Proceedings of the CANADIAN CLUB, Toronto for the Year 1916-1917

VOLUME XIV. 1916-17

ADDRESSES

DELIVERED BEFORE

The Canadian Club of Toronto

Season of 1916-17

Edited by the Literary Correspondent

TORONTO:
WARWICK BRO'S & RUTTER, LIMITED
1917

Warwick Bro's & Rutter, Limited,
Printers and Bookbinders, Toronto, Canada.

CONTENTS

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1916-1917

President — George H. Locke

1st Vice-President — R. R. Lockhart

2nd Vice-President — W. G. Watson

Honorary Secretary — Holt Gurney

Honorary Treasurer — A. M. Ivey

Literary Correspondent — D. B. Gillies

Assistant Secreary-Treasurer — F. P. Megan

Committee

C. E. Abbs
F. S. Corrigan
I. S. Fairty
F. R. Mackelcan
H. D. Scully
C. F. Ritchie
M. W. Wallace
J. Douglas Woods
Lieut.-Col. F. H. Deacon

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR 1917-1918

President — E. C. Fox

1st Vice-President — J. H. Gundy

2nd Vice-President — I. S. Fairty

Honorary Secretary — Shirley Denison, K.C.

Honorary Treasurer — A. M. Ivey

Literary Correspondent — H. J. Crawford

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer — F. P. Megan

Committee

S. B. Chadsey
H. H. Couzens
R. A. Daly
Newton Brown
Capt. E. W. Wright
H. F. Gooderham
D. B. Gillies
R. K. Shepard
George H. Locke

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
Lesslie Wilson	1914-15
Lieutenant-Colonel F. H. Deacon	1915-16
George H. Locke	1916-17

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 person 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
1916-17

(June 19th, 1916.)

The Problem of the Commonwealth

By Mr. Lionel Curtis.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 19th June, Mr. Curtis said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I want as briefly as I can in the time before us to tell you about the organization called "The Round Table," an organization many members of which I see present here to-day. That organization has flourished perhaps more freely in Toronto than in any other part of the British Commonwealth, but the impetus which gave rise to it came from South Africa some years ago.

I must take you back to the year 1906, when the change of government in England brought into power the Administration there which determined to give what it called self-government to the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, a constitution of the ordinary colonial type. I have very little doubt that at the time the members of that Ministry really thought that they were giving self-government to South Africa. I am perfectly assured that in the minds of those men at the time the step they were taking was the only right step. But it was not self-government, for this simple reason, that the questions of primary importance to South Africa were not the questions of interest to the Transvaal or of interest

*Mr. Lionel Curtis was actively engaged in the re-organization of South Africa following the war. His work at that time caused him to institute the Round Table Movement for the further study of the problems of the Empire.

to the Free State, but the questions between the four South African democracies.

The first effect of instituting that form of self-government among our democracies was that it brought about a deadlock in South Africa, and we discovered that there was no machinery for settling such questions; therefore if we were going to have self-government at all, we must have it in full, as members of the British Commonwealth. Our institutions must be based on self-government; we must establish here a government suitable to South Africa itself. That was the whole underlying principle of union.

I must take you on to the moment when after three sessions of the conference of Bloemfontein we were completing the work. A hitch occurred which almost destroyed the movement which had taken two years. The question arose of the apportionment of representation between the British and the Dutch sections. The British section was gravely considering delivering an ultimatum which would have, in my opinion, meant that the Union would not have taken place then, and would not have taken place now.

It was at this very juncture that a telegram came out from England to the effect that Sir Edward Grey had warned the British Empire, not merely, I was going to say, the country, but warned the British Empire, of the danger of attack from Germany. It was the first muttering of the storm which broke out two years ago. The South African Union became an accomplished fact that day! The British party felt that in view of the danger to the whole structure, it was too great a responsibility to take to leave South Africa ununited.

Thus at the very moment when we attained the status of a Dominion, which you attained just fifty years ago, we were in this dramatic way brought face to face with responsibilities for national life or death. But that was not all. You must realize what the South African Union meant to the Englishmen who were supporting it, who had come to fight in the war but were staying to live there. It meant that not only the Transvaal and the Free State, but the whole of South Africa, was to be governed by the very generals we had been fighting! We knew it must mean that. We were prepared if it meant government by General Botha; but we knew perfectly well the risks we were taking, that it might not be Botha,—it might be Hertzog or Beyers; in that case we knew perfectly well, that in the event of a world-wide war they would declare South Africa absolutely neutral; that we as Britishers would be told to observe an attitude of neutrality,

when our whole instincts would be impelling us to struggle for Britain. It was a very serious position for us to face.

Both these aspects of the question brought home to us that although we had attained the status of a Dominion, which brought within the scope of the South African Government every purely South African question, the greatest of all questions lay outside the scope of that Government.

As Englishmen living in England, we had gone to elections feeling that the first responsibility laid upon us was that of choosing a Government in whose hands the safety and freedom of the whole Empire would be secure. But now that South Africa had risen to the full status of a Dominion we found that we had no control whatever over the issues of peace and war. That position we felt could not be allowed to stand as it was, and, therefore, we decided to visit Canada, the country mainly responsible for the development of the whole status of the Dominions. Therefore in 1909 three of us came here.

We asked everyone we met what he thought about this question, and always received the answer that the Empire was one and indivisible, and would always remain so; that there were five partners or sister States, all Dominions, absolutely equal. When we asked about issues of peace and war we always received the same answer, that they were to be controlled through the medium of co-operation. We did not see how foreign policy could be carried on by co-operation, and when we came to sift the facts we found that the issues of peace and war were not settled at Ottawa, or at Melbourne, or at Wellington, or at Pretoria, but were settled at Westminster.

Now we did not see how that could continue, and not being politicians but Government servants by training, we sat down to analyze the whole question in a memorandum. The conclusions we came to were so much at variance with the orthodox creed on this subject, that we thought it would be madness for us to publish them. So we printed our memorandum, and went to New Zealand, where we met a number of University and business men, and asked them, "Will you study this question with us?" That invitation was cordially accepted, and through that Round Table groups sprang up.

We then went on to Australia, and groups sprang up there. Both Australian and New Zealand groups urged us to come back to Canada and again put our cause there. So in 1910 I came back to Toronto, saw the friends I had made, and put this case before them. Out of that, Round Table groups

sprang up in Canada, where perhaps they have had a more vigorous existence than in any other part of the Empire.

Just one word as to the composition of these groups. What we wanted was not approval but criticism of our proposal; we wanted juries to sit on it. Therefore we wanted all shades of thought represented. These Round Table groups, including men of all parties, took this printed memorandum; the members read it individually, and then met together and discussed it, and drew up reports upon it. A torrent of criticism was sent in to myself. It was then printed, with the original memorandum to which it related, each criticism opposite the passage to which it referred. These criticisms were sent to the different groups, and what each group had done was put before the other members. The next thing was to prepare a general and comprehensive report on the whole problem; the task of doing that was imposed upon me. I did not realize when I undertook it its formidable nature. Only after a year's work did I realize that is was impossible to deal with the problem in any shorter compass than that in which, for instance, Mr. Bryce dealt with the American Commonwealth.

As instalments of the report were printed they were sent out for criticism to the groups in the Dominions. In 1914 I came to Toronto, and discussed the report with the groups here. It was believed that the document was too formidable for any but students to read, so it was thought well to draw up a popular report for popular consumption. Then the war broke out. "The Problem of the Commonwealth" was prepared, and I think about eight hundred copies went among the various members of the groups in Canada, and again criticism began to pour in. A great many people began to press for its publication; strong reasons for its publication began to appear, and finally I was left no choice in the matter, because unfortunately one magazine in Montreal published a review, and discussion of the unpublished book began to spring up in the public press. There was no secrecy about our work, but there was necessarily privacy, for it is impossible for men to study a grave political problem in the atmosphere of political controversy. Everybody was at liberty to know as much about our work as we did, provided it did not get into the papers. When, however, this book began to be discussed in the public press the papers began to treat the view it contained as those of the Round Table. Therefore I took the only course possible, and decided to rewrite the report in the light of all the criticisms of all the groups, to rewrite it in final form as far as my own views went, and republish it as my

own views. About a month ago it was republished in Great Britain. I came over here, for the simple reason that there was not paper enough in Britain for more than a limited number of copies, so it will be printed in Canada for distribution here and in Australia and New Zealand. In the course of a very few days it will be printed in Toronto and this will be in front of you.

I am afraid I have only a few minutes left in which to present a pretty big case, but I will put it as briefly as I possibly can.

My first position is this: that the British Commonwealth stands for self-government. The ultimate responsibility for all public affairs must rest on the people themselves, that is, on the part of the people who are qualified to bear them.

Now I say all public affairs, in Canada and in South Africa, all Canadian and South African affairs, do rest on the people themselves; they are in the hands of Ministers who can be turned out of office at any moment by the people themselves, and others put in their places. And I venture to say that, when you analyze political responsibility, it ultimately comes down to that. This problem which I suggest to you comes from the fact that the whole of your public affairs are not in the hands of your Ministers at Ottawa. There is no use burking that fact. The events which led to this war were not handled in Ottawa, but in Britain. Nor are the Ministers who handled it responsible to the people of South Africa or of Canada. No Canadian or South African or Australian can affect the life of the Ministry. And peace will be made by these same Ministers. If that peace is not satisfactory, the voters in the United Kingdom will call those Ministers to account; you cannot, nor can we in South Africa; in none of the Dominions can they be called to account.

Now that cannot last, in the lurid light of this war. It is not conceivable that the first and greatest of all public issues, of all public interests, should permanently lie outside the scope of the British subject in Canada. The time is coming sooner or later when peace and war for Canada will be made by the Ministers responsible to the people of Canada. It is impossible for me to conceive anything else. How are you going to bring about this change? A great many people talk as if the Ministers at Ottawa were responsible for the issues of peace and war; they are not. But you can make them so, with a stroke of the pen; or they can make themselves so. But they cannot do so merely by giving notice to the British Government at London. If in the future peace and

war are to be made for Canada at Ottawa instead of at London, that change can be made only by giving notice to Washington, to Paris, to Berlin, to Tokyo, and to the other capitals in the world. When you have done that, you have severed Canada from the British Commonwealth, and destroyed the status of every man, woman and child in Canada as a British citizen. You have effected the most drastic of all revolutions.

There is only one alternative: the Ministers who do at present make peace and war for Canada, including the whole British Commonwealth, should be made just as much responsible to Canada, to the British subject in Canada, as they are now to the British subject in the United Kingdom. In order to effect that, you have to effect certain constitutional changes. I have not time to say what these changes are.

"The Problem of the Commonwealth" is not an attempt to formulate a constitution for the British Empire. It confines itself to the question, what constitutional changes must you make in order to effect that change?

I have only one other thing to say. It is this. Hitherto the future and safety of the Empire has mainly rested on the Old Country; now it is my conviction, that the future and safety of the British Commonwealth rests, and must rest, on the decision taken on this question. Now I have no doubt whatever as to the decision which will be taken on this question in England when the issue is before them: the financial pressure on the country will be so overwhelming it will be impossible for them to do otherwise than to turn to the Dominions and ask them to bear this burden with them. The burden will rest on the Dominions, but it will rest mainly and primarily on the largest of the Dominions, Canada.

I speak my deepest conviction, when I say that I believe it will be settled here rather than in any other part of the British Commonwealth. For that reason, I would appeal to you, in laying this case in front of you, to look at that case, to look at it candidly before you make up your minds on it. You will find, I venture to say, that it is not a case which either political party has laid in front of you; it is not a party matter at all. I would add this: the choice which Canada makes is, and must be, a free one: it cannot possibly, from the nature of the case, be otherwise; but in making that choice, all we who live in other parts of the British Commonwealth realize you are settling your own future and fate, but not your own future and fate only, but ours as well.

(*September 25th, 1916.*)

Our Canadians at the Front

By Mr. N. W. Rowell, K.C.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 25th September, Mr. Rowell said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I am very glad to be privileged to meet with so many of my fellow citizens of the city of Toronto, and to talk over with you for a few minutes some of the matters that are of very deep interest to us all.

One cannot visit Great Britain and the front and return to Canada without realizing that the atmosphere here is not the same as in Great Britain, and in Great Britain not the same as at the front.

Distance from the actual scene of hostilities lessens one's sense of the reality and the magnitude of the conflict now being waged. The closer one gets to the front the deeper is one's consciousness of the titanic character of the struggle and of the mighty issues affecting the welfare of humanity which are now being decided upon the High Seas and the battlefields of Europe, Asia and Africa.

The first vivid impression I received of the war was upon my arrival in London. When passing down the Strand at Charing Cross station I found all traffic stopped and great crowds gathered. The ambulances were moving out with wounded soldiers from the Somme, and the flower women were throwing flowers to the wounded "Tommies," who picked them up with a smile as the ambulances passed on their way to the various hospitals in London. I saw there the patient and cheerful courage of the soldier and the deep sympathy of the crowd. This incident revealed the heart and strength of England.

But one must reach the actual scene of operations—see the conditions under which these heroes are fighting, if one is to appreciate their service or their sacrifice. The battle line of the western front is over 500 miles in length, stretching from the sea to Switzerland. This line is held by British, French, and Belgian troops. The Belgians, assisted by the French, hold the portion nearest the sea; the British come next; and

*Mr. N. W. Rowell, K.C., had just returned from the Front where he had had an exceptional opportunity of estimating the work that was being done by Canadians and the sacrifices that were being made.

the French hold the balance of the line. The present great Somme offensive is at the point of junction between the British and French forces. The British portion is held by British, Canadian, Australian, New Zealand and South African troops. Our Canadian corps is assigned a certain section, and is responsible for conducting the operations on that section. We must therefore keep our forces up to strength, so as to properly guard our front and advance when required.

The policy pursued by our Militia Department has been to enlist and organize our battalions and give them some months' training here; then send them to England to complete their training, when they are available either to increase the strength of our forces at the front or to provide reinforcements to make up the wastage in the Divisions already at the front.

The bulk of our troops in Great Britain are stationed either at Bramshott or Shorncliffe. Broadly speaking Bramshott has been used as the base for the completion of the training of battalions that go to form new divisions, and Shorncliffe as the base for the completion of the training of the battalions which are to provide reinforcements for the front. Certain particular units have had their training elsewhere. At the time of my visit to the front our Canadian Army Corps consisted of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Divisions, which with Corps troops made about 70,000 men. They were anxiously awaiting the arrival of the 4th Division, and it was hoped when it arrived the 1st Division, which had not had a real rest period since it entered the trenches more than a year and a half ago, would be withdrawn for a rest. The 4th Division went over last month, but while it relieved the 1st Division at Ypres, our gallant 1st Division, instead of securing a much needed rest, has cheerfully marched to the Somme and there during the past few days in company with other Canadian divisions has again rendered distinguished service to Canada and the Empire.

The Corps is under the Command of General Sir Julian Byng, who has already rendered distinguished service in this war. He was the Commander of the 3rd Cavalry Division at the first Battle of Ypres, and knows the situation intimately. He has complete confidence in his men. He told me no General could wish to command finer troops than the Canadians, and I am sure the officers and men reciprocate this confidence.

At the front, I spent four days as the guest of Headquarters. I presumed to send a cable of congratulations to Sir Julian Byng and the officers on their recent achievements. I think you will be interested to hear his reply, received this morning, "On behalf of the officers and men of the Canadian Corps I

thank you for your message of congratulation. It is encouraging for them to know that their efforts here are seconded and appreciated in Canada."

Our Canadian Army Corps is a complete fighting unit consisting of Infantry, Artillery, Cavalry, Intelligence, Army Service and Army Medical Service branches. The only branch which Canada does not provide is the Air Service and Great Britain has supplied this for us. The fact that we have not a Canadian Air Service is not due to any lack of young Canadians in the air service. Wherever I went I found them among the most expert air men at the front. More than one British officer said to me that they preferred young Canadians. In difficult and dangerous tasks their daring and skill have won for them a unique place among the airmen.

Australia has her own air service with one air squadron at the front and another in training; and I cannot see why Canada should be behind Australia in this respect. May one express the earnest hope that we will no longer delay the establishment of a Canadian air service in which we will provide not only the officers but the mechanics, and that we at once set about the development of the aircraft industry in Canada, making the machines here. There will be a wonderful development in the air service in the future, and we should take advantage of the courage and skill of our young Canadian aviators, so as to give Canada her proper place in this vital branch of military service.

Until the movement of a portion of our troops to the Somme our full Canadian Corps was in the Ypres sector, holding a portion of the much discussed Ypres salient. You will be interested to know that from the early spring until recently our brave Canadians shared with the Guards Divisions—the flower of the British Army—the honor and responsibility of holding this vital point on the western front, thus barring the way to Calais and the sea. More than one of our officers said to me—"We would not choose the salient as a health resort, but who would choose the battle front anywhere as a health resort?" And the men who saved the situation in the second battle of Ypres are ready for any post of danger or responsibility to which the Commander-in-Chief may think it wise to call them. While the casualties in the salient have been heavy —both the British and French have suffered as severely and they have held it the greater part of the time.

At our Canadian front one meets almost as many familiar faces as on the streets of Toronto. Time will not permit me to refer to more than one or two. The first old friend I met was Col. C. H. Mitchell, Chief of the Intelligence Department

of the Canadian Corps, looking as cheerful as when he left us two years ago, though the two years of responsibility and unceasing labor have left their impress upon him. He has already been honored by the King of Great Britain and the President of France for distinguished service; and to-day the Intelligence branch of the Canadian Corps is, I believe, a model of efficiency. Much of the four days I spent with our Canadians was spent in his company visiting various sections of the front and looking into different branches of the service under his guidance.

My most interesting and impressive hours were spent in company with my old friend and our fellow townsmen, Brig.-Gen. Rennie, D.S.O., M.V.O., or as we who have curled or bowled with him familiarly know him, "Bob" Rennie, who also has been honored by the King for distinguished service. His brigade was holding a section of the front line when I was there, and I had the opportunity of spending the night with him in his dugout and visiting the trenches with him the following morning. After dinner Gen. Rennie remarked, "I am glad you are here to-night, for we have a bit of a show on. We do not always have a show on." He explained that at a late hour in the evening our batteries would commence a bombardment of the German positions. My old friend, Capt. J. M. Macdonnell of the Artillery, better known among us as "Jim" Macdonnell of the National Trust, took me out to see the "show" in company with my partner Captain Wright. We made our way to the best observation point between our batteries and the front line. The whole battle line was lit up by the flares which the Germans were sending up to illuminate "No Man's Land"—which on our front, or the larger part of it, would vary from 40 to 200 yards in width. The Germans did this so well that there was no necessity for our side to take part in the illumination.

At the appointed hour our batteries commenced the bombardment. Behind us was the thunder of the guns. The shells went shrieking over our heads on their mission of death. In the lulls between the firing of the guns and the explosion of the shells one heard the sharp crack of the rifle, the rapid fire of the machine guns and the dull heavy sound of the bursting shells from the trench mortars. A stray bullet whizzing past made one involuntarily start and added to one's sense of reality if not of security. The bombardment ceased before midnight, but the trench mortars, the machine guns and rifles were still firing when we lay down to rest.

Early next morning I was awakened by a vigorous cannonade. My first thought was that it was probably the Germans

retaliating for the previous evening's bombardment; but upon inquiring from General Rennie I was assured that it was our guns which were firing. As I listened the bombardment increased in intensity, and I could only liken it to a terrific thunderstorm overhead with peal following peal in quick succession. In the course of half-an-hour it stopped. It was just dawn, and inside of five minutes the birds were singing in the trees around us. Such are the contrasts between war and peace.

When we went to the trenches we found that some of our brave Canadians, who had entered upon the night's work with high courage and firm faith, were sleeping their last sleep. Our casualties that night fortunately were light, but one could not look upon the calm face of one of these soldiers without feeling that he had made the supreme sacrifice for us and for each of us, that we might preserve our homes and our liberties. How could one witness such a scene, much less be a participator in it, and be just the same? When one is face to face with the realities of life and death in the desperate struggle which goes on from day to day, one's view of life unconsciously undergoes modifications.

I found our men physically fit and ready for any task that might be assigned to them. Life at the front has not made them lovers of war; they have become more ardent lovers of peace. But in the presence of the grim realities of war and meeting the enemy face to face they are convinced that there can be no permanent peace for Europe or for Canada until a decisive victory is won. And to win that victory for you and for me they are prepared to lay down their lives. How many of those gallant men that I met at the front have since made this supreme sacrifice. I spent a couple of hours on the last day of my visit in the company of my young friend, Lieut. Willison, son of my old friend, Sir John Willison. Frank, brave and generous, he died doing his duty. Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to his young wife and to Sir John and Lady Willison, and to all other Canadian wives, fathers and mothers who are similarly bereft.

Before leaving the front I visited some of the cemeteries where our gallant Canadians lie buried. I shall only refer to Lizssenthoek where that brave and trusted soldier, my fellow townsman, General Mercer, lies among his brother officers who have fallen on the field of honor. There I saw the graves of Marshall, Van Sittert and Malone, Hazen and Greenshields, Platt and Doheney, Cotton and Brosseau and many other Canadian officers; and as one stood with bowed head before the last resting place of these brave men one could not but feel

"Greater love hath no man than this, that a man may lay down his life for his friends." They were worthy of Canada; let us solemnly resolve to be worthy of them.

Everywhere in Great Britain and France I heard from soldier and civilian alike the most unqualified expression of appreciation of the work of our Canadians and of the spirit and attitude of Canada in this war. Premier Asquith, I am sure, voiced the sentiment of Great Britain when, in referring to our troops he said, "None have fought better, none could have fought better." And Premier Briand voiced the feeling of France when he declared, "None of the allied soldiers are more welcome in France than these splendid men who have won imperishable glory for themselves in this war."

I have returned to Canada a stronger Canadian than ever. I am convinced that our troops need not fear comparison with the best troops of Europe; and I am persuaded that we have in almost every walk of life in Canada men, who, if the opportunity offered and the occasion demanded, could qualify themselves to meet on equal terms the men of any country in Europe. Our problem is, how can we best utilise the ability we have to meet the present situation and the grave issues which will call for solution after the war.

I found in some quarters in Great Britain the impression that we had raised 500,000 men or nearly this number. The announcement by our Government on the 1st January last that Canada had authorized an increase in the Expeditionary Force up to 500,000, has been taken by some to mean that this number has been raised or that it will be raised in the near future. But I am sure the expressions of appreciation would not be any less generous even if they knew that we had not raised this number.

It is most gratifying to feel that the initiative on practically every front has now passed, and we hope finally passed, from the Germanic powers to the Allies; and we are being cheered with reports of advances on almost every front.

I found everywhere in Great Britain and France confidence in the ability of the Allies to win a decisive and complete victory; and everywhere the most striking evidence of the unity and determination of the Allies not to cease the struggle until complete and decisive victory is achieved. But you would receive a wrong impression of the situation if you went away from this meeting to-day thinking that the Allies have the situation so well in hand that we need not put forth still greater efforts. The hope and the only hope of complete and decisive victory lies in the willingness of the Allies to continue to make the sacrifices necessary to achieve it.

The initiative of the Allies can only be retained at the cost of thousands upon thousands of valuable lives; and the advance can only be pushed if we are prepared to keep up a constant supply of reinforcements, so that when the German army is exhausted we may still be able to put into the battle line fresh and vigorous troops who will strike the final and decisive blow in this struggle.

Great Britain has put her back under the burden of this war, and with an energy and resistless power which is one of the marvels of our time, is moving forward to her great objective—a just, a righteous and a lasting peace. But for British intervention, and but for British energy and perseverance, this war would have ended long ago in irretrievable disaster.

Statesmen in Great Britain have told me that she has been able to face this task and move forward to the present vantage ground because of the loyal and spontaneous co-operation of the Dominions. They say with confidence the war will be won, but that without the co-operation of the Dominions this would not be possible. The fidelity of the Dominions in this supreme and critical hour in the history of the mother-country has touched the heart, quickened the enthusiasm, stimulated the energy, steadied the nerve and strengthened the resolution of the men and women of the Old Land. And if Great Britain is to continue to carry the burden and save civilization for the future she must receive from all the Dominions continued and even increased co-operation and support.

When I asked our men at the front what we could do for them in Canada their thought was not for themselves but for the cause. They said "Send us more men, men completely trained and properly equipped. We are prepared to give our lives, but that alone is not sufficient. We must have reinforcements to keep our ranks full."

On the 1st of September last, without counting the men in other services, we had in Great Britain, I should judge, in actual training for our Infantry battalions, somewhere between 25,000 and 30,000 men. In the battle line in France, assuming our battalions were up to full strength, we had at that time about 90,000 men. When you recall the casualties of this month and bear in mind that the wastage is estimated at about fifteen per cent. per month, you will realize how vital and how urgent is the question of reinforcements.

A new Division is now in process of formation at Bramshott Camp, and a considerable percentage of the Infantry battalions in England have been assigned to this new Division. Each battalion at the front has a sufficiently difficult task to

perform when up to full strength; and we require additional troops in Great Britain as fast as they can be transported across the sea. Our first and paramount duty is to back up the men now at the front with adequate and fully-trained reinforcements and to make our plans without delay to do so.

We recognize, I am sure, that we should not only maintain but steadily increase our production of munitions. One cannot over-emphasize how vital to our success as well as the saving of the lives of our men, is a constant and even increasing supply of munitions. In Canada as in Great Britain we must appeal to both employers and employees to work together for the common good to ensure increased production. The women of Canada are just as ready to help as the women of Great Britain and France; and one can see no more inspiring sight than the manner in which the women of Great Britain and France are working in the production of munitions for their husbands and brothers at the front.

Should we not so practise the virtues of thrift and economy as to be able to finance in Canada all the munitions purchased by Great Britain in Canada? We are doing well, but cannot we do better? The time may come when we must do so. In view of our prosperity should we not be prepared to pay now a larger share of our own war expenditure by taxation? Let those who are profiting by the war pay a real share of the cost of the war. In Great Britain they are collecting enormous sums out of the profits made by the war to apply on account of the war expenditures. The men who have gone to the front should not have to do the fighting, and then come home to find the paying has yet to be largely done.

What do we in Canada propose to do for the future? This is the question I should like to press upon every man present, and every man present must accept his full share of responsibility for what Canada does or does not do in the future. We are enjoying unusual prosperity. Large sections of our people are growing rich out of this war. The men at the front think so and do not hesitate to say so. Can any of us play a worthy part and still make no real personal sacrifice or contribution, to some slight extent at least, commensurate with the sacrifice and contribution of the men at the front. The men at the front will value our patriotism, not by our professions, but by our sacrifice and achievement. Our new place among the nations has been won for us primarily by the men at the front and we are reaping the reward. I am sure there is no lack of willingness on the part of the Canadian people to respond fully to every need. All that is required is that they should know the facts and the need, and they will cheerfully respond.

