries in the world. We find the increase of the production of the soil is far outrunning the world's population. The average man is better off to-day than fifteen years ago: he has more bread; he has more clothing; he has more of almost everything. Of course, you can point to meat, or some other particular commodity, which is relatively scarce; but take things in the large, you cannot explain the rise in prices through a progressive scarcity of goods. On the other hand, we do find increased abundance of means of paying for goods. Money has increased very fast in the United States; it has increased very fast in almost all the civilized countries where the gold standard exists, and as a consequence of the great increase of gold production in Cripple Creek, in the Klondyke, and in South Africa.

Then, not only has money increased, and not only has its velocity increased, but deposits subject to cheque have increased still faster. In Canada the deposits held by the people in the banks have increased something like 12% per annum, and in the United States there has been an increase at the rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ % per annum in deposits subject to cheque. In Germany, where they are just beginning to wake up to the advantages of banking, we find a very great increase,

something like 13%, in deposits subject to cheque. You can readily see, if my philosophy is correct, these facts will fit into it. To put it into the form of an equation, the money, multiplied by the velocity, plus the deposits multiplied by their velocity, will equal the price level, multiplied by the volume of trade. Almost every year we find by studying the statistics of this equation, an inflation of money and credit just enough to explain the facts which we have actually to explain; we find there has been an increase in price just exactly enough to keep pace with the increase in the money and deposits which would cause that effect.

Now, what are the evils. What is the real significance of this increase in the cost of living? To my mind, if the causes are monetary, the significance is monetary, the evils are monetary, and the cost of living problem is a problem of currency and banking. And by the way, I tried to make a rough forecast of what would happen in the next fifteen years, and I believe we have good reason to suppose that in the next fifteen years prices will rise very much as they have risen in the last fifteen years. I base that conclusion not simply on the fact that there is a great deal of gold still in sight in South Africa, but even as much on the frightful rate at which our deposits subject to cheque are increasing. When I say that, I do not mean that the banks are not performing an important service to trade. I was one of those who advocated the change in our banking system by which we will have eight or twelve central banks in the United States. I believe this would greatly outweigh the disadvantages. But it is unfortunate that this reform should take place just at the time when we are all suffering from a surfeit of the means of purchase of goods. As it is, this expansion of deposits, or deposit currency, will be superimposed upon the expansion already going on of a monetary kind. Consequently, although we shall reap the advantage in benefits from this reform, we shall aggravate for ourselves the cost of living. That is inevitable by reason of the expansion of banking going on all over the world. You will recognize that only in Anglo-Saxon countries is the bank book, the cheque book, used. In the United States 92 per cent. of transactions are performed by cheque; so in other Anglo-Saxon countries you will find something like this percentage. It does not hold true of France, or of Germany. If then expansion is still going on where they have already reached the limit, think of the tremendous, enormous room for expansion in the continent of Europe, in Japan, and elsewhere in those lands now waking up to the advantages of banking.

They are going to introduce the cheque book. However much good it may do in other ways, it will aggravate the evil of inflation, and tend to increase rapidly the rising prices all over the world. And then in the next two or three decades, when the continent of Europe will have perhaps in some degree caught up with the Anglo-Saxon nations in this regard, there will next be an expansion rapidly going forward in the Far East. Banking is being introduced in India, and will be introduced into other Oriental countries in the Occidental sense. So if there is the same tendency to increase the cost of living, while having a temporary slump due to contraction, the tendency will be to expansion, so in the next decade or two we may look forward to an increased rise of prices.

If it ever transpires that prices shall fall, we are simply jumping out of the frying pan into the fire, for a progressive fall of prices is just as injurious as a progressive rise. Many of you can remember a long period of falling prices, from 1873 to 1896. There was a proposal to inflate our currency with silver, and the "16 to 1" heresy held men's minds at that time. In other words, we were gradually waking up to the fact that we were suffering from a monetary cause, from inadequacy of the monetary means to pay for the goods to be exchanged. And not having a scientific remedy to propose, people got one of the most unscientific and harmful remedies that could be proposed. And I venture to predict, if the business men don't get some scientific treatment, we will find some unscientific treatment, which may be as hard to get rid of, as we found in the United States the free silver heresy.

The fact of high prices, not understood scientifically, is leading to bread and meat riots, discontent, and Socialism. A Socialist who recently spoke at a meeting at which I gave my views, said, "Professor Fisher, I know you are right, that this high cost of living has a monetary cause, but we let them think it is due to capitalists." Some day, business men will be sorry, when there is a violent revolution, if they do not take up and handle it in a scientific manner.

What are the evils? The evils are of distribution. We may sum them up in the phrase, a transfer of wealth and a gamble in wealth. During the last fifteen years a certain class have lost heavily, but their losses, in some individuals, have produced gains for others that did not belong to them. Those who have lost are the creditors and the creditor-like classes, namely, bondholders, savings bank depositors, salaried men—

some of us can speak feelingly on that subject—(Laughter)—and wage earners; and those who have gained are the stockholder, the independent producer, the farmer, the speculator, the plungers. There has been a subtle transfer of wealth from one great class to the other, but the net loss to society is the lack of certainty and the increased risk; we have become to-day, as it were, speculators in the dollar, speculators in gold. And the evil in every speculation is, that though someone is bound to win, the net effect of increased speculation is a loss.

The bondholder and the savings bank depositor has not been getting any increased income. This seems at first impossible. But consider the servant girl who put \$100 into the savings bank in 1896; to-day, if she has allowed it to accumulate interest, she has \$150, having accumulated 4 per cent. She says, "I have got 50 per cent. more than I had," but when she tries to spend that \$150, she finds that everything costs 50 per cent. more than it did in 1896—(Hear, hear)—therefore she gets for her \$150 only as much as she could have bought for \$100 fifteen years ago. Where is her interest? (Applause.) She has been unconsciously swindled out of her interest from depreciation of the dollar!

With the bondholder it is the same way. Suppose a bondholder owning \$100,000 of 4% bonds, he has been spending every year his \$4,000 of interest paid him on those bonds, and calling it income, but it was not income. One of the first principles of you business men is that you must first put back a depreciation fund to upkeep your principal. When we are talking in absolute units we must keep up the principal to real, not nominal, value. If a bondholder fifteen years ago had \$100,000 of principal, to-day he will also have \$100,000, but only two-thirds of this \$100,000 to-day is really worth the principal with which he started. If he had really kept up his principal, he would have had to put by a sinking fund every year to have accumulated the increased amount, so as to-day to have not \$100,000 but \$150,000 invested, to equal the principal of \$100,000 when he started. How much would he have had to put by each year out of his \$4,000 interest? Every cent!—it would have taken every cent to keep up the principal, so he has simply been eating up, and living on his principal every year. So I assert the creditor is robbed of his interest, if the interest is only 4% per annum; if it is more, he will get only the difference.

With the stockholder we find the opposite effect. During the Civil War we had a depreciation of paper money;

between 1860 and 1865 paper money depreciated until it was not worth more than about 40 cents as compared with its original purchasing power. What happened? The farmers in the West liked it, for those on farms which were mortgaged were paying off their mortgages in depreciated money, and these "disappeared like smoke;" they were getting the advantage, and at the expense of the creditors. During the past fifteen years the stockholder has been winning from the bondholder. He has been getting not only his dividends, but what belonged to the bondholder as interest. Consequently there is a new class of rich people. The people on Fifth Avenue are an entirely new set. These people have been unconsciously picking the pockets of other people,—and I use the word "pickpocket" in the highest sense. (Laughter.)

Now, gentlemen, this matter is of very considerable importance. It means there has been a transfer, a subtle transfer, from one set of pockets to another set of pockets during the last fifteen years, running into billions of dollars, due to lack of a stable monetary standard, due to the fact that our money is a fixed weight of gold; and gold will vary inevitably in purchasing power like any other commodity. There could not be any more unscientific yard stick of commerce than the gold dollar. I don't mean that the silver dollar would be any better, or that an iron dollar, or a tin dollar, or a platinum dollar, or a radium dollar. The one ideal dollar would not be dependent on one metal or one commodity, but one which represents the same average purchasing power over all things.

We got the gold standard by accident. Gold was selected because it was a convenient medium of exchange. Money in the early days served only that one function, of being a medium of exchange, but to-day it serves as standard of value, for life insurance companies, railways, banks, all sorts of relations where contracts are a feature. Leases are sometimes framed to run for a thousand years; but even if they ran but ten years the depreciation or appreciation of the dollar in the intervening time is of the utmost importance.

I think every business man should recognize that a standardized dollar is of first importance. We have standardized every other unit,—the yard stick, the measures of electricity, such as the ampere, the kilowatt, the volt, the ohm, etc. There is an international standard, everything except the dollar is standardized; and yet the dollar enters into every contract, whereâs these other units only enter into some. What would

you think if the yard stick was not a standard measure? The yard was originally the girth of the chief of the tribe, it was called a gird; afterwards they took the length of the arm of Henry I.; then a stick was made, of a certain length of iron; then it was made of platinum. What would a business man think if the yard stick were the girth of the Governor-General of Canada, or the President of the United States? (Laughter.) Imagine some of you business men having made contracts to supply cloth, so many yards of cloth, which contracts were drawn before the 4th of March last—(Laughter)—I am a friend of Mr. Taft, and I voted for Mr. Wilson, and intend no derogation of either; but I think you will agree that there would be a depreciation in the yard stick! Well, that depreciation in the yard stick, if we had an unscientific yard stick, would affect only the cloth merchants; but the depreciation of the dollar affects every merchant. The dollar is on the other side of every contract. We have standardized the unit on the one side, but not that on the other!

My proposal, therefore, is this: to standardize the dollar, to do for money what we have done for every other magnitude, to have a unit of value that shall be a unit of *value*, of purchasing power, and not a unit of weight.

There are some shallow minds who have said that gold must have been selected because it is stable. Look, they say, at the mint price: £3 17s. 10½d. an ounce; or, in the United States and Canada it is \$18.60 an ounce 9-10 fine, or \$20.60 an ounce for pure gold. Does the constancy of the mint price prove there is any stability in gold? Not a bit!

I remember some months ago attempting to banter my dentist: with a very sober face I said to him: "I suppose you suffer from the high cost of living just as other people? Does it affect the price of gold?" He replied, "I do not know; I will look it up," and he asked his clerk to find out the prices of gold then and some years back. The clerk came back with a surprised look on her face, and said that the prices were the same to the last cent as fifteen years ago! I said, "Well, that is just about as surprising as that the price of a quart of milk is always two pints of milk!" (Laughter.) The dentist said, "I don't get your meaning." I answered, "You are measuring the price of gold in gold; you measure in ounces, the other man in dollars; which is simply another weight, that is all; one weight is called an ounce, another weight is called a dollar. The dollar is 1-19 of an ounce; so naturally it takes 19 dollars to equal an ounce. Therefore an ounce

of gold costs the same in dollars now as it used to, just as a quart of milk will always cost the same in pints." So the fact that the mint price is constant is no argument in favor of the stability of gold. (Applause.)

Some men have objected to the plan I am going to describe, saying it interferes with supply and demand, but the opposite is true. The plan we now have interferes with supply and demand. We have an enormous quantity of gold from South Africa flowing through the mints into the world; has that affected the price of gold? Not one cent! If you had increased the amount of tin, or of lead, or of any other metal like that, it would decrease the price enormously; but an increase in the production of gold does not influence the price of gold, because it is fixed by law. This will continue as long as we have a fixed weight of gold for the dollar. Since the increased supply of gold cannot decrease the price of gold, it takes revenge by increasing the cost of living. Since you can't decrease the price of gold in terms of which everything else is expressed, you increase the price of everything else in terms of gold as your alleged unit.

My proposal is this: turn the thing around; have gold affected by increased supply, just as everything else is; let the increased supply of gold reduce the price of gold, instead of increasing the cost of living. That amounts to the same thing as for the price of gold to be allowed to fall, as to say that the weight of the dollar is to be allowed to rise. We now have a dollar of fixed weight, and therefore of variable purchasing power. We should have a unit of fixed purchasing power, and therefore of variable weight. That is the proposition. We have now but a mockery of the standard, just as much a mockery as to have for a yard stick a stick that weighs a pound. Suppose we elaborately weighed the yard stick, and were to say that every stick that weighs a pound should be called a yard. It would make a great difference whether the stick were of hickory or of pine. For a dollar, we want a unit that buys just the same, we don't care what it weighs.

"But," you say, "how are you going to vary the weight?" I am not going to say change the weight of coins from time to time. The best way would be to get rid of the actual gold in circulation altogether, and have in Canada what we have in the United States and Canada, only paper, representing gold bullion. We have a gold certificate. There are a billion dollars in the United States Treasury to-day represented by a billion dollars of gold certificates. A bar weigh-

ing a thousand times 25 8-10 grains of gold is called a \$1,000 bar, and will always buy or sell for \$1,000. A man comes from the Klondyke with gold weighing that much,—he will get \$1,000 for it; and the jeweler can go to the Sub-Treasury and get back that bar for \$1,000.

I propose that the bar shall have a variable, not a fixed price. That price shall be not \$1,000 always; sometimes it will be \$990; in other words, the price of bullion shall be, not \$18.60 for all time and forever, but \$18.50 sometimes, \$18.30 sometimes; it shall vary back and forth.

“But,” you ask, “are you going to leave a dangerous discretionary power with the Sub-Treasury officials,—to always name the price? No. We have an index number now;—you have a most excellent system gotten up by Mr. Coats. This index number of prices would be calculated from market prices by clerks, also without discretion. That is, the idea is simply to watch the prices of the market averaging them into an index number. Suppose between now and next month the Index Number should show 101 per cent.; that deviation of 1% above par would *ipso facto* be the signal for decreasing the price of gold by 1%. So the Sub-Treasury would always know what to do—follow the official Index Number. Therefore, in international relations all we would have to do would be to have the Powers fix on one Index Number for the world. The system would be introduced without a jar; individuals in commerce would not know there was any change, except that instead of great convulsions in prices, which cause discontent, and are the cause of the increased cost of living, this discontent in trade bringing on crises, we would be on even keel, the general level of prices would always be near 100 per cent., never varying more than one or two per cent., since as soon as it varies the correction is applied and it is brought back to par.

I have taken so much time in the preliminaries, I have not given any details. I would not like you to accept the proposal second hand, but I don't mind saying that where my proposal has been studied it has been almost universally accepted. Naturally the stand-patters of society are averse to making any improvement, even when it promises something good, but with that exception, there are really none who have studied it but have accepted it. President Wilson told me some time ago that my plan was entirely feasible. Sir David Barbour, largely responsible for introducing the gold exchange standard into India, one of the greatest steps forward in practical monetary science; Prof. F. Y. Edgeworth of All

Souls College, Oxford, England; J. M. Keynes, editor of the *Economic Journal*, London; Adolphe Landry, author and member of the French Chamber of Deputies, Paris; G. H. Knibbs, Commonwealth Statistician of Australia, are all endorsers of the plan which I have suggested for standardizing the monetary units. In this is the promise of a stable yard stick of commerce. The idea of stabilization is the important thing, not my particular method of producing stability. There may be many other ways of achieving stabilization and of standardizing the dollar. Whether my particular method or some other device is better, whichever we adopt does not matter, so long as we adopt a standardized dollar. It seems to me the idea of standardization should be in the bottom of the minds and hearts of all business men. For that reason I came to speak to you to-day, because it will not be through college professors and presidents, but only through the growing of the idea in the minds of business men that the standardization of the dollar will ultimately be brought about. Then, and not till then, shall we have a real standardization of the dollar." (Applause.)

(March 23, 1914.)

Some Rural Problems.

BY GEORGE C. CREELMAN, ESQ., LL.D.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club, held on the 23rd March, Dr. Creelman said:

Mr. President and Hon. Mr. Duff, and Members of the Canadian Club of the City of Toronto,—Surely the farmer is coming into his own, when I am permitted to appear before you as a guest of the Canadian Club in this great cosmopolitan city, at what we call a banquet, and at a time when things are quiet on the farm and there is nothing much to do but the chores. On behalf of the farmers of Ontario, I thank you for inviting me to your party. (Laughter.)

If I have got to decide right off whether the city of Toronto is to have a million people or not in the immediate future, I have a bigger problem before me than I anticipated when I came; because the President said nothing of that when he gave me the invitation; and like Hon. Mr. Duff and those who are keeping the seals of the Province, I will ask you to let me take it into my consideration. (Laughter.)

FARMING IN ONTARIO.

Perhaps there never was a time in the history of Ontario when there was as much need for instruction in agriculture as at the present day. Farming and farm operations have changed so materially that the father can not now give the best and most up-to-date instruction, even to his own boys.

Wheat is now but one of our minor crops. You remember the common saying, "What as good as wheat?" That is all changed; corn, and sugar beets, and alfalfa, and peaches and apples, and onions and tomatoes, and tobacco, are coming to be counted among our staple crops. The climate of Ontario seems to be adapted to the growing of so many varieties of crops that there is no reason why the farmer's daily life need any longer become monotonous. Ontario has changed her methods with the new order of things—I say that advisedly

* Dr. George C. Creelman is President of the Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph. He has devoted his whole life to the improvement of farming methods and the welfare of the agriculturist. He was trained in Canadian and United States schools, universities and agricultural colleges.

—and owing to the superior intelligence of her people she has established herself as one of the best farming Provinces of the whole world. Perhaps you don't just appreciate that, but if any of you have had the opportunity of looking at the state of farming in other countries, you would observe that they specialize in one crop, and do it to perfection; but the splendid intermingling of English, Scotch and Irish blood has produced a race of farmers here who are no longer called "moss-backs" and "hayseeds," but are indeed responsible for the real prosperity of this great Province of ours.

Notwithstanding the great development in our Western Provinces the field crops of Ontario yet exceed in value all the field crops produced in Canada west of Winnipeg, in spite of the fact that a large percentage of the Western farmers have been drawn from Ontario farm homes.

As one goes through this Province, from county to county, and township to township, he is forced to the conclusion that as an agricultural district it is very highly favored indeed. Good land, well watered, and excellent climate with plenty of sunshine, always insures fair crops, and while our bank managers in their annual statements often forecast good or bad times, according to the conditions of the crops in the West, yet because they have never been disappointed in Ontario crops they never speak of what might happen if we had a failure here.

FARMING NOT POPULAR.

In this favored Province, then, one would expect to find farming the most popular business of all, and the people from cities and towns would only live in such places until they could make money enough to own and operate a farm of their own. (Laughter.) As a matter of fact, the situation is exactly reversed. Farmers' boys and farmers' girls are leaving, in large numbers, for the cities and towns, and most of the farmers themselves hope to remain on the farm only so long as will enable them to make enough money which at 3% will give them sufficient income to retire to the neighboring town or city. Here they hope to pass their days in peace and idleness, to sleep late in the mornings and sit up late at nights, in fact to "eat, drink and be merry" all the rest of their lives. (Laughter.)

Now you know as well as I do how differently it works out. (Laughter.) The farmer has as much right to retire, after a life of hard work, as anyone else, perhaps more so, as he is one man who has earned every dollar that he has

made. (Laughter.) The difficulty is that he does not know the difference between the life of the producer and the consumer, nor can he appreciate the circumstances with which he will find himself surrounded when he gets out of his own element.

RETIRED FARMERS.

Speaking of retired farmers,—and I do it kindly and reverently—(Laughter)—this may be a new view to you, but it seems to me that the great pity lies, not so much in the fact that he does not fit into his new conditions, but that his long experience, his habits of thrift, his knowledge of the community, and his leisure time, are now all lost to the neighborhood in which he has done all of his work, and in which position he should be able, in his declining years, to do a great deal of good. (Hear, hear, "That's true," and applause.)

You know, perhaps, better than I do, how much clear-headed, conscientious, broad-minded help is needed among the School Boards in our rural communities, and our urban communities sometimes as well. (Laughter.) You know what one man of the right sort could do with a little leisure in improving the appearance of the school and the conditions of the school grounds. You know what can be accomplished by such a man coming forward, in the support of the teacher, in the introduction of modern methods, and you know how such a man should stand as a strength in the community, and could very easily secure additional funds each year for the purchase of those little things, in the way of school equipment, that make the difference between the mere humdrum of teaching by text books and teaching by demonstration. (Applause.)

THE BOY AND GIRL.

If then the coming generation of farmers are to be kept in the country, are to be expected to settle on a corner of the old farm after they have turned their larger property over to the son or the son-in-law, then we must start very early to interest the boy and the girl in the ethics of rural living. You can't teach old dogs new tricks; and if the old dog is living on the old concession, the young dog doesn't see many new tricks there. (Laughter.) The farmer's boy must be encouraged to play in a systematic way; he must be taught to cooperate with his neighbors in everything; he must be instructed in the first principles of scientific farming; he must be encouraged to read widely and persistently. He must be

taught to draw as well as to read and write, and he must be encouraged along the line of his talents, to do everything systematically, that his latter days on the farm may lead to neatness about the buildings and fences, orderliness in the barns, stables, harness rooms, and implement sheds; shorter hours for men and teams; the desire to adopt new methods which have been proven to be the best at the Colleges and Experiment Stations; and the readiness to change from one method to another, on the advice of the best farmers in the community.

All such ideas must be inculcated in youth, and as the parents are now asking for more help from the Agricultural College, the boy will get more encouragement at home than would have been the case a few years ago.

THE COLLEGE AND THE FARMER.

The Agricultural College during its existence of nearly forty years has proven by experiment, surely and definitely, that by farming certain fields, in a certain way, that breeding and feeding certain classes of live stock, that introducing certain crops on certain soils, that handling the orchard by certain methods, and draining the land in a certain way, absolute success in farming is assured.

From that point, however, we have not done all that we should in getting this information to the individual farmer on his own farm. We have at the present time over five thousand farmers conducting experiments on their own farms, and reporting to us, but there are over two hundred thousand heads of families on farms in this Province whom we reach but indirectly. As a matter of fact, the difference between the average and the possible yield on the ordinary farm is at least 300%. What do you think of that, you hard-headed business men, who if you can cut down your costs to a very narrow margin say, "If I could cut down my expenses to 10% I'd scrap the old machinery?" Yet when we point out to a man how he can save 300%, he very often does not take it down, or thinks it applies to someone else.

I think it would be quite within the mark were I to say that our Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations had already proven, by experiment, enough facts to double the output on the ordinary farm, if put into actual practice. The whole trouble has been that we have not been able to get the farmers to adapt these facts to their every day work on the farm.

WHAT SCIENCE HAS DONE.

Take for example that the crop of wheat is 22 bushels on the average in this Province. We are rather behind other countries in that. In England the average is 32 bushels, in Germany 36, after a thousand years of cropping! Where shall we be a thousand years from now at the present rate of increase? In Germany and in Sweden, in old inhospitable Sweden, they far outstrip us,—in the latter country they produce 75 bushels to the acre in fields, and 90 in plots! But they never sow wheat unless it is pedigreed. A newspaper might be spread in the field anywhere, and it would touch evenly the heads grown from pedigreed seed—we are a long way from that yet!

Alfalfa is worth pound for pound as much as bran for feeding live stock. We can and do produce 5 tons of alfalfa hay per acre in the ordinary season in Ontario. Bran is worth to-day—and I made special inquiry—\$24 a ton, which would make the alfalfa crop actually worth to the farmer \$120 per acre; and yet it is the hardest kind of work at times to persuade farmers, who have suitable land, to risk ploughing up even an old pasture to put into alfalfa.

The average cow in Ontario produces less than 3,500 lbs. of milk per year, and yet we had a cow in the College herd that produced 20,788 lbs. by actual weight in twelve months. This is a difference of nearly 600%. The average hen in Ontario lays less than 100 eggs in a year, while last year we had whole pens of hens that produced 180 eggs each, while the six hens in one coop, pedigreed stock, produced 256 eggs each.

And so I might go on, but the very telling of these things does not help you to produce this kind of hen, or cow, or crop.

We were a long time finding this out, but now we have come finally to the conclusion that the best and quickest way to improve the farming in this Province is to actually send trained men into the country and leave them there long enough to get the confidence of the people. (Hear, hear.)

You know the farmer has been a long time coming into his own, and he has not got very far yet; but we would have been much less advanced if Sir James Whitney had not himself taken an interest in the matter and said we should take the College to the people.

CARRYING THE GOSPEL OF AGRICULTURE TO EVERY FARMER.

No sane man would think of asking a young doctor, or lawyer, or preacher, if you will allow me to say so, to go back to a community and work for the people and pay his own board; yet people have been expecting a young man to spend just as much money at an Agricultural College, and go back and work as hard as before; he is expected to keep his fences all straight, his barns painted, his trees in exact rows, to have no weeds in his crops,—it is to be a model farm, because he has had a course at College; then he is expected to attend meetings of Farmers' Clubs and Institutes, meetings in the school house and the church, and when he is not too tired making a model farm for himself to teach others! That is what the Agricultural College was up against, till we put men at this work and pay them. We find that one man visiting farmers can teach a thousand people. These men are being employed, and paid for it, enabling them to get in touch with the farmers.

Such men we have termed Agricultural Representatives, and we have now one in each of forty districts in this Province, and they are all doing excellent work. They have already accomplished a good deal through holding short courses for farmers, longer courses in High Schools for farmers' sons; introducing pure seed; starting Farmers' Clubs; giving plans for farms for drainage; starting school fairs—we distributed 17,500 eggs last spring to school children, they took them, put them under hens, raised them and fed them, and more than half of them were brought to exhibitions last fall; judging at local exhibitions—boys thought they could judge Shropshires because their fathers raised them, but those boys got around where a man could give reasons for judging, and those boys watched with their mouths open, and now they say, "The best is none too good for me"; taking old orchards and regenerating them and making them produce good fruit; helping in the selection of improved tools and machinery; helping to conduct experiments on different farms; and a thousand and one other activities, according to climate, soil and altitude. I want you to watch the operations of these men, and note the progress they are making, because I believe they are going to wield a greater influence on the future prosperity of Ontario than anything else that has ever been attempted up to this time. (Applause.)

Then the educationists of the Province have fallen right in with this, and are working with them, because we believe

that the teaching of this thing in spots is not going to accomplish very much except to give some of us a chance to talk; so we have opened our doors to the teaching profession, and from the letters being received from day to day, it would look as though this has been a move in the right direction.

The Agricultural Representatives will work among the young men and the older men in active co-operation with the schools at the same time, so that there may be no conflict in the subject matter, or in the methods taught. Am I going too far, when I say, that I am not sure but that rural teachers and rural preachers may have to take Agricultural College courses yet, that they may learn to teach morals and religion to farmers in terms of their daily life? (Hear, hear, and applause.)

SOME PROBLEMS.

There are of course very many problems. I am not going to worry with them to-day, but will just touch on some of them. First, the killing of weeds. Weeds share our crops to-day to the extent of one-third. The variety of weeds is so great—you knew of the Canada thistle, but that is mere child's play to get rid of, compared with the sow thistle, the bindweed, the cockle, and others we have now.

The second problem is the planting of varieties of crops best suited to the farm and the neighborhood. You remember that Hon. John Dryden was an extensive breeder of Short-horns; he said he wished that twenty or thirty Short-horn breeders would come and settle near him. The average man thinks competition is going to hurt his business. But he did not; he said, "No, it would do good." The real competitor, he considered, was the man who came to buy a carload of cattle but could get only five or six or seven head of cattle in that neighborhood, and would have to go to Wellington or Middlesex for the rest of his carload; if that man could get a whole carload at one place, the entire car would cost less. That is good business.

Our extreme southwest, from Essex to Elgin and perhaps Norfolk, should devote most of its energies to growing corn and beans and tobacco and poultry and early fruit and vegetables; the Niagara peninsula to fruit growing and truck farming; the shores of Lake Ontario, Lake Huron, and the Georgian Bay to apples; Eastern Ontario, generally speaking, to dairying; and Western and Northern Ontario to general farming and live stock.

A third problem is the securing of better and more permanent hired help. A great many men could put up a cottage and let it on terms to make that hired man a human being. (Laughter and applause.) We forget that the hired man is the farmer of to-morrow. Sometimes the hired man will take over the farm, and after he has worked it for ten years then turn it back to the farmer and work for him again. So I tell a great many English immigrants that say: "Jack is as good as his master." "Yes, if as good, but not unless." (Laughter and applause.) On the farm you need to keep a man busy all the year around, to give him a house, so his children can attend school and get a chance to become bright, young, intelligent Canadian citizens.

I do not know how the Minister of Agriculture would look at it, but I would send good men, good farmers, of both political stripes, such as Farmers' Institute workers, and judges of live stock, to the Old Country in to the lanes and byways of Great Britain, where the people are talking of emigration, to hold meetings and show pictures of our orchards and our farms, our cattle and sheep and homesteads. We need all the farm help we can get, and perhaps we could do with fewer so-called mechanics—Jacks of all trades.

CO-OPERATION.

We have to come to marketing our crops by co-operation with our neighbors, that we may get the most possible for our labor.

This is a question which has occupied the attention of political and social economists for many centuries. It has gained little ground among farmers in this country, but has dominated the whole system of farming in some of the countries of Europe. In Denmark and parts of Germany co-operative methods have given the farmers charge of the banks, the telephones, the railroads, and even the Governments. Money may be had at from two to three per cent., and the poorest citizen,—if he be but honest—I don't go farther than that, that is important and necessary, if he be but poor and honest—has the same chance to promote his business and sell his goods in the best market as has the largest farmer in the land.

In America it looks as though our farmers will be forced almost to the wall, our farms worn out, and our land desolate, before we give up our small jealousies and our petty suspicions of one another. It is remarkable, that farmers, when they hire a man to manage a co-operative society, as soon as

he realizes \$50 a month they think he is getting more than he is worth, and break up the society. The reason is that most farmers wait until the end of the year and sell their produce in bulk; but they are feeding their families and educating their families all the way through, and never see \$50 in cash, or very seldom; the result is that they are not accustomed to doing a cash business. And so apples that we could have bought last year for \$2 a barrel easily, we pay now \$4, \$5 and \$6 for, and many farmers sent their apples to the canning factories, where they got 30 cents a hundred pounds!

With so many people rushing from the country to the city, and so many people coming into our cities from foreign lands, it is not surprising that prices of all foodstuffs are dearer. Fewer people producing and more people consuming, easily accounts for the present conditions of high prices.

The question then arises, How may we, with more mouths to fill, and inefficient as well as insufficient help, meet the increased demands? The Colleges and the Experiment Stations have done their part, and done it well. They have, by experiment, proven absolutely many things that if put into general practice would easily double our present output. They have taken a certain number of students from towns and cities and country places, and have taught them the best known methods of farming.

I think it is lack of organic union among ourselves, whereby every farmer on his own farm may obtain information at first hand, not only as to raising a crop, but as to the marketing and transporting and delivering of it to the customer, that is the great fault. And the farmer will not get into his real stride till we have that.

ROAD IMPROVEMENT.

The next point is the improvement of roads. This is absolutely essential, and I am now of the opinion that some School of Practical Science must put on a course of instruction in road making which must teach draining, draining, draining, before metal or cement are thought of at all, to make roads in country places. (Hear, hear.) These principles need to be instilled into the average pathmaster and roadmaster. I have seen hundreds of tons of gravel put on roads that did no good at all, because the road was not first drained. We need draining first, draining second, draining all the time, of the middle of the road and the sides, and when it gets hard the water will not permeate.

ELECTRIC POWER.

The securing of electric power on the farm is another problem. This is coming very fast. Besides the actual saving in animal power, what an uplift it will give the home life, to have electric light in every room of the house and barn and stable. At present farmers work so hard that they have a poor chance to enjoy the light of day, and at night a poor light to enjoy the chance of reading or anything else. (Laughter.)

Think also what it will mean to have running water in the house.

MORE PLAY IS NEEDED.

We want more shrubs and perennial flower beds and tennis courts and time for play, that the farm life may be the envy of the young people of the city and town. I am convinced—I ask you to listen carefully—I am convinced that it is not the glare and glitter of the city streets that attracts boys and girls to the city, but rather the lack of social organization in the country where every healthy young man and young woman may have some exercise and entertainment and amusement, in the furthering of which both sexes may take an active part. This is most important. Plowing and sowing and reaping and mowing and doing chores may be exercise enough, but it is not the highest kind of entertainment,—(Laughter)—and youth must be served.

EDUCATION.

In the Old Country I find that the aim of education is to make a “well dressed man who reads books and speaks correct English.” In Canada he must also work for a living, therefore he must have special training. In country places our young people are practically all intelligent—is not that so?—temperate, frugal and industrious—is not that so? That accounts for our young men adapting themselves to any walk of life when they go to our cities or to the United States, and our girls who practically control and manage the large hospitals of this continent.

But what about the country boy and girl who remain at home? We have made a start. Five hundred young men took instruction in agriculture from our Agricultural Representatives this winter. Nearly one thousand more attended short courses at the College. Some school teachers have taken

courses at the Agricultural College. When all rural school teachers have a good working knowledge of agriculture, I predict a great awakening in rural affairs.

WHAT ABOUT OUR GIRLS?

What about the girls? Do you realize that 90 per cent. of the women of this country do their own work, or with the help of their mothers or sisters or mothers-in-law? I believe as many men go to perdition each year from bad cooking as from strong drink? (Laughter, and applause.) I believe also that strong drink tastes better after poor cooking. (Laughter.) If you can't get the real thing, you have to get some substitute. I say seriously now, and never so seriously, if at least 90 per cent. of the women of this country do their own work, every girl should be taught how to cook and to sew while her time is not worth much, that she may economize time when it is valuable. Flour and sugar and salt are three of our most necessary foods, and yet they are cheaper than twenty years ago. If it takes $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents to make your five cent loaf of bread in Toronto, and $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents to deliver it, then half the cost of the staff of life was saved you by your mother's baking. Why don't your wives bake now? They don't know how. (Laughter.) You have sent your girls to some ladies' college, because you have had some sort of crazy idea that you must have your young people "finished," and so you have sent them to schools which have undertaken to finish your girls for you,—and many of them they did! (Laughter)—that is, so far as usefulness is concerned. Of course we are going through the same old mill: if our girl can play a few chords, she has the making of a great musician; if she can draw a few strokes, she is likely to become a great artist! If she is writing essays—and doesn't get them published—we are quite excited, and spend a lot of money to have her "finished." Many musicians and artists and essayists have in this way been *not* made, but good cooks lost. You say you don't want your girls to learn housework. Why not? We have got to come to it. There has got to come to this country, among our homes, a feeling of the dignity of labor. (Applause.) What greater credit than for a young girl, in her own kitchen or her mother's properly clothed for her work, with knowledge, making up something for the people she loves in her own home! (Applause.)