I had the opportunity of meeting a distinguished Japanese officer who, on behalf of his Government, was spending some months in studying certain aspects of the present world conflict in the countries at war. Whatever we may be thinking or doing, the Japanese are awake and alert. They are looking ahead to see what the future promises for them and for us. He was exceptionally keen and intelligent, and this was his summing up of the situation. "The two great revelations of this war," he said, are (1) the soul of France, her unity, courage, resolution, and self-sacrifice; and (2) the voluntary and spontaneous co-operation of the British Overseas Dominions with the mother-country. A question he was most anxious to have answered was, Why did the Dominions, living in peace and loving peace, without compulsion or even appeal, throw themselves into this conflict? Was it the call of the blood? Was it one of the fruits of free, responsible self-government, under which, while managing their own affairs, they still enjoy citizenship in the Empire? Was it because they are real democracies and love peace, and saw in Prussian militarism Democracy's greatest enemy and the greatest menace to the world's peace?

If humanity has been staggered by the German atrocities, and inspired by French heroism and self-sacrifice, humanity has been thrilled by the spectacle of the men of the Dominions at the first clash of arms coming from all the seven seas and standing by the side of the mother and showing to the world, "In the great day of Armageddon we stand together." To-day this is one of the great moving, inspiring compelling facts of history. The world outside appreciates its significance. As citizens of the oldest, the largest and the most influential of these Dominions, let us grasp its deep meaning. It is the supreme vindication of Democracy and Free Government. It is one of humanity's largest hopes for liberty and for peace in the future.

You say this war has shown how irretrievably our humanity is divided. I say, No. It has demonstrated beyond question its essential unity. If an assassination in the Balkans can set the world in flames, no part of the world can be indifferent to what is happening in every other part. That is one of the most significant lessons of this war. We all live in the same world. We must continue to live in the same world. Steam and electricity have broke down the barriers which have separated us and have made us a part of one great world community. What part will Canada play in this community?

This war has deepened our sense of nationality and enlarged our sense of destiny. We have swung out into the full

current of the world's life; and whether we view with satisfaction or with apprehension the situation in which we find ourselves, we can never retrace our steps. Let us face the future with courage and with faith.

British North America is the one portion of the British Empire which neither needs nor asks any territorial compensations, which seeks absolutely nothing in this war. Canada is the one nation engaged in this conflict which needs nothing and looks for nothing in the hour of victory except the preservation of her liberty and free government, and secure guarantees against the repetition of this crime against humanity. If we are to play a part here at home worthy of the men who are fighting for us at the front, worthy of the virile and liberty-loving people which have made Canada what she is, worthy of the high destiny to which the future is beckoning us, we may make, not only a still greater contribution to the successful prosecution of the war, but a great and invaluable contribution to the settlement of the terms of peace. Let us all work together, so that out of the blood and sacrifice of these days there may come a new day, a better social order and a nobler civilization.

(October 2nd, 1916.)

With the Canadians at Salonika

Prof. J. J. Mackenzie, B.A., M.B.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 2nd October, Professor Mackenzie said:

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Canadian Club,— I esteem it a very great privilege and honor to be invited to speak at one of your Club luncheons, and I am very pleased that I can convey to so many citizens of Toronto greetings from the Toronto citizens who are at present in Salonika.

I think it must have occurred to all the members of this Club the significance, the great significance, of the occasion of a Canadian Hospital being established with the Imperial army in Macedonia. It is one of the most striking manifestations of the Imperial idea, and I would like you to remember that in Salonika there is not only the University of Toronto General Hospital, the 4th Canadian, but also the 5th Canadian, from British Columbia, and also the Stationary Hospital sent out with the first contingent and operating first in France, but later moved to Salonika. So we are not the only Canadians in Salonika. In addition to that we have a large number of Canadian officers and men who enlisted with the Kitchener's and Territorials, and one historic day those officers and men challenged the University Hospital staff to a game of baseball, in which the University Hospital team was badly defeated.

One has heard criticism of the policy of sending Canadian Hospitals to Salonika and to Egypt, where there were no Canadian troops. I wish to say that in this war we want no sectionalism and no parochialism. If the Empire is to be benefited to the full through this lamentable war, it will be benefited by these units giving their work for one another. We don't want to neglect Canadians, but the more the units of the Empire are mixed, I think the better for ourselves in the end.

In regard to Salonika, I may in passing remark that the

*Prof. J. J. Mackenzie, B.A., M.B., is a member of the Faculty of the University of Toronto. His graphic story was particularly interesting because the hospital unit to which he was attached is made up entirely of University of Toronto men.

newspapers of Canada and the United States give the Turkish name, "Saloniki" but you remember it has not been Turkish since 1913. If you look at the "Times," the "Morning Post," and other British newspapers, you will find they spell it "Salonika." I don't know of a writer that gives it the other way. The French call it "Salonique." I imagine we have our own right to speak of it as we do, but it is of course an abbreviation of "Thessalonica," the name of the ancient Greek city. I pronounce these Greek names with deference to the gentleman present who taught me the "Little Latin and less Greek" I know.

When one comes into the harbor, a magnificent harbor, which stretches up into the Balkan peninsula—we came into the Gulf early in the morning, and it took the whole morning to steam up it—one passes Mount Olympus on the left, and comes into this wonderful bay, which could accommodate the whole British fleet, certainly the whole French or Italian fleet in the Mediterranean. The city is built on the side of a sloping hill and as you look at it from the bay you see the little houses, with low, red-tiled roofs, stretching up to end in the old Byzantine fort, situated on the Acropolis at the back of the city.

The most striking feature to a westerner is the number of minarets—twenty or thirty—topping the churches, because in Turkish times every church was converted into a mosque, and every one of these mosques is surmounted by a minaret.

The hill at the back is 3,000 or 3,500 feet in height, and is called Hortiak. Stretching west from that is a range of low hills which separates Salonika proper from the Macedonian plain.

When you land, the impression you get is first of all the smell. The French try to make a bad pun, saying that the place has a good name, "Sale unique!" The streets are paved with very rough cobbles, difficult to walk on, and there is a trench in the middle of the street. The British Consul told us, "You have no idea how much Salonika has improved since the Greeks took it over in 1913!" We could imagine what is must have been like under the Turks!

The street population is varied. Naturally the troops add to its varied character. Over fifty per cent. of the population is Jewish, and the older Jews all wear a special costume. The old men wear a gabardine, usually of bright colors, lined and fringed with fur. The old women also have a special costume, and a hat with a curious tail behind; the only difference is in the color of the velvet and silks.

Greek soldiers are everywhere, but clad in khaki, so they are not specially striking, except the Cretans. You will have noted in the papers that at the head of every revolution a prominent part was played by the Cretan gendarmerie. They all wear a black forage cap, and a jacket, and nether garment which has a bag from the seat which hangs down as far as the knees—some people say they imagine the Cretan policemen use it to carry their luncheon in.

You see Turks, but they are not so striking as at Cairo. You meet veiled women at Cairo, and so you do there; at Cairo the veils are light, easily seen through but at Salonika the veils are a deep black, and you have no idea what is behind them.

The history of the city is extraordinarily interesting. It has been for two thousand years a city for which the eastern Mediterranean nations have striven. A French writer calls it "la ville convoitée," the coveted city. I have hardly time to give you a description of its history, but throughout the Middle Ages it was compared with Venice, its old rival. Their situation is almost similar, the only difference being that as far as Salonika is concerned it has the impassable Balkan peninsula behind it, cutting it off from the European nations, but still they all tried to get it.

It has a very old history. As I will point out in a moment there are most interesting archæological evidences there, showing that it was actually founded in B.C. 315, when Cassander, one of the generals, and a successor of Alexander, built it; he married a half sister of Alexander, named Thessalonika, and called his capital after his wife—a very proper thing to do!

Paul landed there in 52 A.D., but he did not get a very good reception, you will remember, and had to go on to Berœa, where his reception was better.

The Bulgars held the city for a while, but their power was shattered in the 10th century, and they have been struggling ever since to capture it. The Crusaders also took it, in the 12th century. During the Fourth Crusade, the Normans conquered the district, and founded an independent Norman kingdom. Later the Serbians, the Turks, the Venetians, possessed it. Finally it became Turkish in 1432, and remained a part of the Turkish Empire until 1913, when the Greeks took it.

A most interesting period of its history was in 1492, when Jews came from Spain and Portugal, being driven out by the Inquisition. They came in large numbers and settled in Sal-

onika and other cities of the Levant, but Salonka was peculiarly a Jewish settlement, so that to-day you see Jewish names over the shops, but they are names of a Spanish type. All through the town these Spanish names are seen, and the ordinary language of commerce there is Spanish, of the old type, the mediæval type, different from modern Spanish. Of course they all speak French, as the Jews of Paris established schools, and Paris was the natural place for Salonikan Jews to go for their education. There are about 100,000 Jews in Salonika, out of a population of 175,000. So they mean a very great deal in the city.

A very interesting part of the Jewish population is the so-called "Deunmeh." In the 16th century a "Messiah" from the Levant came to Salonika, and got a tremendous following there. Subsequently he became ambitious and set up a kingdom of his own. The Turks took him to Constantinople, where he embraced, willingly or not is uncertain, Mohammedanism. There are fifteen or twenty thousand of these so-called Deunmeh converts, who are publicly Mohammedans and go to the mosques, but at home are said to practise Jewish rites. Zangwill mentions one celebrated example, Enver Pasha. A large part of the Committee of Union and Progress of the Young Turk party is composed of Deunmeh, who live at Salonika.

The city's most recent history you know. The Committee of Union and Progress became strong after the Turkish Revolution, in which revolution all the various vicissitudes of the Turkish Government of that time centered. To a large extent the Macedonians are members of the Young Turk Party. Finally in 1913 the Greeks took the city from the Turks. There was a small fight in the streets one day, and they threw out the remaining Bulgars in the second Balkan War.

It is rather difficult to visualize the relationships of the area in which Salonika is situated. So I have attempted myself to make a map to give you some notion of the district. I have taken the map of Ontario, on a scale of eight miles to an inch, and superimposed upon it a map of the Macedonian front. Toronto represents Salonika. The Gulf of Salonika stretches across the lake to the Niagara peninsula. The chief mountain ranges are colored green, but I hadn't time to note all the mountains; when one gets back some thirty miles from the town it is all mountainous country. Monastir, Florina, Orsova, are to the northwest, Monastir just a little beyond Listowel, at a distance of forty miles from Toronto. Lake Doiran, on the Serbian boundary, comes about Beeton, south of Camp Borden. The

Struma river is coming down from Lake Simcoe, across Lake Scugog. The fighting that is described in the papers this morning is taking place not far away from that district. Kavala, which the Bulgars took, is a short distance beyond Peterboro'. That will give you some idea of the size of the district.

Mount Olympus, of which we are rather proud at Salonika, is just in the Niagara peninsula. It is about 9,000 feet high, and on a clear day its triple top, for it has three peaks, can be seen; Ossa is a flat pyramid to the south of Olympus; Pelion, we don't see. Olympus and all the other mountains are all snow-covered the greater part of the year.

Back on the peninsula is Mount Athos. On the plain, gradually rising to the Struma, the troops are operating along a semicircle. That, I think, gives you some notion of the area.

The appearance of the country to the west, where our Hospital was when we landed in November, is somewhat like the prairies; south there is the great sweep of the Vardar marshes. A very striking characteristic of the whole of that part of Macedonia is the tumuli, as large as this room, I should think. One used to dig out these tumuli to form habitations for the troops. The French and Tommies used them because they were easy to excavate. They live in the top, and digging farther down find archæological remains beneath them. The place is hardly touched yet archæologically. However, a number of articles have been brought out by the British and placed in an archæological collection in charge of Professor Gardner, of London, a war volunteer, attached to the navy, while those found by the French area are in charge of a French professor from the Sorbonne, attached to a French regiment. They are all gathered together. Pottery of Mycenæan and premycenæan times is found at the bottom of these tumuli.

Professor Gardner kindly shows the sights to visitors. He showed me one rather interesting, and I am inclined to think rather unique memorial of the days of Alexander, which had been dug up in constructing a line of trenches. It was a marble tablet, about the size of the top of this table with deeply cut Greek characters which could be readily interpreted. It turned out, when Professor Gardner got the dirt cleaned off it, to be a memorial to an army contractor who supplied the armies of Alexander the Great. It was said the reason for the memorial was that "in times of famine he fed the poor, and he supplied the army with the best goods, at the lowest rate, nad never took an undue profit." I don't know

that that is unique, but it is certainly unique that it should be put on a tombstone.

So much for the archæology. One could talk a long time about it, but I have not much time left, and I want to speak of the Hospital.

We arrived on November the 8th, and were put into tents on rising ground overlooking the Monastir Road, or Via Ignatia, that Roman road from Durazzo through Salonika to Constantinople. It is a most interesting place, with natives passing up and down, and we are in an ideal spot to see all that is going on in the district, about six miles from the town. We had the patients and the Administrative office in Hubert tents, Canadian made. We took them with us, and they accomplished their purpose well. Behind, on higher ground, were the nursing sisters, in Indian tents, which were much better. Beside them were the officers and men of the unit, in bell tents. One might think they were uncomfortable, but I may say that was the most comfortable winter—except occasionally—I ever passed. I always had had an ambition to spend a winter up north in the Nipissing district, amid the snows of Northern Ontario. I never expected to camp in the snow in Macedonia. But it was only when it was really bad weather that one suffered. That is, when the wind came down from the Balkans or the Albanian hills it was very cold, usually accompanied with snow. It was very trying with the rain, wind and the flopping tents; but that was not for long. The wild flowers came out in February, the whole plain was dotted with anemones, and up in the hills there were the most wonderful orchids and wild flowers of all kinds.

When the fighting was more intense it always brought in more wounded. At one time we had as many as twelve or thirteen hundred patients. When the spring came on, conditions improved. The sanitary condition of the troops was good, the amount of sickness very small, and for two or three months we had very little work. There were the ordinary camp casualties but not many serious illnesses to treat.

Our situation at first, close to the Monastir Road, near to the Vardar marshes, was not very good, owing to the proximity of the marshes, breeding grounds for the Anopheles mosquito, which carries malaria. So the War office decided that we must be moved, and in May we were transferred on the east side of the city, in eighty-two or eighty-three huts, these serving as hospital wards for patients, and laboratory and administration huts, huts for the officers, nursing sisters and men of the unit. It made a large town of huts. The huts had red-tiled roofs, as wood is scarce and there are no shingles. Each

hut has windows at each side, and a door at each end; the accommodation was good. In the ward huts there was a small room for the nursing sister, with a sort of diet kitchen and sanitary arrangements at the end.

We were situated on the main road which the British engineers had built, along which the ambulances brought the sick and wounded. When the sick were to be removed from the tent hospital the ambulances formerly went to the wharf, some six miles away; but now the lighters from ships come straight to the hospital wharf, and in that way the British engineers by building a mole have made it possible to save this six mile ambulance trip, it is only a quarter or half a mile to the new wharf, and the sick can be taken straight to the hospital ship. The policy of the British authorities is to concentrate the hospitals in this area, where the sick can be easily evacuated to the ships.

The work of the hospital is varied. It is hard to give you an idea of it. When we moved to the hut hospital the weather was quite hot, generally about 102 in the shade. The British soldiers complained bitterly, but we said, "This is what we have in Toronto in August sometimes!" At any rate, it was very hot weather for two weeks. At the same time, up country there were swarms of mosquitoes, so that when I left they were getting malaria cases from the front, and some dysentery, that has given a good deal of work with the ordinary camp casualties. The weather has become cool again, though, and the last letters I have had tell of its being seventy or eighty degrees in the daytime, with cool nights, but still I think the hospital is pretty full with casualties. It has been increased in size, so that now we have 1,340 beds, instead of the 1,000 beds with which we started.

We were well equipped, splendidly equipped, better than any other hospital in the area. These supplies came from Ontario, from Toronto, from the University, in which the people supported us magnificently, enabling us to purchase things other hospitals did not have. There was an enormous quantity of dressings sent us by the women of the University and of the Women's Canadian Club and of Toronto generally,—they supplied us with everything necessary, in every particular, I think there was nothing lacking. If we wanted anything, we got it, because we had the money. Naturally we fed our patients well, so the Tommies liked to come to the Canadian Hospital, and we got a great reputation.

I imagine the reason why we fit into that work so well and have had such marked succcss is because we are a University

company, especially brought together, and accustomed to working together at home. A letter from the chief Roman Catholic priest with the British Expeditionary Force, who was living with us during the winter, said that what struck him particularly,—and I think it is what especially impressed me,—was the friendliness within the unit, as a University Corps. A British Officer remarked "You people seem to have lived together so long that you have got all the corners rubbed off; while we in the other hospitals were just like a lot of new dogs that just saw one another for the first time when we got on the hospital ship!" There is a very distinct advantage in our being all men associated in work at home.

(*October 5th, 1916.*)

The Mother Country and the Great War

By Sir Hamar Greenwood, Bart., M.P.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 5th October, Sir Hamar Greenwood said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I always thought I was a typical Canadian. At any rate in England I have always been, and will continue to be, a Canadian, nothing but a Canadian, believing that a man is always best when he is most honest to himself; and I'd rather be a first class Canadian than a third rate Englishman. And the people of the Old Country, quite, I think, among the finest people in the world, barring yourselves the finest, only respect the man who is true to himself; and if I could criticize Canadians, if they ever fail to get that respect which is their due, it is because they try to be feeble Englishmen rather than robust Canadians. If you have the opportunity to go to the Mother Country, don't allow your Canadianism to be submerged when eating strawberries and cream, even if served by a Countess or a Peeress or some other gentle person of that sort.

Now this afternoon allow me first of all to express my sincere pleasure in coming to speak in the city of Toronto, where I spent a happy part of my life at the University to which I owe my education; and at visiting my native town of Whitby, from which I see two friends, Dr. Embree, who taught me, and Col. A. G. Henderson, who started me on my political career by enlisting me in the 25th Battalion in 1886. I may thank you, Colonel, for the start you gave me, and I hope you are not disappointed in Private Hamar Greenwood.

This afternoon I intend to speak very seriously of the part which the Mother Country has played, is playing, and will continue to play in this war. I can't go on to that without expressing my profound and heartfelt sympathy with those who have lost their best and bravest in the war. We live secure because these men have died for us, died as much for

*Sir Hamar Greenwood was born in Whitby, Ont., and is a graduate of the University of Toronto. He has been a member of the British Parliament for several years, where he has had a successful and honorable career.

the French-Canadian habitant as for the citizens of Toronto, and for the Australians, and the South Africans as for the inhabitants of the Mother Country. No words of mine can adequately console those who have lost those gallant lads. But I am bound to say that those lads have made the Canadian name honored. It is the loyalty of those Canadian boys, and the warm-hearted sympathy of the best elements in Canada, that have made the name of Canadian, in England, in France, and throughout the world, honored as it has never been honored before.

I am going to speak of the Mother Country in general this afternoon, because it is sadly obvious to me that there are still Canadians who do not realize the mighty and major part played by that country in this great war. I remember, as if it were but an hour ago, when that fateful decision was made by the British Government to enter this war in defence of Belgium, which defence meant, and they knew it meant, the defence of this Empire, and, I think, of the civilization of the world. That was the most momentous decision in the world's history! If they had faltered in that decision for one week, it would have been too late! A million Germans would have been massed before we could have stopped them on the coasts of France, twenty-two miles from England, and before Christmas, 1914, we should have been brought to our knees. And you would have become either a German colony or a German dependency, in spite of your love of liberty and of Britain. Two things stand up as having prevented that result from having come to pass: first, that decision of the British Government, and secondly, the preparedness and efficiency of the British fleet. That fleet's supremacy has never for a moment been lost, and is greater now than ever before in history. It has kept the race dominant, and the remotest corner of the world secure, and people continue their ordinary vocations and live safe through the war, because of the protection of that fleet.

Speaking as one of your best friends, it is a deplorable thing to me that this great and rich Dominion never has contributed either ships or money to add one ounce of force to help maintain the supremacy of the fleet which keeps her inviolate to-day. It is not for me to go into controversial questions; I never did and never will; but I wish to point out that the time is coming, and quickly, when eight million of British citizens living in Canada should do something to maintain the supremacy of the fleet without which you would have no future honorable and in my mind in keeping with your allegiance to the Home Country.

To-day that fleet is incomparably larger and stronger, in men, in armament, and in ships, than ever before in its history. Every neutral ship that plies the sea to-day owes its safety to the mine sweepers of the British fleet, that clear the harbors of the oceans of the world from the menace from mines and submarines, which menace not only British shipping but all shipping. Only the mine sweeper removes that threatening disaster, and as for the other menace, the submarine menace, it is a thing of no account. I dare not tell you of the catch of submarines, but I dare tell you that the submarine peril is no longer a serious problem to the British Navy.

The Mother Country has raised practically from her great sea-faring and shipping population not only the men to keep up her regular fleet but to build up also an auxiliary fleet which is larger at present than at any other time in the history of the war. Nothing is more inspiring than the way these men have contributed seamen to patrol the sea. There is not a creek or bay in the north of Europe or along the long littoral of the Mediterranean but is patrolled by the British fleet, nosing after submarines or some other part of the fleet of Germany.

The people of this country do not realize that when this war broke out the duty fell upon the British Government of doing certain things: first, to have her fleet ready—she had it ready; secondly, to have, if necessary, an expeditionary force of six Divisions,—she had them ready, to the last man, the last horse, and the last rifle! In due time they were transported to France, without the loss of a single man or mule. You know how they did their duty. The British Government fulfilled in spirit and in letter, and more than filled the arrangement made among the Allied Powers in the event of Germany moving. They thought she would never be threatened. Then the rapidity of the massing of German forces on Belgium, their rush into France, the retreat of the British and French armies, showed the Powers that all the Powers of the world had under-estimated the German menace. For forty years they had been preparing, under the guise of friendship, to carry out the invasion of Belgium, with the ultimate desire—and let this be vivid to everybody—of crushing the one Power they feared, the British Empire. They very nearly brought us to our knees. It was the Expeditionary Force and the fleet that alone saved England from being placed in a humiliating position from which she might never have recovered. Since those days of 1914 the Old Country has roused herself, and in two years has so organized her men, her money and her output, that we have surpassed the Germans as an empire in our production of munitions and of all the various things that go to make war, except one thing, the production of men.

May I remind you that Germany has one of the largest populations, and that the British Empire is the smallest in population of any of the great Empires of the world. That is a thing no man or woman should forget, because the future, with the only possible decision of this war, will be dark indeed for us if we cannot reach up to and overtake other Empires which may in the dim and distant future—though God forbid—be our enemies.

Since the 4th of August, 1914, there has been practical unanimity among all classes of the people of the Old Country. You will hear and read in the papers of this section or party doing this, or of that section or the Irish party doing that, but it is never more than a ripple on the strong, deep, even surface of British unanimity. Take one case: no doubt the papers were full of the reproaches of conscientious objectors; it has been established that the total number of these never exceeded one thousand, and the grat majority of them were put up by certain interested persons, and as soon as they were clothed in khaki they became first class British soldiers. The unanimity of the Mother Country is the best guarantee of her determination to prosecute this war to a successful close, and she will do so.

Did the world ever see a finer thing than the fact that this small country, the British Isles, contributed five million men, a voluntarily enlisted army? That was probably the most colossal contribution ever made on the voluntary system. National service has come in. I am one of those who think the British Government could have had it six months before it did. But when it came in it was a colossal success: it remedies many grievances, establishes equal sacrifice, and it does more. We have got the best reserves in the country; some are fit to be in the infantry, many are used in munition works, many are best left where they are to carry on industries.

A word now about the splendid women of England, for you will wish to hear something about their work. When I left England many had gone into munitions and other works, and they had been wonderfully successful. I don't know how we ever would have produced the enormous output,—it is always growing,—necessary for ourselves and our Allies, if it had not been for the splendid response of the women of Great Britain. That is an interesting topic for you here, because I believe it is being considered in Canada. I have visited large numbers of these munition works where women are employed: they are better in health, they have got a cheerfulness of appearance because they are doing all they can to serve their country, they are most efficient work people,

and they are the best time keepers in the history of Labor!

Now these women you can see on busses, and trucks, as lorry drivers, they take the places of the postmen, indeed in every vocation in England, I don't care what it is, where a women can be substituted for a man she is substituted, and the man is used where he can best be used, for the army, the navy, or the factory, so we can get the maximum efficiency.

They are a fine race of people! To me it is an inspiring thing to go through England now. There are no slackers, there are no idlers, there are no motor cars—except those used for military duty or for the wounded, of whom there are a large number. I venture to say there are more motor cars going about the streets of Toronto to-day than can be found in use in all England. I am not condemning it here, because probably you don't have to pay so much for petrol, and you couldn't send it to us if you wanted to, if only because of the question of the ships we have available for such purpose. But in a country like England it is different. With probably the largest percentage of leisured people of any country in the world, the cars are either stored up or they are sent to France where they are used on war service.

You still go on in Canada as if the war were not your first consideration. In the Mother Country every mind and heart is concentrated on this war. The boys of seventeen are volunteering by the scores of thousands, to be trained so they will be fit when they are eighteen and a half, the earliest we send them into the army in Britain. The schools and universities are empty. I have never in my life seen such an attitude of mind towards war as you see in your old Mother Country to-day, unless in the old Republic of France, which has suffered agonies of death and humiliation and wounding greater in other lines up to the present. France indeed has gone through some chastening by fire, which has made that old race of men and women work and act with an inspiration and thought and emotion that I would not have considered possible as I knew France years before the war. It must be that the Celtic strain that is in that great people, the French, has made the rejuvenation of soul, and I am certain of this, that when the history of this awful war is written, there will be no man who admires sacrifice who will not touch his hat to the infantry soldier of the great Republic!

Now let me deal just in a word with the finances of the Old Country. Do you know that the Mother Country is the only one of the Allies that has been able to levy extra taxation during the war? The others cannot levy extra taxation because they have no margin of taxation. We have levied

taxation unexampled in its severity, and unexampled in the cheerfulness with which it has been paid! And we have still a large margin for ourselves and our Allies. I am sure you all realize that the financial power of the Mother Country has enabled the war to be prosecuted. Without that power the war could not go on a single day. There is not an Ally but will admit that it is the power of English finance and the English organization that has enabled them to feed their armies, to clothe their armies, to munition their armies. And what is important, which people in an inland country like Ontario may forget, it is Britain and Britain alone, with her immense shipping, that has enabled troops to be transported from one part of the earth to another, a larger army than Britain ever had being transported from point to point constantly.