You can get whatever permission you want from the Education Department for its introduction of this subject. I

have talked with the Minister of Education, and with his Deputy, who is here to-day, asking if they would give us teachers. They have said to me, "Certainly, you can get them; we will give you teachers for this work." They will instruct your girl, and she will get to the Entrance or Matriculation just as quickly, if one-third or one-quarter of her time is devoted to the things she has got to come to. (Applause.)

WHAT WE NEED.

You say, "Why bother us city people with your rural problems?" Because you are specialists in organization, and we are not. We are willing to do the work, but we don't know how. We also need public money, and we don't know how to get it. (Laughter.) We could use an extra million dollars right now to demonstrate and put into practice what we already know.

We want rural architects to show us how to lay out and plan our homesteads, and to get running water into our houses.

We want a model mile of good road in every township. (Hear, hear.) Right now.

We want traveling teachers of agriculture, and traveling teachers of cooking and sewing, in every district.

We want a weed killing and good seed campaign in every county.

We want more orchards sprayed, and lessons in apple-packing, and pre-cooling fruit houses, and egg circles, not here and there, but everywhere—and we want them now! What's the use of proving these things in the Agricultural College and the Experiment Stations, if we go back and do no better?

Please excuse my impetuosity, but my heart is in the work, and we need the help and sympathy of every thoughtful Toronto citizen. (Hear, hear.)

We want as many instructors and experimenters and demonstrators in each county, to look after the better breeding and feeding and nourishing and improving of crops and animals, as we now have doctors of medicine, and that is not too many. Then our farmers, who are already intelligent and temperate and industrious, will produce for you more and better food, and put it on the market where the consumer can get it, in such attractive condition that canned vegetables and dried fruit and blank sausages and last year's eggs will all be forced out of competition—(Laughter)—and your wife

will with confidence, bred of knowledge, take the greatest pride in personally manufacturing or personally superintending the manufacturing of your bread and your biscuits, and your cakes and your cookies, and your sauces and your salads, and your jams and your jellies, and your preserves and your pancakes, all because you have come to your senses and insist that vocational training is sensible and necessary training for boys and girls.

The training of country children must be different from that of city children, but the proper training of each is essential to the best success and happiness of the Canadian man and woman of to-morrow, and perhaps in the end country people will lose their jealousy of their neighbors in the cities and towns, and the town people will come to appreciate more and more the economic as well as the social value of the farmers, to the credit and benefit of both. (Hear, hear, and very long and hearty applause.)

(March 30, 1914.)

Antarctic Exploration.

BY COMMANDER EVANS, R.N., C.B., OF LONDON, ENGLAND.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 30th March, Commander Evans, R.N., C.B., said:

Mr. President, Members of the Canadian Club, and Fellow Guests,—It goes straight to my heart to feel that fresh from the Antarctic we are welcomed in this fashion. I think in England perhaps we are a little bit slow in showing our feelings—at least the English are—I am half Welsh and half Irish. (Laughter.) But the whole lot of us are quick and keen to appreciate real hospitality and also absolute patriotism, and that is what we get over here.

Well, gentlemen, I am not here to talk on the Home Rule question, or Canadian railways, or anything of that sort. I have only one subject, my association with Captain Scott. You were perhaps present at the lecture the other night and heard what was connected with the history of the expedition. I will try to-day to give some of the more human touches.

First of all, in an Antarctic expedition, one gets men of all sorts, but after working together you shortly discover that your view point has been exaggerated. You have Canadian, Australian, English, Irish, Isaac, Jacob, all sorts—(Laughter)—the only difference is a little difference due to training, making some fit in in one direction, others in another. An engineering training makes a man a better mechanic, whereas Charles Wright was a better practical man. The training of a Canadian makes him better as a sledger, perhaps a better pioneer than those brought up in other parts of the Empire.

While particular differences are bound to obtain, the selection was a very difficult thing. The selection of sixty men out of eight thousand volunteers was a great responsibility on those who were trying to perfect arrangements for the expedition. The scientific selection was in the hands of Captain Scott and Dr. Wilson. They were very broad-minded, and it turned out well. As many men came from the Dominions as those from home universities; there was no difference

* Commander Evans was second in command of the famous Scott Expedition to the South Pole. He has been identified with Polar expedition work since the voyage of the Discovery in 1902. He entered His Majesty's navy in 1907.

among them. It was very interesting. We picked up some in Australia and they wished to go and say good-bye, so they met us later going by another route—the “Terra Nova” took a hundred and twenty days to reach New Zealand,—some people can get there more quickly than the rest. To me as Commander of the “Terra Nova” it was very interesting to see how each new man who joined the party was received; it always reminded me of a little bit of fish handed to a sea anemone—all hands were out to receive him, he was assimilated at once, and became part of the party. The view point of course of some men was quite peculiar. Cheetham, the boatswain of Capt. Scott’s relief expedition, had also been on Shackleton’s; he told us he was starting on his seventh voyage to the Antarctic, and was on the last southern voyage of the “Terra Nova.” He was allowed certain privileges a man of his rank was not usually entitled to, by virtue of his long and faithful services. He used to talk to the Captain and express his opinions fairly freely. (Laughter.) One of his opinions expressed to me as Captain of the “Terra Nova,” was this: “You know, Sir, Antarctic expeditions ain’t what they used to was.” (Laughter.) Asked what he meant, he said: “In the old days of Captain Cook”—I don’t mean Dr. Cook—(Laughter)—“Men went out and never knew when they were coming back; now you know to a month, almost, when you will come back home—it takes half the excitement out of it.” (Laughter.) When you get men of that kind, you don’t feel afraid of going anywhere or doing anything. The principal factors making an expedition a success are immense good will and sense, unselfishness, and I think a sense of humor. Setbacks are inevitable, and after all, all expeditions are governed tremendously by luck.

One setback we had was on a sledging journey. Wright and I with two Irish seamen left a depot on the great ice barrier. It was St. Patrick’s Day, and we had put aside a little for a celebration. Observing that there were two and a half Irishmen in the party of four (Laughter), we gave it to Wright to prepare the feast. We put in all the pemmican, and chopped up biscuits—those of us who had better teeth—we bit them up and dropped them into the aluminum mugs, after which they were turned into the soup. No one ever thought of asking whether you had cleaned your teeth, for as a matter of fact you had not for five months. We didn’t mind that at all. What was jealously guarded was the possibility of a crumb being swallowed, so the people with good teeth were made to open their mouths, to see that no crumb

was left there. When we had the soup all ready, one of the men was suddenly seized with a cramp in the leg, and upset the dish, so that it very quickly disappeared into the snow. The one remark made was that by Charles Wright, "I have never known anything so funny in my life." (Laughter.) Of course when men look on life in such a bright easy way, you can't be angry, and you always do your best. We certainly did pull well together on this expedition. (Applause.)

I happened to read the other day something by Rudyard Kipling; he said he was not an explorer but a traveler; but that all travelers bring back memories in the same way, whether travelers or explorers, and that there are a great many things you can't publish. You never think them worth while; sometimes you can't publish them—the printers wouldn't print them. The scents and smells of the places visited are among these. You have vivid memories of these. It is quite true. One smell that always permeated our nostrils was the smell of the cooker, the paraffine stove; and whenever I pass a motor car, the odor I get recalls that stove. In the ship we had the smell of the dogs; that was horrible; but the smell brings one back to the days of sledging,—it is very much the same whether in the north or the south. First of all, you get up about two hours earlier than usual,—if you are accustomed to getting up at 7, you get up at 5, but generally, due to the difference in longitude, you find you are being called at 4 instead of 5. The cook is a privileged man, he remains inside the tent; the others get ready, dig the sled out from its snowed-up condition, which is its usual condition—and the men put on their fur boots. Your fingers are by this time thoroughly cold, and you warm them on the mugs of tea. You have no water unless you cook it, and to do this you would need to carry fuel, which means more weight, and that shortens the rations, so you give up all ideas of washing and cleanliness, but it is extraordinary how clean you remain. (Laughter.) After warming one's hands, and filling—or not filling—one's stomach, one starts at length on the run. Usually the first stage is short. For the first few miles you experience terrific discomfort; but first your feet get warm, then your hands, last of all your face. It takes at least an hour to warm up; then one can open one's coat a little bit. After struggling along for four hours or five, you stop for lunch. Everyone is very glad, but the lunch is very sad, for the best meal is the one at the end of the day; lunch is usually two biscuits and a mug of tea. Those who smoke have a pipe of tobacco, and they have been known to chew all the "dollar" at the

end. After four or five hours' march again one is very tired. This always culminated in one thing—thoughts of food, what you would like to eat; things you would ordinarily refuse as most distasteful, you hunger for, but you seldom or never get enough.

At the end of the sledging day, the tired out men pitch the tent. The ice is frozen very hard,—you here in Canada know something about it, but add a little to your cold temperature, divide it by the same faces that always accompany you—it is really the same company, and instead of fresh faces and new landmarks, you have the great wide bleak plain always the same,—but the faces, the more the men become familiar to you, really become better looking, on any proper kind of expedition the ugliest man becomes handsome before you are done with him; subtract the comforts you are accustomed to, and multiply it by the days you spend, and you get some idea of the hardships of a sledging trip.

I had perhaps the hardest time, as I was the first man smitten with scurvy. As my men got tired they would be replaced. I started to pioneer the way ahead of Captain Scott, but although the spirit was willing—in the end I broke down, as scurvy overcame me. I managed to struggle on, with two men, two splendid men to help me.

It was an enormous sense of relief when the fight was almost over, and at last I found myself strong enough to go on again. We came to the little shack we left some years ago as a magnetic observatory; we had built it in the first expedition in 1904. I shall never forget the first day in that shack, when we experienced actual warmth from a stove! Nor the reception from the bluejackets, and we were put into sleeping bags, the delightful sense of comfort! As Peary said, it was “not a case of sleeping, but sleep, sleep, sleep, then turn over and sleep again.” (Applause.)

I made four voyages to the Antarctic regions—I am sorry to talk so much about myself, but one can't quite eliminate self when describing things one has seen—(Applause)—the first voyage south was very much like the others. Before one could get from New Zealand and civilization to the ice-bound Antarctic one had to face gales and long heavy seas washing over the ship. The decks were most slippery with the briny water. Everyone was wet through the oilskins. The dogs were the most pathetic animals, and our best friends. A dog can stand cold, but not salt water. As he loses his hold and slips down the waterways, he looks up almost pathetically, as much as to say, “It is your fault.” Of course it is,

for you take them there. We brought those that were left back—we did not kill any dogs—and gave them all homes in various parts of the Empire, and they will never have to pull any more sledges,—and by Jove I don't think they could if they had to, I think they are fatter than the other members of the expedition! (Laughter.)

Then when one gets across this more disturbed ocean, and reaches calmer seas, one sees real beauty, the orange-glinting crystals, and enormous bergs, some many miles in length, before they become disintegrated as they drift farther up north.

When we get into winter quarters, there is the first sadness. There is, however, a spirit of humor, not only amongst the men, but also in the penguins. I think the most humorous things on earth are the penguins, also the most determined. They would follow the ship and try to touch the ship, but directly they would fly off the floes and get near, the kick of the propellers sends them away fifty or sixty feet, and they don't know what's up. They get on the ice, and don't know what to make of the ship at all, so after looking at it a while they collapse like drunken men on the ice floes. Then everyone laughs, and throws coal at them. (Laughter.)

The first sign of a real sense of sadness, when you feel really cut off from civilization, is when the ship turns home, and takes your little messages; then you realize how splendid your companions are, and you get to realize what good comrades they are going to be.

I can only conclude by saying that there is a tendency nowadays—I may be contradicted—to say the young men of the day are not the men their fathers were. Many of our fathers are alive still, and are fine men, splendid fellows; we emulate their example; but Captain Scott and his company show that men are to be found nowadays worthy of holding up that splendid heritage as a nation that our fathers won for them. Thank you. (Long applause, followed by three hearty cheers and a "tiger.")

(April 3, 1914.)

Poetry.

BY MR. ALFRED NOYES.*

AT the special meeting of the Club, held on the 3rd April, Mr. Alfred Noyes provided what proved, in the words of the President, "a unique and altogether delightful contribution to our program, by reading four of his poems, viz., "The Admiral's Ghost," "Forty Singing Seamen," "The Highwayman," and "The Barrel Organ." Mr. Noyes simply prefaced the several poems with a few words of introduction, and made two or three passing comments during the readings. The audience, of some four hundred men, was loth to have the poet cease reading. Mr. Noyes said:

"I have been asked to inflict some of my own poems upon you. I know you will understand the circumstances. I should like, however, before beginning to read, to sweep away at one blow what the reporters have said about the financial aspect of poetry. (Laughter.) I would ask you to pay attention if you can to the poems, rather than to the person who reads them.

"The first poem I shall read is based on an incident in Devonshire, told to me by a native of Devonshire.

THE ADMIRAL'S GHOST.

I tell you a tale to-night
Which a seaman told to me,
With eyes that gleamed in the lanthorn light
And a voice as low as the sea.

You could almost hear the stars
Twinkling up in the sky,
And the old wind woke and moaned in the spars,
And the same old waves went by.

Singing the same old song
As ages and ages ago,

* Mr. Alfred Noyes has been described as the "most considerable" English poet since Tennyson. He was educated at Oxford, and was recently appointed lecturer of English Literature at Princeton University.

While he froze my blood 'in that deep-sea night
 With the things that he seemed to know.

A bare foot pattered on deck;
 Ropes creaked; then—all grew still,
 And he pointed his finger straight in my face
 And growled, as a sea-dog will.

“Do 'ee know who Nelson was?
 That pore little shrivelled form
 With the patch on his eye and the pinned-up sleeve
 And a soul like a North Sea storm?”

“Ask of the Devonshire men!
 They know, and they'll tell you true;
 He wasn't the pore little chawed-up chap
 That Hardy thought he knew.

“He wasn't the man you think!
 His patch was a dern disguise!
 For he knew that they'd find him out, d'you see,
 If they looked him in both his eyes.

“He was twice as big as he seemed;
 But his clothes were cunningly made.
 He'd both of his hairy arms all right!
 The sleeve was a trick of the trade.

“You've heard of sperrits, no doubt;
 Well, there's more in the matter than that!
 But he wasn't the patch and he wasn't the sleeve,
 And he wasn't the laced cocked hat.

“*Nelson was just—a Ghost!*
 You may laugh! But the Devonshire men
 They knew that he'd come when England called,
 And they know that he'll come again.

“I'll tell you the way it was
 (For none of the landsmen know),
 And to tell you it right, you must go a-starn
 Two hundred years or so.

* * * * *

“The waves were lapping and slapping
 The same as they are to-day;

And Drake lay dying aboard his ship
In Nombre Dios Bay.

"The scent of the foreign flowers
Came floating all around;
'But I'd give my soul for the smell o' the pitch,'
Says he, 'in Plymouth Sound.'

"'What shall I do,' he says,
'When the guns begin to roar,
An' England wants me, and me not there
To shatter 'er foes once more?'

"(You've heard what he said, may be
But I'll mark you the p'int's again;
For I want you to box your compass right
And get my story plain.)

"'You must take my drum,' he says,
'To the old sea-wall at home;
And if ever you strike that drum,' he says,
'Why, strike me blind, I'll come!

"'If England needs me, dead
Or living, I'll rise that day!
I'll rise from the darkness under the sea
Ten thousand miles away.'

"That's what he said; and he died;
An' his pirates, listenin' roun',
With their crimson doublets and jewelled swords
That flashed as the sun went down.

"They sewed him up in his shroud
With a round-shot top and toe,
To sink him under the salt, sharp sea
Where all good seamen go.

"They lowered him down in the deep,
And there in the sunset light
They boomed a broadside over his grave,
As meanin' to say 'Good-night.'

"They sailed away in the dark
To the dear little isle they knew;

And they hung his drum by the old sea-wall
The same as he told them to.

* * * * *

"Two hundred years went by,
And the guns began to roar,
And England was fighting hard for her life,
As ever she fought of yore.

"'It's only my dead that count,'
She said, as she says to-day:
'It isn't the ships and it isn't the guns
'Ull sweep Trafalgar's Bay.'

"D'you guess who Nelson was?
You may laugh, but it's true as true!
There was more in that pore little chawed-up chap
Than ever his best friend knew.

"The foe was creepin' close,
In the dark, to our white-cliffed isle;
They were ready to leap at England's throat,
When—O, you may smile, you may smile;

"But—ask of the Devonshire men;
For they heard in the dead of night
The roll of a drum, and they saw *him* pass
On a ship all shining white.

"He stretched out his dead cold face
And he sailed in the grand old way!
The fishes had taken an eye and an arm,
But he swept Trafalgar's Bay. (Applause.)

"Nelson—was Francis Drake!
O, what matters the uniform,
Or the patch on your eye or your pinned-up sleeve,
If your soul's like a North Sea storm?" (Applause.)

"The next poem that I am going to read—I am not sure that there is any definite philosophy in, until one reads the last stanza; though, some time after it was written, I suspected there might be an allegory hidden in it somewhere. (Laughter.) It is based on a legend of Pope Prester John, in which the following words occur—

"In our lands be Beeres and Lyons of dyvers colors as ye redd, grene, black, and white—"Possibly Post—Impressionist animals," remarked Mr. Noyes, amid laughter). And in our land be also unicornes and these Unicornes slee many Lyons. . . . Also "this seemed rather a rash statement." interjected the poet)there dare no man make a lye in our land, for if he dyde he sholde incontynent be sleyn." (Laughter.)