In the Mother Country the rich men will pay about 8s. 6d. on the sovereign income tax. And sixty per cent. is levied on the profits of industry, subject to charges, and paid to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. And it is paid loyally and honestly. What other country has the courage to levy, and the honesty to pay a tax like that? Sixty per cent.! It staggered the Chancellor of the Exchequer when the first returns came in. He had no idea of the enormous wealth of the Old Country until this tax was levied. What also pleased him and strengthened his hands was the splendid honesty and willingness of the men who sacrificed the major part of their income to help win the battle for the British Empire.

And the fact is, the burden of this great war is day by day becoming more and more laid on the shoulders of the Mother Country and the British Empire. We have still resources of money and of men that France, alas! no longer has, that Belgium has not got, that the Slav countries like Roumania and the gallant Serbs cannot have, nor has Italy. Russia is irresistible in men, but in men only; the Russian army is clothed in khaki, and the suits are paid for by the British Government! There are gallant men there. Without Russia, don't forget that, without Russia we could not bring this war to the desirable conclusion. I am one of those who look forward to friendship with that mighty people after the war, that will be of splendid benefit to them, to us, and to the world.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I know Canada intimately, and I know the Old Country intimately; I hope you all know me as a loyal Canadian; but I tell you, with intimate knowledge of what the Mother Country does and general knowledge of what you have splendidly done, neither you nor those in any part of this old Empire have in proportion done anything com-

parable with the sacrifices and the efforts of your Mother Country! Therefore don't for a moment fault-find with that Old Country unless you are possessed of knowledge,—and if you are possessed of knowledge, you will not find fault!

The difficulties of the British Government are the difficulties of every war Government. It is impossible to disclose publicly the reasons for the courses they take or do not take, because such a disclosure would be of priceless worth to the enemy, and a war Government of all governments must be trusted. The war Government of the Old Country, though I criticize it in the House of Commons, I still think, loyally reinforced as it has been by the unanimous and patriotic people, has been one of the marvels of the history of this world!

May I add one word about Ireland? And I stand here very feelingly as a lifelong Home Ruler,—I am a descendant of one of those old men who shouldered his useless musket and marched up to Montgomery's Tavern and got a sound thrashing by the soldiers of the British Empire. When one looks at Ireland, one almost weeps at the tragedy of that great race, splendid as soldiers, loyal as friends, successful throughout the world. As far as the little Sinn Fein revolt was concerned, it was of no importance. The principles involved were trivial, but it already was over. The cause of unrest is due to much different trouble. But remember that with all the drawbacks she has contributed to the army in proportion to her population quite as many as you and Australia have. The same problems are facing her as face you, the various Irish battalions are being wasted by the casualties of the war, and as this waste goes on, as surely as this wastage is not made up by Irishmen and Canadians there is going to be humiliation in the future when these units must be reinforced by other races not their own.

I only say this for Ireland because there are some who try to make out that Ireland is still in the throes of rebellion and discontent. That is not so. Never in her history was she more prosperous. Never had any country financial privileges such as Ireland enjoys at this moment. And I am certain that the vast majority of Irishmen, irrespective of creed, are loyal and intend to remain loyal and fight for this same Empire for which you and I are proud to fight!

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have very briefly dealt with what the Mother Country has done. After the war mighty problems will confront you and will confront her. I am one of those that hope that all this mighty energy now seen, in the making of munitions, in factories, and in the various avenues that go to the prosecution of a successful war,—I

hope all this energy of men and machinery will be conserved and will be bent to the development of the commerce of the Old Country and the British Empire. There will be an attempt by Germany and her allies after the war to win back by unscrupulous commercial methods what she is bound to lose by being defeated in war. She never can win back her colonies. It is as certain as that we sit or stand here. The Australians will never give back what they have captured in the Southern Pacific. New Zealand will never surrender Samoa. From what I know of General Smuts and General Botha in Africa, they are not men to give back the territory they have taken from Germany there. So the German starts after the war without anything outside of the German Empire; but he will do his best, I am certain, to carry on in the name of peace the most unscrupulous possible campaign against this Empire's well being. Therefore I hope that our industrial activities will be conserved to serve useful purposes in times of peace as they have been developed to serve essential purposes in time of war.

I would like to see a great Imperial Conference assembled in London before the war is over, while hearts are warm, and people realize the meaning of the Empire. I have always urged that it is of no use having an Imperial Conference unless you bring into it not only the Prime Ministers of State of the Dominions and Colonies, but the leaders of the oppositions as well, so that you can get a general consent towards some advance in Imperial unity, and that you can be certain of continuity in such policy as you adopt.

I shall not delay you further to-day. But I want to express again my gratitude at your assembling here in such large numbers giving me an opportunity of speaking to you. I appreciate the warmth of your reception and your words. Would to God that all the British Empire did as well as this splendid city of Toronto. But while they and you have done much, much remains to be done. If you have read the words —I commend them to you—of General Sir William Robertson, Chief of the General Staff, you will appreciate the need of men and more men. General Robertson, whose career is the most remarkable in the history of the British Empire—he started as a poor boy, a trooper, and now he occupies the highest position in our military fabric!—is a quiet unassuming man of few words; so when he says "We want men, and more men," he speaks with intimate knowledge. Do what you can to impress this knowledge on others.

You have sent many of your finest lads to the front. I saw some of them in my battalion in the fire trenches on Hill 60,

when I was with the Gordon Highlanders, which lost seven hundred men in the Battle of Loos. When I went to the front, the Canadian was not differentiated from the American, the West Indian, or the Brazilian. The ordinary Englishman did not know the difference. But I tell you, they know the difference now! They know the difference in the Ypres salient. That convinced the Gordon Highlanders, and they appreciated them. And when you get a Scotch regiment like the Gordon Highlanders appreciating men, they must be fine lads! And they have been fine! But you have sent them there; now the question is, are you going to desert them? Or are you going to keep the battalions filled up with Canadians, each willing to do his share to uphold the honor of this great Dominion, and to maintain the integrity of this great Empire? I hope so! I hope so! You have got the men here, and I hope my few words going into your ears, and possibly read by many more, will do something to bring to a more effective condition your mighty resources. The Mother Country has set you a great example. There is no walk of life, either military or otherwise, in my mind, in which she does not set an example. Those who refer to her as stupid and slow don't know what they are talking about! She has set an example in the determination if necessary to resort to conscription; if necessary she will muster five million of her colored subjects throughout the Empire. She will never submit to the German menace! She will never give in so long as she has a gun or a shilling left! That is the spirit of the Mother Country! And in their fight they are fighting for you, quite as much as they are fighting for themselves, and for civilization itself.

I said that we ought to have a Conference, and that the Conference is essential before the war is over. My reason for saying that is that the war, as far as the Home Country is concerned, is being carried on by the soldiers and sailors under a National Service Board, which is unique in the kingdom as far as touches the distinctive raising of men, so that the Home Country Cabinet is in a position to discuss affairs and deal with questions that arise after the war. I am all for the Conference now. And at that Conference, Mr. Chairman, and in conclusion, I know the people of that Old Country will welcome you to attend with the warm emotion born of a common sacrifice and with a glowing hope for the glorious and united future of the great British Empire, which, in the words of Lord Rosebery, is, and remains, "the greatest secular instrument for good the world has ever seen."

(*October 10th, 1916.*)

My Impressions of the French Front

By Lieutenant Zinovi Pechkoff.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 10th October, Lieutenant Pechkoff said:

It is really a very embarrassing task and a very embarrassing pleasure to tell of all I have seen and experienced, all that I think about the war. I have seen so many things, and there are so many things that I would like to communicate to you—though it is really very hard—but I will try my best. I am not a speaker, not experienced. I rarely spoke before an audience before the war, and during the time of the war we really did not speak too much, because we acted!

I am glad to come here to this continent to let people know what is going on in Europe. When I came to the United States all the people were very sympathetic, and all very nice, but still you felt it is a neutral country. It *is* a neutral country. And I was so happy when I just set foot on the soil of America to get Dr. Locke's letter, and it was so welcome, that I was very much touched, and I thank you for the opportunity of speaking here before you.

You see I'd like to tell you all of the life of the trenches—an interesting life, though with no thrilling stories. When we came to the Front I descended to the trenches on the 27th September, 1914. My regiment was in reserve after the Battle of the Marne, and I have passed after the German retreat all through the villages and towns of Champagne, so much wronged by the German invader.

I am not going to tell you all about the atrocities, about the cases of atrocities that I have seen, because I think many of you or all of you have read about it, very much about it, may be too much about them. You think from your daily life

*Lieutenant Zinovi Pechkoff, of a prominent Russian family, and formerly a resident of Toronto, crossed from Italy into France on the opening day of the war and was enrolled in the French Foreign Legion. He has been in the fighting ever since and has received the Croix de Guerre with the palm, a medal for special valour from the Russian Government and one from the French Government. Having lost his right arm by an explosive bullet from a German machine gun he was detailed for special service by the French and was enabled to pay us a short visit.

"It is impossible, the Germans are not like that." Many people knew Germans, and they think they know it is impossible. Well, things that seemed impossible before the war are not only possible now, but they are facts, common facts of every day. I have passed through many villages in Champagne, and I have seen the ruined houses, I have seen the deserted villages and towns because all the people went away into the woods and further still—they ran before the enemy, and many young people, with many young girls, did *not* get away—and they lie, some of them, in the ground near the villages and towns.

Well, we come to the trenches. They were not so elaborate, these trenches, as they are now with dug-outs and spaces to rest, nor with all the means even of defence that they have now: they were simply ditches. I remember it was very dark and rainy and windy the night when we came to the trenches. Nobody knew, or had any idea, what a trench was. I remember for two weeks, or a month, we had just a little ditch to lie down in, so we just lay down. What is next? We came to the trenches about 12 o'clock midnight, a very rainy night, and we stood there to arms, our rifles on the parapet so, for an hour, for two hours, three hours, until daylight. Then we were told to put down our arms and rest: so we rested where we were, there was no place else, and the rain poured down on us.

It would take very long to tell you of the three days and three nights we stayed there in the rain. We just stayed there until another battalion came to relieve us. That was my first three days and nights in the trenches, wet to the bones; but nobody minded that. I remember people joking and laughing at what we had done. Everybody thought of that part of the campaign. I have seen people playing cards, as if they did not mind at all.

We went to the village about four kilometers away, I think about two and a half miles, from the trenches, to rest for three days; when we came back to the trenches we commenced to work and to dig further trenches. And the men worked all through the winter. There is one fact I would like to tell you to explain the situation. When we came to the trenches, we were about 800 yards from the trenches of the Germans. We thought that was too near; we were not allowed to speak or even allowed to smoke through the winter. I have been three months where we thought the trenches were very close to the Germans; but when my regiment was sent to another part of France, the northern part, the position of our trenches —our first line—was only 85 meters from the Germans! And

our "Poste d' Ecoute"—what do you call it? Yes, listening post,—was not 15 meters from the German barbed wire entanglements. All this work of course had been accomplished by us during those three months. And all of it was done under fire—both the artillery and the machine gun fire of the enemy. I was very curious. Sometimes, on a moonlight night our shadows would show black on the ground, and the Germans would think it was our bodies, and they fired at our shadows. Of course sometimes a bullet would hit the men also, I mean their real bodies, their material bodies, but we did not mind their firing.

Now how is war carried on? How is the watch carried on? How are the twenty-four hours of the day spent in the trenches? The time is spent differently; it depends upon whether a man is in the first, second, third or fourth line. Generally, we would be eight days in our first line, eight days in the second, and so forth. In the first line, the soldiers don't do any work, any digging of trenches; upon them lies the task of defending the trenches; they carry on sentinel work. The soldiers who are in the second line—they go in at night time to take guard, to reinforce the first line, and work partly during the day. The third line trenches don't take guard at all, but go to the villages to cut wood, prepare barbed wire entanglements, etc., and during the night they bring these to the first line. The fourth line are those coming up to help in the work.

What work is carried on? Human nature is very adaptable. Just imagine—no, I don't think anyone who has not been there can imagine—how people can live under such conditions. We all, I think you all, undress yourselves to sleep—I think you do; well they do not! I have been in the trenches eight months and never undressed to sleep. Nobody thinks of that! I remember one day one of our sergeants bought some horses twenty-five kilometers away; the people offered to let him stay over night and the people told him: "Here is a nice room, you will rest well here—there is a good bed with clean sheets." The old sergeant looked at the room, and said "All right, thanks very much." And he was left alone. When the people woke in the morning the sergeant's room was open, but no sergeant was there! The people thought, "This is very queer, surely he would not leave without saying good bye." Presently he appeared and they asked him about it. He told them, "I did not find the bed uncomfortable, I was afraid to sleep. When I turned one way, I thought—there is something empty here—and when I felt the other side I thought—there is something empty there,"

so he went to the barn and slept on the hay! This is a very pretty little story, but it is characteristic. I remember myself, when I was brought to the hospital in rather bad condition, my first sensation when they put me upon the bed, and I touched with my left hand a white sheet, touched a real white sheet, I thought it very pleasant. It certainly was a beautiful sensation to be lying there with a white sheet below me, and a white sheet on top of me. Well, I thought, if I were not so sick, I would feel it was dangerous to lie in this bed, like the sergeant. But I was safe, I could not move, so it was all right.

Well, now, of course, life in the trenches is very different. In some parts, where there is no activity, for example in Champagne, there is not much activity, the life is nearly the same, with little difference. The dug-outs are very nice, lit with all kinds of lights, with the spirit of the soldiers perhaps more than any other lights.

To-day it is a month since I left the Somme Front. On Tuesday evening I left the Somme, and on Saturday I sailed from Bordeaux for the States. So I have seen the Somme fighting. I have not been at the Front for many months. I myself was wounded on the 9th May, 1915. Then I was six months in the hospital. I was hit by an explosive bullet. Some people do not realise what it is; some people don't believe it, and say it is exaggerated. I was fortunate enough and proud to take two machine guns of the Germans —never mind, some people have done more,—and when we examined the bands of the machine guns we found pretty nearly thirty per cent. of the cartridges were explosive! And I may assure you it is true, because I have seen it! And if I had not been hit by an explosive bullet, I would have had my arm! I would have lost it probably in another battle, but I would have had a chance to do some more fighting. It was a very nasty thing!

In October I left the hospital and went straight to Italy. There I lectured in Italian; I know Italian very well, better than English; I wish I could speak English as well. After returning from Italy in the early summer of 1916, I again enlisted and went to the Front. And what a difference I found! Almost impossible to recognise the Front as it was. For example, one example—the efficiency of our artillery; in 1914-15 we soldiers would sometimes really feel queer when the Germans fired at us with their artillery, and we did not reply half as much. I have seen behind our trenches the best of artillery, so when I came now I have seen "woods" of artillery, I mean the cannons. Well, that gives wonder-

ful encouragement to the soldiers. Our first attack,—I have been in four attacks, the 23rd November, the 2nd February, the 3rd March and the 9th May, four charges—they were quite local, three of them, but the fourth was on a very great scale. The preparation was not one-half, not one-hundredth time so efficient as now.

The preparation was not half, not one-hundredth time so efficient as now. They just fired half an hour and then we marched on. We were near the German line, and of course suffered great losses; but now it is quite different. You have all read in the papers about the efficiency of that attack. In the first attack, in May, 1915, our artillery was firing for sixteen hours before we went forward. The first line trenches and the second line, we took without firing even one shot; but in taking the third and fourth lines we suffered heavily. I was wounded between the third and fourth lines. My regiment, of which I am very proud, carried the fourth line of trenches in forty-seven minutes. You see between the third and fourth lines we suffered great losses, but now, in the Somme fighting, and especially in the last two months, there is such efficient artillery fire that the losses are really not great. They were very great in July, in the first drive, but now everything works just like a workshop.

I was in General Quarters a month ago, and there the work is carried on as in a workshop too. For example, the efficiency of our aviation: I have seen twenty-seven of our "ballons captifs," twenty-seven of ours, and three of the Germans! And then we have the advantage in aviators. About seven kilometers from the front I have seen the aviators, 12 esquadrilles, that means 144 machines, in only one line. So you can see in aviation we have the advantage, and how really magnificent it is! Aviation has played a great rôle in the recent attacks. The Colonel of the General Staff showed me everything. Of course I told him I was going away, and he showed me about. He showed me, for example, while a bombardment was going on, every hour, sometimes every forty minutes, an aviator comes to the General Quarters with a report. His report is not one in words, but in photographic plates of places just bombarded of the enemy lines. There is a "Usine photographique," a photographic plate, in General Quarters, and as soon as an aviator comes he gives his plate in, and in seven minutes after it is developed; nine minutes afterwards the General sees that print; one minute more, and it is telephoned to the artillery

post, to adjust the fire, to fire a little to the left or to the right. This gives you an idea of the efficiency of the work.

The General Quarters are under ground. You see, there is a beautiful château, but most of the château is ruined, so the people live in a cave. There they have electric light and other things, all this "Frabrique." If you come to the drawing room it is just like an architect's office. Every day a map is drawn of the present position of us and the enemy, so there is a clear understanding of what we are doing from day to day and from week to week. It is not a mere blind enterprise —"Perhaps it will be successful—may be yes, may be no"— now we know what we are doing. Sometimes there is too much loss—well, it can't be helped! And everybody who goes to war expects to pay for it, to be rewarded I mean!

Of course you see we should not be praised, we Allied people. It is only our duty. So why praise us?

A few days ago I had a letter from an American woman whose son was killed in the war—Kiffen Rockwell. He was a soldier in my company. A very brave boy, about 23 years old. He was wounded the same day with me. They cured his wound—it was not very serious. Then he enlisted in the Aviation Corps. He brought down three German aviators, but a fourth he did not see, and he was killed. When read in the papers that Kiffen Rockwell was killed, I wrote a letter to his mother in North Carolina. In her answer she says "How your letter comforts and cheers me, just to hear from someone who knew my boy, my faithful boy! . . . So my dear boy is gone—but I am not rebellious! He leaves a beautiful memory." This is how the mother of an American volunteer feels—the mother of a United States volunteer. So for us people, it is only our duty—and that is all.

Well, I don't know, there are so many things to tell! I will finish with the Somme. You see, now we have sufficient of everything, not only aviation but big artillery. I may say to you that I have seen batteries and batteries of 380 calibres, and I have seen one place at the Front, I cannot tell you which, where there were three trains of 400 calibre artillery. It is such a pleasure, such enjoyment, to see that. It means less loss of life.

It is less costly to spend money on material than to spend it on men—men have to grow for nineteen years, but material can be made in one year. We recognise that, and that it is better to spend millions on material than millions of men's lives.

One more thing. I don't know whether I am tiring you. (Cries of "No—no.") What impressed me on the Somme—I was driving with the Colonel of the General Staff along a new road, and I asked him if it was not quite new. "Yes," he said, "six days ago it did not exist." The men had made a road on which four big auto cars could run abreast. From a big depot it goes right up to the third line trench, sixteen kilometers. It was done in one day, he told me. I said, "How was that?" "Well," he said, "we had to do it." There were a lot of men wanted, and we had to bring material to the trenches, and had to bring provisions up, and evacuate people,—we had to do it. So we took four territorial regiments, sixteen thousand strong, and lined them up along the sixteen kilometers; we gave the eight thousand picks and eight thousand shovels; and every man had to use them for only one meter; and it was done!

Now, no more Somme! I want to read you—it is not much, only three and a half pages (cries of "Go on")—you know on the 14th July there is a great national feast in Paris, and every year they celebrate it by having a splendid review of troops in the streets of Paris. This year, the review was an unusual one, I would say a symbolic review really. You see, the soldiers who marched in the streets of Paris this year were not those polished troops that parade the streets and constitute the garrison of Paris. No, these troops were brought from the trenches. Here are some impressions on that day and if you will allow me, I will read them to you.

"I was in Paris on the 14th of July, the great National Feast day, and it was with the deepest emotion that I watched the Allied troops from all the world parade through the streets. I realised it was a sight unique in the world's history, and this feast the greatest event that Paris has ever witnessed. Everyone felt that it was the day of fraternisation between all the Allies, companions at arms. Friends and sons had stolen a day between two battles to come and visit those waiting anxiously at home, and Paris opened wide the gates of her heart and worthily did them honor.

"One wishes that the enemy could have seen the streets of Paris on that day; even his pride would have received a cruel shock!

"Paris has certainly never seen more wonderful military parade than that on this 14th July, 1916; the sepectacle will hardly be surpassed when the triumphant armies return and march under the Arc de Triomphe. Except that on that day our hearts will be lighter and more joyful.

"The first to march were the Belgians, the first in honor as in sacrifice. Then followed the English, who had nobly kept the anniversary of France's national feast by freeing three French villages from German hands. Canadians, who had crossed the seas to come and fight for the 'old country.'" —Long live Canada! (This emotional outburst of the speaker moved deeply the audience and evoked "Hear, hear" and applause.)—"Russians who greeted Paris in the beautiful religious accents of their military songs. And finally our troops closing the procession, proudly greeted as they passed with the names of their greatest exploits: mountaineers of the Vosges, rifle brigades of the Argonne and Verdun, naval fusiliers of the Yser, colonials and native troops, who showed their gratitude for our having brought them peace and security by coming to fight for our cause. Such was the army that Paris had the honor to acclaim and decorate with flowers, the army of European union, the first symbol of the army of the future, the army of the world, that will stand up for right against might.

"It was a really magnificent and unique sight to see these war-tried troops march before one, in the very midst of war, at the same moment as from the Somme to the Carpathians the battle is raging, and this historical pageant borrowed the most beautiful setting that heart could desire for the display of its military pomp.

"The troops passed on and on, but they did not pass according to the ordinary rites of military ceremonies, here it was all quite different.

"Along their course, except at the approach to the Place de la République, there accompanied them other men and women who took their places in the ranks and marched bravely forward, as if they too meant to accompany these brave troops to the end, performing their duty as nobly; and there was not one man in the whole lot who besides his medals and Croix de Guerre did not also bear a token of fresh flowers to remind him of the ever fresh and grateful thoughts of those at home.

"Soldiers and civilians had all the same expression of concentrated resolution; there was only one little difference: the eyes of the spectators were wet with tears, those of the departing were wet and shining—they laughed.

"The boulevards represented to them a great road, a road that led not to the Bastille, the French Bastille, but a road that led onwards into the East towards that other Bastille which is Germany. The revue, or rather the March, thus assumed

a symbolic character, the Allied armies marching to the assault of that terrific and colossal fortress of despotism which rises up heavy and crushing like that monument of nations at Leipzig, a nightmare of stone, typical, expression of the spirit of the nation that built it. The German bastion darkens and oppresses the sky of Europe and the world. It is imperative for the peace and security of humanity that the Bastille of Prussian militarism should be destroyed.

"The 14th July was the finest proof that could be given of the unanimity of a spirit among the Allies. It showed that there is only one war, and only one front, and that the soldiers of all the Allied nations are fighting one enemy in the common cause; for the liberty of small and oppressed nations, for the respect of international treaties, for the free development of each nationality on the basis of equality and justice, against the military oppression of Prussia, who wanted to conquer the whole world by mere brutal force."

(October 30th, 1916.)

Public versus Private Management of Railways

By Mr. Samuel O. Dunn.*

AT a meeting of the Club held on the 30th October, Mr. Dunn said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—To say that I appreciate very highly the honor conferred upon me by the invitation to come over here and address you, would be to express myself very inadequately. I fear, however, that I shall fall short of any expectations that you may have of me, if your expectations have been at all built upon the kind of public speaking that I have been accustomed to hear from gentlemen who have come over to our side from this side. I happen to have been a regular attendant for some years at the dinners of the Railway Engineers' Association, of Chicago. That organization, like a great many other organizations on this continent, is made up of gentlemen from our side and from your side. It has been an annual custom to invite some distinguished speaker of Canada to be one of the speakers at that dinner, and that job of getting our men has always been left to Mr. William McNab, of the Grand Trunk Railway. During the time that Mr. McNab has been on the job he has brought so many interesting and eloquent speakers to our side that I have almost begun to be persuaded that Canada is a nation of orators.

My subject, unfortunately, is one which does not lend itself to oratorical treatment: I am going to talk to you about Government versus Private management of railways. I have felt that it would be ungracious of me, a citizen of the United States, to come over here and discuss your local situation. I have discussed the question of Government ownership in Canada elsewhere, but to-day I am going to discuss the question on somewhat more general lines. I hope, however, that any references which I may make to results on your own

*As Editor of the *Railway Age Gazette,* Mr. Samuel O. Dunn has attained a position of authority as a writer on railway problems. His articles on the Intercolonial Railway have been widely discusssd in Canada.

State railways will not be taken amiss. I do not pretend to be able to tell you people over here what you should do about your own business, but I have made some study of government railways in your country, and so I shall use some of the results of that study because I think they will be more interesting than examples drawn from the experience of other countries.

One of the most marked tendencies throughout the world during the last half or three-quarters of a century has been the tendency of governments to intervene more and more in industrial affairs. During a long period, which ended at about the time of the French Revolution, governments everywhere, and especially on the continent of Europe, were active participants in industry, and regulated closely almost every class of business which they did not undertake to manage. There then began a great and widespread reaction both in economic and political philosophy and in economic and political affairs. The leading thinkers on economic and political subjects began to teach that that government was best which governed least, and a very large amount of legislation was enacted to take governments out of business and to emancipate industrial enterprises from public control. The period during which the doctrine of *laissez faire* prevailed lasted, roughly, until the beginning of the latter half of the nineteenth century. Then the pendulum commenced to swing the other way, and it has continued to do so until now throughout the leading countries of the world governments are managing many important enterprises and are strictly regulating many which they do not manage. About the latter half of last century a man who advocated introducing an amount of government management was a "Radical." To-day a man who favors it is called a "Conservative"; on our side he is a "Reactionary." Perhaps in fifty years a man who advocates reducing the amount of government management will be called again a "Radical."

In no field has this increasing tendency of government to intervene in industrial affairs been more strikingly illustrated than in the railway field. So extensive has the policy of government ownership and management of railways become that it is often represented as having grown to be the dominant policy of the world. This, however, is by no means correct. The mileage of railways owned and managed by private companies is still more than twice as great as that owned and operated by governments. In 1913, the latest year for which we have complete statistics, there were in the world 690,133 miles of railway. Of this, 464,421 miles, or 67%, belonged

to private companies, and only 225,712 miles, or 33%, belonged to governments.

It is a fact, however, that North America is the great stronghold of private ownership, and that outside of this continent there is now a greater mileage in the hands of governments than in those of private companies. There are over 305,000 miles of railways in North America, and of this more than 290,000 miles, or over 95%, is privately owned and operated. In all the world outside of North America there are 385,000 miles, and of this 211,147 miles, or 55%, is owned by governments, while 174,000 miles, or 45%, is owned by private companies. It will be seen, therefore, that the mileage in North America which is privately owned and operated exceeds the total mileage owned by governments in all the world, while even outside of North America almost one-half the mileage is owned and operated by private companies.

Nor does it give a correct idea to say that government ownership has been adopted by most leading countries. Germany has adopted it, but Great Britain adheres to private ownership. Most of the railways of Austria-Hungary are state-operated, but most of those of France are still in private hands. Most of the railways of Italy and Russia are state-owned, but in the principal country of South America, Argentina, with a mileage greater than that of Italy, and in Canada, with a large and rapidly increasing mileage, private ownership is still greatly preponderant. Japan is committed to government ownership, but in the United States, which alone has a mileage exceeding that of the combined state-owned railways of the world, private management is the sole policy.

To say, therefore, as some do, that countries such as the United States and Canada should nationalize all their railways because the enlightened public sentiment of the world has decided in favor of this policy is to reason from an assumption which is not based upon facts. Furthermore, even if it were true that all the rest of the world had adopted government ownership, this would be no very forcible argument for adopting it in North America. In reasoning regarding any policy which is proposed for adoption we should give the greatest weight to the particular conditions under which it would have to be carried out. Now, the conditions, political, military and economic, which prevail in the United States and Canada, are widely different from those which prevail in Europe, for example. Military considerations have been very influential in shaping the railway policy of some of the European countries, and especially Germany. The conditions

which made it desirable, or which have been regarded as making it desirable, for some of the governments of Europe to directly own their railways, so that they can be prepared to use them for military purposes at a moment's notice, do not exist on this continent, and we all hope and believe that they never will. Many of the countries of Europe which have extensively adopted government ownership are monarchies, while, regardless of constitutional forms, Canada as well as the United States is a democracy. It is hardly necessary to add that the economic conditions on this continent are widely different from those in Europe. If we on this continent are going to decide wisely on the question of private versus government ownership, we must get clearly and keep constantly in mind our own peculiar conditions, and then try to determine which policy will produce the better results under those particular conditions.

The policy of government ownership is sometimes advocated on the somewhat theoretical ground that the provision of highways is a funcion of the state, and that railways are highways. Of course, on this theory it follows that railways should be owned and managed by the government. But this argument disregards the fact that railways not only provide a highway but also carry goods and passengers. Now, this fact is of some importance, for never before the railways was invented was it considered a function of the state to become a carrier for hire, and even since it was invented governments very seldom have assumed the function of carriage except when they have become the owners and managers of railways. They provide highways for water carriers; but they do not ordinarily own the ships operated on them. They provide highways for vehicle traffic; but they do not ordinarily own the teams and wagons, the motor trucks and taxicabs which use them. While it must be conceded that governments always have provided highways, it cannot logically be concluded from this fact that the ownership and management of railways is naturally a government function. How can it be held to be naturally a government function, when about 60% of the expenses usually incurred are attributable to the service of carriage, which, on historical grounds, may be held to be within the normal scope of private enterprise?

The question of government versus private ownership has various phases, but there are two whose importance is paramount. One of these is the economic phase. Which policy will better promote the material welfare of the public—in other words, which will better promote the efficient production

and the equitable distribution of wealth? The other phase which is of the first importance is the political phase. Will private ownership or government ownership have the better effects on the government of the country, and specially on that of a country having democratic institutions such as yours in Canada and ours in the United States?

Let us turn, first, to the question of which policy will more efficiently promote the production of wealth. The transportation of freight by rail, and the transportation of passengers by rail when they are traveling on business, is merely one of the processes of production. If the management of the railways is inefficient and wasteful and, in consequence, the expense incurred in furnishing the service of transportation is excessive, this reduces the efficiency and increases the cost of all the industrial processes carried on in the entire country. This remains true whether the total cost incurred in rendering the service is covered by the rates charged for it, or only part of it is covered by the rates charged and the other part of it is covered by taxes levied upon the public to pay deficits incurred by the railways. If it actually costs $10 to move 1,000 tons of freight one mile the burden directly or indirectly imposed upon the industry of the country for the transportation of that 1,000 tons one mile is just the same whether $5 of the cost is paid by the taxpayer and $5 by the shipper, or the entire $10 is paid by the shipper.

As, in the long run, the entire expense incurred in providing the service of transportation must be borne by the industry of the country, the public welfare demands that, other things being equal, that railway policy shall be adopted which will keep this expense at the lowest practicable minimum. Now, assuming that there are certain unit costs, such as the wages of labor and the prices of materials, which must be met, and a certain standard of service which must be maintained, it is evident that that railway policy will be most conducive to economical management which is adapted to securing the ablest and most energetic administration of the affairs of the railways.

Business costs are always of two classes—return to invested capital and expenses of operation. It is as absolutely impossible to avoid incurring the one as the other. If private companies are to be permanently successful in furnishing railway service they must be able to raise capital, and they will not be able to raise capital unless they are able to, and do, pay interest and dividends on it. Likewise, if a government is to provide railway service it must raise capital, and if it is to

raise capital it must pay interest on it. The books may be so kept as not to show how much interest actually is paid on the investment, but because the books are not made to show the facts will not alter the facts. You might also so keep the books as not to show all the operating expenses, but this would not make the operating expenses any less.

The advocates of government ownership contend that it enables capital for the construction and development of railways to be raised more cheaply, and that it causes their administration to be more efficient than private ownership and management. Governments ordinarily can borrow money cheaper than private companies. But the total return which must be paid on the capital invested in railways does not depend merely on the rate of interest paid. The total return required on the investment in a mile of railway is determined not only by the rate of interest, but also by the amount of capital spent to produce that mile of railway. If a company would have to pay 5% for capital and a government only 4%, but the company would build a railway for only two-thirds as much as the government would spend, the total interest which the company would have to pay on the investment would be less than the total interest the government would have to pay.

Now, whether the cost of building a new railway or of improving an old one will be high or low will be determined chiefly by the skill with which its affairs are administered. The same thing is true as to operating expenses. The situation is precisely similar to that met in other lines of business. One man builds a factory extravagantly and operates it expensively, and it is a commercial failure. Another, with perhaps less credit and financial resources, builds a factory economically and operates it efficiently, and it is a commercial success. In the railway field, as in that of manufacturing, costs of production depend upon the skill of the management; and the requisites of skillful administration are the same under government—and I assume that when private ownership obtains, public regulation will also—as under private management.

Probably the most fundamental and important difference between government regulation and government ownership of railways is that under the former public officials exercise merely the authority of supervision and correction, while under the latter they exercise the authority and perform the duty of actual administration. The two functions are widely dissimilar. The main function of all regulating bodies is to make broad general rules for the guidance and control of the acts

of others. The administrative, or managing, function, on the other hand, is initiating, dynamic, executive. The management of a railway system conceives projects and carries them out. It determines where it will be advantageous and desirable to build extensions and make improvements and how these things shall be done. It determines according to what ideals and standards the property shall be maintained and operated. It selects and directs the officers of all ranks. It selects, directs, trains and disciplines the employees and determines within limits fixed by law and public opinion their wages and working conditions. On its judgment, courage, energy and ability in doing these things mainly depends the success of the railways, whatever their ownership.

Whether the governments of Canada and the United States, under the political conditions which prevail in these countries, may be confidently relied on to develop and support railway administrative organizations which will manage the railways as well and economically as private companies, is open to grave question. One of the greatest difficulties met in securing the skillful administration of government concerns is that of obtaining and retaining efficient managers for them. Governments, and especially democratic governments, will seldom pay as high salaries as private concerns to get men for positions demanding first class ability. However, the honor inherent in public office is more attractive to many able and public-spirited men than a large income, and therefore, in spite of small salaries, governments may often get strong men if their appointments and tenure of office are made to depend on their merits and if they are left free to do their work without political influence. But in most democratic countries, such as Canada and the United States, the appointments to important offices in the public service are usually determined chiefly by political considerations. There is hardly an officer of a railway or of an industrial corporation on this continent who does not owe his position to his experience and proved ability in his special line of work. There are few high public officials, except in the army, the navy and the courts, who do owe their positions to such qualifications.

The managers of any business, public or private, even though of great ability, cannot administer it with energy and skill unless left free from interference except on business grounds. But are the officers of government railways in democratic countries likely to be as immune from such interference as those of private railways? You have had some experience with government management of railways in Canada, and I

do not understand that the higher officers of your state railways always have been appointed solely because of their qualifications or that they have always been left free from political interference. But if the managers of government railways are not to be chosen and retained solely because of their peculiar qualifications for their duties, and are not to be left free from political interference, upon what gound can it be assumed that they will be able to develop and operate the properties so as to keep down the cost of transportation to what it would be under private management?

Political considerations tend to cause lines to be built and improvements to be made where they are not most needed to promote the economic welfare of the country. They cause men to be taken into, retained and advanced in the service largely regardless of their merits. They cause a greater number of men to be employed than are actually needed. They sometimes cause contracts to be let and purchases to be made which would not be countenanced if business principles alone prevailed. They sometimes cause passenger and freight service to be rendered, not on business principles, but to placate the voters in certain forward communities. These statements are not based merely on surmise. They can be substantiated by evidence afforded by government management of railways in many countries. Nor are those directly charged with the management of the railways to be held entirely responsible. In many cases they have fought courageously and determinedly against such abuses, only to find that their resistance availed but little.

The conclusion necessarily suggested is that, under democratic conditions at least, state railways are less likely to be efficiently and economically developed and operated than private railways. This conclusion is supported by evidence afforded by the operating and financial results of government and priviate railways throughout the world. There are seventeen countries in the world in which the capitalization, or cost of construction per mile of the railways exceeds the average of the railways of the United States. In only six of these does private ownership preponderate, while in eleven government ownership preponderates. The cost of construction of the Intercolonial Railway of Canada, the oldest, and until recently the largest, government-owned railway on this continent, is officially reported at $75,000 per mile. This is about the same as the cost of the leading railways of Australia, the state railways of New South Wales. The National Transcontinental, which also has been built by the government of Canada,

has cost substantially more than this. These figures greatly exceed the average capitalizations per mile of the private railways of Canada and of the United States. The average net capitalization of the railways of the United States, including all the great systems, with their numerous multiple track lines and dense traffic in the populous eastern part of the country, is only $67,000 a mile. There are, of course, exceptions, but the general rule throughout the world is that governments invest more capital in railways to handle a given amount of traffic than private companies do.

When we turn to a comparison of the expense of operation that state and private railways incur in proportion to the total traffic which they handle, we find facts of a similar character. The private railways of France handle more traffic in proportion to their operating expenses than do the state railways of that country. The railways of Prussia are the best state managed railways in the world, and yet the private railways of France handle more traffic in proportion to their operating expenses than do the state railways of Prussia. The private railways of Canada handle more traffic in proportion to their operating expenses than does the Intercolonial. In fact, the private railways of Canada and of the United States handle more traffic in proportion to their operating expenses than any other railways in the world, in spite of the fact that railway wages on this continent are the highest in the world. I would not undertake to maintain that private railways always are more economically managed than state railways. I do not believe that is a fact. But I am sure, after having studied the subject for a long time, that, as a rule, private management is more economical than state management. It may be suggested that the higher expenses of state railways are due to the fact that they give better and more adequate service than private railways. But the strongest stimuli which promote the development and improvement of the service under private ownership are wanting under government ownership. The opportunity for private gain is abolished. Competition is eliminated. There is no superior regulating authority to compel the government to remedy the defects of its service. As substitutes for these influences there is a public sentiment which demands the construction of new mileage and the making of improvements, and a management desirous to please that part of the government or the public which can apply the most pressure. It does not seem probable that ordinarily the influences tending to promote the improvement of railway service under government ownership will

prove to be more potent than those tending to promote it under private ownership, and, furthermore, the facts do not show that state railways ordinarily do give better service than private railways.

It may be said, and truly said, that even though it be demonstrated that it costs more to develop and operate railways under government than under private ownership, this does not make out a case, even on economic grounds, in favor of private ownership. Equity in the distribution of wealth is as important to the welfare of the public as efficiency in its production, and it may be contended that under government ownership the wages paid to labor will be higher, the passenger and freight rates charged to the public will be lower, the public instead of private companies will receive the profits earned by the railways, and, in consequence, the public, on the whole, will be better off. Let us, then, turn to a brief consideration of the relative effects which private and government ownership may be expected to have on the distribution of wealth. It may safely be assumed at the outset that under either system there will always be a struggle going on between the various classes of the community and sections of the country to determine how the burdens and benefits resulting from the development and operation of the railways shall be divided. Under either system travelers and shippers always will want low rates, labor will want short hours of work and high wages, and the owners of the railways, whether they be private capitalists or the public, will want to keep the profits large or the deficit small, as the case may be. The welfare of the public demands that this struggle shall be kept within reasonable bounds, and that at the same time it shall not be allowed to result in some of those engaged in it securing unfair privileges and advantages at the expense of the others who are engaged in it. The only authority which conceivably can thus at once control and arbitrate the struggle is obviously the government of the country.

But the government of a country is not a mere mechanical device which automatically registers what is right and wrong, what is fair and unfair, and in the same manner issues its decrees and compels obedience to them. The government of a country is composed of ordinary men who enact and administer laws; and in a democratic country those who make and administer the laws owe their offices, and depend for the opportunity to continue in them, on the votes of their fellow citizens. Therefore, we may be sure that under either system, the men who, in a democratic country, compose the government will

always deal with matters affecting railways with some regard to their own political interests as well as with some regard to the economic welfare of the public; and the system which will be most likely to cause equity to be done between all parts of the people is that system which will tend most strongly to make it to the interest of those in office to hold the balances even as between all classes.

Under the system of private ownership and public regulation—and public regulation has become the rule wherever private ownership exists—public officials, including especially those particularly delegated to regulate the railways, occupy positions of more or less detachment with respect to railway affairs, and the pressure brought to bear upon them by the various classes and sections of the country tends to cause them to deal out approximate justice. Railways cannot be successfully developed and operated under private ownership unless those who invest in them are allowed to derive a reasonable return from their investment, and the arguments that may be marshalled and the pressure which may be brought to bear in support of making the practice conform to sound principle usually result in private railways being allowed to earn enough to raise adequate capital. There are likely to be temporary deviations from the correct practice in this respect, as we have found in the United States, but recent decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission have shown that even in our country, where hostility to the railways has been extreme, it is by no means impossible to convince intelligent regulating bodies and the public that advances in rates are sometimes as justifiable as reductions are at other times.

At the same time, under the system of private ownership and public regulation rates and earnings are not likely to be allowed to become excessive, for, as experience has shown, and nowhere more conclusively than in Canada and the United States, those who directly pay the rates are quite capable of organizing effectively for the purpose of fighting for reasonable reductions in rates and to prevent unreasonable advances in them, and are not at all loath to do so. Similarly, the employees of private railways subject to public regulation have shown that by organizing, arguing, threatening to strike, and even going to the government for legislation, they are able to get and keep their wages on quite as high a basis as the employees of other classes of concerns and even as the employees of governments themselves. Finally, where railways are privately owned public officials are pretty sure in the long run to be alert and active in compelling the companies to con-

tribute in the form of taxes and otherwise their fair share, if not more than their fair share, toward the support of the government. At least that is our experience in the United States.

The situation is most radically changed when railways become the property of the government. As I have said, the struggle between the various classes and communities of the country over railway matters continues under this system, but the government and the men who compose it then cease to be in a position where they can arbitrate between the various parties involved, and become directly as parties to it themselves. In a democratic country, such as yours and ours, the authority of the law-making body over the railways under government ownership becomes omnipotent and it can make any distribution of the burdens and benefits of railway operation that it sees fit. It may delegate the regulation and management of the railways to commissions or other officers and give to them a large amount of independence, but this is seldom done except for short periods, for no matter how much independent authority may theoretically be given to others under government ownership, it is always well known that the authority the lawmakers have given they can take away, and, therefore, there are always bound to be constant appeals from the railway managers or the railway commission to the law-making body itself. In consequence, the lawmakers, and through them the management of the railways, are bound to be constantly subjected to political pressure from all of the interested classes and communities. They will be subjected to pressure by bodies of the employees for higher wages and easier conditions of work. They will be subjected to pressure by organized bodies of shippers for low freight rates and by organized bodies of commercial travelers, working men and commuters for low passenger rates.

There is, however, one class in the community which is not susceptible of organization, except, perhaps, very sporadically and temporarily, for the purpose of influencing government in its behalf. This class is that composed of the taxpayers. It is a much larger class than any of the others, but an organized body of voters, having a single interest which it has been organized to promote, is as much more efficient than a larger unorganized body of voters, in exerting political pressure in a democratic country as a trained body of regular soldiers is superior as a fighting body to a mob of untrained, undisciplined recruits. The consequence is that the one class which under government ownership of railways is likely not to have

its interests protected by the government is the taxpayers. Most of us pay some taxes directly. All of us pay taxes indirectly. They enter into our house rent, into the cost of our clothing, into the prices of everything we eat or drink. There is no way by which their payment can be evaded, and, in consequence, the cost of living of all classes increases with the increase of taxes. Because of this increase of taxes the results of government ownership to certain persons may be different actually from what they are nominally. The passenger or shipper who may get lower rates or the employees who may get easier conditions of work, may largely, or wholly, pay for these advantages in the form of higher taxes and a higher cost of living; and for a large majority of the public the increase in their taxes and cost of living caused by government ownership will be a net loss. Unfortunately, the taxes raised to pay the deficits incurred by state railways are usually so mixed up with the taxes raised for other purposes that those who pay them have no idea what part of them is to be used to pay the ordinary expenses of the government and what part is to be used to pay the deficit of the railways.

The conclusion that the increased economic burden which will usually have to be borne by industry and by the public as a result of government ownership will be imposed mainly on the taxpayers is supported not only by theoretical reasoning, but by the actual experience of most countries where government ownership of railways obtains. It cannot be shown that the average wages paid by state railways are ordinarily higher, under comparable conditions, than those paid by private railways, although undoubtedly under government ownership more men usually are employed to do a given amount of work. It cannot be shown that under comparable conditions the rates of state railways usually are lower than those of private railways. It is true that in Canada the rates of the Intercolonial, both passenger and freight, are relatively low, but the usual rule is that the passenger rates of state railways are somewhat lower than those of private railways, while the freight rates are somewhat higher. Considering the passenger and freight rates together, the total amount which has to be paid for the transportation of a given amount of traffic usually is relatively more on state railways than on private railways.

One thing, however, which may be conclusively demonstrated is that while private railways invariably are required to pay taxes to the public, the usual rule as to state railways is that taxes have to be collected from the public to make up

deficits which they incur. One of the most extreme examples of this kind is afforded by your own Intercolonial Railway. My study of its figures, and a somewhat hasty and cursory observation of the physical property itself, have led me to believe that the Intercolonial is now being managed with an economy and skill which are a vast improvement over those shown in its management until within the last two years. Regardless of that, however, during the years from 1867 to 1914 the Intercolonial failed by $9,600,000 to earn even its fair operating expenses. In 1914 the property was carried on the books at a cost of $103,431,000. I had a calculation made to ascertain the total amount the road had cost the people of Canada. This was based on the assumption that, on the average, it ought to earn its operating expenses and 4% on the actual investment in it. This certainly is a conservative basis. This estimate showed that up to 1914, including the actual investment in the road and the total losses it had incurred, the road had cost the people of Canada over $348,000,000. Assuming that it is actually worth to-day the cost at which it is carried on the books, its total cost to the taxpayers of Canada has been $245,000,000 more than its present value. These losses have been partly due to the lowness of its rates, and partly to its uneconomical management; but to whatever causes they have been due, the losses have had to be borne by the taxpayers of this country.

While the case of the Intercolonial is an extreme one, it is by no means exceptional among government railways. There are some state railways which earn the interest on the total investment in them, and even more. This is true, for example, of those of Prussia and of Japan. But in Belgium, Italy, France, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and most other countries the state railways have on the average failed to earn their operating expenses and interest, thereby incurring deficits which have had to be borne by the taxpayers. I am aware that it can be shown that in some years the railways of some of these countries have earned their interest. I am speaking now of what they have done on the average over substantial periods, and the rule is, that over any considerable period almost every state railway in the world imposes burdens on the taxpayers, while almost every system of private railways pays taxes into the public treasury.

One question which may be raised in this connection is as to whether it is a violation of sound principle for state railways to so make their rates as to cause deficits, and thereby

impose burdens on the taxpayers. It is a well known fact that the rates of your Intercolonial Railway are relatively low, and it is sometimes contended that all its losses have been due to the lowness of its rates. My study of its statistics and observation of its physical condition convince me that its losses, at least until within the last year or two, have been due more to uneconomical management than to low rates. This conclusion derives strong support from the fact that within the last two years the present management has been able to increase the earnings about $1,600,000 a year, while actually reducing the expenses by about $600,000 a year. But suppose its losses have all been due to the lowness of its rates, is that sufficient defense of them? Either those who pay non-compensatory rates and those who pay the taxes levied to meet the deficits they cause are the same people, or they are different people. If they are the same people, what they gain by the rates is taken from them in increased taxes. If they are different people, those who pay the rates get their transportation for less than cost and those who pay the taxes pay for something they do not get. It is hard to see how anybody can be benefited by saving money through low rates and having it all taken away in increased taxes. It is also hard to find justice in giving some people low rates at the cost to others of higher taxes.

Both common sense and equity require rates to be so fixed that those who receive transportation service shall pay for it in full. The application of this principle to the situation in Canada makes it easy to decide in regard to the soundness of the rate-making policy followed on the government railways, if to it are due their losses. These railways serve only the people of the eastern provinces, and but part of them. The people of the entire Dominion must pay the taxes levied by the government. Therefore, if the trouble with the government railways is that their rates are too low, the few who use their service are unfairly benefiting at the expense of all the people of the country.

There is absolutely no more justification, on grounds either of economics, or of equity, for so making railway rates as not to cover interest on the investment, and then calling on the taxpayers to make up the deficit, than there would be for charging no rates at all, and calling on the taxpayers to pay both the total operating expenses and the interest. The interest on the investment is just as clearly a part of the cost of providing the service as are the operating expenses.

The conclusion suggested by the foregoing facts and con-

siderations, it seems to me, is that not only are private railways more likely than state railways to be so managed as to keep the economic cost of transportation down to the minimum, but that they are more likely under the system of public regulation, which now obtains almost universally where private ownership obtains, to be so managed and regulated as to promote equity in the distribution of wealth than state railways.

Let us now turn to some of the political considerations bearing on the subject. Many years ago a commission of the Italian government investigated the subject of government ownership and reported that, in its opinion, under that policy "politics would corrupt the railways and the railways would corrupt politics." I have given my reasons for believing that especially under democratic conditions political considerations and political pressure are bound to exert so great an influence on the management of state railways as to cause them to produce less satisfactory economic results than would be produced by private ralways. But whatever makes political considerations and political pressure exert more influence on the management of railways under government than under private ownership will at the same time make the railways under government ownership a more demoralizing influence in politics than they would be under private ownership. If it tends to demoralize the management of the railways to have men taken into and advanced in their service for political reasons, this taking of them into and advancing them in the service for political reasons will also have a demoralizing effect on politics. If the giving of railway contracts for political reasons will tend to demoralize the management of the railways, it will at the same time tend to demoralize politics. If the granting of concessions to the employees for political reasons will tend to demoralize the management of the railways it will at the same time tend to demoralize politics. And so all along the line.

Now, a country with an autocratic government, such as that of Prussia, may be able to keep politics out of its state railways and its state railways out of politics. In such a country, therefore, the dictum that under government ownership "Politics will corrupt the railroads and the railroads will corrupt politics" may not be true. In Prussia the suffrage is so regulated that the political influence of the different classes of the people is determined by their wealth and not by their numbers, and therefore the railway employees are almost entirely without political influence. It is in consequence of this

that the government is able to, and does, prohibit them from belonging to labor unions of any kind and subjects them to a strict military discipline. But what can be done in a country having such a government, and having a people willing to submit to such a government, as Prussia, is no criterion of what can be done in a country having such a people and such political institutions as you have in Canada and we have in the United States.

I am not sufficiently familiar with your affairs to know just to what extent politics pervades your government affairs and enterprises. I have, however, devoted much study to the results of your state railways, especially the Intercolonial, and I have talked a good deal about the management of these roads with citizens of your country, and I have gained a very strong impression that these railways at times have played some part in politics and that politics has played some part in their management. My familiarity with affairs in the United States is greater, and certainly there is no department or enterprise of the government of my own country in which politics does not play an important part. Therefore, to assume in the United States that under government ownership the railroads would not corrupt politics and that politics would not corrupt the railroads would be to disregard practically all past experience of the country.

One may sincerely and ardently believe that democracy is the best form of government to secure to the citizen the inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; one may have confidence that democracy can succeed in so regulating the relations between large business concerns and the public, as well as between individual and individual, as to protect the rights and further the interests of all; and yet be convinced that so far as democratic government has as yet developed in most parts of the world it is not a good form of government for managing commercial enterprises. A government to be successful in the management of large commercial enterprises must, to a very great extent, be organized and administered as successful private business concerns are organized and administered. The fundamental requisites of successful business management cannot be altered by the simple expedient of transferring concerns from private to public ownership. Whether a business is owned and managed by a corporation, or owned and managed by the public, the owners, in order that it may be run successfully, must choose and retain the managers solely because of their special fitness for their duties. Having done this, the owners must give

the managers wide discretion and authority, especially for dealing with the employees. The owners must interfere very little with what the managers do, and ordinarily must try to hold them responsible only for general results. A democratic government may successfully regulate private concerns that are thus organized, officered and managed; but few democracies have ever shown an effective disposition to have business concerns owned by themselves organized, officered and managed in this way; and until they do show such a disposition it is folly to expect them to manage railways and other great industrial enterprises efficiently and beneficiently.