"Incidentally, I may say in regard to my method of reading these poems, that I try to read them exactly as it occurred to me to write them, without any attempt at elocution. (Laughter.) It seems to me one of the worst enemies of Grail poetry during the last decade, has been a certain kind of elocutionist who makes it his business to destroy exactly what the poet has spent weeks, and sometimes, months, in the endeavor to perfect, namely, the metre and rhythm of the poem." (Applause.)

FORTY SINGING SEAMEN.

Across the seas of Wonderland to Magadore we plodded,

Forty singing seamen in an old black barque,
And we landed in the twilight where a Polyphemus nodded
With his battered moon-eye winking red and yellow through
the dark!

For his eye was growing mellow,
Rich and ripe and red and yellow,
As was time, since old Ulysses made him bellow in the dark!
Cho.—Since Ulysses bunged his eye up with a pine-torch in
the dark!

Were they mountains in the gloaming or the giant's ugly
shoulders

Just beneath the rolling eyeball, with its bleared and vinous
glow,
Red and yellow o'er the purple of the pines among the boulders
And the shaggy horror brooding on the sullen slopes below,
Were they pines among the boulders
Or the hair upon his shoulders?

We were only simple seamen, so of course we didn't know.
Cho.—We were simple singing seamen, so of course we
couldn't know.

But we crossed a plain of poppies, and we came upon a fountain

Not of water, but of jewels, like a spray of leaping fire;

And behind it, in an emerald glade, beneath a golden mountain
 There stood a crystal palace, for a sailor to admire;
 For a troop of ghosts came round us,
 Which with leaves of bay they crowned us,
 Then with grog they well-nigh drowned us, to the depth of
 our desire!

Cho.—And 'twas very friendly of them, as a sailor can admire!

There was music all about us, we were growing quite forget-
 ful

We were only singing seamen from the dirt of London-
 town,

Though the nectar that we swallowed seemed to vanish half
 regretful

As if we wasn't good enough to take such vittles down,

When we saw a sudden figure,

Tall and black as any nigger,

Lik the devil—only bigger—drawing near us with a frown!

Cho.—Like the devil—but much bigger—and he wore a
 golden crown!

And “what's all this?” he growls at us! With dignity we
 chaunted,

“Forty singing seamen, sir, as won't be put upon!”

“What? Englishmen?” he cries, “Well, if ye don't mind being
 haunted,

Faith, you're welcome to my palace; I'm the famous Pres-
 ter John!

Will ye walk into my palace?

I don't bear 'ee any malice!

One and all ye shall be welcome in the halls of Prester
 John!”

Cho.—So we walked into the palace and the halls of Prester
 John!

Now the door was one great diamond and the hall a hollow
 ruby—

Big as Beachy Head, my lads, nay bigger by a half!

And I sees the mate wi' mouth agape, a-staring like a booby,

And the skipper close behind him, with his tongue out like
 a calf!

Now the way to take it rightly

Was to walk along politely

Just as if you didn't notice—so I couldn't help but laugh!

Cho.—For they both forgot their manners and the crew was
 bound to laugh!

But he took us through his palace and, my lads, as I'm a
sinner,

We walked into an opal like a sunset-coloured cloud—

"My dining-room," he says, and, quick as light we saw a
dinner

Spread before us by the fingers of a hidden fairy crowd;

And the skipper, swaying gently

After dinner, murmurs faintly,

"I looks to-wards you, Prester John, you've done us very
proud!"

Cho.—And we drank his health with honours, for he *done* us
very proud!

Then he walks us to his garden where we sees a feathered
demon

Very splendid and important on a sort of spicy tree!

"That's the Phoenix," whispers Prester, "which all eddicated
seamen

Knows the only one existent, and *he's* waiting for to flee!

When his hundred years expire

Then he'll set hisself a-fire

And another from his ashes rise most beautiful to see!"

Cho.—With wings of rose and emerald most beautiful to see!

Then he says, "In yonder forest there's a little silver river,
And whosoever drinks of it, his youth shall never die!

The centuries go by, but Prester John endures for ever

With his music in the mountains and his magic on the sky!

While *your* hearts are growing colder,

While your world is growing older,

There's a magic in the distance, where the sea-line meets
the sky."

Cho.—It shall call to singing seamen till the fount o' song is
dry!

So we thought we'd up and seek it, but that forest fair defied
us,—

First a crimson leopard laughs at us most horrible to see,

Then a sea-green lion came and sniffed and licked his chops
and eyed us,

While a red and yellow unicorn was dancing round a tree!

We was trying to look thinner,

Which was hard, because our dinner

Must ha' made us very tempting to a cat o' high degree!

Cho.—Must ha' made us very tempting to the whole menar-
jeree!

So we scuttled from that forest and across the poppy meadows
 Where the awful shaggy horror brooded o'er us in the dark!
 And we pushed out from shore again a-jumping at our
 shadows

And pulls away most joyful to the old black barque!

And home again we plodded

While the Polyphemus nodded

With his battered moon-eye winking red and yellow through
 the dark.

Cho.—Oh, the moon above the mountains, red and yellow
 through the dark!

“This,” remarked Mr. Noyes, “is where I think the philo-
 sophy comes in”—

Across the seas of Wonderland to London-town we blundered,

Forty singing seamen as was puzzled for to know

If the visions that we saw was caused by—here again we
 pondered—

A tippie in a vision forty thousand years ago.

Could the grog we *dreamt* we swallowed

Make us *dream* of all that followed? (Laughter.)

We were only simple seamen, so of course we didn't know!

Cho.—We were simple singing seamen, so of course we could
 not know! (Laughter.)

“Agnostics to the very end, you observe,” said the poet.
 (Laughter, and applause.)

“I may say it is with a great sense of relief that I read that
 poem, with an expert on Greek mythology on my right (Prin-
 cipal Maurice Hutton, of University College). Because
 when I read it recently before a Women's Club in the United
 States a woman came to me afterwards, and asked me, ‘Oh,
 Mr. Noyes, will you please tell me where I can read some
 more about that delightful Irish woman Polly Famus?’”
 (Laughter.)

“The next is ‘The Highwayman.’”

THE HIGHWAYMAN.

PART ONE.

The wind was a torrent of darkness among the gusty trees,
 The moon was a ghastly galleon tossed upon cloudy seas,
 The road was a ribbon of moonlight over the purple moor,
 And the highwayman came riding—

Riding—riding—

The highwayman came riding, up to the old inn-door.

He'd a French cocked-hat on his forehead, a bunch of lace at
his chin,
A coat of the claret velvet, and breeches of brown doe-skin;
They fitted with never a wrinkle: his boots were up to the
thigh!
And he rode with a jewelled twinkle,
His pistol-butts a-twinkle,
His rapier hilt a-twinkle, under the jewelled sky.

Over the cobbles he clattered and clashed in the dark inn-
yard,
And he tapped with his whip on the shutters, but all was
locked and barred;
He whistled a tune to the window, and who should be waiting
there
But the landlord's black-eyed daughter,
Bess, the landlord's daughter,
Plaiting a dark red love-knot into her long black hair.

And dark in the dark old inn-yard a stable-wicket creaked
Where Tim the ostler listened; his face was white and
peaked;
His eyes were hollows of madness, his hair like mouldy hay,
But he loved the landlord's daughter,
The landlord's red-lipped daughter,
Dumb as a dog he listened, and he heard the robber say—

"One kiss, my bonny sweetheart, I'm after a prize to-night,
But I shall be back with the yellow gold before the morning
light;
Yet, if they press me sharply, and harry me through the day,
Then look for me by moonlight,
Watch for me by moonlight,
I'll come to thee by moonlight, though hell should bar the
way."

He rose upright in the stirrups; he scarce could reach her
hand.
But she loosened her hair i' the casement! His face burnt
like a brand
As the black cascade of perfume came tumbling over his
breast;
And he kissed its waves in the moonlight,
(Oh, sweet black waves in the moonlight!)
Then he tugged at his rein in the moonlight, and galloped
away to the West.

PART TWO.

He did not come in the dawning; he did not come at noon;
 And out o' the tawny sunset, before the rise o' the moon,
 When the road was a gipsy's ribbon, looping the purple moor,
 A red-coat troop came marching—

Marching—marching—

King George's men came marching, up to the old inn-door.

They said no word to the landlord, they drank his ale instead,
 But they gagged his daughter and bound her to the foot of
 her narrow bed;

Two of them knelt at her casement, with muskets at their
 side!

There was death at every window;

And hell at one dark window;

For Bess could see, through her casement, the road that *he*
 would ride.

They had tied her up to attention, with many a sniggering
 jest;

They had bound a musket beside her, with barrel beneath her
 breast!

"Now keep good watch!" and they kissed her.

She heard the dead man say—

Look for me by moonlight;

Watch for me by moonlight;

I'll come to thee by moonlight, though hell should bar the way!

She twisted her hands behind her; but all the knots held good!
 She writhed her hands till her fingers were wet with sweat or
 blood!

They stretched and strained in the darkness, and the hours
 crawled by like years,

Till, now, on the stroke of midnight,

Cold, on the stroke of midnight,

The tip of one finger touched it! The trigger at least was
 hers!

The tip of one finger touched it; she strove no more for the
 rest!

Up, she stood up to attention, with the barrel beneath her
 breast,

She would not risk their hearing; she would not strive again;
 For the road lay bare in the moonlight;

Blank and bare in the moonlight;
And the blood of her veins in the moonlight throbb'd to her
love's refrain.

Tlot-tlot; tlot-tlot! Had they heard it? The horse-hoofs
ringing clear;
Tlot-tlot, tlot-tlot, in the distance? Were they deaf that they
did not hear?

Down the ribbon of moonlight, over the brow of the hill,
The highwayman came riding,
Riding, riding!
The red-coats looked to their priming! She stood up, straight
and still!

Tlot-tlot, in the frosty silence! *Tlot-tlot,* in the echoing
night!

Nearer he came and nearer! Her face was like a light!
Her eyes grew wide for a moment; she drew one last deep
breath,

Then her finger moved in the moonlight,
Her musket shattered the moonlight,
Shattered her breast in the moonlight and warn'd him—with
her death.

He turned; he spurred to the Westward; he did not know who
stood

Bow'd, with her head o'er the musket, drench'd with her own
red blood!

Not till the dawn he heard it, and slowly blanched to hear
How Bess, the landlord's daughter,

The landlord's black-eyed daughter,
Had watch'd for her love in the moonlight, and died in the
darkness there.

Back, he spurred like a madman, shrieking a curse to the sky,
With the white road smoking behind him, and his rapier
brandish'd high!

Blood-red were his spurs i' the golden noon; wine-red was
his velvet coat;

When they shot him down on the highway,

Down like a dog on the highway,
And he lay in his blood on the highway, with the bunch of
lace at his throat.

*And still of a winter's night, they say, when the wind is in the trees,
 When the moon is a ghostly galleon tossed upon cloudy seas,
 When the road is a ribbon of moonlight over the purple moor,
 A highwayman comes riding—
 Riding—riding—
 A highwayman comes riding, up to the old inn-door.*

Over the cobbles he clatters and clangs in the dark inn-yard;
 And he taps with his whip on the shutters, but all is locked
 and barred;
 He whistles a tune to the window, and who should be waiting
 there
 But the landlord's black-eyed daughter,
 Bess, the landlord's daughter,
 Plaiting a dark red love-knot into her long black hair.

“The next, and probably, I think, the last, as it may take nearly ten minutes to read, is entitled ‘The Barrel Organ.’ The reference is to a celebrated operetta, an elaboration of songs really sung by children in some parts of London on May Day. Interspersed through the poem are attempts to reproduce the cries of London streets, not the actual cries, but the effects of them,—an attempt, you might say, at a *London symphony*.” (Laughter.)

THE BARREL-ORGAN.

There's a barrel-organ carolling across a golden street
 In the city as the sun sinks low;
 And the music's not immortal; but the world has made it
 sweet
 And fulfilled it with the sunset glow;
 And it pulses through the pleasures of the city and the pain
 That surround the singing organ like a large eternal light;
 And they've given it a glory and a part to play again
 In the Symphony that rules the day and night.

And now it's marching onward through the realms of old
 romance,
 And trolling out a fond familiar tune,
 And now it's roaring cannon down to fight the King of
 France,
 And now it's prattling softly to the moon,

And all around the organ there's a sea without a shore
 Of human joys and wonders and regrets;
 To remember and to recompense the music evermore
 For what the cold machinery forgets. . . .

Yes; as the music changes,
 Like a prismatic glass,
 It takes the light and ranges
 Through all the moods that pass;
 Dissects the common carnival
 Of passions and regrets,
 And gives the world a glimpse of all
 The colours it forgets.

And there *La Traviata* sighs
 Another sadder song;
 And there *Il Trovatore* cries
 A tale of deeper wrong;
 And bolder knights to battle go
 With sword and shield and lance,
 Than ever here on earth below
 Have whirled into—a *dance!*

Go down to Kew in lilac-time, in lilac-time, in lilac-time;
 Go down to Kew in lilac-time (it isn't far from London!)
 And you shall wander hand in hand with love in summer's
 wonderland;
 Go down to Kew in lilac-time (it isn't far from London!)

The cherry-trees are seas of bloom and soft perfume and
 sweet perfume,
 The cherry-trees are seas of bloom (and oh, so near to
 London!)
 And there they say, when dawn is high and all the world's
 a blaze of sky
 The cuckoo, though he's very shy, will sing a song for
 London.

The nightingale is rather rare and yet they say you'll hear
 him there
 At Kew, at Kew in lilac-time (and oh, so near to London!)
 The linnet and the throstle, too, and after dark the long hal-
 loo
 And golden-eyed *tu-whit, tu-whoo* of owls that ogle Lon-
 don.

For Noah hardly knew a bird of any kind that isn't heard
 At Kew, at Kew in lilac-time (and oh, so near to London!)
 And when the rose begins to pout and all the chestnut spires
 are out
 You'll hear the rest without a doubt, all chorusing for
 London:—

*Come down to Kew in lilac-time, in lilac-time, in lilac-time;
 Come down to Kew in lilac-time (it isn't far from London!)
 And you shall wander hand in hand with love in summer's
 wonderland;
 Come down to Kew in lilac-time (it isn't far from
 London!).*

And then the troubadour begins to thrill the golden street,
 In the City as the sun sinks low;
 And in all the gaudy busses there are scores of weary feet
 Marking time, sweet time, with a dull mechanic beat,
 And a thousand hearts are plunging to a love they'll never
 meet,
 Through the meadows of the sunset, through the poppies and
 the wheat,
 In the land where the dead dreams go.

Verdi, Verdi, when you wrote *Il Trovatore* did you dream
 Of the City when the sun sinks low,
 Of the organ and the monkey and the many-coloured stream
 On the Piccadilly pavement, of the myriad eyes that seem
 To be litten for a moment with a wild Italian gleam
 As *A che la morte* parodies the world's eternal theme
 And pulses with the sunset-glow?

There's a thief, perhaps, that listens with a face of frozen
 stone
 In the City as the sun sinks low;
 There's a portly man of business with a balance of his own,
 There's a clerk and there's a butcher of a soft reposeful tone,
 And they're all of them returning to the heavens they have
 known:
 They are crammed and jammed in busses and—they're each
 of them alone
 In the land where the dead dreams go.

There's a very modish woman and her smile is very bland
 In the City as the sun sinks low;

And her hansom jingles onward, but her little jewelled hand
Is clenched a little tighter and she cannot understand
What she wants or why she wanders to that undiscovered
land,

For the parties there are not at all the sort of thing she planned,

In the land where the dead dreams go.

There's an Oxford man that listens and his heart is crying out
In the City as the sun sinks low;

For the barge, the eight, the Isis, and the coach's whoop and
shout;

For the minute-gun, the counting and the long dishevelled
rout,

For the howl along the tow-path and a fate that's still in doubt,
For a roughened oar to handle and a race to think about

In the land where the dead dreams go.

There's a labourer that listens to the voices of the dead

In the City as the sun sinks low;

And his hand begins to tremble and his face is rather red
As he sees a loafer watching him and—there he turns his
head

And stares into the sunset where his April love is fled,
For he hears her softly singing and his lonely soul is led

Through the land where the dead dreams go.

There's an old and haggard demi-rep, it's ringing in her ears,
In the City as the sun sinks low;

With the wild and empty sorrow of the love that blights and
sears,

Oh, and if she hurries onward, then be sure, be sure she
hears,

Hears and bears the bitter burden of the unforgotten years,
And her laugh's a little harsher and her eyes are brimmed
with tears

For the land where the dead dreams go.

There's a barrel-organ carolling across a golden street

In the City as the sun sinks low;

Though the music's only Verdi there's a world to make it
sweet

Just as yonder yellow sunset where the earth and heaven
meet

Mellows all the sooty City! Hark, a hundred thousand feet

Are marching on to glory through the poppies and the wheat
In the land where the dead dreams go.

So it's Jeremiah, Jeremiah,
What have you to say
When you meet the garland girls
Tripping on their way?

All around my gala hat
I wear a wreath of roses
(A long and lonely year it is
I've waited for the May!)
If any one should ask you,
The reason why I wear it is—
My own love, my true love is coming home to-day.

And it's buy a bunch of violets for the lady
(*It's lilac-time in London; it's lilac-time in London!*)
Buy a bunch of violets for the lady;
While the sky burns blue above:

On the other side the street you'll find it shady
(*It's lilac-time in London; it's lilac-time in London!*)
But buy a bunch of violets for the lady,
And tell her she's your own true love.

There's a barrel organ carolling across a golden street
In the City as the sun sinks glittering and slow;
And the music's not immortal; but the world has made it
sweet
And enriched it with the harmonies that make a song complete
In the deeper heavens of music where the night and morning
meet,
As it dies into the sunset gow;

And it pulses through the pleasures of the City and the pain
That surround the singing organ like a large eternal light,
And they've given it a glory and a part to play again
In the Symphony that rules the day and night.