(*November 6th, 1916.*)

The Economic Conference at Paris

By Sir George E. Foster, K.C.M.G., Ph.D., LL.D.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 6th November, Sir George E. Foster said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—In the first place, before beginning my talk, I wish to associate myself very strongly and emphatically with the sentiment expressed by your Chairman, (Mr. W. G. Watson). He put it in a way which appeals—that those who remain behind have something to do for those who have gone to the front; they have also something to do in the place of those who have gone. Some will never come back, but others will come back and will ask how we have "carried on" in their absence. These men will ask, if we are not able to engage in actual warfare, whether we have been sufficiently alive to the claims that peace times have upon us and have been keeping in order what they left, and putting it into the best shape to be available when they return. If the Chairman has no patent right on that expression of his thought, I shall proceed to emphasise it in other places.

Now I am afraid that after the illustrious gentlemen who have addressed you heretofore, and the great interest of the subjects on which they have spoken my task is of a rather drab and sober hue, for there will be nothing sensational and not very much that is sentimental in my remarks to-day. It seemed to me, however, that a commercial community, a business community, a reading community, might be interested in a sketch of the Allied Economic Conference which assembled in Paris in the second week of June, this year, not that I expect to add very much to your intrinsic knowledge, but rather to brush up by way of personal narrative, your memories of what no doubt you all read about at the time, and may be to enphasise a few facts as to its significance.

It was called the Economic Conference of the Allies and it was conditioned upon events and a history which runs far back. It is very seldom that any event of a broad nature,

*Sir George E. Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, stands in the first rank of Canadian orators. His address on "The Economic Conference in Paris" is a model of lucidity, picturesqueness and eloquence.

like that I am chronicling to-day, emerges, which has not its roots deep grafted in a time more or less removed from the date of its actual occurrence. And the man who tries to explain it by taking a restricted purview generally fails in his explanation; he must go far and dig down deeply if he will thoroughly understand the origin and meaning of a gathering like that at Paris.

I think no one, without such study, will properly understand this war, the reason why it is being waged, why it should not end until it has ended the evil it set itself against, and why we should be very careful about peace terms and the conclusions to be reached after the war. We must go back forty or fifty years to find the basic reason for the Economic Conference at Paris. I think, to understand the war, how and when it should end, and the conditions upon which it should end, we must go back and look upon this gigantic world contest as not simply being now waged on land and sea by force of arms, but as having for a long period of years been in process in a quieter way and along a different plane and we must agree upon two facts: That the contest is waged for the economic dominancy, first of Europe and afterwards of the world; and the other, that this idea of economic dominancy is now being pushed *vi et armis* to a more speedy and more effectual political hegemony.

A half century ago Prussia emerged through its policy of "Blood and Iron" to the headship of the German States. Aterwards to strengthen her position war was waged against Austria and against Denmark. Then in 1870 came the first great act in the play for supremacy in the war against France, with its rapid conclusion, its tremendous significance and its far-reaching effects. That was along the line of war by the force of arms on the theory of "Blood and Iron" applied first to the German States, later to various neighboring nations of Europe, and as it is now being sought to be applied to the world at large. But from 1872 and onward, there was carried on a unique campaign, a most ingenious and thoroughly systematised plan of procedure by the Germans, aiming at the economic and political dominancy of Europe, and afterwards of the world along the line of what we may call "peaceful penetration." It would take too long for me to attempt to set forth this afternoon the story of that most ingenious system of national education designed as a preliminary to saturate the German mind with the idea that the German was to be become the super-man, his nation the super-nation, his culture the regnant all prevailing world culture. To this end,

the home, the school, the college and university were to bend all their moulding, directive and teaching force, to this end the press, the magazine, the pulpit and the lecture halls were to focus all their persuasive powers, and the forces of legislation and administration were deployed from the limited sphere of the lowly peasant to the powerful circles of the high nobility and the Kaiser War Lord.

Coincident with and consequent upon this tireless pervasive education and preparation at home the nearer zones of the neighboring small states were invaded by the quiet methods of peaceful penetration. German travellers and tourists frequented railways and steamboats, filled hotels and watering-places; German clerks offered service free to business houses and banking firms, and possessed themselves of their secrets; German brokers and financiers formed partnerships and controlled ventures; German spies swarmed in public places and German diplomats besieged the courts. This invasion proceeded through Belgium and Holland and Switzerland, spread gradually along the Scandinavian front, fairly engulfed Italy and Western Russia, passed through the Balkans to Constantinople and beyond, set up headquarters in London and Paris, whence it radiated in all directions. It crossed the seas on palatial steamers and resumed its march in South America, planted its millions of trusty comrades in the United States and entrenched its forces in Australasia and Africa. Progress was rapid, success was striking, German wares and German representatives were everywhere, her treaties bound the weaker nations and her espionage encircled the world. She mapped out the countries to be ultimately conquered, tabulated their resources and photographed their defences. Her excellent system of scholastic and scientific training, its unrivalled chemical equipment and its perfect and meticulous organization, attracted students from all countries whom it sent back to their distant homes as preachers of the new German evangel of system, scientific knowledge and cool and calculated thoroughness. Had she restrained her over-vaulting ambitions for quick and spectacular conquest by force of arms, and pursued for another quarter of a century the victorious march of peaceful penetration, the world might have waked up too late to make successful resistance to her claims to universal headship.

The ultimatum of Wilhelm on August 2nd broke the spell, roused the fascinated bird to the peril of the forked tongue and superb ruffled scales, but it has taken two years of terrible war to fully reveal the menace and intent of the soft-paced, peace-beflagged world enemy.

It was on the revealed evidence of this long peaceful campaign for economic and political domination and a knowledge of the intent and purpose thereof that the Economic Conference was based.

If you read the preamble to the agreement reached by the Economic Conference you will find two statements made; first, the allegation made—and it is absolutely true—on the part of the Allies that theirs is not an offensive war but is a war of defence; that it was pressed upon the Allies and that the challenge had to be taken up and met, or the Allied Powers must submit to an intolerable German dominancy; the second, that along with the challenge to arms now being fought on land and sea, there was also a challenge to economic war and dominancy as well; and the object of the Economic Conference was to prepare in peaceful times to defend the Allies against unfair economic conquest by the Teutons, as by the union of the Allies on the fields of war on sea and on land, they are now protecting themselves from political conquest. The two sides of the world-wide warfare were both of them in mind—the one met by alliance of arms, the other to be met by alliance of economic resources.

So the Allies' Conference in Paris was brought about and there, during the second week of June, it met. I attended that Economic Conference as one of the four representatives of the British Government. It was, as I said before, a gathering unique in the history of the world, an occurrence which three years ago would have been supposed impossible in Europe or in the world. It was a meeting of eight great nations of the world, eight nations whose populations, outside of India and the dependencies of the British Empire, amounted in all to about 318,000,000 people; or, if you take in the dependencies and trusts of the British Empire and the Overseas Dominions, they comprise pretty nearly half the population of the world. That great combination of human units, that equally imposing array of nationalities, met, conferred and came to their conclusions at that Conference.

Let me try, if I can, to give you just one breath of the atmosphere that pervaded it. Those eight Allied Nations had been in the death grapple of arms for more than two years already; they had from a congeries of separated nations, through common ideals, common purposes and motives, so overcome their divergencies of geography, of administration, of race, and of political methods, that at the time this Conference met, those eight different nations had become so closely united that they moved on the thousands of miles of con-

tested fronts as though one people and under one strategic management.

For nearly two years this gigantic struggle had been proceeding and at the time the Conference met, there was a strained tenseness in the atmosphere, greater perhaps than at any other time during the war. France and her legions were holding the great part of the long lines in France and Flanders, and it was then the fifth month of that unprecedented heroic, successful, defence of the approach to Verdun. For five terrible months, an enemy, perfectly equipped, ruthless in all its methods, determined to the point of absolute death in gaining its objective, had been battering this line of French defences. At that particular time, though Hope always whispered encouragement, there was the tensest kind of feeling, there was deep down the growing apprehension that some time, by some unhappy fortune, human endurance might reach its limit, those defences might crumple, and France might lie at the mercy of its enemy.

Up to that time Great Britain had done little more in France than to throw in her small heroic band of 125,000 perfectly trained soldiers, who performed their saving work on the Marne and at Ypres, and held the lines in Flanders, but not yet had the great British power been able to exercise its full strength or to make the force of its growing armies felt. Up to that time Britain had been preparing in her busy workshops and on her tented fields, an army which some place, somewhere, sometime, would take its full part on equal terms against the common foe and relieve its gallant Ally. But up to that time the big battalions had not crossed, the Big Push had not commenced, and the worn and weary veterans of France were bearing the brunt of the attack at Verdun and elsewhere. A little before, a great disaster had robbed the Empire of its greatest war figure —the Imperial Kitchener—and even yet the despondent shadows of Gallipoli and the Tigris hung upon the Eastern horizon. The conditions combined to create an atmosphere of intense feeling, and as we sat and worked around the tables in that Conference in Paris the air was vibrant with expectancy and thrilling interest.

Under these circumstances picture to yourselves the great hall of the Foreign Ministry in which were gathered the representatives of half the world. At the head of the table sat the representatives of France, at the right were those of battered Belgium, of Great Britain and of Italy; on the left side, the one and sole representative of conquered Serbia,

and the representatives in order of Russia, Portugal and Japan. Figure this historic scene to yourselves, give wings to your imagination for a moment and sweep in swift course the centuries of time. There sat Japan, with traditions and history reaching away back into the dim mists of thousands of years, Japan, the old realm of the Shoguns, transformed into a modern power, moving side by side in impulse and alliance with the great nations of the West. Russia, an empire of one hundred and seventy-five million people, inhabiting one-seventh of the world's territory, with races and creeds innumerable, and ideals different in many respects—there sat Russian representatives, voicing all Russia was in the past, all she was fighting for in the present and all she hoped to be in the future. As your eye takes the picture and your imagination is given free rein, you trace the evolution, behold the struggles, catch the spirit and hear the aspirations of these attendant nations. There was one lone Serbian, representative of a people now without a country. There were the Belgians, exiles from a home now overrun and in the grasp of a brutal conqueror. There sat the French, one-tenth of whose country was under the heel of the enemy, and the other nine-tenths threatened and menaced by a resourceful, cruel and relentless foe. You can imagine what feeling thrilled us as we of the young Dominions sat there—myself from Canada and Mr. Hughes from Australia, as members of the British delegation—as we looked into the faces of those old civilizations and let our minds run back far into the centuries of the past and follow rapidly on up to the present, and then try to fathom the spirit, the impulse, the ideals of those oldtime worldwide nations, and what would come out of the Economic Conference.

I confess, as I looked upon that Conference, it seemed that with all the diversities of interests, the multiplicity of motives, the differences of policy and administrations, it would be impossible that we should come anywhere near to agreement upon any principles of economic and commercial action with reference to enemy powers.

The first two days of that week were spent by those delegates in calling upon and becoming acquainted with each other, because you must remember that most of these delegates had never seen each other before. It was a wise management that devoted the two full first days of the week to this social intermingling and to interchange of views as to subjects of discussion and conference. Then followed the four days of active and official sessions.

Now, I must hurry along and just give you brief glimpses. One of the factors that contributed as much as anything else to the success of the Conference was its Chairmanship, which was provided by the French Government and was entrusted to M. Clementel, Minister of Commerce, a polished gentleman—that goes without saying—a man of great tact, with steady nerve and strength of will. He had intimate knowledge of all delegations, and it was due to his wise and courteous management of the Conference, as much as to anything else, that the conclusions were reached and results obtained which will afterwards become apparent. Much in a Conference of that kind depends upon the man who guides and tempers the course of discussion, and in that respect the Conference was fortunate in the choice of M. Clementel.

Four days were devoted to the discussion of the different propositions placed before the Conference. Some time in and between was given to committee work amongst the delegates themselves and to conference amongst the representatives of the different delegations, in order to compose differences of opinion and of varying views which occasionally arose. But in the end they were straightened out and the Conference was united. So it came about that all the conclusions reached—and they were wide and all-embracing—were absolutely unanimous conclusions. That was a great thing. One reason why those conclusions became unanimous was because the spirit of unity developed in the long contest in the field inspired the Peace Conference. The delegates, all through those days in Paris, felt that if unity was necessary in the field of battle, unity was also necessary in the economic and commercial field; that if they had to give and take in order to bring about unity in the field of battle, so also they must give and take in the economic and commercial field. And so, as this spirit of unity prevailed, the conclusions were absolutely unanimous and represented the views of all.

What are those conclusions? They divided themselves into three categories.

First, what should be the action of the Allies while the war was on? It was comparatively easy to come to conclusions in that respect, because the war had been on for two years and the path had already been well laid out and well trodden. The object was mainly to secure a greater uniformity and unanimity in practising by all the Allies continuously what had been practiced wholly by Britain and France and in part by other Allies before the Economic Conference was convened. Briefly, it was agreed that while the war was on, and until it was

finished, there should be entire prohibition of all trade exchanges and business transactions between the subjects and residents of any of the Allied Powers with enemy subjects, whether direct or indirect, through their own or other countries. It included also the cancellation of contracts for trade transactions already made. It meant the control and sequestration of enemy businesses being operated in Allied Countries under the auspices or management or control of enemy subjects. And it meant also that the Allied Powers should not allows munitions of war or supplies tending to support the war to get into Germany or Austria or other enemy nations by the sea ports or by transit through neutral countries.

This latter presented a problem of great difficulty and complexity—to determine how much trade should be participated in by contiguous neutrals like Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, and for a time by Italy and some of the Balkan States. These countries, like huge sponges, absorbed on both sides and emitted both ways, and it was a question of very great delicacy and complexity how Great Britain and the Allies could act so that these countries should get everything that was necessary for themselves, and that they had been accustomed to import for themselves, and should not get for Germany what she desired, or become purveyors of German goods to outside countries. That question was a most perplexing one and was managed with great tact and fairness by Great Britain and the Allies, not of course without giving some offence to neutrals, though in the main the rights of neutrals have been studied in every possible way and their predilections respected wherever possible, considering the absolute necessity of defending the life blood of Great Britain and the Allies from the assaults everywhere made upon them.

The second category referred to the course of action that should be taken by the Allied nations after the war ceases, and the negotiations for peace begin—during what is usually called the reconstruction period. For that period the conclusions of the Conference were along these lines. It was agreed that the war had broken into shreds the treaties and conventions with most favored nation clauses under which Germany had exploited the bordering countries in such a way as to strengthen her commercial and economic position and weaken the economic and commercial position of those nations. These are all waste paper now, and the conclusion of the Allied Conference was that they should remain so during the period of reconstruction; that as they have been abolished

by the war, they shall not be renewed during the period of reconstruction by granting any like privileges or like concessions to enemy countries. That leaves the Allied powers a perfectly free hand to make such arrangements as they please among themselves, without having to give to the central or enemy nations equal privileges. It allows them to give such privileges as they desire to neutral nations without granting the same to enemy nations; it leaves them free to make any economic, commercial, financial or transport arrangements with each other, which may promote Allied relations and protect Allied interests from the aggression of central or enemy powers.

As to the duration of the period of reconstruction, no stated limit was fixed. The period is to be determined by the Allies themselves and the time to be fixed by the necessities of the case; it may be one year, or it may be two years, but during that period no such concessions or privileges or anything like them shall be granted to enemy nations.

Likewise during that period of reconstruction, whether long or short, the Allies agree to co-operate with each other in every possible way in conserving and mutually using the important basic resources of each country, first for that country itself and then for its Allies, and shall prevent the products of enemy countries from being dumped into Allied countries. It would, indeed, be most unfair to allow that. Belgium, for instance, is not only conquered, but it has been absolutely looted, its fields wasted and its homes destroyed, its factories, its machinery for manufacturing, its raw materials, everything that could be possibly laid hands on by the Hun has been either dismantled and carried away or, if not, has been operated for the benefit of the Huns themselves, and now they are deporting the workmen as well. After the war is over—for I am venturing a prediction that as the Hun is driven back league by league he will leave behind him little of economic value—what has not been looted or carried away will be destroyed by fire or sword. Then you will have a country of seven million people, once happy, thriving and prosperous, absolutely forced to commence anew and rebuild its homes, its factories, its industries—everything. During that period of reconstruction it shall not be competent for the central powers to set their factories in motion, their industries at work, and overflood and supply the country they have devastated. Therefore for the defence of the Allied countries in their wasted and devastated places, this prohibition of enemy goods shall be operative during the period of reconstruction.

During the period of reconstruction also, whatever can be

done by the Allies themselves to provide compensatory markets for the exchange of commercial, agricultural and industrial products, or to give financial help and to aid each other in the reconstruction of the Allied countries immediately desecrated and devastated by the war, will be done. That is, there will be mutual co-operation, mutual advantages, mutual economic, commercial and industrial exchanges, a systemisation and mobilisation of common resources for the building up of their countries. The first call for all these things will be for the Allies, themselves, the second for the neutrals, but for the enemy there will be no call.

The third category includes the policy and action of the Allied countries after reconstruction has been accomplished in whole or in part, that is as to permanent relations. Equal agreement on that was reached as upon the other two lines which I have briefly designated, and the conclusions come to were these.

It shall be the aim of the Allies to have—and they agree that they shall have—respect to each other's economic situation and each other's materials of prime and basic value, to the industrial products which are key products and which are of immense importance to the country itself, that all these shall be developed in a spirit of co-operation and good-will with a view towards best developing the resources and building up the Allied countries to the point of complete independence of the central and enemy powers, and the thorough up-building and advancement of the Allied nations themselves in their maritime, their agricultural, their commercial and industrial interests. That is, in brief phrase, that most favored treatment in good-will and co-operation shall be the rule of the Allies with reference to each other in their permanent policy, and whatever is necessary to be done, whether it shall be done by government enterprise, or by corporate enterprise, helped by governments, or by restrictive tariffs, keyed up to the point of efficiency, these measures will be adopted, and when adopted, will be enforced to attain that full efficiency. All shall agree upon these principles in order to secure results and there shall be a uniform, constant, and honorable use of these different means, one or all or any of them, as may be best suited for the purpose.

These are the three lines, briefly and inadequately stated, along which the Conference proceeded and with reference to which unanimous agreement was reached in those four days of negotiation and consideration by the delegates with each other.

Anyone can see what that all means. Something new has come to the world through this war,—an aggregation of a majority of the most powerful nations of the world, widely separated from each other in the ways I have mentioned, who have by blood contact on the field of battle baptised their ideals and consecrated their oneness of purpose. Growing out of this, coincident with and consequent upon it, there succeeds a wider human sympathy and a more brotherly co-operation in realising these ideals in the future, so they shall become strong and powerful. And, if this union continues, as I believe it will, it will make of these nations a unity of powers that shall absolutely prohibit the possibility of any such war as has been lately thrust upon the world.

A good deal has been said these days about what neutral powers may do after this war ceases in order to bring about terms of peace, and what may be their influence. No one recognises more heartily than I do the influence and importance of the neutral powers, particularly that to the south of us, which has so much in common with us in blood, in language, in traditions, and I believe now in real sentiment. But outside and beyond that, there is now guaranteed what is a fundamental factor, in that union of widely distributed powers which have already now for nearly three years fought side by side along the lines of defence on the ensanguined field, which have made costly sacrifices and braved every risk for common ideals, and which are now united along the lines of co-operation in economic, industrial and commercial upbuilding and progress. There, it seems to me, you have the league of nations, the combination that will link the world to peace, and which, with the hearty co-operation of progressive neutral powers, will make it impossible in the future that any Kaiser, or any aggregation of Kaisers, shall be able to throw the whole world into a hell of war, which the world did not want, which the world hates, and from the thraldom of which this world pines for relief and freedom. And I believe the world has made up its mind that it is possible to police the robber nations and that hereafter they shall be policed.

Now, I have kept you quite long enough. One word in conclusion. All this has some lesson for us, as Canadians, and members of the Imperial Commonwealth. The Economic Conference had nothing to do with the home affairs, or the status or constituent parts of each Allied nation, or as to what shall be done in meeting and solving the problems of the British Empire or the French Republic or the other countries that met for conference. But arising out of these conditions there comes to us a clamant note, an impelling

call, that the British Empire shall get together, shall reconstruct herself, so that acting as a whole, within the great community of nations, she shall within her own borders so mobilise, so systematise, so develop her resources and realise her ideals that she shall be better able to fulfill her own great destiny and to work more effectually with the great nations who, with her, are struggling to win this great world war. With the means by which this is to be brought about I will not deal this afternoon, but we all should be thinking about it. Every man and woman in the British Empire should be pondering and thinking, thinking and pondering over it. Britain knows well and we know well that on the long-drawn battle lines throughout the world, her efficiency and force have been infinitely greater because the Empire has been mobilised and acts with unity of purpose for the work of the war. And if for the work of war it has proved of such advantage to draw itself together, to act by common impulse, and along common lines to defend the Empire and guarantee its security, how much more can the Empire, and how much more is it the duty of the Empire, to so knit itself together, by co-operation and combination, by mutual self-help and development, that it may be equally as powerful in advancing the arts of peace, in giving impulse to the works of peace, in bringing about the rich results of peace, after the troubled years of blood and death have ended and we tread again the paths untroubled by war's alarms. For the works of peace are mightier far than the works of war. We have learned from the war that we are mightily more powerful when we act together than when we act apart. Let us learn the lesson that has been written on our hearts in the red rich blood of our nerves and let us whole heartedly and with all our might apply it to the arts of peace.

(November 13th, 1916.)

Public Ownership of Railways Up to Date

By Mr. W. F. Maclean, M.P.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club held on the 13th November, Mr. Maclean said:

Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—I am here to-day to say a word for the public ownership of the great public services more or less joined up with railways: travel, freight, express, postoffice, telegraph, telephone, wireless, public communication of any kind, whether by land, by water, by current or wave, above or below. The French try to make the word "communications" include the idea; "transmissions" is another embracing word; perhaps "carrying" is our simplest, and our everyday term, "common carrier," is the most in use, and takes in most. Railways and ships "carry"; telephones, telegraphs, waves of all kinds "carry"; things and forces "carry" for the many, whether by land, by water, by air, by light and the like. Whatever "carries" for the many, serves the many, ought to be owned and handled by the many, or the public. Public ownership of railways means for me public ownership of the common carriers in the wide sense above set out. By public ownership I mean the ownership of all those common carriers, whether they be telephones, telegraphs, railways, aerial waves, or anything of that kind, and I include under public services anything that should be publicly owned.

One of the ends of government ought to be to enlarge the number, to widen the use, to cheapen the cost, of the common every-day services, the every-day needs, the every-day conveniences and comforts of life. This can best be done in most cases by public ownership or by public distribution, or by public regulation. Now this is my point: these great public conveniences of life, in which all are concerned, and especially those ones which we call public carriers, should be owned and controlled by the people, and not by private corporations.

*Mr. W. F. Maclean, M.P., has for years been the leading exponent in Canada of public ownership of railways and other services. Both in Parliament and through his newspaper, *The World*, he has advanced the policy which is here developed.

The welfare of the many is more than the wealth of the few. In other words, I take my departure from many political economists heretofore who have relied on statistics that show wealth. Welfare is greater than wealth, and the welfare of the community is the object of government, and therefore public services should be under public ownership and public control.

Public ownership seeks only the welfare of the many, private ownership strives for the wealth of the few mainly, and that at the cost of the many. We have worshipped wealth rather than welfare.

Public ownership: how many of the people can be served at the lowest cost; private ownership: how few can be served with the greatest profit to those who may hold a franchise therefor, or a control thereof. All this means that under private ownership they are looking for profit, and they are not looking—they don't regard it as their duty—to give service; and yet they like to give service. I know Lord Shaughnessy and Sir William Mackenzie and they are just as fit to shine in this new day in giving public service as they are in seeking to make money in their "cribb'd, cabin'd and confin'd" position at present, trying to get profit for their shareholders; and that is the difference between the two propositions. One seeks to give service to the people; one to make profits for a few private owners. Service and profit make in most cases an ill-matched team. If you try to put these two together—welfare for the many, profit for the few—the team won't work together. But you can get service and you can get profit, and sometimes they may go together, but I have hardly ever seen them do so; they diverge.

Welfare of the many is everything; wealth of the few may be a menace.

Statistics that show welfare mean much; figures that show wealth accumulated by a few at the cost of the many may sum up unmeasured misery to men and women untold. There have been men going around the world now for years, especially in the last seventy years, who have measured up human progress by statistics as to wealth; where is the man showing statistics as to the welfare of the people? And yet that is everything, and until you come to statistics that show the welfare of the many rather than statistics showing the profit for the few, I can't accept the proposition you present.

The New Day will be more and more for service, less and less for profit. For welfare rather than wealth, for service rather than profit.

This life at best is an everlasting struggle for the many; State ownership seeks to lighten the struggle by public service whenever it may be worked out.

Life is more than property; welfare more than wealth; democracy more than the rule of the few; common comfort more than accumulated reserve in the hands of the few.

So much for your standing ground, or, as our sophists might say, for the philosophy of it. Now, let us come to the application of it in certain well known services in the way of the trade and the talk of the nation; let us deal with what we make and seek to sell; with what we need and wish to buy; with trade and communication, with talk and travel, all of which services have to do with our common carriers, and, for this discussion, our railways.

Public ownership gives you co-operation in its widest and best meaning. The railways when public-owned fit in with one another, can be made to fit in with one another, work together. The one organization can run them all—railways, telegraph, telephones, express, postoffice, etc.—all common carriers. You can put them all under that one service, "common carriers," and you will get better service, more articulated, more improvements, and you can put them all under one management, and I contend better management at that.

Public ownership does away with all unnecessary duplication of lines, with unnecessary competition. Look at the passenger and freight and express services, say, between Montreal and Toronto, carried on by three or four lines, where co-ordination and co-operation by one would give a better and cheaper service. Did you ever see that service? Now, I go week after week between Hamilton and Toronto, and I see all these passenger and freight services, this unnecessary duplication, and unecessary switching, to bring that traffic into Toronto. Public ownership would co-ordinate the lines, and would give better administration, better service, and cheaper service. And I don't know that you will get this tangle straightened out until this city of Toronto takes hold from the point of view of service to the people and not profits to shareholders.

Public ownership makes railway service and water service complementary one of the other. Where the service is cheaper by water than by rail use it, and give it by the one organization. Water and rail make a well-matched team. The private-owned railways are always hocking the other horse. Our railways have blocked our canal development, our railways have tried to put navigation out of business; failing that,

have sought to get control of it. There are miles of docks in America that the railways have got hold of in order to let them go to rot. The United States has had to pass a law to compel the railways to go out of water transportation because of the blight they put upon it. I have heard a Minister of Railways confess that the railways palsied or tried to palsy his arm in the building of our public canals; so with river and harbor improvements. Toronto by its Harbor Commission is at last breaking these bonds to-day.

The railways in this country—I charge them with it, and the proof you all know,—have combined among themselves to kill and destroy water competition. Never has there been a harbor or canal development proposition without the railways having their representatives at Ottawa, trying to paralyze the hand of the Government, because it might be in the interest of the people to improve their water transportation.

Public ownernship makes all terminals, sidings, wharves, approaches, for the use of all, not for limited monopolies. The Grand Trunk owns the sidings at the front of Toronto: the Canadian Pacific those uptown. The Canadian Pacific largely owns the harbor of Vancouver. These things make them masters. Public ownership will end all these abuses.

Public ownership gives equality of treatment to all shippers in the use of all services. No discrimination to the big shipper over his smaller rival; the big miller over the small one. Equality to all towns and districts with preference to none. The Grand Trunk gives a suburban service with commutation tickets to Montreal, and almost denies the like treatment to Toronto. A railway or a ring of private railways have it in their power to blight a community. There are a lot of instances of that all over America, where a railway has had it in its power to blight a community, to blight even a province, and to hold back great interests in which the people are concerned. But public ownership will never be used against a community, against a locality or a great geographic section of the country.

Public ownership can raise the capital for public service at less cost than can private companies. Capital in public service is never in default in its interest, nor are its shareholders plundered by private exploiters like in so many cases in the States. Mr. Dunn didn't tell us, when he spoke of what the railways had accomplished in the United States—about the over-exploitation of European people who put capital into the United States. Public ownership has never cheated capital out of its investment.

Public-owned railways are consecrated to giving public service at the lowest cost; private-owned railways seek to make profits for the shareholders or owners at the expense of the public. One is for the most service to the public; the other for the most profits to the owners.

Public ownership would give Toronto terminals, sidings and street crossings the best possible. Public ownership would let all the railways leave Toronto to the east by a four-track line on a half of one per cent. grade; the three go out now on a one per cent. grade at three different places. The half per cent. grade can be got and might cost a little more, but once got it would quicken the service, reduce the cost, improve the whole layout of the city.

Public ownership of terminals and sidings should fit in with all harbor improvements and industrial layouts, not antagonize one another.

Public ownership of railways and telegraphs, telephones and express, post office and radials, would make a public centre in every village and town. These would have their headquarters in one fireproof building that was open for public service every hour in the day; instead of as now being out of commission, many of them, more than half the time. You go into many of these villages and towns where so much money has been spent on railways, telegraphs, and other services, and do they serve the people? In the smaller villages of Canada what is the situation? For one public building that is open all the time, how many you find that are not? But if you had one building for the railways, express, post office, and money orders, that would regenerate more than anything else the whole of this country. Canada is a hard country to live in, the struggle to live is more than usually severe. Regeneration lies in the creation of a civic centre in each little community, by a combination of these things which should be under one head in one building, and by the improving of communications by a centre of communication in that district. This would do more toward building up this Province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada than anything else I know. And you will never get this improvement in connection with these services unless by public ownership.

Lastly, where you have public ownership you have absolute freedom to do whatever you like, whenever you like, with what is your own; once you part with a public franchise you have lost your freedom. A nation that is free can take up any and every improvement that comes along; private ownership tries to oppose all advance.

A private-owned monopoly becomes, in nearly every case, a public enemy. The private railways fight our post office in parcel post and cheap express service just as the private-owned banking institutions of Canada fight the postal money order, and the rate of interest in deposits paid by the postal savings banks. Why should a nation create unfair dictation within its own border?

This great war has brought into the forefront the idea of public service before anything else. A State must own its railways for purposes of national defence, if for that alone. Had it not been for our State-owned railway, the Intercolonial, we could not have sent a man to the front, except in summer, from Montreal and Quebec. Canada, to-day, has no absolute control of her three private-owned railways. The control may be in the States; that of the C.P.R., was at one time in Germany. We must own them ourselves. Bonds issued to build State railways may be held out of the country; stock that controls them should never be allowed to go out of the country. Lord Shaughnessy is bound to think more of his shareholders' interests, no matter where they live, than of the Canadians who are served by that road. Germany controls our nickel mines, and she could buy up our railways to-morrow by way of agents in the United States.

Now I want to tell you Canadians, these railways which you have built with your own money, which gridiron the country, the control of them could be in a foreign country;—the control was, I believe, at one time in Germany. And no country can afford in this war time to allow its railways to be controlled outside its own country, and outside the whole Empire, when its future might be menaced.

When I speak about the national reason for public ownership, let me say that Boston telegraph and telephone interests control the cable, telegraph and telephones that serve Canada. The Empire must own the cables. Our great Canadian Pacific has its closest allies in Wall Street, not in Canada. A State that owns its railways can assist therewith in promoting foreign trade; in giving the best freight charges on her exports, and on her raw products from other countries needed for her manufactures. Germany uses this to the great advance of her wealth and interest. National railways have made Germany able to defy the world.

Our National Policy was good, so we are told, for our national industries. Germany has used her State roads for the development of her manufactures, for getting cheap rates on the export of products, and cheap freights on raw products

brought in to aid Germany by her railway policy before the war, and by her industrial development. We talk about our industries and trade, but Germany is far ahead of us because she has gone into it in a systematic business-like way and used it for the advance and the upbuilding of her industry.

And now let me apply what I have said to the situation at home, and make myself up-to-date in regard to public ownership of railways in Canada.

I would take over all the railways in Canada by the State, and thereby follow the example of most of the countries of the world. Great Britain will never let her railways pass into private hands again. She will never let the King's Highway pass into private hands. Now the railways, to my mind, and to the minds of those who are studying this question, are nothing but the King's Highway. Even in the old days the King's Highway was the property of the people; surely it is in this modern day, for the people to go up and down on it and get all possible out of it.

Our friend who spoke here a couple of weeks ago just touched on this aspect of the subject. Those ancient rights are something above this interest of money, and statistics of development that is supposed to come with it. We have let the King's Highway pass from us. On that ground a leading man should be able to stand up in any community and say he is in favor of public ownership of railways, if he has seen the King's Highway in the past and in the present, owned and controlled by the people.

I would take over all the railways in Canada by the State, and thereby follow the example set by most of the countries of the world. Most of all I would follow the example of our sister Dominions, Australia and New Zealand, where they have always had State ownership of railways. As a war measure we should long ago have followed the example of Great Britain and taken over the railways in this country as she took them over. The clear-cut position taken by the Australians in the war was made easier for them by their advanced legislation in the past, especially in regard to railways, and they dealt with the metal question in a settled and striking way because they had already learned the art of putting the public interest before everything else. Great Britain will never let her railways pass into private hands again, and it was the mistakes of Great Britain at the beginning of the railway building that led to the United States and Canada following a bad example. Great Britain let, and we let, the "King's Highway" pass into private hands. So the States.

I would take over the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern, all at once, and link them all up with the Intercolonial. If I had to take any one first before the others I would take the Canadian Pacific. We could afford to guarantee all the commitments of the Canadian Pacific and pay the shareholders 8 per cent. on their shares, provided we got all the assets; and the organization of the Canadian Pacific, linked up with the Government railway staff, would be competent to administer the consolidation.

Next I would take over the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern, assume the liabilities, and pay the shareholders some reasonable compensation for a transfer of their holdings. I have very little sympathy with the proposal that the Grand Trunk or Canadian Northern should be put through the hands of a receiver. A way can be found to take them over on terms fair to all. The Canadian Northern, notwithstanding all that has been said about it, in many respects has the greatest potentialities of any road in Canada, and those who have made it are worthy of a reasonable compensation for their services, and for the surrender of their prospects. The Grand Trunk is the best road we have in Eastern Canada, and could be taken over by some reasonable compensation to the shareholders who now get little or nothing.

But take them over I would forthwith, and consolidate them all into one system, under one administration, absolutely removed from politics, and put them in charge of a commission of one or three men of the highest ability, and free of all interference. It would be their duty to consolidate and coordinate all the present systems; to cut out unnecessary and duplicate lines and services, to use the unnecessary rails and equipment for portions of Canada now without railroads and in need of them; to save unnecessary expense, to unify the whole, and to make the united railway system of the country complementary of the water transportation of the country, even to the extent of taking over the ocean steamship lines that the railways may now own. You can't settle the transportation problem by railway unless you also settle it by water, and there must be the one owner of both means to that end.

Now anyone who has listened to the discussions and complaints of the farmers of the West knows that they complained in regard to the small share they had out of the bushel of wheat, and the large amount for ocean transportation which the railways got out of it, and every concession the railways gave by reason of pressure was immediately grabbed by ocean

transportation. You can never solve this question until you settle the question of water transportation along with that of railways. They talk about my proposal sometimes as half-baked, that I am talking about something where we have no jurisdiction, that we haven't any jurisdiction over ocean lines. I wish I had a say—I would soon find a way, to bring them under supervision and compel them to give reasonable rates for their service. Sir George Foster is going around the Empire to see if there is a way to bring these ocean lines under the jurisdiction of the various parliaments. But there is a way if we have the disposition to do it, and you begin by associating railway and water transportation; this must be by public ownership. That way is there, and you can apply it.

And even before I did this from a Federal point of view, I would take over by the province and by the municipalities all the radials and street car lines in Ontario, link them all up more or less, and also take over the main water powers of the province, and use them, first of all, for the local railways and industries, and next for eventually supplying the motive power for the Federal railway system.

I would not allow a single water power in any part of the Dominion to be hereafter alienated to a private company if it were needed for the railway services of Canada.

We have not coal, but we have the greatest store of water power in any country, sufficient to drive every railway and every mill, and to give cheaper industrial power and transportation than any other country, if we had these things for the people and had not alienated them to private owners.

There is the secret of railway transportation, not only public ownership of the railways, but also of the water powers, yet we are letting them pass away every day, and making a great fight to get them back. Let us, at least in this Province of Ontario, forbid forever any alienation of our water powers and keep them for the people. The hour I believe will come some day when economical electric energy will be used for heating our houses; but if we let it go into private hands we will have electric energy barons, as they have coal barons in the United States. Therefore, now is the time to deal with this thing. No matter that there may be some objections to it; the main course is on the lines I have taken.

Now I am going to delay you just a moment to refer to the excellent speech we heard two weeks ago, by Mr. Dunn, under your auspices. He said a great deal in favor of the private-owned system of the United States, and with all its faults

it has merits, as you all know. It has done a lot in the way of competition, but it has ruined an innumerable number of shareholders; it has made enormous waste in unnecessary duplication, in unnecessary overhead expenses that can be eliminated; and it stands adjudged in the awful discrimination it has exercised against individuals, against communities, against interests.

And Mr. Dunn gave his whole case away when he said they now had public regulation. But this public regulation was attained and secured by the people as against the railways, and forced out of them; Mr. Dunn now makes a virtue of what he not long ago regarded as a crime. There was not a railway in the United States that did not say public regulation was a crime. Now it is not fair of Mr. Dunn when he comes over and tells you of the great virtue in the railways of the United States that are under public regulation. But whoever justifies public regulation must be prepared to go the whole distance and justify public ownership. Public ownership is but the completion of public regulation and control.

And one thing said by him do I wish to discuss, and that is the introducing of politics and political corruption. I was sorry to hear him, an American, and therefore a republican of the United States, declare his lack of faith in the democracy of the United States. He was afraid of the people, most of all of the corrupt people! I take full responsibility when I say that the railways have been the greatest source of the widespread corruption that has prevailed in the United States. They are not able now to do so much in Congress, but they have demoralized nearly every legislature in the United States. The source of political corruption in nearly every case has been the man who found the money, and not the man who took it. And the railways are more or less blameworthy in this country. The Canadian people are not the source of corruption that prevails here, and once you remove the source of corruption the corruption itself must largely disappear.

I could talk for two hours on that one subject. But I never yet saw that the source of corruption in this country was in the people, it is in somebody who goes to the people like the devil went as a tempter to Adam and Eve. And now about Mr. Dunn—when he says he has no confidence in the American democracy, in the American people, and that public corruption would stalk through the land if there were public ownership of railways,—well, I don't quite agree with him!

Nor does it follow, as Mr. Dunn says, that politics must necessarily get into the administration of public-owned railways. They can be absolutely separated and kept as a business proposition, just as it has been done in Australia and New Zealand and in the countries of Europe. Give men like Lord Shaughnessy and his assistants, or men like Mr. Chamberlin of the Grand Trunk, Mr. Hanna of the Canadian Northern, or Mr. Gutelius of the Intercolonial, full control, and back them up with legislation taking our railways out of politics, and I have no fear of public ownership in this respect.

Now, gentlemen, in a word, this is my argument. There is no way of dealing with this problem of transportation, whether by land or by sea, on river or canal, except by taking jurisdiction over all, and changing the old phrase, "the King's Highway," into "the People's Highway," which the people shall own, use and control, to make life more livable for the people who have to live in this country.

(November 20th, 1916.)

Democracy and Social Efficiency

By Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 20th November, Mr. Abbott said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I greatly appreciate the honor of being asked to speak to you to-day. I especially appreciate it because it gives me the opportunity for the first time since the European War was declared to put my foot on the soil of a country which is taking an active part in this contest for human liberty.

You know the story of the Irishman in one of our western cities who, while walking along, came across a street fight, and with the good-natured, amiable belligerency of his race crowded his way in and said, "Is this a private fight, or can anyone get in?" Gentlemen! the fight that is going on across the Atlantic to-day is not a private fight of Great Britain or France or Belgium, it is a fight that every democracy that believes in liberty ought to get into, and I wish my country were in it! You see, I am not a neutral!

One of the noblest democrats of modern times, noble in character and recently ennobled by title, James Bryce, on one occasion, advising young public speakers, said, "Never read your manuscript unless you have something very important to say." Well, gentlemen, what I would say to-day is important to me whether it is to you or not, so I am going to read it.

My subject is "Democracy and Social Efficiency." It is always wise to begin a discussion with a definition of the subject or else the discussion is apt to end in bewilderment and confusion and nothing is accomplished.

The lexicographers tell us that the word "democracy" comes from the two Greek words "demos" and "kratein," meaning "rule of the people." But I prefer Abraham Lincoln's definition. He said that democracy is "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

*Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott is President of the Outlook Company, New York. His thoughtful address was received with more than ordinary pleasure because of the strong and consistent support given by Mr. Abbott to the allied cause.

Democracy does not mean well paved streets, fine public utilities, workmen's insurance, old age pensions, State-owned railways, splendid harbors and shipping, great universities, prosperous factories and well fed population, although many people confuse these agencies of human welfare with democracy and an efficient democracy ought to strive to possess them. But Germany has them and is not a democracy. The State of Illinois, when it gave to the country Abraham Lincoln, did not have them and it was a democracy. Democracy is a matter of spirit, not a product of material things. Democracy often makes mistakes, sometimes terrible mistakes, but the important thing is that it shall maintain the right of its citizens to exercise a free choice in government. For the right to think, the right to reason, the right to unsuppressed opinions, the right to choose his course of action are the conditions that distinguish the free man from the slave, the citizen of a true democracy from the citizen of an absolute autocracy.

But on the other hand democracy does not mean anarchy. To say that every man may do as he pleases and the devil take the hindermost is as far from true democracy as absolute despotism is. Anarchistic and irresponsible freedom is in fact a kind of absolute despotism in which each man tries to play the part of the despot. The true end of democracy is the welfare and development of each and all of the individuals of the group, or the community, or the State, or the Nation, to which the individual is related by his free choice. He must, therefore, submit himself to the rules or regulations which we call laws, framed by the community for its protection and benefit. In brief he must submit to constituted authority.

But, says the objector to democratic institutions, that is all the enlightened absolute monarch requires of his subjects. The German Kaiser simply demands that his subjects shall obey the laws he lays down for their benefit,—laws which have made Germany one of the most orderly, most efficient, most contented, most prosperous, and most powerful of modern nations. It might be said in response that, *because* of its Kaiser-made laws, Germany at the present moment is one of the most bloody, most tormented, most unhappy, most poverty stricken, and most unsuccessful nations of all history. But let that pass. Let us assume that up to the outbreak of the war Germany's extraordinary national growth, her splendid cities, her industrial prosperity, her learning, her science, her rapidly growing wealth, her various ingenious devices for

increasing the material welfare of her people, were due to the beneficent rule of the Kaiser. What I wish to point out is that all this is not democracy, but is directly antagonistic to democracy. The Kaiseristic principle is that the ruler who regulates the individual citizen exercises his authority by Divine Right and is responsible only to God. The democratic principle is that the individual chooses to obey a ruler whose authority is delegated to him by the people and who is responsible to the people. The question is not one of Republicanism versus Monarchy; it is a question of the source and responsibility of authority. Germany is an absolute Imperialism which professes an obedience to an imaginary God. England is a constitutional, that is to say a democratic, monarchy in which the King is an hereditary executive who puts into action the will of the people as expressed through their parliament. The British Prime Minister is responsible, not to King George, but to parliament and the people. The German Chancellor is responsible, not to the German people, not even to the Reichstag, but to the absolute German Emperor.

Two recent occurrences, one in your Empire and one in my Republic, have brought out in a most striking fashion the difference between democracy and absolutism. Your sister Colony of Australia has just voted against Imperial conscription. Now I am so bound up in passionate hopes for the success of the Allies that I deeply regret this. I think Australia has made a mistake. But even if it is a mistake I would far rather have Australia possess the democratic right to say wether her young men shall be drafted to this war or not than to have imposed upon her by an absolute despotism that kind of conscription which has sent free men from Belgium as slaves to work in the factories of Germany. What are Frenchmen and Englishmen, what are your Canadians, what are some of my own countrymen dying for at this moment in the trenches but to maintain on the face of the earth the freedom of choice which has just been exercised by the Australians, even in a matter of the life and death of their own Empire.

The other illustration is shown in my own country. We have just had an election for President. The candidate whom I wanted chosen has been rejected, and the candidate who I thought acted with selfish, timid, and comfort-loving neutrality in the face of one of the greatest international murders ever committed—the sinking of the *Lusitania*—has been re-elected. But, nevertheless, although my feelings are strong on this question, I thank Heaven that I live in a

democracy where sixteen millions of men, feeling deeply and even passionately on the subject, can choose their ruler peacefully at the ballot box instead of fighting with almost insane skill and with every savage contrivance known to science to impose the ruler they desire upon the rest of Europe, as the Germans are now doing.

However alluring may be the theoretical and spiritual definitions of democracy it must stand or fall by the way it works in practice. The most telling objection to it as a system of government is that it is not socially efficient. You have the story of the remark of the Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, in the middle of last century, when a Lincoln man was about to take his degree came and asked for advice as to what he should do when he went up to London, in the matter of allying himself with either party. It was just at the time when the Whig party was laying those foundations of democracy which have made Great Britain in our time so strong and great. He was given this answer by the Rector: "My advice to you, when you go up to London, is to vote with the Whigs, but dine with the Tories." I should be more discouraged by this objection than I am if it were not for France. France is a thorough-going democracy, so democratic in fact that not many years before the war Englishmen and Americans were often apt to think that France was going to be torn to pieces by the pulling and hauling in opposite directions of various democratic clans and factions of government. Yet to-day, a true democracy, France is proving herself to be more efficient, not merely in devoted and deathless patriotism, but in military skill and strategy and in industrial capacity than despotic Germany. If France can do this, cannot other democracies?

That reminds me of a story of Joffre, told some months ago —you may have read it. A correspondent asked him whether a French submarine would have sunk the *Lusitania,* supposing that France had been in the relation to Germany that Germany was to Great Britain. Joffre answered this way, disclosing the principle of democracy: "Our soldiers and sailors are human beings, and you cannot give inhuman orders to human beings."

I must here attempt another definition. I define Social Efficiency as that "quality which enables a group, a people, or a nation, acting in a united, co-operative, and persistent spirit, to accomplish with skill and success any work they undertake." Now, however anti-German we may be, if we are honest, we must admit that the German people have carried the idea

of social efficiency to a very high state of perfection. The German people have indeed been widely regarded as the greatest exemplars of social efficiency in modern history. Their cities are admittedly the best administered municipalities in the world. Their military establishment has proved itself the admiration of experts and the terror of combatants. Whatever may be the final outcome of the war the Teutonic peoples are to-day holding almost single-handed practically all the rest of Europe at bay.

But it is not only in military matters that German social efficiency has displayed itself. With practically only two harbors giving access to the Atlantic Ocean—Bremen and Hamburg, built on a couple of muddy rivers—the Germans had created previous to the war a merchant marine nearly equal to that of Great Britain and vastly superior to that of the United States. Industrial, commercial and financial statistics demonstrated the superiority of Germany in the production of agriculture staples, of ore, and of manufactured goods up to the outbreak of the war. Her giant strides in productive industry and commerce during the last quarter of a century are known to all the world.

What is the cause of this almost unparalleled advance? The cause, gentlemen, is social efficiency.

The German theory of democracy, for strange as it may seem they have a theory of democracy, is social; it asserts that the individual exists for the welfare of the State. *Deutschdand über Alles,*—The Fatherland before all things.

> "I verily believe," says Professor Kuno Francke of Harvard University, "that it is impossible for an American to understand the feelings which a loyal German subject, particularly of the conservative sort, entertains toward the State and its authority. That the State should be anything more than an institution for the protection and safeguarding of the happiness of individuals; that it might be considered as a spiritual, collective personality, leading a life of its own, beyond and above the life of individuals; that service for the State, therefore, or the position of a State official, should be considered as something essentially different from any other kind of useful employment—these are thoughts utterly foreign to the American mind, and very near and dear to the heart of a German."

The danger of the social theory of democracy thus alluringly described by Professor Kuno Francke—the theory that the State is the ultimate product and that the individual is merely

one of the component parts—merely like that insect or animalcula—I am not a zoologist and do not use the technical term—which builds the coral reef: the coral reef is the great thing, the creature that produces it dies,—the danger of this theory is that, when carried to its extreme, it gives us military despotism. It gives us, to use the recent and admirable phrase of an English critic, autocratic and compulsory organization instead of democratic and voluntary organization.

Over against the *social* theory of democracy, which is exemplified in an exaggerated form in Germany, stands the *individualistic* theory of democracy, which is exemplified in an exaggerated form in the United States. The American believes that the State exists simply for the welfare of the individual. The danger of this theory is that, when carried to an extreme, it leads to confusion, anarchy, lack of discipline, failure to co-operate and social inefficiency. Individually—and I am now speaking for my country, not Canada—we Americans are among the most efficient, or at least the most capable, beings on the face of the globe; socially we are very nearly the most inefficient. We have many great individual inventors, many great individual financiers, many great individual lawyers and judges; but we have more homicides and railway accidents per capita, less foreign trade per square mile of territory, and fewer bushels of wheat per acre than Germany. We make the greatest fire apparatus in the world and possess the greatest individual firemen and we burn up more millions of property in a year than any two other civilized nations combined!

The fact is—and I ask you gentlemen to note that I am speaking for my own country now—we Americans don't care to work together unless somebody answers the question, "What is there in it for me"; and we don't care to do what we are told unless it suits our particular interest and pleasure. And we can prove the justice of our attitude by logic. Thus:

> "A free-born American citizen is entitled to do what he chooses with the saliva he secretes; I am a free-born American citizen; therefore I shall spit where I please!" And our sanitary anti-spitting ordinance becomes, if not a dead letter, at least a very feeble letter!

Men and women daily take the ferry to cross the Hudson River, and they see before them on the ferry boats this notice in gilt letters: "Spitting on the floor of the cabin is prohibited. Life preservers may be found under the seats." Really,

gentlemen, that is indicative, unconsciously indicative, of the way we obey our municipal laws.

Or:

> "A free-born American citizen has the right to be sick if he wants to be; I am a free-born American citizen; therefore I defy you to enforce your school vaccination law." And typhoid is still a terrible American epidemic.

Or:

> "A free-born American citizen is the master of his own larynx, palate, tongue and lips; I am a free-born American citizen; therefore I shall harangue a crowd on any street corner or in any public park I choose, and to hell with the police!" Yet well-meaning sentimentalists are indignant when anarchist orators are thrown into jail.

Or:

> "A free-born American citizen is entitled to the earnings of his property; this railway is my property, therefore the public be damned!" And the old-fashioned railway manager used to assert that the Interstate Commission is meddlesome and un-American.

Perhaps you think my language is inelegant and my picture highly colored. Well, let me give you out of my own personal experience two instances which illustrate this tendency in American life to assert, sometimes with the aid of expletives, the authority of the individual or the faction as opposed to the community at large.

Two or three years ago, I happened one spring—and I may say that I don't know how much you gentlemen know about our local American politics, but I intend to be entirely free from partisan prejudice, so I will take one example from the Republican party and the other from the Democratic, while I myself am, or perhaps I should say was, a member of the Progressive party—to be driving along a section of so-called State road on the west bank of the Hudson River. It was one of two main thoroughfares between New York and Albany,—the richest metropolis in the western hemisphere and the capital of the Empire State. The road that spring had been practically impassable on account of either dishonest or inefficient construction. On this particular day a contractor, a good looking big fellow, with a gang of men and horses, was distributing little dabs of broken stone along the highway. I stopped and protested at this foolishness. "You're right," he said; "they have allowed only two hundred and fifty yards of stone between Newburgh and Vail's Gate

and two thousand yards are hardly enough. When I complained yesterday to Albany, a prominent Democratic official of the Highway Commission said to me over the long distance telephone: 'You damned Republicans built that road, now you damned Republicans can ride over it."

This unconscious lack of perception of the fact that the holes in the road jounced the Democrats just as much as the Republicans struck me as both a humorous and a melancholy illustration of the light hearted manner in which the American individualist is wont to ignore the general social welfare.

The second incident that comes to my mind is also connected with road building. A year or more ago in the vicinity of my home a dangerous grade crossing at the bottom of a steep and tortuous hill was abolished and a long, well designed embankment, viaduct and bridge were substituted. Each end of this viaduct was connected with a concrete or tar-finished State road. The viaduct, however, stood for more than a year with an uncompleted rough earth surface, which was washed by the rain almost to the danger point. By our State law such railway overhead crossings are constructed under the joint auspices of the State, the County and the railway. When the viaduct was completed these three authorities could not agree upon the surfacing; and the Republican county supervisors, in order to sustain their authority, carried the matter into the courts. It may be that justice was on their side, but in the meantime the community was suffering. I asked a Republican town official what we could do when the viaduct became impassable from gullies and washouts. "Why," said he, with easy good nature, "I suppose we shall have to drive around by Orr's Mills."