And there, as the music changes,
The song runs round again;
Once more it turns and ranges
Through all its joy and pain:

Dissects the common carnival
Of passions and regrets;
And the wheeling world remembers all
The wheeling song forgets.

Once more *La Traviata* sighs
Another sadder song:
Once more *Il Trovatore* cries
A tale of deeper wrong;
Once more the knights to battle go
With sword and shield and lance
Till once, once more, the shattered foe
Has whirled into—a dance!

*Come down to Kew in lilac-time, in lilac-time, in lilac-time;
Come down to Kew in lilac-time (it isn't far from London!)
And you shall wander hand in hand with Love in summer's
wonderland,
Come down to Kew in lilac-time (it isn't far from Lon-
don!) (Applause.)*

(April 27, 1914.)

The Canadian Club Movement and Its Future.

BY MR. GEORGE WILKIE, B.A.*

AT the annual meeting of the Club, held on the 27th April, after the conclusion of the business, Mr. George Wilkie, B.A., one of the early Presidents, introduced a discussion on the subject, "The Canadian Club Movement and Its Future." Mr. Wilkie said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—On all important occasions of this kind, it is usual for the speaker to thank you for the honor which you do him in giving him the opportunity of expressing his views upon the question on which he addresses you. And so I thank you, Sir, for your kindness in allowing me to reminisce a few minutes, and to tell you how much better they used to do in the early days of this Club than you and your coadjutors have been doing this past year. (Laughter.) In those good old days when I was President of the Club, it was the usual practice of the retiring President to give an account not merely of his stewardship but of the events in the world at large which had had an effect upon Canada and Canadians. For a great many years now, I believe, that subject has been neglected. Of thirteen or fourteen Presidents, none has taken over that duty, none has performed it. It was the custom to take an hour for that, and so I propose now to take up seriatim the matters which should have been treated by those Presidents, and to deal with each at such length as each of them should have done. (Laughter.)

The first thing I propose dealing with is the Canadian Club. I will read you a portion of the Constitution, the most important portion, that is, its objects. The President has very kindly turned up the volume here, so I shall be able to read it, although I should not be able to remember it. It is more necessary, perhaps, to read it, because this Club is so well fitted with a Constitution that it does not even feel

* Mr. George Wilkie, B.A., was one of the first Presidents of the Toronto Canadian Club, and has always taken an active interest in its affairs. A lawyer by profession, he has been a keen student of Canadian problems from his youth, and is a speaker of no mean ability.

its presence. "The purpose of the Canadian Club shall be to foster patriotism, and to encourage the study of the history, literature, arts, and resources of Canada." That was the object with which a gathering of young men some seventeen years ago undertook the business of forming a Canadian Club in Toronto. There had been one in Hamilton for a few years previous, the solitary instance in which Hamilton had got ahead of Toronto. (Laughter.) The objects of the Club, if I recollect aright, received a good deal of careful attention. Reading it now again after a considerable lapse of years one is struck once more with the wisdom of the draughtsmen of this Constitution, in setting forth the purpose of the Club as being "to foster patriotism"—notice the astuteness, they did not say patriotism towards what, because we live in a Canada that is not undivided, because in Canada some people are patriotic towards one set of institutions, and some to another, and perhaps the draughtsman foresaw what Lord Milner was to say some fourteen years later, that he could no more understand Canadians being patriotic to England than he could understand Englishmen being patriotic to Canada.

For a short time we attempted to live up to the Constitution. For the first two or three years we did encourage the study of the institutions of Canada, at any rate we encouraged the discussion of them, among ourselves—we only incidentally or occasionally introduced a stranger to tell us what we ought to do. We studied the history of Canada, and we gave heed to the study of the arts. It was an event in those days for the Canadian Club each year to attend the exhibition of the Ontario Society of Artists, and we made provision that on the night the Toronto Canadian Club attended that gathering no strangers were to be admitted, the whole exhibition was sacred only to the members of the Toronto Canadian Club, none others. I don't know to what extent that encouraged the art of Canada, but that was the only art exhibition at the time in Toronto, and we did our best by attending that one.

As for the literature of Canada, I think in some ways we did better in that regard than now. We had Canadian poets speak to us from time to time, and gave them a luncheon or a dinner, just as we thought they most stood in need of. (Laughter.) We had Dr. Drummond on several occasions. He was a most excellent man, a most charming man to meet, and I hope many of you are encouraging Canadian literature by reading Dr. Drummond's poems. On one occasion,

or more, we gave a dinner to Sir Gilbert Parker. And so we entertained literary men who were Canadians, some Englishmen, and I hope some of them were Irishmen. (Laughter.)

With regard to studying the resources of Canada, perhaps we then did no more than you are doing now, perhaps not so good work, but we had some idea in the early days of the Club of endeavoring to fulfil its function. Whether as a result of those efforts or not, I do not know, but certainly after them, and therefore according to popular logic because of them, the years following were years of great importance to Canada. Those of you who are not so old as Mr. Cooper and myself can get an idea of the position of Canadian affairs in 1896 and 1897—only with considerable difficulty. If you have great difficulty in imagining it, and Sir Richard Cartwright says you will—get his "Reminiscences." You will find there an account of the position of our trade. For many years it had grown at a very slow rate, something like 3 per cent. per annum; population was stagnant, not even retaining our own natural increase—according to the census of the United States there were 1,200,000 Canadian-born persons living in the United States. Those were trying times in many ways. Just a few years before the question of annexation occupied a considerable space in the newspapers and on the public platform. Three or four years before a member of the Legislature called a meeting at Windsor, in which annexation was advocated and a resolution in favor of it carried. A similar meeting was called for Woodstock, but Sir Oliver Mowat arranged matters so that when the vote was taken there the resolution in favor of annexation was voted down by a majority of something like twelve to one. The Dominion Government had recently changed, the defeated government had gone out under a cloud. The new government was new, and untried, new men, at any rate, in whom the populace had not yet learned to have confidence.

In order to understand the objects of the Canadian Club, it is necessary to have some idea of the problems which were presenting themselves to the Canadian people at the time. At that time the position of Canada in the Empire and in the world, was very different from what it is now. If you will read books of the day, you will find some indication of the progress Canada made in those few years. I think in 1895 the Ministers of the Cabinet of Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada and other colonies—everybody called them colonies then, nobody thought of them as anything else

--the making of treaties was the exercise of a sovereign power which the colonies did not have; for colonies to have the making of their own treaties was nothing more or less than colonial independence! To-day, and for years, we have made our own treaties in trade matters, without a thought of doing anything more than exercising the proper functions of Canadian government. We made a treaty with France, and Mr. Asquith knew nothing of it, and he said it was quite proper and right. Since then we have made treaties with Germany, one with Italy, two with the United States—I am not now referring to 1911. (Laughter.) At any rate we have gone thus far in the few years since the birth of the Canadian Club, we have advanced to a point unthinkable when it originated. So far have we gone that we call ourselves a nation, and are called a nation by thinking men in Great Britain, and by thinking men everywhere. The term is one, however, that requires a little consideration, because while in common practice we make our own laws and treaties, and administer our own laws, with the single exception that there is an appeal to the King in his Privy Council, perhaps even it might be said that having theoretically one set of rights we are exercising in actuality another set—so far as we are concerned, in practice we make our own laws and treaties, and to all intents and purposes are our own governors, yet in theory we are as much to-day as ever we were dependent upon the British Crown; our Constitution is an Imperial Statute which the Imperial Parliament may amend or repeal, but in practice this is like the veto of the King, which no one, he himself least of all, thinks of exercising. So far as the growth of self-government is concerned, we have advanced greatly beyond the point where we stood fourteen or fifteen years ago. The problems of the right to govern ourselves and deal with our own affairs are practically wiped off the slate of practical affairs with which we need concern ourselves.

We have added during the past fourteen or fifteen years a very valuable chapter to the history of the world; we have, partly by our own efforts, partly by the good offices of the Imperial authorities, and partly by the force of circumstances, changed the condition of Canada so that it is practically working out its own affairs, still retaining its British connection unworn and unstrained. (Applause.)

The course of our literature is perhaps not less interesting than that of our history; while our resources are growing more interesting every day.

In the year 1896-7 we were divided by one of the most bitter sectarian strifes that ever cursed a people. We got rid of that, and for the sake of cold, bald, bare justice, I want to tell you how we got rid of it. It has been my misfortune, in this Orange city of Toronto—I have no objections to its being Orange, but it is Conservative, and I have objections to that—(Laughter)—to listen to attacks made upon my fellow Canadians of Quebec. I have let them go unchallenged when I thought they should not be unchallenged. To-day I am going to say something about them. I need not dwell upon the origin of the topic,—I refer, as you all know, to the Remedial Bill. Under the Constitution, when the Roman Catholics of Manitoba came into Confederation, they preserved their rights to their schools.

The Privy Council said there was a right under the British North America Act to remedy the difficulty. The Remedial Bill was brought in and a Dominion election held upon the issue. I do want to tell you to-night, that throughout the Province of Quebec, which we are disposed to-day to call Roman Catholic, priest-ridden and bigoted, the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church made the fight in favor of the Remedial Bill their own and went so far that one Archbishop said it would be a mortal sin for a Catholic to vote for the Remedial Bill. There was an election practically on that question, and if I had not the figures I would not venture to give you the result, but Manitoba, whose rights were invaded by the Remedial Bill, voted in favor of having the Dominion Parliament force that Remedial Bill down its own throat. Ontario, which then as now, was unsectarian, unbigoted, and free to pass upon the question, sent a majority in favor of the Bill. That is perhaps just a little doubtful, because the parties were not divided definitely, and there were the Patrons of Industry, whose allegiance was perhaps not easily defined. But of the opponents of the Bill only forty-four went to Parliament from Ontario. The other Provinces divided in such wise that if the Province of Quebec was left out there would have been Remedial legislation, and Manitoba would have had Remedial schools, if it had not been for Quebec's vote. Now I have done saying my own words about this, and I will now read you the words of a member of your own party—no matter which party you belong to,—in the Life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier by Sir John Willison (Laughter):

“To the Liberals of Quebec, maligned, misrepresented and misunderstood from the very birth of Confederation,

faithful through long years of adversity to the essential principles of civil and religious liberties, we owe the delivery of Manitoba from the policy of federal coercion, and the pacific settlement of a quarrel which threatened the integrity of Confederation and menaced the self-governing rights of all the Western communities.”

On the political aspect of that I wish to have nothing to say to-day, but on the Canadian aspect of it I have something to say. I should like every man here to have something to say about it. It was not the first nor the second nor the last time that the French-Canadian has demonstrated that he does not deserve that we should say that he is either priest-ridden or bigoted.

What do I think should be the business of the Canadian Club? I think the great work of the Canadian Club in the future will be wholly different from what it was, and perhaps rightly, in the past. The problems of material success we have measurably solved, at any rate we have demonstrated our capacity to produce sufficient for our people. The problems of distribution of wealth we have perhaps yet to solve. But it seems to me, if we are to work out our great destiny in this last and best piece of land fit for the habitation of white men, we can do so only on great principles, principles of fairness and justice to the East and to the West, of fairness and justice to the English-speaking man and of fairness and justice to the French-speaking man. (Applause.)

I wanted to present to you the most striking fact in showing that we were not always fair, not always just, perhaps not always honest, in dealing with those who speak another language, but who are nevertheless just as good Canadians as we, notwithstanding that they speak a different tongue than we do, who were Canadians indeed before we were, for their history stretches back to the earliest history of this continent. If I were a Frenchman, if French were my mother tongue, I should glory in that history just as they do; and if my native tongue was the French tongue, with all its glory of literature, drama and history, I should glory in that tongue as they do. And I sympathize with them to the full when they want to preserve, as much as they can, all these things which they have inherited from their glorious ancestry. (Applause.)

Then another people to whom we in Ontario should extend great consideration are those who form that advanced guard of civilization who are furnishing the labor and the

hardship in making the new country in our Canadian Northwest. There always has been on the North American continent a struggle between the East and the West. There was in the United States years ago, but bitter as it was, as those of us who were grown up then remember, it is pretty well past. I am afraid we have that struggle with us now, have had for some time, and shall have it for some time longer; and our position is a more dangerous one than theirs, because their territory stretched unbrokenly from east to west, while between the fertile East of Canada and the fertile West there stretches eight hundred miles of uninhabitable rock and water. West of that is an inhabitable tract of rich country, in which at some time in the not distant future there will be a population probably greater, potentially many times greater, than the population of the East. To the south lies another people, of the same race, speaking the same language, carrying on the same class of business, manufacturing goods that these people want to buy, and buying goods these people want to sell. And yet, if we are to have such a Canada as we ought to have, we must have that West knit to this East, if we are to have unity we must have understanding; and we must have more, we must have plain, simple, fair, even-handed justice and fair dealing.

What do I see ahead of the Canadian Club? I see this as its greatest practical work, to broaden the minds of the people of Ontario, of the people of the other Provinces, so that the people of Ontario will understand and appreciate the good qualities of the people of the other Provinces. What are the words of the poet:

"Be to their faults a little blind;
Be to their virtues always kind."

One hears something of the bad qualities of this Province and of its people; one hears it said that Quebec is slow; and the same man, perhaps, will tell you that the Provinces of the West are too fast, too ambitious, too proud, too hopeful. But that is just what you ought to have in the West. And I would look for, in Quebec, something different—we have there what we need, a steady population, clinging close to the soil, working out their way along that slow and toilsome road that leads to an honorable but not highly ornamented grave. But the more active, hurly-burly life of the West preserves the nervous hard crust of life. That being so, now, we find that our greatest literary men are Quebecers; our greatest sculptor is from that Province; many of our

greatest painters, too. On the other hand, the West is hopeful,—if you like to try it, see how long you would stay there if you have not hope in abundance—it is a necessary condition of life upon the prairies; to every pioneer it is needful to bear the labor and struggles of life. The chief business of the Canadian Club, indeed, is to see to it that every Canadian is making this Canada of ours what it should be, and will yet be, the best place under the sun for a man to live in.” (Applause.)

Annual Report of the Literary Correspondent.

Seldom in the history of this organization has a single season brought within the reach of the Club so many distinguished world figures who were available for addresses as in the past year. The high standing of those invited to address the Club in the season, their authoritative knowledge of the subjects on which they spoke, combined with the timeliness of the topics, enabled the Club to set a new high-water mark in point of attendance at and interest in meetings.

The season just closed was productive of information on a varied range of subjects, and will be remembered for the discussions, not only on civic, provincial, national, imperial, and world-wide matters, but also on topics for the uplifting and betterment of the lot of man.

The duties of the Literary Correspondent are practically confined to the editorial preparation of the volume containing the addresses delivered before the Club during the season. This part of the Canadian Club's work has become an established and recognized feature, and the modest volume issued from year to year is a valued source of information for those not so happily placed as are the members of this Club in securing first-hand information on current topics.

F. D. L. SMITH,

Literary Correspondent.

May 22nd, 1914.

Report of the Honorary Secretary of the Canadian Club for the Season 1913-1914.

Mr. President and Gentlemen:

The season of the Canadian Club which is now being brought to a close has been an unusually successful one in the points of increase of membership and uniformly larger average attendance at meetings. The gratifying attendance has resulted to a considerable extent from the development and extension of the Club's membership among young and enthusiastic business and professional men. The prominence of the speakers and the exceptionally interesting character of the subjects have also, of course, been largely responsible for making this season a record one in the Club's history.

It has been my custom in previous reports to analyse the changes that have taken place in the Club's membership and to compare the results attained in the season under consideration with those of previous years. The following figures will be interesting in this connection:

The paid up membership is now 1,541 as compared with 1,255 for the preceding season, a net increase of 286 members as compared with a net loss of 31 members last season and a loss of 114 members the season before; this increase resulted from a quiet membership campaign carried on by the Executive Committee. No effort to add to the membership has been made for some years past owing to crowded conditions at important meetings and the unsatisfactory character of the accommodation. The more regular attendance this year, coupled with a small increase in the price of luncheons, has made possible a slight improvement in the catering, which it is hoped will encourage the incoming Executive to renewed efforts to solve the accommodation problem, which has been such a handicap to the Club's activities from the very beginning.

From such a large membership in a Club which has been established so long and which has no entrance fee, there are necessarily many resignations from year to year. This season 137 old members dropped out as compared with 158

last season. In this connection it should be pointed out that many of our older members joined fifteen or sixteen years ago, and we must now face a reasonable diminution of their interest and enthusiasm. This can be met, as was done this year, by recruiting our membership in the future from young men. The new members this season amounted to 423 as compared with 127 new names last season.

Ten Executive Committee meetings were held, the same number as last season, with an average attendance of ten out of thirteen members. Numerous informal meetings of the Program Committee also took place.

Twenty-seven Club meetings, regular and special, including a successful banquet, were held. The average attendance increased from two hundred and fifty at the twenty-seven meetings last year to three hundred and forty-five this season. Two meetings only fell below 250, the attendance at the smallest being 161 as compared with 125, the smallest meeting last season, and 75 the lowest of the year before. Seven meetings this season had an attendance of over four hundred, and twenty meetings were attended by upwards of three hundred members.