Think of what would happen if this kind of thing were done in Germany! Imagine the commander of the Tenth Army Corps coming to such a viaduct, finding is impassable for his artillery, inquiring of a town official what the trouble was and being told that the Herr Geheimrath Ober Bürgermeister and the Herr Geheimrath Eisenbahn Minister had quarrelled and could not agree how to finish the road, but that it really didn't matter as he could haul his big siege guns ten miles round by way of Mülhausen!

The individualist, separatist, particularist, idea of democracy displays itself not only in our villages and little municipalities but in our great political units. At a recent conference of Governors at Madison, Wisconsin, Governor Spry of Utah in an important speech on Conservation denounced Fed-

eral control of our natural resources. Federal control, he asserted, is inimical to the growth of Western communities because it discourages individual enterprise.

Of course!

The Kentucky moonshiner by the same token asserts that Federal control of whisky distilling is inimical to *his* community because it discourages individual enterprise!

We see the same error and the same danger in the political and industrial history of that product of American inventive genius, the Trusts. I am not afraid of the word Trust; what I am afraid of is the oligarchic or individualistic power of the bad trust. With all its faults,—and they have been numerous, serious and culpable,—I think the Standard Oil Company has performed a great service for mankind. When I was a boy and was sent to the corner grocery, in the village in which I lived, to buy kerosene oil, I had to be very careful to select the proper brand of oil so that the lamp on which I depended to get my lessons for the next day might not explode and burn the house down and me with it. Now, thanks to the Standard Oil Company, *any*body can go to *any* grocery, at *any* crossroads in *any* part of the country and ask for kerosene oil, knowing that he will be given a standard product at a standard price. This is the advantage of combination. This is the basic principle of social efficiency—to have and to live up to some common standards. The way to meet the evil of the great combinations or trusts is not to destroy them, but to regulate them.

No sensible man asks that the New York Central Railroad shall be broken up into its component parts. He does not want in travelling from New York to Chicago to change cars three or four times as he formerly did before the days of combination. He prefers with great good sense standard trains, standard gauge and standard time. Combination gives us standards. All that the individual can justly and reasonably ask is that he shall have some voice in the fixing of those standards; and this he has a right to demand.

What can be done in a democracy on the one hand to promote social efficiency without permitting it to take on the intolerable injustice of bureaucratic despotism, and on the other hand to protect individual rights without letting them degenerate into individual license or hoodlumism? This in the last analysis is the problem of the trusts, of the political bosses, of the conflict between Labor and Capital, of the establishment of a just proportion between private profit and social welfare. And if democracies do not solve this problem

and others on a basis of efficiency which is compatible with human liberty, democracy will fail, and we shall all go back to barbarism, gentlemen.

Now in answering this question as to what is necessary to promote social efficiency in a democracy. I shall consider the problem as it applies to the United States and I shall speak to you as though you were citizens of my own State of New York instead of citizens of the great democratic Dominion of Canada, for to a certain extent your problems and our problems are similar and you may, perhaps, obtain some light on your own problems from such suggestions as I may be able to give you about ours in the United States.

To promote democratic social efficiency we must first have *Authority*. This we have succeeded in establishing in the United States from the legal point of view. The Supreme Court of the United States is admired and justly admired as one of the greatest legal achievements of civilization in all history. The decisions of its majority are final. Five men are thus able to determine the policy of the United States with regard to any great social or political movement. If the democracy does not like their decisions it must wait until it has a chance to elect an executive who will appoint men to that Court who will interpret the policy in accordance with the wishes of the people, or it must go through a long process to change the Constitution. This has happened in our history more than once. Twenty-two years ago a majority of the people of the United States eagerly wanted an Income Tax. A bill was passed, proceedings were even begun to collect the tax, when five members of the Supreme Court, constituting a majority of that body, decided, after one of the judges had changed his vote, that the tax was unconstitutional. Our democracy submitted to this authority without a murmur, but proceeded by a process of education and publicity to induce the legislatures of more than thirty-six separate States to amend the Constitution. The Constitution was changed. About two years ago another Income Tax Law was passed, and after nearly a quarter of a century the people have obtained what they wanted. This is a long process to be sure, but it is a process which shows that democracy can and will submit to constituted authority, provided it creates that authority itself. We must extend this idea of authority from our legal structure to our executive and administrative system, and those who believe in democracy must never cease to preach the necessity of authority in government and its complete compatibility, if properly constituted, with true democracy.

Second, we must have a patient but persistent improvement

in the standards of *Popular Education*. We must cease to think that "book-learning" alone is education. We must cease to draw a distinction between cultural and vocational education. It is possible, although, perhaps, not easy to work out a system of democratic education which shall arouse the interest and enthusiasm of our boys and young men just as their baseball, football, rowing and other forms of athletics now interest them. This is a large question which would take an entire paper by itself, and I must content myself with saying to you that I think Education is the second factor in democratic efficiency.

The next factor I would name is *Agriculture*. Unfortunately in the United States agriculture has lagged behind manufacturing. Our life comes from the soil and our business prosperity also comes from the soil. If some omnipotent being with a gigantic machine were to cover to-morrow the surface of the United States from California to New York and from Maine to Texas with a coating of asphalt, in a few weeks every financial institution and factory in the United States would go into bankruptcy and we should be on the verge of starvation. But the entire surface of New York City is to-day covered with asphalt and the banks are more flourishing there than in any other part of the country. Why doesn't the asphalt kill the bank in one case as it does in the other? Because the bank depends upon the farm and if you destroy the soil of the farm the bank is gone, the college is gone, the hospital is gone, even my newspaper—worse than all—would be gone! Something must be done to promote intensive and scientific farming, to make the small farms pay better, to make them more attractive and comfortable for the growing generation, and to make the farmer's financial share in the products of his farm larger and more just.

The next factor—there are many factors—I shall mention is *Commercialism in Politics*. Usually this is condemned by reformers. I commend it and deem it a necessary factor in democratic efficiency. I believe that young men in a democracy should go into a political life to make their livelihood precisely as they go into banking, law, medicine, teaching, or the church. But they should also go into politics as they should into medicine, the law, or the church, in order to do their share for the public good and to be paid only what they deserve for that service. The man who goes into the law purely to make money we call a pettifogger, the man who goes into medicine purely to make money we call a quack, the man who goes into the pulpit merely for the salary we call a hypocrite, and the man who goes into politics solely for what

there is in it for his pocket we call a corruptionist. But, thank Heaven, all doctors are not quacks, all lawyers are not pettifoggers, and all clergymen are not hypocrites. Why, then, need we regard professional politicians as potential corruptionists? Why can we not have all our politically ambitious young men devote themselves to politics in the spirit in which Sir Edward Grey or Theodore Roosevelt have devoted themselves to politics? Politics should be a profession, a career, and our best men should choose it as a life work in the same proper commercial spirit that they exercise in choosing banking or a trade or a profession.

The next factor which naturally suggests itself is *Political Bureaucracy*. I stand here to defend political bureaucracy, —though reformers generally denounce it,—and here is a chance for another definition. You remember the story of the little girl who said that "Faith is believing things you *know* are not so." If we accept such a definition of faith as that, it is useless to discuss the great mysteries of life and death and the universe which, invisible and intangible, lie outside the domain of our physical senses. So if you define political bureaucracy as a group of men banded together to employ useless red tape for their own material advancement, like some of the Chinese bureaucrats, of course it has no place in a true democracy. But by political bureaucracy I mean a group of men educated and trained in administrative work. In private industry we follow the principle of bureaucracy. A man becomes a book-keeper in a small bank in a small town; is promoted to be a higher official of that bank; is called to a larger city to become the official of a bank there; and finally reaches the very top notch of the financial world because of his training and his administrative ability. This principle of promotion and advancement in a guild, or clan, or bureau, we should adapt to democratic government. I see no reason why a young man in the country town in which I live may not choose the postal service for his career; may not become the assistant to our village postmaster, then become the postmaster himself, then be called to the adjacent city of Newburgh and become the postmaster there, then through efficiency be called to an assistant position in the New York post office, then become the New York postmaster, and so finally, perhaps, Postmaster-General of the United States. That is what I mean by political bureaucracy, gentlemen, and we have to have that. This principle is followed in Germany. Mayors there are promoted from one city to another. But the old-fashioned Yankee democrat thinks this is bureaucracy. He prefers to turn out his post-

master every four years or his mayor every two years and put a new man in who knows nothing about the work: this is democracy. It isn't! it is only inefficiency.

The next factor of democratic efficiency I mention with some hesitation for I do not want to precipitate a riot in what has been so far—to me at least—a delightful occasion. Nevertheless I consider that one of the important factors in democratic social efficiency in *Woman Suffrage.* Now, I do not propose to discuss here women's rights. Personally I do not believe that woman has a divine right to vote any more than man has. The suffrage is conferred by the community as one of the agents of democratic welfare and the community has a right to lay down the conditions under which the suffrage shall be exercised. But it seems to me that for a democracy which professes a belief in the doctrine of universal suffrage, to exclude one half of the citizens of that democracy is inconsistent, irritating and, therefore, inefficient. Whether or not it will do any good to the State to have women vote is, perhaps, a debatable question. But I do not think it is a debatable question whether it will do the women any good to possess and exercise the right to vote. We men sometimes complain of the trivial things in which women interest themselves, of their devotion to the fashion magazines and the society columns of the newspapers. And yet by law we prevent them from taking an active interest in the most absorbing and profoundly important questions that concern mankind on this terrestrial globe,—the social and political questions of government. Has not the work of women in England and in Canada during this war proved that they are interested in such questions when given the chance, and that they are capable of handling them with wisdom, skill and efficiency? Have they not for this very reason become more interesting to themselves and to you men whose companions they were designed by nature to be? I have been converted to woman suffrage, as one factor in democratic efficiency, if for no other reason, because I believe that with the right to participate in the discussion and decision of questions of democratic government women become more intelligent and, therefore, more interesting human beings, and thus better mothers, wives, daughters and companions of men. For this reason I feel bound to name Woman Suffrage as one of the factors of democratic efficiency.

Because no democracy can long exist in which its citizens do not have the untramelled and free opportunity to express their choice regarding their representatives, rulers, or executives, and because this free choice can be thwarted by fear

of the powerful or suffer miscarriage through bribery and corruption, I regard the *Secret Ballot* and *Corrupt Practices Acts* as forming an important factor of democratic efficiency. In the United States, thanks to your sister colony of Australia, we now have the secret ballot. It is popularly called "The Australian Ballot." The voter, as you know, goes into a little booth and casts his ballot in secret and no other man, if he so chooses, may ever know for whom he voted or whether he even voted at all. When I cast my first vote for a President of the United States, for General Garfield in 1880, this secret ballot was not in existence. Hangers on or agents of each political party hawked the ballots of their party and handed them to you as you approached the ballot box. They were little tickets bound together by an elastic band and any one of the many party workers in the voting place could see exactly what sort of ballots the voter cast. Bribery and corruption were easy and rampant. On the whole in the United States to-day the humblest voter is perfectly free in casting his vote, but we need some improvement in our Corrupt Practices Acts to prevent some candidates from using the power of money in their nomination and election.

Finally it seems to me that an essential factor of democratic efficiency is what is popularly called *Preparedness*. While the chief function of a democracy is to promote the life, liberty and happiness of its own citizens within its own borders and without encroaching upon the rights of other peoples, there are also certain world duties which such a democracy must bear and perform. It must be prepared to play its part in protecting the life, liberty and happiness of other peoples less fortunate than its own. It must have ships and soldiers not merely for its own protection, but in order to be able to join with other democracies in maintaining the rights of man throughout the world. And so a nation may be truly a democracy and truly a military nation at the same time, like Switzerland or France. Militarism is a thing of the spirit, not a thing of powder and guns. There is not a man in this room who is not at heart a lover of peace, but I hope there is not a man in this room who would not, with a rage of blood in his heart, rush to give all the protection he could to a woman or a child trampled down by a band of savage ruffians. "Not a cent for tribute, but millions for defense!" is the inspiring watchward of protection for one's native land. To this motto for an efficient democracy I would add another: "Not one shot for conquest, a million broadsides for the violators and murderers of a sister democracy!"

(November 23rd, 1916.)

The Importance of Humor in Tragedy

By Sir Herbert Tree.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 23rd November, Sir Herbert Tree said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I feel greatly honored in having been invited to address an assembly of the Canadian Club. Your President has said that he hoped you would bear your burden with equanimity. I can only fervently second that resolution.

In proceeding to talk to you, and largely to read to you, about the Importance of Humor in Tragedy,—and in doing so the most facile orators occasionally have to refer to notes when they have not learned their impromptus by heart,—I am reminded of advancing age. There are three symptoms which remind one that one is reaching the years of—shall I say indiscretion?—when one should really settle down to a respectable life and accept the world as it is—a thing, alas! which I have never been quite able to accomplish. The three symptoms are these: the worst one of all is when people meeting you in the street say "How young you are keeping!" That is a danger symptom! Then there is another symptom, when publishers ask you to write your reminiscences;—I am bombarded with applications from publishers who are waiting for the words that shall drop from me before my demise. The third symptom is the use of glasses when one is not short-sighted—and that is one of the compensations of life for short-sighted people, that their vision gets normal as they grow older. I have been endeavoring for these few months, gentlemen, to emancipate myself from the tyranny of these glasses, but I haven't emancipated myself yet, so bear with me, with equanimity.

Were I asked what companion I would choose to start on life's journey in quest of happiness, I would unhesitatingly summon to my side humor—humor, the darling love-child of intelligence. As instinct is greater than learning, as intelligence is greater than intellect, so is humor greater than wit. Wit has

*Sir Herbert Tree, the eminent Shakespearean actor, was in Toronto for the week giving us the pleasure of seeing him as Cardinal Wolsey and Lyn Harding as the King in Henry VIII.

its birth in the head of intellect, humor in the heart of intelligence. Humor is the power of self-criticism—it enables us to estimate men and events at their true value. It is the touchstone which distinguishes the real from the sham in art. As in art so in life. Humor helps us to bear with injustice, to laugh at pretension, to behave with modesty in success, and to face adversity with calm. The man who has it will not lose his dignity in emergency. In the great tragedy of life's end he will meet even Death with a smile.

It always seems to me that there is a fine spirit of humor in the famous epitaph in Hull churchyard on the grave of one Martin Elginbrod:

> "Here lie I, Martin Elginbrod,
> Have mercy on my soul, O God,
> As I would if I were God
> And thou wert Martin Elginbrod."

People are too apt to treat God as if He were a minor royalty.

I take it that the main object of man is to find happiness—each after his own fashion. By happiness I do not mean pleasure, for which it is sometimes mistaken—indeed, in pursuing the phantom of pleasure we often lose the substance of happiness. Happiness is a condition of the mind, and does not depend on conditions of pleasure. It is in ourselves, it is a kind of self-hypnotism. Humor helps us to attain this condition of mind which we call content. Some will find happiness in a debauch of pessimism—they "enjoy bad health," as the charwoman said. Persons of a certain order of mind will extract a perverse kind of joy from attending the funeral of a complete stranger. Such an event becomes a holiday treat to the born pessimist. To what base uses do the poor resort in quest of happiness—but I suppose the only joy of life vouchsafed to many of these is the cessation of pain. Thank God, the toiling masses are given to-day greater opportunities of human joys than in the "good old days" when their nearest approach to sweetness and light was to be found in the public house.

Humor being an attitude of mind, it can to a certain extent be developed—given the seed it can be cultivated. I remember a valued friend once said, "Life is a mirror—smile at it and it will smile back, frown at it and it will frown again."

Children should be taught lessons in happiness: that, for instance, it is not a sin to be joyous, any more than it is a

virtue to be miserable. A kind of Pagan spirituality has of late years taken the place of the "Fee, fi, fo, fum" brimstone teaching of our Victorian childhood—though I confess that long before I had ceased to crack nuts with my teeth I had given up the doctrine of "open your mouth and shut your eyes."

It may at once be granted that like every other precious force (like radium and electricity) the force of humor can be misapplied, and so become dangerous; it is undeniable, too, that an absence of humor will enable men to reach the goal of their ambition more quickly, for they who see only what is immediately in front of their noses will often outstrip in the race those who are hampered with humor and the sensitiveness and love of life which that humor implies. The earnest worldling keeps his eye on his main chance, blinkered to the life that passes him, and sallies forth on his way undismayed by snubs, impervious to criticism, undaunted by ridicule, deaf to the song of the siren, unmindful of the by-lanes where primroses beckon the passer-by to linger in pleasant dalliance.

> "A primrose by the river's brim
> A yellow primrose was to him,
> And it was nothing more."

"And what in the name of common sense should it be more?" exclaims the man in the street—who is generally the man *of* the street. There let us leave him.

Certainly humor may be a clog in the game of life. On the other hand, he who is gifted with it will laugh at the bludgeonings of fate. The man who yields to the assaults of adversity is often stronger than he who offers them a rigid resistance. Iron breaks, steel bends, and recovers its equipoise.

Humor assuages pain, though I am bound to say I have found it inefficacious in toothache or in sea-sickness. Thus we see that philosophy has its limitations. Our humor is apt to stop short at ourselves—that is the tragedy of life. The misfortunes of others we bear more philosophically. The supreme test of humor is in its personal application. It is the quintessence of humor which enables a man to laugh at himself and gives him his highest dignity, for he who can laugh at himself must needs be gifted with a tolerance, a pity for others. None so sensitive to criticism as those whose business it is to ridicule others. True humor is rarely cruel, cruelty and sarcasm belong rather to the domain of wit. Nothing will appeal to an audience's sense of the ridiculous so much as the fall of the decrepit pantaloon on the butter-slide prepared by the wily clown. But that is not humor.

A homely illustration of the difference between wit and humor came within my knowledge. I have two friends—one a wit, the other a humorist. They were staying at a country inn and retired to their rooms in high spirits. A. conceived the brilliant idea of changing all the boots that were put outside along the passage. He did so. (That was wit.) B. thought of the inconvenience that this derangement would entail on the victims of his friend's ingenuity, and without telling A., lest he should deprive him of his triumph, changed all the boots back to their rightful owners' doors. (That was humor.) You will say these are not brilliant examples of wit or humor—you are right. 'Tis but a homespun fable.

Humor, like love, cannot be bought—it is common to the peasant and the king, to the prelate and the 'bus-conductor. Between those who have it there exists a kind of freemasonry—it is the touch of nature which makes the whole world kin. I believe that humor is unofficially and secretly possessed by both political parties. I remember sitting at a table at which were gathered distinguished men—Conservatives and Liberals. Turning to my neighbor I said: "Is it not curious that all these sitting here appear to think alike to-night on every conceivable subject, while in their public utterances they differ so violently?" "Yes," replied my friend, "but this is our holiday. Here we are allowed to speak the truth, for humor is in the chair—*and there are no reporters.*" In public life nothing is so suspect as humor. Perhaps that is why so many men scruple to tell the truth in public.

One blessing the war has brought to us—the abolition of parties. I have never been able to understand why parties should exist. If every man acted according to his conscience, clarified by humor, there would be no necessity for the barbed red-tape entanglements which divided Englishmen in deadly enmity. If a plain man ventured before the war to express a merely human opinion on some great social question which came within the range of politics, he was liable to be dubbed a "ruddy Radical" on the one side or a "gory Tory" on the other. A common cause and a common humor unites all classes in a great brotherhood to-day.

In saying that our sense of humor stops short at ourselves in the ordinary affairs of life, I recall an instance which was related to me by one who has the medical care of the inmates of Broadmoor. This story shows that the points of view of normally sane persons is apt to lapse from sanity at the lure of vanity. My medical friend escorted on two successive occasions two distinguished visitors who were interested in the

condition of his patients. The first visitor (Mr. Smith) was a young man who expressed a desire to be presented among others to one whose ambition in life had proved to be a too wholesale extermination of the human race. "Be polite to him," said my friend, "for he is the most dangerous inmate of this asylum." "Mr. Gallstone," he proceeded, "let me present to you my friend, Mr. Smith." "Take off your hat, sir," said the criminal. Mr. Smith took off his hat. "Turn your profile, sir," continued Mr. Gallstone. Mr. Smith turned his profile. Mr. Gallstone exclaimed, "A truly noble Aryan type, the forehead of a poet laureate, nobility of feature, a generous mouth, a personality which should be the cynosure of womanhood, a born leader of men. You have an eye, sir, which shows the fire of the idealist held in check only by the power of logic. You will go far, sir; you will go far. Put on your hat, damn you, and pace forth to victory!"

Mr. Smith replaced his hat. In leaving the premises he turned to my doctor friend and said, "I have been greatly interested by all I have seen; but there is one case in which I think the patient may be unjustly detained. Is it not possible that a grave error of judgment may have been committed?"

"To which case do you refer?" inquired the doctor.

"I refer to the case of a Mr. Gallstone, who appeared to me remarkably intelligent," said the young man sympathetically as he took his leave.

The next week a distinguished permanent official of the public service paid a visit to the prison. He, too, was escorted by my friend. "Mr. Gallstone," said he, "allow me to present to you my friend, Mr. William Jones."

"Take off your hat, sir," said Mr. Gallstone, "and make yourself at home here."

Sir William removed his hat and tried to look at home.

"Any relation of the celebrated thinker and philosopher of that name?" inquired Mr. Gallstone.

"Yes," replied Sir William; "I am his son."

"Remarkably paltry head for the son of so great a man. Put on your hat, sir," said Mr. Gallstone, as he turned to finish a game of solo dominoes.

Sir William, in bidding farewell, took the doctor aside and said, "I have been deeply interested in all I have seen, but I have never been so shocked with the depraved criminality of a fellow-being as I was to-day."

"To what case do you refer?" asked the doctor.

"I refer to the case of Gallstone. I wonder you don't put him in irons." . . . Points of view differ. Our humor stops short at ourselves!

It is a fact, by the bye, which I have observed in life, that all madmen are singularly deficient in the quality of humor. I have noticed that an inordinate conceit characterises that sad state. I presume it is because the sense of proportion is distorted. Persons without a sense of humor always write long letters; and I have noticed, too, that all madmen write letters of more than four pages. I will not venture to assert that all persons who write more than four-paged letters are mad. Still, the symptom should be watched.

One of the most alarming signs of insanity, it has often seemed to me, is that of writing to the newspapers (invariably more than four written pages) to prove that Hamlet was mad, and that Bacon wrote Shakespeare. Yet the same writers who scorn the idea that Hamlet pretended to be mad, generally assert with equal vehemence that Shakespeare pretended to write the works of Bacon. I am satisfied that many of the learned commentators have only been kept out of lunatic asylums by the energy which they have expended in the harmless occupation of discussing these two kindred subjects in print. In many cases it has proved a most valuable safety-valve.

Though the subject of the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy is somewhat musty, I will ask you to bear with me while I wander down a bye-lane of parenthesis in order to prove to my own entire satisfaction that, tested by the touchstone of humor, the Bacon theory vanishes into the air. If there is one quality which characterises the writings of Shakespeare more than another it is humor. He cannot resist it—it is irresistible. Humor, like murder, will out. Had Bacon humor? I think not.

Bacon had learning, Shakespeare not much. But he had instinct. Some people are born educated; Shakespeare inherited the knowledge of his forefathers, and he possessed an unexampled power of assimilating all that came in his way. He made precisely the mistakes that Bacon would never have made. Book-learning is not wisdom. Shakespeare himself ridicules this most whimsically in "Love's Labours Lost":

> "Study is like the Heaven's glorious sun
> That will not be deep-searched with saucy looks;
> Small have continual plodders ever won
> Save base authority from others' books."

The King replies:

"How well he is read to reason against reading!" How small a thing is education save for those who have the imagin-

ation to illuminate it. Too much reading is certainly a hindrance to the development of the imagination. Indeed of giving birth to original thoughts, the man who has only reading gets to think by quotation— he relies on the cold storage of memory.

Many years ago I met at the house of a friend an eminent cryptogrammatist who had written a work proving by algebra that Bacon wrote Shakespeare. I made so bold as to ask him whether Bacon wrote the Shakespeare Sonnets. He replied that his case rested on that certainty. I pointed out to him that while it was conceivable that Francis Bacon, for political reasons, did not wish to acknowledge the authorship of the plays, it was inconceivable that in the outpourings of his soul in the Sonnets he should call himself "Your own sweet will," constantly punning on the Christian name of his paid "ghost"—the vulgar poacher-butcher-actor-manager.

Again, look here upon this picture and on this: Could he who had proved himself a heartless advocate, who sacrificed the Earl of Essex, and after the grave had closed over him published a vile attack upon his dead friend and benefactor, "like wrath in death and envy afterwards"—could he whose meanness was aggravated by respectability, who had paddled long in the putrescent puddles of politics, till right and wrong were merged in the melting-pot of expediency—could he have written these words:

> "Tired with all these, for restful death I cry,
> As, to behold desert a beggar born,
> And needy nothing trimm'd in jollity,
> And purest faith unhappily forsworn,
> And gilded honor shamefully misplaced,
> And maiden virtue rudely strumpeted,
> And right perfection, wrongfully disgraced,
> And strength by limping sway disabled,
> And art made tongue-tied by authority,
> And folly, doctor-like, controlling skill,
> And simple truth miscall'd simplicity,
> And captive good attending captain ill:
> Tired with all these, from these would I be gone,
> Save that, to die, I leave these my love alone."

Is there in any of Bacon's works one hint of this sweet humor, this noble scorn, this glowing melancholy which breathes throughout the works of Shakespeare? I think not. Writers more dissimilar than these two cannot be found.

There is one thing quite certain, that if Bacon wrote Shakespeare, then Shakespeare must have written Bacon!

But to return to my text. In its essentials, the oil of humor is the same throughout the world as is the essential vinegar of wit; but each nationality has its own characteristic humor, and though it is perhaps pre-eminently developed in the Anglo-Saxon race, I have found it in the Arab and the Japanese. The Japanese are a peculiarly smiling people. There is a Japanese proverb which says, "A melancholy face is stung by the bees." Another Japanese proverb contains excellent advice to intending suicides: "When you take poison, don't lick the plate."

Humor is everywhere; it can be picked off the hedges of the highway. A gipsy was asked by a friend of mine, "How do you decide which way to go next?" "I turn my back to the wind," replied the gipsy. An excellent piece of philosophy! Yes; humor is a gipsy—it has no country; though there *are* Englishmen who deny true merit to the humor of America, whose peculiarly attractive characteristic is that it leaves something to the imagination of the listener. A curious instance of this British intolerance was given me by a brilliant American friend. A stolid Englishman was his guest, and would listen to the American's prolific anecdotage with the mild and surprised courtesy of fatigue. On his way to the station at the conclusion of his visit, the Englishman, while thanking his host for his hospitality, confided to him that he deeply regretted that he had been unable to appreciate the characteristic humor with which the American had sought to outvie the Englishman's brilliant flashes of silence.