The following is a list of the meetings, the dates, the names of speakers and the attendance:

DATE	SPEAKER	SUBJECT	ATTEN- DANCE
1913			
June 2 (S).	Mr. Norman Angell.....	"Canada's Best Service for British Ideals."	400.
Sept. 24 (S).	Lord Northcliffe	"Newspapers".....	475.
Oct. 4 (S).	The Rt. Hon. Herbert Louis Samuel.	"Imperial Relations".....	450.
Oct. 14 (S).	Right Hon. Sir Alfred Moritz Mond.	"The Land Question in England."	350.
Oct. 21 (S).	Chas. R. Van Hise, Ph.D....	"What the University Can Do for the State."	235.
Oct. 27 (S).	Mr. F. R. Benson	"Shakespeare, Fashioner of Fate."	380.
Nov. 3....	General W. Bramwell Booth	"The Salvation Army"....	390.
Nov. 10....	Dr. Adam Shortt, M.A. . . .	"Britain's Treatment of Canada."	337.
Nov. 17...	Sir Wm. C. Van Horne, K.C. M.G.	"The Railways and the Public."	471.
Nov. 24....	Mr. J. Joyce-Broderick.....	"The British Consular Service and It's Relation to Canada."	355.
Nov. 29 (S).	Mr. Bion J. Arnold.....	"The Street Railway Situation in Toronto."	425.
Dec. 4 (S).	Sir George Paish.....	"The Financial Outlook in Canada."	401.

DATE	SPEAKER	SUBJECT	ATTEN- DANCE
1913			
Dec. 8....	Hon. P. T. McGrath.....	"Why Newfoundland Has Not Entered Confederation"	265.
1914			
Jan. 5....	Mr. Z. A. Lash, K.C., LL.D	"The Navy Question",...	310.
Jan. 12....	Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, M.P.	"The Quebec Act".....	255.
Jan. 19....	G. G. S. Lindsay, Esq., K.C.	"Self Government in Canada."	161.
Jan. 29....	Hon. Willlam Howard Taft, Ex-Pres. United States; Sir Charles Fitzpatrick; Sir John Willison; Dr. J. A. Macdonald.	"Banquet"	400.
Feb. 3.(S).	Freder'k A. Cleveland, Ph.D.	"Toronto's Financial Administration."	370.
Feb. 6(S).	Mr. A. Maurice Low.....	"Imperial Federation: The Lesson of the American Colonies."	295.
Feb. 16....	Rev. Dr. W. S. Rainsford...	"Two Years Among Wild Men, Wild Beasts in England's Newest Colony."	370.
Feb. 23....	Sir Thomas Tait.....	"Australia"	352.
Mar. 12 (S).	Josiah C. Wedgwood, M.P. Mr. Fred Bancroft	"English Radicalism"....	250.
	Mr. Wm. Redmond, M.P.	"Workmen's Compensation"	
Mar. 16....	Dr. Irving Fisher.....	"Home Rule for Ireland."	
		"The High Cost of Living and Standardizing the Dollar."	285.
Mar. 23....	George C. Greelman, Esq., LL.D.	"Some Rural Problems"...	295.
Mar. 30....	Commander Evans, R.N., C.B.	"Antarctic Exploration"...	475.
April 3(S).	Mr. Alfred Noyes.....		275.
April 27....	Mr. George Wilkie, K.C....	"The Canadian Club Movement and Its Future."	

Fourteen of these speakers were Canadians, eleven were Englishmen, and the remainder were from the United States.

The meeting of January 29th took the form of a banquet in honor of Hon. W. H. Taft, ex-President of the United States. Mr. Taft's address was one of the most interesting speeches ever delivered before the Club. He talked in a delightfully informal manner for about one hour on "Canadian-American Relations." Unusually excellent addresses were also delivered by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Sir John Willison and Dr. J. A. Macdonald. This meeting was in every way a complete success, and undoubtedly played an important part in giving the members who applied early enough to secure tickets a common-sense view of good relations between Canada and the United States.

My report would not be complete without some reference to the old problem of accommodation. This problem appears almost as far from satisfactory solution as ever, but it hardly needs to be said that no effort has been spared by your Executive Committee to solve this question, which has militated so seriously against the Club's success in the past. Your Committee have endeavored to interest various individuals and Corporations in the project of supplying a suitable convention hall which would accommodate our largest meetings.

There is nothing definite to report at present, although there are several possibilities from which a satisfactory result may develop in the next two or three years.

It is a pleasure to be able to report that the work of the Association of Canadian Clubs is now on a permanent basis. A paid Secretary has been engaged, with headquarters in Ottawa. The promotion of new Clubs and the development of the smaller existing Clubs along the ideal lines already laid down in the Canadian Club movement should now be undertaken in a businesslike and satisfactory manner.

I cannot conclude my last report as Honorary Secretary without a hearty expression of thanks to all members of the Canadian Club for their kindness and toleration in electing me to this office for so many seasons. The work has been a continual source of pleasure and recreation for me. It has been my most interesting hobby for nearly five years, and now I look forward with dread to a dull, prosaic future which will lack the thrilling excitement of finding a speaker and a subject for each Monday during the seven or eight months of the Club's season. The associations have been so congenial that I would seek the office for many a year to come were I able to spare the time to handle the work as I can see it should be done.

I have the heartiest congratulations for my successor, whoever he may be, on being chosen for such a highly honorary office, the work of which is so full of interest and pleasant associations, and I bespeak for him as a perquisite of the office a continuation of the refreshing enthusiasm and the generous co-operation of the members of the Club and the Executive Committee with whom it may be his good fortune to be associated.

I am pleased to add, however, that I am convinced that the maintenance of the Club's traditions and its future progress are assured so long as the Honorary Secretary has an assistant such as I have had to do the work. I cannot speak

in high enough praise of the efficiency of Mr. Scully, and of his sober enthusiasm and his absolute infallibility. I feel that the success of the Club during the past five years, during which he has held office, has been more due to his efforts than to those of any other single person. I have the necessary deference, of course, for the Presidents and other officials who have served the Club so well in that period, but I seriously believe that results would have fallen far below what they have been if the work of the higher officers had not been so splendidly implemented by Mr. Scully with his tireless energy.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

C. LESSLIE WILSON,
Honorary Secretary.

Report of the Honorary Treasurer.

To the President and Members of the Canadian Club of Toronto:

The paid membership this season is 1,541 as compared with 1,255 for the previous season, a net gain of 286 members or \$858 in membership fees. The number of old members who dropped out during the year was 137, but as 423 new members joined there was a net gain of 286.

The receipts and disbursements this year are much in excess of the previous year. The total receipts of the Club for the past season were \$6,682, which is \$1,232.27 greater than last year. This is attributable to the increased membership. The ordinary expenses of the Club were higher than during the previous season, the principal increases resulting from the increased postage by reason of the larger mailing list; higher catering charges, the higher cost of the Year Book, and to the fact that a greater proportion of the Club's guests had their expenses paid by the Club this year than last. Smaller increases are also noticeable in the printing and reporting accounts. Your Executive, at its first meeting, decided to transfer the work of the Literary Correspondent to the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, and by reason of the additional duties thus placed upon the latter officer, and also having in mind that the amount of correspondence and other work involved in administering the Club's affairs has greatly increased since ten years ago, when the combined honorarium to the Secretary and Treasurer was fixed at \$750, voted to increase this figure to \$1,000. It should perhaps be explained to the members of the Club that out of this sum the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer pays for clerical assistance. This was the largest individual increase in the Club's expenditures during the current year. The only item in which a substantial saving was made was in the expenses involved in visits to Sister Clubs. No delegates were sent from the Toronto Club to outside meetings this year, and considerably over \$100 was saved by reason of this.

Taking the items of printing and stationery, postage, sundries, catering, reporting and guests' expenses into consideration the average cost of meetings this year was \$70.75, as compared with \$57.70 last year, an increase of \$13.05, which is made up of approximately \$3.00 in post-cards, 50c. in

printing of post-cards, an average of \$3.00 in head table expenses due to the increased price of the luncheon, \$4.00 in rent of chairs through increased attendance, and the balance of the increase in guests' travelling expenses.

At the end of last season we had on hand \$1,978.28. From this sum has to be deducted \$901.40, the cost of printing and distributing the Year Book for the season 1912-13, and \$26.10 representing accounts chargeable to the season 1912-13, which left a net surplus of \$1,050.78. Of this, \$971.07 was invested in a \$1,000 debenture of the City of Owen Sound to yield $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. Your Executive has already acquainted the members of the Club with its decision to supply Year Books only to those members who advised the Secretary that they wished a copy. A circular to this effect was sent out in October. Orders for approximately 600 books were received. The reduction in the number of books ordered will effect a material saving in the cost of the book, so that the cost of the book and its distribution next year should not exceed \$650. Practically all other outstanding accounts have been paid. Allowing \$25 for sundry expenditures, which will be charged back to 1913-14, and estimating the cost of the Year Book at \$650, the net surplus of the Club, including the investment of \$971.07, will be approximately \$2,022.90. It will be seen, therefore, that the Club could safely invest an additional \$500 of its cash surplus, which is \$1,051.83, immediately. The balance will finance the Club until October next, when the fees for next season are due, and after these fees are collected the balance of the present cash surplus could be invested. The Club has improved its position to the extent of about \$600 during the past season.

The fixed charges of the Club next season should, if anything, be a little less than last year, so that the Club has every reason to look forward to continued prosperity.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

D. H. GIBSON,
Honorary Treasurer.

TREASURER'S STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS,
SEASON ENDING APRIL 30TH, 1914.

RECEIPTS

By Balance in Imperial Bank, Toronto, May 1st, 1913.....	\$1,930.28	
By Petty Cash on hand, May 1st, 1913.....	48.00	
By Membership Fees,		
Old members, (1912-13) 3 @ \$3, \$ 9.00		
Old members, (1913-14) 1,118 @ 3, 3,354.00		
New members, (1913-14) 423 @ 3, 1,269.00		
	\$4,632.00	
By Interest credited by Imperial Bank	47.08	
By Interest on Investment, Owen Sound Debenture	25.00	
	4,704.08	
		\$6,682.36

PAYMENTS

To Accounts chargeable to the season ending April 30th, 1912, as per detailed statement attached..	\$ 927.50	
To Assistant Secretary-Treasurer's Honorarium....	1,000.00	
To Printing notice cards and stationery	230.48	
To Telegraph accounts	43.23	
To Telephone accounts	52.50	
To Postage, post cards, and petty cash disbursements	582.35	
To Sundries	28.64	
To Catering	508.31	
To Reporting.....	160.50	
To Guests' expenses	369.90	
To Expenses re Taft Banquet.....	\$1,405.05	
Less amount rec'vd from sale of tickets 1,324.00	81.05	
	\$3,984.46	

SURPLUS

Petty Cash on hand and in Bank	\$100.00	
Investment, Owen Sound Debenture	971.07	
Balance in Imperial Bank of Canada	1,626.83	
	2,697.90	
		\$6,682.36

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND PAY-
MENTS FOR THREE SEASONS ENDED
APRIL 30TH, 1912, 1913 AND 1914.

RECEIPTS

	1911-12	1912-13	1913-14
Income from Membership Fees, Interest, etc.....	\$3,966.22	\$3,823 33	\$4,704.08

PAYMENTS

Club Expenses.....	\$2,961.16	\$3,471.81	\$3,984.46
Net revenue earned by years.....	\$1,005.06	\$ 351.52	\$ 719.62
Surplus brought forward from previous years.....	621.70	1,626.76	1,978 28
Accumulated surplus by years.....	\$1,626.76	\$1,978.28	\$2,697.90

MEMO OF MEMBERSHIP

Number of members by years.....	1,236	1,258	1,544
---------------------------------	-------	-------	-------

LIST OF MEMBERS.

1913-14.

A

Abbs, C. E.
Acres, Chas. R.
Adam, George.
Adam, G. G.
Adams, E. Herbert.
Adams, Herbert R.
Adams, J. Frank.
Adamson, Agar.
Addison, W. L. T.
Agar, Chas. J.
Aikens, J. W.
Aikins, H. W.
Alcock, T. B.
Alderson, W. H.
Alexander, R. O.
Alexander, W. H.
Algate, A. J.
Allan, W. A.
Allen, G. F.
Allen, J. B.
Allen, Thos.
Alloway, A. R.
Ames, A. E.
Amyot, J. A.
Anderson, A. C.
Anderson, C. W.
Anderson, H. W.
Anderson, R. M.
Anderson, Wallace.
Andrew, R. B.
Andrews, E. B.
Anglin, R. W.
Anglin, S. E.
Annandale, A. W.

Anthes, L. L.
Appleby, F. L.
Appleton, John.
Archibald, J. W.
Argue, W. L.
Armer, J. C.
Armour, E. N.
Armstrong, A. E.
Armstrong, J. J.
Arnott, A. W.
Arnup, J. H.
Ashworth, Ed. M.
Aspden, T. Fred.
Atherton, J. W.
Atkinson, C. J.
Atkinson, D. H.
Atkinson, J. E.
Atkinson, M. LeC.
Auld, A. R.
Austin, G. C.
Austin, J. F.
Austin, Wm. R.
Authors, Hartley G.

B

Bach, J. S.
Bach, W. A.
Back, W. G.
Bailey, Fred S.
Bailey, John.
Baillie, F. W.
Baillie, J. W.
Bain, W. A.
Baird, W. A.
Baker, E. G.

- Baker, J. Chas.
 Baker, R. A.
 Baker, R. L.
 Baker, S. A.
 Baker, W. H.
 Baldwin, L. H.
 Balfour, G. B.
 Ball, G. B.
 Ballantyne, A. W.
 Balm, Henry.
 Banfield, E. J.
 Banfield, W. H.
 Barber, H. A.
 Barker, H. W.
 Barker, R. J. W.
 Barr, Walter J.
 Barrett, J. H.
 Barrett, W. W.
 Bastedo, A. E.
 Bates, Gordon.
 Batten, A. C.
 Baxter, D. W.
 Beamish, W. G.
 Beard, M. D.
 Beaton, John W.
 Beaton, Wm. J.
 Beatty, H. A.
 Beatty, J. W.
 Beaumont, J.
 Beck, E. L.
 Beck, H. T.
 Beck, J. J.
 Beecroft, F. L.
 Beemer, A. A.
 Beemer, A. H.
 Beer, E. G.
 Beer, G. Frank.
 Begg, E. A.
 Begg, Geo. M.
 Belcher, A. E.
 Bell, A. J.
 Bell, John.
 Bell-Smith, F. M.
 Berry, W. W.
 Bertram, Geo. M.
 Beyer, J. C.
 Bickle, E. W.
 Biggar, E. B.
 Bilger, W. F.
 Bilton, N. C.
 Binnie, A. W.
 Binnie, J. L.
 Birchard, I. J.
 Bird, E. G.
 Bird, T. A.
 Bishop, C. H.
 Bishop, G. J.
 Bishop, R. H.
 Blachford, A. W.
 Blachford, Chas. E.
 Blachford, F. E.
 Blachford, H. C.
 Black, H. H.
 Black, J. C.
 Black, R. G.
 Black, S. W.
 Black, W. A.
 Black, Wm.
 Blackburn, A. R.
 Blackburn, F. J.
 Blackburn, Herbert.
 Blacklock, S. C.
 Blain, Hugh.
 Bland, A. G.
 Bland, Thos.
 Bleasdall, W. H.
 Blogg, A. E.
 Blogg, T. Lyle.
 Bole, W. W.
 Bollard, Arthur.
 Bone, J. R.
 Bongard, C. W.
 Bonnar, H. D.
 Bowen, Thos. P.
 Bowles, H. W.
 Bowles, R. P.
 Bowman, W. M.
 Boyd, George.
 Bradley, H. E.
 Bradshaw, Thos.
 Brecken, P. R.
 Breckenridge, E. A.

Breckenridge, J. C.
 Brent, W. C.
 Brigden, George.
 Briggs, A. A.
 Briggs, A. W.
 Briggs, S. E.
 Bristol, Everett.
 Bristol, J. R. K.
 Britnell, Albert.
 Britnell, A.
 Britnell, Ed.
 Brock, S. G.
 Brocklebank, C. M. T.
 Brooks, W.
 Broughton, J. R. Y.
 Brown, B. R.
 Brown, C. A. B.
 Brown, T. Crawford.
 Brown, E. B.
 Brown, E. P.
 Brown, H. S.
 Brown, James.
 Brown, Jas. H.
 Brown, Richard.
 Brown, W. E.
 Brown, W. N.
 Browne, E. S.
 Bruce, H. A.
 Bruce, H. M.
 Bruce, John.
 Bruce, R. J.
 Bryden, Jas.
 Bucke, Wm.
 Buckland, H. G.
 Bull, Emerson.
 Bull, W. P.
 Bulley, Chas.
 Bundy, J. W.
 Burnett, A. H.
 Burnett, H. E.
 Burns, A. N.
 Burns, C. E.
 Burns, J. A.
 Burns, R. N.
 Burruss, G.
 Burton, C. L.

Burwash, N. A.
 Bushell, Amos.
 Butchart, A. S.
 Butt, H. A.

C

Caldbeck, G.
 Calhoun, J. C.
 Cameron, D.
 Cameron, D. A.
 Campbell, A. M.
 Campbell, E. T.
 Campbell, G. C.
 Campbell, J. L.
 Campbell, Paul.
 Campbell, W. F.
 Candee, C. N.
 Canfield, F. B.
 Capp, T. W.
 Carder, M. D.
 Cargill, Wm.
 Carnahan, W. J. A.
 Carrick, John.
 Carruthers, A.
 Carter, J. S.
 Carveth, J. A.
 Carr, W.
 Caskey, H. K.
 Cassidy, E.
 Caswell, E. S.
 Catto, J. A.
 Causton, E. N.
 Caven, J. G.
 Chadsey, S. B.
 Chamberlin, J. E.
 Chamberlin, J. R.
 Chant, W. A.
 Chapin, A. S.
 Chapman, F. M.
 Chapman, S. H.
 Chapman, W. F.
 Charlewood, C. B.
 Charlton, W. A.
 Chatterson, A. E.
 Chipman, W.

Chisholm, A.
 Chisholm, R. W.
 Chisholm, T. A.
 Christie, R. J.
 Churchill, F. W.
 Clancy, W. T.
 Clare, Harvey.
 Clark, E. R.
 Clark, G. M.
 Clark, Dr. Harold.
 Clark, J. M.
 Clark, L. J.
 Clark, W. J.
 Clarke, F. G.
 Clarke, G. B.
 Clarke, W. F.
 Clarke, W. J.
 Clarkson, Roger.
 Cleaver, S.
 Cleland, F. A.
 Clemes, H. B.
 Clements, A. G.
 Clendennan, G. W.
 Cliff, G. J.
 Cliff, W. C.
 Coakwell, J. A.
 Coatsworth, E. T.
 Coburn, John.
 Cockburn, E.
 Cody, H. J.
 Cooper Cole, C. E.
 Coleman, R. H.
 Collins, J. R.
 Collinson, Frank.
 Colquhoun, A. H. U.
 Colwell, C. A. E.
 Congdon, J. W.
 Connor, R. N. E.
 Cook, T. S.
 Cook, M. H.
 Cooke, H. M.
 Coombs, F. J.
 Coombs, J. W.
 Cooper, J. A.
 Cooper, J. E.
 Copeland, C. M.

Copeland, R. J.
 Coreoran, J. W.
 Corner, H. C.
 Corrigan, W. J.
 Corson, R. R.
 Coryell, R. S.
 Costello, T.
 Cottrelle, G. R.
 Coulson, D. C.
 Coulter, J. A.
 Couzens, H. H.
 Cowan, H. P.
 Cowan, John.
 Cowan, Wm.
 Craick, W. A.
 Craig, Jas.
 Craig, Jas. H.
 Craig, Wm.
 Crane, S.
 Cranston, J. K.
 Crean, G. C.
 Creer, F. N.
 Creighton, W. B.
 Cringan, J. W.
 Crofoot, C. W.
 Croft, Wm.
 Croft, Wm. H.
 Crosby, G. W.
 Crossland, E. F.
 Crowe, H. J.
 Crowther, A. T.
 Crowther, W. B.
 Crowther, W. C.
 Cummer, W. E.
 Cuthbertson, A. E.
 Cuthbertson, C. R.
 Cutten, L. F.

D

Dale, J. G.
 Dallyn, F. A.
 Dallyn, R. E.
 Daly, H. J.
 Daly, R. A.
 Dancy, A. H.

Dancy, R. C.
 Daniel, C. D.
 Daniel, F. C.
 Darling, Frank.
 Davidson, N. F.
 Davidson, Richard.
 Davies, A. B.
 Davies, E. S.
 Davies, T. A.
 Davis, B. N.
 Davis, B. N.
 Davis, E. J.
 Davis, L.
 Day, F. J.
 Deacon, F. H.
 Deacon, G. P.
 Dean, W. F.
 Dean, W. G.
 DeLong, F. L.
 Denison, G. T.
 Denison, Shirley.
 Denne, A. J.
 Dent, C. R.
 Dewart, H. H.
 Denton, Frank.
 DeWitt, N. W.
 Deyell, J. W.
 Dick, John.
 Dickenson, H.
 Dickinson, D.
 Dignum, E. J.
 Dilworth, R. J.
 Dineen, F. B.
 Dineen, W. F.
 Dingman, R. G.
 Dinnick, W. S.
 Dixon, Geo.
 Dockray, T. D.
 Dobbs, J. E.
 Doherty, G. F. B.
 Doidge, W. A.
 Donaldson, A. G.
 Donogh, J. O.
 Doolittle, P. E.
 Doran, F. W.
 Douglas, W. M.

Douglass, W. A.
 Duffett, W. G.
 Duggan, R. B.
 Duggan, T. W.
 Duncan, E. J. B.
 Duncan, J. M.
 Dunlap, D. A.
 Dunstan, K. J.
 Dyke, F. G.
 Dykes, Philip.

E

Earl, T. R.
 Easson, R. H.
 Eaton, J.
 Eaton, J. C.
 Eaton, R. W.
 Eaton, R. Y.
 Eberhard, C. R.
 Eby, Hugh D.
 Eby, W. P.
 Echlin, J. A.
 Eckardt, A. E.
 Eckardt, A. J. H.
 Eckardt, H. D.
 Eckardt, H. P.
 Eddis, Chas. S.
 Eddis, J. W.
 Eddis, W. C.
 Edmonds, C. E.
 Edmonds, W. L.
 Elgie, R. B.
 Elliott, A.
 Elliott, F. C.
 Elliott, T.
 Elliott, W. F.
 Ellis, A. W.
 Ellis, J. A.
 Ellis, J. F.
 Ellis, M. C.
 Ellis, P. W.
 Ellis, R. Y.
 Ellis, W. G.
 Elwood, A. L.
 Emslie, B. L.

Endicott, J.
 Evans, G. T.
 Evans, L. C.
 Evans, W. B.

F

Fairbairn, R. D.
 Fairley, H. T.
 Fairty, I. S.
 Falconer, R. A.
 Farewell, F. L.
 Farquharson, Jas.
 Farr, H. Y.
 Fawcett, W. J.
 Fearnley, Wm.
 Pennell, W. J.
 Ferguson, H. V.
 Ferguson, J. B.
 Ferguson, J. M.
 Fetherstonhaugh, F. B.
 Fielding, Ed.
 File, L. K.
 Findley, Thos.
 Finkle, E. D.
 Fisher, A. B.
 Fisher, R. C.
 Fitzgerald, J. G.
 Flavelle, J. E.
 Flavelle, J. W.
 Fleming, C. H.
 Fleming, J. H.
 Fletcher, A. G.
 Fletcher, H. G.
 Foley, F. J.
 Foley, J. J.
 Follett, J. H.
 Ford, Wm. H.
 Forster, J. W. L.
 Fortier, H. C.
 Foster, A. S.
 Foster, S. B. R.
 Foster, S. H.
 Foulds, A.
 Foulds, A. E.
 Fountain, Wm.

Fox, E. C.
 Fox, W. C.
 Foy, F. C.
 Franks, Harold.
 Fraser, G. W.
 Fraser, R. D.
 Fraser, J. A.
 Fraser, W. J.
 French, D. G.
 Frost, H. R.
 Fullerton, J. A.

G

Gaby, F. A.
 Gage, W. J.
 Galbraith, G. M.
 Gale, G. C.
 Gallagher, Z.
 Gardiner, J. J.
 Gardiner, J. N.
 Garlick, H. S.
 Gartshore, J. J.
 Garvin, J. W.
 Gates, F. W.
 George, James.
 George, W. K.
 Gibson, D. H.
 Gibson, J. J.
 Gibson, R. E.
 Gibson, Theron.
 Gibson, Thos.
 Gibson, T. A.
 Gifford, J. R.
 Gilbert, G. A. E.
 Gilchrist, Jas.
 Gilchrist, John.
 Gillespie, Walter.
 Gillies, D. B.
 Gillooly, C. J.
 Gilmour, C. H.
 Gilmour, J. T.
 Gilverson, A. E.
 Gissing, Edwin.
 Gladman, J. G.
 Godfrey, J. M.

- Godson, T. E.
 Goforth, W. F.
 Goldsmith, P.
 Goodenow, A. H.
 Gooderham, G. H.
 Gooderham, Henry.
 Gooderham, H. F.
 Gordon, A. R.
 Gouinlock, Geo.
 Gould, R. J.
 Gourlay, R. S.
 Gow, Walter.
 Gower, Edwin P.
 Graham, Wm. M.
 Grange, E. A. A.
 Grant, W. H.
 Grassick, F. C.
 Gray, Arch.
 Gray, F. M.
 Gray, G. H.
 Gray, R. A. L.
 Gray, Wm. A.
 Greening, W. S.
 Greenshields, G. A.
 Gregory, W. D.
 Greig, E. R.
 Greig, W. J.
 Griffin, Watson.
 Grimbley, Maurice.
 Grover, G. A.
 Grubbe, T. P.
 Gulley, C. L.
 Gulley, Thos.
 Gundy, J. H.
 Gundy, W. P.
 Gunther, R. E.
 Gurney, E. H.
 Gzowski, C. S.
- H**
- Hachborn, E. G.
 Hagyard, Chas.
 Haig, D. C.
 Hale, E. R.
 Hales, Jas.
- Haley, J. S.
 Hall, A. F.
 Hall, H. E.
 Hall, J. B.
 Hall, J. E.
 Hallam, J.
 Halliday, Roy.
 Halpenny, E. W.
 Halstead, J. A.
 Halsted, T. A.
 Hamilton, R. C.
 Hamilton, W. A.
 Hamly, H. T.
 Hammond, M. O.
 Haney, M. J.
 Hanna, H. G.
 Hanna, W. J.
 Hanning, G. F.
 Harecourt, F. W.
 Harecourt, R. B.
 Harding, C. V.
 Harding, David.
 Hardy, G. B.
 Harper, E. W.
 Harris, E.
 Harris, H. K.
 Harris, Jas.
 Harris, R. C.
 Harris, W. C. R.
 Hart, H. B.
 Hart, J. H.
 Hart, J. S.
 Hart, M. M.
 Hart, Percy.
 Hartney, F. B.
 Hartwell, W. J. F.
 Hassard, F. G.
 Hastings, Chas. J.
 Hatch, A. E.
 Hathaway, E. J.
 Hawes, A.
 Haworth, G. F.
 Hay, A. M.
 Hay, C. McD.
 Hayes, F. B.
 Heaton, Ernest.

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------|
| Heaven, W. J. | Housser, J. H. |
| Hedley, Jas. | Houston, Wm. |
| Henderson, David. | Howarth, C. E. |
| Henderson, Jos. | Howe, L. P. |
| Henderson, L. A. | Howell, D. J. |
| Henderson, P. E. | Howell, G. A. |
| Henderson, Q. B. | Howes, E. J. |
| Henderson, Robt. | Howitt, Henry. |
| Henderson, R. B. | Howland, G. W. |
| Henderson, S. | Howland, Peleg. |
| Henderson, T. A. | Huekvale, C. |
| Henry, D. E. | Hudson, H. H. |
| Hermant, Percy. | Huestis, A. E. |
| Hessin, A. E. | Huestis, A. M. |
| Hetherington, W. J. | Huffman, Louis. |
| Hethrington, J. A. | Hughes, J. L. |
| Hewitt, Arthur. | Hull, H. |
| Heyes, H. R. | Hunter, A. W. |
| Heyes, S. T. | Hunt, H. W. |
| Hezzelwood, O. | Huston, B. T. |
| Hiam, T. A. | Hutchinson, A. |
| Higgins, A. T. | Hutchison, O. A. |
| Higgins, F. P. | Hutton, M. |
| Hill, N. A. | Hynes, J. P. |
| Hillary, N. | |
| Hillery, W. O. | |
| Hillman, H. P. L. | |
| Hillock, C. W. | |
| Hillock, J. F. | |
| Hiltz, W. W. | |
| Hindmarsh, H. C. | |
| Hobberlin, A. M. | |
| Hodgins, F. E. | |
| Hodgkinson, C. I. | |
| Hoidge, W. H. | |
| Holden, J. B. | |
| Holliday, T. F. | |
| Hooper, H. | |
| Hopkins, C. F. | |
| Hopkins, H. | |
| Hopkins, J. C. | |
| Hopper, L. R. | |
| Horton, E. E. | |
| Horton, H. G. | |
| Horwood, J. C. B. | |
| Hough, E. W. | |

I

- | |
|--------------------|
| Imrie, J. H. |
| Imrie, J. M. |
| Inglee, J. F. |
| Innes, J. P. D. |
| Innes, W. C. C. |
| Inrig, Wm. |
| Ireland, H. W. |
| Irish, M. H. |
| Irvin, W. C. |
| Irvine, R. N. |
| Irvine, W. H. |
| Irving, G. T. |
| Irving, T. C., jr. |
| Isard, C. H. |
| Ivens, E. H. |
| Ivey, A. M. |

J

Jackson, H. R.
 Jacobs, F. A.
 Jaffray, Robt.
 James, C. C.
 James, C. W.
 James, D. D.
 James, T. B.
 Jarvis, E. M.
 Jarvis, J. B.
 Jarvis, F. C.
 Jarvis, W. H. P.
 Jefferis, C. A.
 Jeffrey, A. H.
 Jemmett, F. G.
 Jenking, E. J.
 Jennings, G. T.
 Jennings, P. H.
 Jephcott, W. C.
 Jessop, W. G.
 Jewell, H.
 Johnson, A. J.
 Johnson, Main.
 Johnston, D. F.
 Johnston, J. R.
 Johnston, R. L.
 Jolley, H. W. B.
 Jones, C. S.
 Jones, J. E.
 Jones, L. M., Sir.
 Jones, T. R.
 Jones, W. A. M.
 Jones, Wm. W.
 Jordan, A. R.
 Joyce, B. F.
 Jull, T. W.

K

Keeler, P. A.
 Keirstead, E. M.
 Keith, Alex.
 Keith, D. L.
 Keith, G. A.
 Keith, J. M.

Kelley, N. P.
 Kemp, C. A.
 Kemp, W. A.
 Kennedy, C. A.
 Kennedy, H. L.
 Kennedy, Frank.
 Keough, T. H.
 Kerr, J. H. S.
 Kerr, J. K.
 Kertland, A. H. R.
 Kettlewell, W. C.
 Keys, D. R.
 Kiely, P. G.
 King, A. C.
 King, A. E.
 King, A. S.
 King, E. E.
 King, J. H.
 Kingsmill, W. B.
 Kingston, G. A.
 Kinnear, J. P.
 Kinnear, Thos.
 Kirby, R. G.
 Kirkpatrick, A. D.
 Kirkpatrick, A. M. M.
 Kirkwood, J. C.
 Kirkwood, W. A.
 Kitchener, Jas.
 Klotz, E. W.
 Knapp, G. H.
 Knight, F. J.
 Knowles, C. O.
 Knowles, Geo.
 Knowles, P. D.
 Kyle, J. C.
 Kyle, J. F.
 Kylie, E. J.
 Kynoch, Jas.

L

Lacey, J. C. T.
 Lacey, L. A.
 Laidlaw, A. T.
 Laidlaw, Robt.
 Laidlaw, R. A.

Laidlaw, W. C.
 Laird, Alex.
 Lake, E. M.
 Lambe, W. G. A.
 Lander, Jas.
 Lander, N. J.
 Lang, David.
 Langlois, W. H.
 Langman, A. E.
 Langstaff, J. M.
 Langton, W. A.
 Larkin, P. C.
 Larsen, C. N.
 Laschinger, E. H.
 Lash, J. F.
 Lash, Z. G.
 Lawson, J. D.
 Lawson, T. W.
 Leadley, A.
 Leask, D. R.
 Lee, C. E.
 Lee, G. H. D.
 Lee, P. J.
 Lee, W. C.
 Lee, W. T. J.
 Leeming, Thos.
 Lefroy, A. H. F.
 LeMesurier, C. C.
 Leonard, C. J.
 Leslie, J. M.
 Lewis, E. A.
 Lewis, J. D.
 Lewis, R. T.
 Lightbourn, E. T.
 Lindsay, J.
 Lindsay, John.
 Lindsay, Martine.
 Lindsey, G. G. S.
 Littlejohn, J. E. B.
 Lines, S. L. B.
 Livingston, C. W.
 Lloyd, H. F.
 Locke, G. H.
 Locke, J. T.
 Lockhart, N. B.
 Lockhart, R. R.

Loftus, J. T.
 Long, A. E.
 Long, W. E.
 Lorriman, J. G.
 Louks, LeR.
 Lovell, J. S.
 Lovell, R. D.
 Lovering, W. J.
 Lucas, I. B.
 Lucas, Jos.
 Lugsdin, L. J.
 Luke, F. E.
 Lukes, L.
 Lyon, A. E.
 Lyons, J. P.
 Lytle, W. J.

M

McArthur, C. A.
 McCammon, L. B.
 McCannell, J. S.
 McCarthy, J. O.
 McCaul, J. G.
 McClain, R. W.
 McClellan, E. E.
 McClellan, G. B.
 McClellan, W. H.
 McClelland, J.
 McClelland, J. H.
 McClennan, A. W.
 McColm, E. E.
 McConegal, E.
 McConkey, D. M.
 McConkey, T. G.
 McCormack, R. L.
 McCoy, S. H.
 McCracken, T. E.
 McCrea, W. J.
 McCreath, B. H.
 McCredie, A. L.
 McCullough, J. W. S.
 McCutcheon, F. W. C.
 McDonald, C. S.
 McDougall, D. H.
 McDougall, W. H.

- McEachren, N. C.
 McEachren, W. N.
 McFall, A. A.
 McFarlane, P. A.
 McGee, Henry.
 McGiffen, G. A.
 McGregor, J. B.
 McGuire, W. H.
 McIlwraith, W. N.
 McIntosh, J. M.
 McIntosh, W. D.
 McIntyre, D. M.
 McIntyre, R. L.
 McKay, A. C.
 McKechnie, J. B.
 McKenney, J. S.
 McKenzie, B. E.
 McKinnon, J. G.
 McKinnon, J. S.
 McKinnon, R. S.
 McKinnon, R. B.
 McKinnon, W. L.
 McKnight, J.
 McLaren, D.
 McLaughlin, F. S.
 McLaughlin, R. J.
 McLaughlin, R. S.
 McLean, F. G.
 McLean, J. S.
 McLean, N. J.
 McLean, W. J.
 McLenaghan, Jas.
 McLeod, G. J.
 McLeod, J. B.
 McMahan, F.
 McMichael, A. R.
 McMichael, S. B.
 McMurray, L. S.
 McNairn, W. H.
 McNaught, W. K.
 McPherson, R. U.
 McQuillen, T.
 McTavish, W. M.
 McWhinney, J. M.
 McWhinney, W. J.
 McWilliams, J. D.
 Mabee, O. H.
 MacBeth, W. J.
 Macabe, T. J.
 Macdonald, A. A.
 MacDonald, C. S.
 Macdonald, D.
 Macdonald, D. B.
 Macdonald, H. W.
 Macdonald, J. A.
 MacDonald, J. A.
 MacDonald, J. B.
 Macdonald, Mervil.
 Macdonald, W. R.
 Macdougall, A. K.
 MacDougall, A. R.
 Macfadden, J. A.
 MacGregor, A.
 MacGregor, J. P.
 MacInnes, B. S.
 MacInnes, C. S.
 MacIntyre, G.
 Mackay, F. D.
 MacKay, John.
 MacKay, J. F.
 Mackenzie, A. J.
 MacKenzie, D. R.
 MacKenzie, J. A.
 MacKenzie, S. H. P.
 MacKerrow, R.
 Mackie, Alex.
 Mackie, A. C.
 MacLachlan, J. P.
 MacLaren, J. F.
 MacLean, J. M.
 MacMurchy, A.
 MacMurchy, J. C.
 Macpherson, G. A.
 Macrae, E. M.
 MacTavish, N.
 Magwood, S. J. N.
 Mahon, A. W.
 Mahony, R. J.
 Malcolm, A. G.
 Mallon, J. P.
 Mandell, H. N.
 Mann, D. D.

- Mann, F. J.
 Manning, C. E.
 Manning, H. E.
 Manning, H. W.
 Mara, F. G.
 Mara, W. H.
 Marks, A. H. S.
 Marshall, G. L.
 Marshall, W. J.
 Martin, A. W.
 Martin, J. P.
 Martin, Wm.
 Martin, Wm. T.
 Martin, W. H.
 Masecar, J. R.
 Mason, A. D. A.
 Mason, D. H. C.
 Mason, H. H.
 Mason, J. H.
 Mason, T. H.
 Massey, A. L.
 Massey, Vincent.
 Mathews, J. B.
 Matthews, W. L.
 Mathison, Robt.
 Maw, F. C.
 Maxwell, P. A.
 Maybee, J. E.
 Megan, F. P.
 Mellish, A. E.
 Meredith, Thos.
 Merriam, G. R. C.
 Meyers, D. C.
 Mickles, L. G.
 Miles, A. W.
 Millard, F. P.
 Miller, J. A.
 Millichamp, R.
 Millichamp, W.
 Millman, Thos.
 Millman, W. H.
 Mills, Alex.
 Milner, W. S.
 Milnes, J. H.
 Milnes, J. P.
 Minns, F. S.
 Mitchell, A. J.
 Mitchell, C. H.
 Mitchell, C. S. F.
 Mitchell, J. W.
 Mitchell, L. W.
 Mitchell, Thos.
 Mix, R.
 Moffatt, F. M.
 Molesworth, G. N.
 Monypenny, L. F.
 Monypenny, T. F.
 Moody, F. H.
 Moore, J. T.
 Moore, S. J.
 Moore, W. H.
 Moore, W. P.
 Morgan, E. R.
 Morgan, M. T.
 Morley, R. B.
 Morphy, E. J.
 Morren, E. W. S.
 Morris, Cecil.
 Morrison, C. E.
 Morrow, A. D.
 Morrow, G. A.
 Morrow, W. B.
 Mortimer, A. B.
 Mortimer, C. H.
 Mortimer, Thos.
 Mosely, G. H.
 Moss, Fred.
 Moss, John.
 Moss, Wm.
 Mowat, G. S.
 Moyle, David.
 Muckle, C. P.
 Muirhead, J. A.
 Mulholland, F. A.
 Mulock, Cawthra.
 Mulock, Wm., Jr.
 Mulveney, Wm.
 Munns, Wm.
 Munro, C. R.
 Munro, Hugh.
 Munroe, E. B.
 Munroe, E. S.

Murphy, F. M.
 Murphy, J. E.
 Murray, C. B.
 Murray, H. W.
 Murray, Wm. G.
 Murray, W. P.

N

Nasmith, H. C.
 Needler, G. H.
 Neely, C. H.
 Neely, T. A.
 Neil, John.
 Nelles, C. M.
 Nelson, F.
 Nesbitt, W.
 Nightingale, Hy.
 Niles, C. B.
 Nisbet, R. A.
 Noble, C. J.
 Northway, A. G.
 Northway, John.
 Northway, J. A.
 Norton, W. E.
 Nourse, C. E.
 Nursey, W. R.

O

Oakley, J.
 O'Brien, A. H.
 O'Connor, J.
 O'Connor, W. M.
 O'Donoghue, J. G.
 O'Hara, G. H.
 Oldham, J. H.
 Oliver, Jos.
 O'Meara, T. R.
 O'Reilly, H. R.
 Ormsby, R. P.
 Orr, W. E.
 Orr, W. H.
 Overend, M. A.

P

Page, Wm. A.
 Pakenham, Wm.
 Palm, O. G.
 Palmer, C. E.
 Park, Andrew.
 Park, A. F.
 Parker, C. Q.
 Parker, Robt.
 Parker, W. R. P.
 Parkinson, M.
 Parsons, R. C.
 Parsons, S. R.
 Parton, G. F.
 Paterson, H. D.
 Paterson, J. A.
 Paterson, J. H.
 Paterson, R.
 Patterson, E. L. S.
 Patterson, I. H. F.
 Paterson, J. D.
 Patterson, J. H. L.
 Payne, A. R.
 Paynter, C. J.
 Peacock, E. R.
 Peacock, H. M.
 Pearce, C. T.
 Pearson, A.
 Pearson, Chas.
 Pearson, Jno.
 Pember, W. T.
 Pemberton, G. C. T.
 Pepler, Eric.
 Perry, Geo. D.
 Perry, J. B.
 Perry, W. H.
 Peters, G. A.
 Peters, Henry.
 Peterson, H. R.
 Pettes, D. H.
 Pettit, J. H.

Pettit, Stanley.
 Phillips, Chas.
 Philips, H. S.
 Phippen, F. H.
 Plant, W. H.
 Platt, S. A.
 Plumptre, H. P.
 Pontifex, B.
 Poole, C. D.
 Poole, J. E.
 Pope, W. W.
 Porter, G. D.
 Potts, F. H.
 Poucher, F. B.
 Price, W. H.
 Priest, H. C.
 Prime, F. A.
 Prime, F. H.
 Primrose, A.
 Prosser, C. B.
 Provan, A.
 Prudham, J. R.
 Putnam, G. A.

R

Rae, H. C.
 Ramsay, J. J.
 Randall, A. E.
 Raney, W. E.
 Ratcliffe, J. B.
 Rawlinson, M.
 Raymond, H. D.
 Rea, A. E.
 Rea, T. W.
 Readman, C. W.
 Redman, H. E.
 Reed, W. G. C.
 Reed, Wm. L.
 Rees, L.
 Reid, A. W.
 Reid, A. J.
 Reid, A. T.
 Reid, G. B.
 Reid, G. J.
 Reid, J. A.
 Reid, Thos.
 Rennie, R.
 Rennie, Thos.
 Rice, A. B.
 Rice, Gordon.
 Richardes, R.
 Richards, E. H.
 Richards, John.
 Richardson, C. F.
 Richardson, J. E.
 Riehey, M. S. L.
 Ridout, Geo.
 Ritchie, C. F.
 Roadhouse, W. B.
 Roberts, F. E.
 Robertson, C. S.
 Robertson, W. D.
 Robertson, W. G.
 Robin, C. E.
 Robinette, T. C.
 Robins, M. E.
 Robinson, E. W.
 Robinson, G. H.
 Robinson, J. B.
 Robinson, M. H.
 Robinson, R. K.
 Robson, A. H.
 Rogers, A. C.
 Rogers, Elias.
 Rogers, E. A.
 Rogers, J. P.
 Rogers, T. G.
 Rohold, S. B.
 Rolph, E. R.
 Rolph, Frank.
 Rooke, C. H.
 Rooke, Henry.
 Rooney, H. E.

Rooney, W. J.
 Rorke, L. V.
 Ross, A. H. D.
 Ross, D. G.
 Ross, D. W.
 Ross, J. F.
 Ross, R. D.
 Ross, W. D.
 Rous, H. L.
 Rowell, N. W.
 Rowland, J. A.
 Rowlatt, F. A.
 Rudolf, R. D.
 Rumsey, R. A.
 Rundle, C. R.
 Rundle, W. E.
 Rupert, H. S.
 Russell, T. A.
 Rutherford, E. E.
 Rutter, A. F.
 Ryckman, E. B.
 Ryrie, Harry.
 Ryrie, James.

S

Saer, J. B.
 Salmond, J. J.
 Sanderson, H. M.
 Saunders, E. M.
 Scott, C. G.
 Scott, E. W.
 Scott, F. W.
 Scott, J. C.
 Scott, R. F.
 Scripture, A. W.
 Scully, H. D.
 Seaman, W. B.
 Sewell, H. F. D.
 Shantz, F. R.
 Shapley, H. W.
 Sharp, Andrew.
 Shaver, Geo. H.

Shaw, J. A.
 Shaw, J. R.
 Shaw, W. H.
 Sheen, H. L.
 Shenstone, J. N.
 Shepard, F. S.
 Sheppard, L. C.
 Sheppard, S. T.
 Sheppard, W. J.
 Shiels, M. S.
 Short, H. V.
 Silverthorn, T. A.
 Sime, T. W.
 Simonski, A. A.
 Simonski, I.
 Sims, P. H.
 Sinclair, J. M.
 Sing, J. G.
 Sisley, O.
 Sisson, W. J.
 Skeaff, J. S.
 Skelton, J.
 Skelton, J. M.
 Slater, L. R.
 Sloan, F. M.
 Smallpiece, H. E.
 Smith, A. T.
 Smith, E. H.
 Smith, F. D. L.
 Smith, F. J.
 Smith, G. B.
 Smith, G. H.
 Smith, H. L.
 Smith, J. M.
 Smith, R. G.
 Smith, R. Home.
 Smith, V. R.
 Smith, W. E.
 Smith, W. H.
 Smith, W. R.
 Snarr, J. F.
 Snively, A. C.
 Snyder, N.
 Somers, G. T.

Somerville, G. A.
 Somerville, J.
 Southam, R.
 Sparrow, J. M.
 Spaulding, W. G. L.
 Spears, J. W.
 Speight, T. B.
 Spence, B. H.
 Spence, F. S.
 Spence, Jas.
 Sprague, H. S.
 Sproatt, G. R.
 Sprott, A. F.
 Spry, F. M.
 Squirrel, J. E.
 Stamper, Hugh.
 Standfield, M. E.
 Stanley, Frank.
 Stanners, A. C.
 Stanway, A. G.
 Stapells, R. A.
 Stark, H. L.
 Steele, J. J.
 Steele, R. C.
 Steele, W. D.
 Steinhoff, I. W.
 Stephenson, F. C.
 Stephenson, H. R.
 Stevens, W. R.
 Stevenson, C. E.
 Stewart, A. F.
 Stewart, E.
 Stewart, H. B.
 Stewart, J. A.
 Stewart, J. F. M.
 Stewart, Wm.
 Stewart, Wm. B.
 Stewart, W. D.
 Stirrett, J. T.
 Stobie, M.
 Stock, H. E. R.
 Stone, W. T.
 Storrie, Wm.
 Stovel, A. E.
 Strathy, F. W.
 Strathy, G. S.

Strathy, Stuart.
 Strathy, Winder.
 Stuart, R. J.
 Sutherland, A.
 Sutherland, Hy.
 Sutherland, J. A.
 Sutherland, John.
 Sutherland, R. F.
 Sutton, S. T.
 Sutton, T. E. P.
 Swan, D. A.
 Sweatman, J. W.
 Sweeny, Bishop.
 Sykes, C. A.
 Sykes, S. B.
 Symons, D. T.
 Symons, W. L.

T

Tandy, H. M.
 Tanner, F. W.
 Tate, J. A.
 Taylor, H. A.
 Tample, H. P.
 Temple, W. M.
 Tew, D. S.
 Tew, Richard.
 Thayer, Ira B.
 Thayer, J. M. G.
 Thomas, E. H.
 Thomas, W. H. G.
 Thompson, B.
 Thompson, H. V.
 Thompson, S.
 Thomson, A. M.
 Thomson, H. G.
 Thomson, J. H.
 Thorne, J. L.
 Thurston, A. D.
 Tidy, C. J.
 Tindall, W. B.
 Tinline, T. C.
 Tippett, W. H.
 Toller, P. B.
 Torrington, F. H.

Tory, John A.
 Tovell, N. W.
 Tow, W. J.
 Trigge, A. St. L.
 Trotter, W. C.
 Troyer, H. L.
 Tubby, C. A.
 Tugwell, H. C.
 Turnbull, Jno.
 Turner, A.
 Tyrrell, H. V.

U

Urquhart, C. E.
 Urquhart, Thos.

V

Valentine, Geo.
 Van Duzer, C. W.
 Van Norman, C. C.
 Van Nostrand, A. J.
 Van Nostrand, C. J.
 Van Nostrand, G. J.
 Van Nostrand, Jno.
 Vanstone, B. S.
 Van Vleet, P. G.
 Varcoe, F. P.
 Vaughan, R. C.
 Vaughan, Wm. H.
 Vearncombe, H. C.
 Vigeon, Harry.
 Vonszeliski, Paul.

W

Wade, R. O.
 Wade, Wm. C.
 Wainwright, C. S.
 Walder, Robt.
 Wales, Alex.
 Walker, C.
 Walker, E. Sir.
 Walker, H. H.
 Walker, J. A.

Walker, Wm.
 Wallace, H. E.
 Wallace, J. S.
 Wallace, M. W.
 Wallace, W. F.
 Ward, A. T.
 Ward, T. E.
 Warden, G. T.
 Wardlaw, T. D.
 Warren, C. A.
 Warren, J. M.
 Warren, R. D.
 Warren, T.
 Warwick, G. R.
 Watson, G. F.
 Watson, Wm.
 Watt, John.
 Weaver, F. I.
 Webb, R. H.
 Webber, L. V.
 Webster, G. J.
 Webster, T. S.
 Wedd, E. K. N.
 Weeks, R. P.
 Weld, H. F.
 West, Gordon.
 West, W. N.
 Westren, J.
 Wetherall, J. E.
 Wetherell, Elgin.
 Whaley, E.
 Whatmough, A. E.
 White, Aubrey.
 White, F. F.
 White, F. J.
 White, F. W.
 White, Geo.
 White, J. P.
 White, M. A.
 White, M. P.
 Whitney, Sir Jas.
 Whittemore, A. R.
 Wickett, J. A.
 Wickett, S. M.
 Wickett, S. R.

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Wickson, John. | Winyard, C. W. |
| Wickware, R. C. | Withers, C. A. |
| Wiggins, Wm. | Wood, E. R. |
| Wildman, J. F. | Wood, G. H. |
| Wilkie, D. R. | Wood, L. N. |
| Wilkie, Geo. | Wood, Robt. |
| Wilkinson, E. H. | Wood, R. G. |
| Wilkinson, H. | Wood, S. Casey. |
| Wilkinson, W. C. | Wood, T. H. |
| Willans, Ed. | Wood, W. A. P. |
| Willard, J. C. | Woodbridge, Thos. |
| Willard, W. T. | Woodcock, J. N. |
| Williams, C. E. | Woodhouse, C. |
| Williams, H. B. | Woodland, C. W. I. |
| Williams, H. H. | Woodland, Fred. |
| Williams, Mackenzie. | Woods, J. W. |
| Williamson, R. | Worth, Arthur. |
| Willison, Sir J. | Worthington, G. R. |
| Willison, W. A. | Wreyford, C. D. |
| Willison, W. T. | Wright, Alf. |
| Willoughby, J. H. C. | Wright, E. F. |
| Willson, C. H. | Wright, E. W. |
| Willson, G. H. | Wright, N. S. |
| Willson, John. | Wylie, Norman. |
| Wilson, A. E. | |
| Wilson, C. L. | |
| Wilson, G. E. | |
| Wilson, Geo. | |
| Wilson, G. L. | |
| Wilson, H. | |
| Wilson, Jno. | |
| Wilson, M. F. | |
| Wilson, S. F. | |
| Wiltcn, R. F. | |
| Winchester, A. B. | |
| Winger, A. H. | |
| Winter, F. W. | |
| Winter, H. N. | |
| Winter, L. A. | |

Y

- Yeigh, Frank.
 Yeigh, Henry.
 Yorston, J. A.
 Young, A. H.
 Young, C. R.
 Young, M. J.
 Young, W. A.

Z

- Ziegler, O. H.

F
5547
T6C33
1913/14

Canadian Club of Toronto
Addresses

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