"Now tell me," said the taciturn Saxon, "one story which you really consider a true sample of American humor and I give you my word of honor as an English gentleman that I will do my best to appreciate it."

My American friend drew up his dogcart and proceeded: "Well, it was a rainy Sunday at St. Louis and the public houses were shut. A stranger stood on the corner of the street wanting to post a letter home. 'Do you know where the post office is?' he inquired of a passer-by. 'Yes,' replied the man, and walked on. But on reflection he took pity on his fellow-man, and retraced his steps to the place where the stranger was still standing in the rain, disconsolately whistling to the wind. 'Do you really want to know where the post office is?' he asked. 'No,' said the stranger, and walked on."

"Well," said the Englishman, "I think they were both extremely rude." There ensued a silence so deep that you could almost hear it.

In life humor enables us to rate ourselves and our own acts at their true value; it helps us to discount flattery. Flattery makes the great little, the little never great. "Oh, that men should be to counsel deaf, but not to flattery." We are none of us entirely proof against flattery, which is the cheapest form of bribery; it is largely employed by lower organisms as a means of self-propulsion. Flattery is a passport to the human heart; few of us can resist its gilded key. I have known people of quite mediocre intelligence who have managed to succeed in life by judicious flattery.

An instance of humor in tragedy (conscious or otherwise) came within my knowledge. I had constantly relieved the importunities of one who claimed to be a literary man, on the ground, I subsequently discovered, that he addressed envelopes for an advertising firm. His constant plea with me was that he wanted to get a glass eye out of pawn. So frequently were his applications on this head that at last my secretary revolted. I received a letter couched in these terms: "Sir, unless I receive ten shillings this evening, by ten o'clock my body will be floating down the Thames. On your head be it! I will call at the stage door!" I was placed in a most invidious position, and told my secretary that he had better send out the ten shillings. At the end of the evening I thought of my friend. "Did you send out the money to that deserving suicide?" I asked. "No," replied my secretary, "I did not." A horrible picture presented itself to my mind. I felt myself guilty of manslaughter at the least. I was much relieved on leaving the stage door to find the importunate literary man outside, dancing a hornpipe to keep himself warm. "Good evening, my friend," I said, in cynical revulsion, "I thought you were in the Thames!" "Don't be flippant, sir," he said, "I did mean to submerge myself—but on gazing on the dark river my better feelings conquered, and I've come back—for the ten shillings." I think he deserved them.

One should be sparing in the use of humor.

Humor is the onion of the human salad; and like the onion it should only be half-suspected. The very possession of this quality will prevent its too frequent use. Good wine should not be wasted—it should not be uncorked to those who gulp it down unthinkingly. In the same way it is dangerous to tell a story against yourself to those who have not humor, for they will always use it as evidence against you.

Flippancy is not humor. There are few things more tragic in life than to be a "funny man." Many a man learns to his cost that it is undesirable to stand on his head at the street-corner too long.

Like every other natural force humor should be man's slave and not his master.

If humor is important as a guide in life, it is no less potent a factor in art. In art humor is our best critic—it guards us from exaggeration. Tragedy, even more than comedy, needs this sweet sanity to hold us in check. Humor is the tingling sense which stays us from over-stepping the modesty of nature and prevents us from thinking out of tune—it is the delicate ear of the mind. It exercises the quality of restraint in tragedy: thus we avoid bathos. The man who pities himself is not a heroic figure. In art or in life one should never weep in the soup. In comedy humor guards us from degenerating into caricature. In the comedian humor is not so essential as it is in the tragedian, for a funny personality, an awkward gait, an impediment of speech, are often a substitute for comic genius. We are so liable to mistake for a gift of God what is, after all, only a visitation of providence.

Humor in comedy guards from degenerating into buffoonery. This, of course, applies also to pictorial art. Nor should one allow one's sense of humor to run away with one's sense of the fitness of things. The originators of Futurism are overburdened with humor. They have too much—their disciples too little. A great deal of nonsense is always talked about new art—there is no such thing as new art. There are always two kinds of art— good art and bad art. There is a certain difference between Art and Science. Science is always advancing upward in a straight line—Art moves in a circle—or shall I say as a fountain which, when it reaches its height, drops back into its basin and thence rises again.

There has been no "advance," for instance, in the art of sculpture— that of the Greeks cannot be excelled. Literature has not "advanced"—it is simply good or bad. The same may be said of acting.

During the war, it is but natural that classic drama, in common with all the arts, should be in abeyance—for art is essentially a pastime of peace—it can only flourish in repose.

In confirmation of what I have said of the psychology of audiences, I may recall a saying of Mr. Gladstone's: "The work of the orator is cast in the mould offered by the mind of his hearers. It is an influence principally received from his audience (so to speak) in vapor, which he pours back upon them in flood." Mr. Gladstone was himself, of course, a great orator, and had that power of self-excitation which made the waves of his passion vibrate in his audience—he had, in fact, the histrionic gift in an extraordinary degree. If that states-

man lacked something of ultimate greatness it was that he fell short of the humor which his great opponent Disraeli was gifted so supremely. It was with the shafts of his humor that Disraeli made his great effects with deadly certainty.

Of all writers he whose works are most charged with an all-informing, all-pervading humor is William Shakespeare, alike in his comic as in his tragic creations.

This brings me to the question as to the possession or non-possession of humor by great men. As I suggested a little while ago, humor may be a help or a clog in life. Many great men have been without it. I think it may be broadly stated that men of action, the great destroyers, the men who take, are as a rule devoid of humor; while men of imagination and contemplation, those who create, who give, *have* the gift of humor.

Among those pre-eminently gifted with humor are: Abraham Lincoln, Disraeli, Goethe and Heine, the late Lord Salisbury, Arthur Balfour, Dickens, Thackerary, Fielding, Shakespeare, Queen Elizabeth, Henry VIII., Charles II., Dr. Johnson, Charles Lamb, Emerson and Byron.

I could enlarge upon this theme until *your* eyelids would no longer wag. But I will content myself with contrasting as typical examples of the yea and nay of humor two of the worlds greatest men—Shakespeare and Napoleon: the arch-creator and the arch-destroyer. I take it that the greatness of a man must be gauged by his output for good—the measure of his greatness is, in fact, in proportion to what he gives to the world, his lack of greatness by what he takes or destroys. Shakespeare gave an abiding joy, one that will contribute to the happiness, the education, and the ennobling of mankind throughout the ages, "in states unborn and accents yet unknown"; Napoleon, on the other hand, took from mankind millions of lives and set humanity wailing. What of his work remains behind? The flower of France was destroyed and the French race is suffering to this day from the depletion it suffered at the hands of a would-be ruler of the globe. Shakespeare enriched the world, Napoleon impoverished it. Which is the greater, the giver or the taker-away? The Poet or the Emperor? The man of humor, or the man of worldly ambition? Shakespeare with humor, or Napoleon without? Napoleon was somewhat of a vulgarian with a mighty brain—and sane to the core; but he lacked humor. He may have had the imagination to visualise the terrors of the war and the suffering he inflicted on mankind—he did not possess the humor to ask himself: "Is this worth while?" And he might

have been the head of a great Republic with a Government which should have been the model of the world. As is was he died in exile and misery; while Shakespeare, who was content to employ his genius in comparative obscurity, died at Stratford-on-Avon in sweet content, let us hope. The game is not worth the candle of fame.

Is it not time that the great ones of the earth learned the lesson, or were made to learn the lesson, which the religion of humanity teaches?

It is difficult to think of the Emperor Napoleon without thinking of the Emperor Wilhelm. The resemblance between these two great criminals is not one of person, for two men could hardly be more unlike; the likeness is in their monstrous ambition.

Before the war, Wilhelm II. had always appeared to me as the best thing made in modern Germany—not the Germany whose rich soul gave us philosophy, the freedom of thought, and great music; but the modern materialistic Germany—the Germany laid low by luxury. To the *nouveau riche* nothing is so disconcerting as luxury. They say that decadence is a product of peace. Is this wholly true? In modern Germany the foul weed of decadence has grown with the growth of a military materialism. They say that war is noble. Has the military spirit ennobled the German nation? No; it has murdered the soul of Germany.

The Kaiser seemed a link with the old Germany—the Germany of Goethe, of Beethoven, and of Wagner. He appeared to be an idealist; his eloquence, the man himself, seemed to possess a certain ethical glow, a mediaeval splendor of feudal egoism—a sincere "I am I," he seemed a true believer in himself and his God whom he made in his own image. Every man has the God he deserves. Had he had the imagination to see that his true *rôle* was to place himself in front of mankind as the champion of peace, he would have gained an immortality above all conquerors; he would have gone down the ages as the temporal savior of mankind. But the temptation of earthly glory was too great.

But even in this great tragedy the importance of humor has asserted itself, for surely it may be said that the force which more than any other has kept up the spirit of our soldiers at the Front has been their unconquerable humor. It is this national gift which has constantly baffled and disconcerted the enemy hordes. While they were singing the Hymn of Hate, the British were singing "Tipperary." But for this good humor the tragedy of those trenches would have been intolerable.

It is this that has enabled the men at the Front to preserve their calm. To be calm in crisis, that is the test of men. Let us hope that this spirit will prevail at peace time among the nations who are vindicating the freedom of the world. Meantime we must fight on.

There could only have been one greater tragedy than the war—the greater tragedy would have been if England had not joined in the war. The proudest thing England has ever done is to have fought for the ideal of the world's right. She went into the war with clean hands, as she may elect to go out with empty. In that great hour it is Britain that should be destined to take the lead among the nations—it is those who have with noble calm guided her in the tremendous times through which we are now passing who will guide us in the hour of victory with a moderation which is stronger than violence. And when the hour strikes, let the note be solemn. Let us have the humor to go forth to greet the Angel of Peace with anthems rather than with comic songs.

Let us hope that the end may come sooner than many of us fear, and that through all, with that dawn, there may be the rainbow, whose arch shall span the seas, from the coast of England to the shores of Canada, and that hereafter, after this peace, England and Canada and Australia and all the other states may stand together as one man, to give a great example to the world. and to tell them all, "We fought for peace!"

(*November 27th, 1916.*)

The Human Side of Trench Warfare

By Ian Hay.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 27th November, Captain Beith ("Ian Hay") said:

Mr. President and Members of the Canadian Clubs of Toronto,—First let me say to you how very proud I feel to be your guest to-day. And let me thank your President for the very generous remarks with which he introduced me, for his kind reference to certain mutual friends of ours whom I left behind on the Western front, but whom I hope to rejoin ultimately and find still going strong. I may mention that Private Mucklewame is now a full Corporal.

Let me say secondly how glad I am to be back, even for a short space, under the Union Jack. The Union Jack means very much more to us to-day than ever before. Not that I have any complaint to make about my treatment under the Stars and Stripes. I have just come from the United States, where I have been treated with the greatest kindness and consideration possible. I have discussed the war with, I suppose, hundreds of Americans, and I have come back with this feeling in my mind, that every genuine American is pro-Ally through and through. They were so ready and willing to hear about the war, and what it means to us, that my chief worry was whether I should get to Canada on time. I have spent four nights this week in the train. One night, as I paced the platform of a remote and extremely well-ventilated railway junction near Pittsburgh, I was reminded of a story, not new, not true, one of the stories grandfather used to tell—of a man who when traveling in Scotland came to a station where he found a number of gentlemen, clad in long coats and wearing black hats with crape around them. He asked one:—"I beg pardon, but is this a funeral?" "Weel," was the reply, "you could not rightly call this a funeral, for the corp has missed his connection." Now, gentlemen, there were moments on that platform when I began to feel I was emulating the "corp." However, I outstripped him, and here I am.

*Capt. Beith, of the Argyle and Sutherland Highlanders, is most favorably known to Canadians under his pen name of Ian Hay, the author of The First Hundred Thousand and many other stories. He has won the Military Cross in the present war.

My little excursion to Canada is in the nature of a holiday. Not long ago I was experiencing trench warfare on the Western front; and I was sent to the United States to endeavor to interest the people there in the war from the more intimate point of view, and at the same time to endeavor, by methods of peaceful persuasion, to enlist their sympathies in our cause. That is why I am here on this side of the Atlantic. It would be superfluous to attempt anything of the same kind in Canada, for Canada's contribution to our cause, our crusade —for this is a holy war if ever there was one—will never be forgotten throughout the British Empire while the words British Empire and patriotism stand for anything at all. I say this with deeper feeling because I have had the honor for some months of fighting shoulder to shoulder in the front line trenches with a Canadian Division.

I don't quite know why I was selected for the pleasant task of visiting the States; what peculiar qualifications were supposed to be mine; except, perhaps, that I had succeeded for a period of twelve months in dodging the missiles of the enemy. Anyone in this war who performs that feat of agility may regard himself as in some sort a veteran. Also I had had the opportunity of studying the development of the campaign with a certain degree of continuity.

The Scottish Division, the 9th, with which I had the honor to serve from its earliest beginnings, was the first of the Kitchener Divisions that went over seas; its arrival in France coincided with, perhaps you might say ended, the first period of the war.

The first period consisted entirely of a period of desperate resistance by the little British Expeditionary Force, the original regular army, never at any time exceeding 120,000 men, who through the autumn and winter of 1914 maintained a desperate resistance against immensely superior odds—superior in numbers only—until spring arrived. And with the arrival of the spring, when the long heroic period of resistance came to an end, the second period began. The arrival of those countless legions, raised and equipped in a few short months by the genius of Lord Kitchener, stiffened and thickened that wofully thin line, held by the remnants of the British army and by the Imperial troops which had hurried from all over the world to the Mother Country's assistance.

The tide of invasion was stopped, and held up forever, but we could not begin to roll it back. We had the men, but not the munitions. All we could do was to hold on, harass the enemy and keep him busy, to make time,

while back at home the forges were roaring, the machines were clicking, and the men and women—especially the women—turned out the pile of munitions necessary for our needs, till at last we got the welcome word, "We are ready; full speed ahead!" We had to wait a long time for that message. All last summer the line was held, by men who a year previously had been artisans, riveters, plowmen, shepherds—with no great military traditions to live up to, and with not much in the way of big guns behind them. If one of our guns put a shell over into the enemy trenches, a whole salvo came back; munitions were strictly limited, and the best we could do was to save up for perhaps a week, and indulge in one great outburst of artillery retaliation, perhaps every Saturday. Between times we sat upon the floor of the trench and wished for better days. It was not altogether exhilarating.

Things were not going too well on the Eastern front, either, and whenever the Russians lost ground there would be a burst of cheering in the trenches opposite, and the enemy would put up a notice board announcing the news. In fact, both sides were extremely helpful and obliging in furnishing information of this kind to one another.

Talking of notice boards, I may mention one incident. At the time of the Sinn Fein riots in Dublin, the enemy had particularly early—suspiciously early—information of all that was going on. A notice board was put up opposite an Irish Division, saying: "Irishmen, the English are shooting down your wives and children in the streets of Dublin!" That intimation was not greeted with the success it deserved. All the Irish Division did was to ask its Commander for permission to "attend to the matter." This permission was granted, and they promptly left their trenches, raced across No Man's Land, to the German trench opposite and captured it; they have got that trench still, and they hold the notice board as a trophy.

Well, gentlemen, that was the second period of the war. We went on and on. We were learning, learning, finding our feet. We were acquiring the priceless art of playing a poor hand well. The matter of saving up for a burst of artillery became a thing of the past; gradually we drew level.

I shall never forget the day when it was brought home to us that we were fairly and squarely on a level with the enemy at last. This day our Division was on the great salient at Ypres—or, if you prefer it, "Wipers"—which stretches like a great bow around the little city of Ypres,

which the Germans tried so hard successively to capture but have never succeeded. Last December things were blowing up for a great storm, another attack on the little city. Every day bigger and bigger guns were brought up against us. The bombardment became almost continuous, in preparation for an advance all around the salient. Our own guns made little reply, so little that anybody less self-satisfied than the Bosches might have smelt a rat. On the 20th of December, about dawn, the bombardment switched off with uncanny suddenness. We knew that it would begin again presently, in the form of a curtain of fire behind us, to prevent supplies or reinforcements from coming up. At the same time gas was liberated at various portions of the salient, and we put on our gas helmets. Then suddenly our guns spoke. There were six hundred of them in the salient which had been brought up quietly day by day; they all spoke, and all spoke together and they spoke several times. Within a period of three minutes 30,000 shells burst in and around the German trenches, which were crowded with men waiting to take part in the great Christmas attack, which never was made. A few men got over to our lines, but they were wiped out. That was the first official intimation to the enemy that the balance of men and munitions had come down at last with a bump on the side of law and order!

I had the honor of serving with Canadian troops this time last year. Our own Division touched the left of the Canadian Division in the Ypres salient. The Brigade, I think, with which we touched, was the Brigade then commanded by that very gallant Canadian soldier, General Victor Williams. By the worst of luck, entirely owing to his devotion to duty, he is now wounded, and a prisoner of war; but I am very glad to hear that he is progressing to recovery.

We saw a great deal of each other, and were extremely happy together in a little village behind the lines. I think both Divisions had a mutual admiration for each other's fighting qualities. The Canadian troops are particularly good in raid work; they are everlastingly devising some method of tantalizing and harassing the Bosch. They are always rivalling one another in it, and are as keen as mustard. I met only one man who was dissatisfied; he was a Highlander, and he said to me, "I don't like wearing the kilts, and between ourselves I am going to try to get exchanged into a pants battalion." But, gentlemen, that is a digression.

The second period of the war came to an end, and the third period came on. I am very often asked in the United

States of America, where, as you know, they are always out for early and accurate information,—I am constantly asked this question, "When is the war going to end?" and I say, "Well, I can't tell you when the war is going to end; but I can tell you when it began." They say, "Thank you very much. We are painfully aware of our lack of knowledge of some things, but we do know when the war began. It began on the 4th of August, 1914." I say: "No, it was on the 1st July, 1916. That was the first day when we were ready for a grand and prolonged offensive. On that day, as you know, our and the French troops went over the parapets and advanced on a front of fully sixteen miles in the valley of the Somme. That was a very critical day for the British army. They had to answer this question. Up to this day they had been fighting uphill and shorthanded in both men and munitions. Now they were as ready as they were likely to be. Is this army, now it is given a fair and square chance, as good as, is it better, regiment for regiment, than the iron-bound army of Germany? I need not tell you, gentlemen, the answer our boys gave to the Germans that 1st of July. That long ridge crowned by Thiepval, Courcelette, High Wood, Grandcourt, and other points, is now in British or French hands. Since that advance began we have taken 500 guns, 1,000 machine guns, a great quantity of stores, and 84,000 unwounded prisoners. Beyond the ridge this ground slopes away for fifteen miles, which means that we have now that priceless asset, direct artillery observation. So you may be tolerably certain that the great .push will be undoubtedly continuous, especially since our output of munitions at Christmas is going to be exactly double what it was in July.

I think it must be extraordinarily galling to our enemy, the Germans, especially to those at the top, to see that great military machine, which they had been polishing and perfecting for forty years for the conquest of Europe, unable to stand up before that first fair and square blow given by an army of men who were practically amateurs, and who go into action singing the choruses of comic songs and kicking a football. As you have perhaps heard, one company actually went over the parapet at Contalmaison, headed by its Captain, and kicked a football all across No Man's Land, then captured the trench. It is this revolting frivolity on the part of our troops which really offends the German's sense of propriety. He takes the war and the business of slaughter so seriously, so sacredly, whether he is emitting asphyxiating gases or sink-

ing a hospital ship, that to encounter troops who regard war as a great game, a clean game, a great adventure, pains him; and to be beaten by them shocks him to the roots of his being.

Thus began the third period of the war—to end, please God, with the relegation of barbarism and bestiality to the place where they came from; and the restoration of the whole of Belgium and northern provinces of France, after many days, to their rightful owners, to be held by them in peace and security to the rest of time!

Well, gentlemen, I could give you many anecdotes. Possibly you will let me give you two, one abroad and one at home. Last September, at Vermelles, just opposite a particularly unpleasant locality, known as the Hohenzollern Redoubt, which was an underground dugout thrust forward towards our lines, it was extremely important for us to find out how far this connected with the main German trenches. A young officer suggested that the best way to find out would be for somebody to go and look, and he offered himself for the purpose. There was a certain amount of method in his madness, because while the artillery bombardment was going on, and we were bombarding every day, the German retired to his deepest dugout and stayed there. Therefore if you went at such time into No Man's Land it was largely probable that no one would see you;—of course there was always the chance of a sniper. However, this officer was allowed his own way. He walked forward, and had a good look into the Hohenzollern Redoubt, making valuable observations. He discovered one communicating trench had been completed, of which we knew, as our aeroplane observers had seen it, and the cartographers had named it "Little Willie Trench." However, we wanted to know about the "Big Willie Trench." We found it was not completed, and we wanted to take it before it was completed. However, this young officer had not reckoned on one thing, our artillery, which did not know of his expedition. The result was that one shell fell fifty yards behind him, and a clod of earth hit him in the back of the neck and sent him back to our own trenches rather dazed and considerably annoyed. However, after having a cup of tea, and having despatched an exceedingly comforting and edifying message to the artillery, he went forward once more, completed his observations, and came back with a most satisfactory map. I am glad to say he got the Military Cross.

However, life at home just now it not altogether without its incidents. Here (holding it up in his hand) is a small square of aluminum, a piece of the first Zeppelin brought down

on British soil. The Zeppelin, I may add, is our best recruiting agent; in fact, I should like to have a Zeppelin go to one or two of the more remote parts of our country to get in a few more recruits. I had the great good fortune to see this Zeppelin descend. I was staying in a house, which was pretty high for that city, and at 2 o'clock Sunday morning, when the alarm was given, we went to the roof and saw the whole sky as far around as you could see, filled with bursting shells from our anti-aircraft guns and the interlacing of searchlights. Above that was the Zeppelin, drifting about in a most uncertain fashion. Finally we saw it had gone down towards the north. There was a great number—I suppose a million people—to see it, because London, instead of obeying the orders of the police and retiring to the cellar, was all on the roof enjoying the sight. There was the Zeppelin, drifting to the north, turning from silver grey to blood red, and finally it went down in one mass of fire to the earth, having been brought down by an aeroplane manned by Lieut. Robinson, who got the Victoria Cross. It was certainly a historic spectacle, and it had a historic sequel, because the population of London, having got up out of bed at 2 o'clock Sunday morning, was in no great hurry to return. Suffering from a delusion common on these occasions, they thought that the Zeppelin had fallen in the next street and started off to have a look. But that Zeppelin had fallen twelve miles out of London. The result was that by 8 o'clock in the morning every country lane was filled with people half dressed, half starved, almost barefoot, hunting for souvenirs. They never got near the Zeppelin, and as the railway service is not a conspicuous feature of English country life on Sunday morning, special rescue parties had to be sent out to bring them in!

If I might turn to another topic,—if I am not keeping you —I am immensely impressed with the work our women are doing for their country. They realized the actual situation more quickly than the men. While the men were still handing out heavy talk about the economic and industrial aspects of the situation and not depriving our industries of their needed man power, the women were mobilizing. They simply said to the men:—"You go to the war! We will look after the industrial output!" And they do.

Last July I saw a procession in London showing what the women are doing in the war. These workers come under two heads: one is of the women engaged in direct war work, such as Red Cross, hospital, and munitions work; and the second comprises those women, each of whom has liberated

a man for the service of the colors by taking over his work for the duration of the war. I think that procession would have interested you. One part of the procession was composed of Red Cross nurses, hospital nurses, ambulance workers; there was an enormous number of women serving as waitresses; then there were elevator tenders, bell boys,—or rather, girls—cab drivers, letter carriers, car conductors, car cleaners, and others. Each one of those women had liberated a man to serve his country. Then stretched the long line of women employed in munitions work. There were many young, attractive girls, whose faces and arms were stained a bright orange color from the effects of the picric acid used in the manufacture of lyddite shells. They had deliberately sacrificed their good looks for the duration of the war. But they did not mind: they laughed, and waved their hands to us—it was their contribution to the cause of their country!

There was a great army of women who had never been classed as workers at all: they had not needed to do anything for a living. Of course it is always easy to collect a body of so-called workers for a fashionable charity, where the limelight is plentiful and the work not long or too hard. But there is no limelight here, and the work is hard! There are three classes: one class is that of those who have devoted themselves to the work of making munitions, to let the regular workers rest at night, or over the week end; another class is those who serve in hospitals. There are thousands of these, for practically every big house is a private hospital. These women are not employed upon the romantic task of nursing wounded heroes back to life—they never see the wounded in the ordinary way—the regular nurses attend to that,—no! their work is in the basement, washing, scrubbing, cooking, with sometimes an occasional treat of answering the street door bell. That may not be important and interesting work, but the question with the women was: "What can we young girls do, to liberate stronger women for the work of munitions?" That has been answered.

Further, they are managing canteens and rest clubs for soldiers on leave and for munition workers. I know a girl—to obviate any misunderstanding I may say she is my wife—who works in a great London Club which has been turned into a club for overseas soldiers. Any soldier from overseas or of the Imperial army can walk into that club and order a meal, which is served to him gladly, proudly, by volunteer workers. My wife's proudest possession is the sum of five pennies, given her as a tip by a Canadian private—you observe, gentle-

men, he was faithful to the decimal system even three thousand miles away. Well, he slipped these five pennies into her hand with a friendly smile, and said, "Here, get yourself some candy with it!" I don't think she will, because she is going to cherish those five pence; first, because it is the first money she ever earned in her life, and will probably be her last—because she has a very indulgent husband—and secondly, because of its very romantic and gallant associations.

This, gentlemen, is the kind of work that is going on all over England, Scotland and Ireland to-day. You here know, better than anybody else, the influence of that; you know the strain, the intensity of all. But while to outward appearance there is strain and intensity, there is an inner peace: they hold up their heads proudly, and carry on!

This war, terrible though it is, will confer untold benefits upon the Empire. No nation can engage in it and endure the task and strain without emerging from it all a bigger minded, wider minded, more united nation and Empire.

One other word I should like to add if I may. Arising out of all this, in the United States just now there are strong rumors of an early peace. I think there is no difficulty in tracing these rumors to their source. They are put into circulation by a nation which is discovering that a people who wantonly draw the sword are liable to perish by the sword. And great though our sacrifices must be, and hard though the struggle is,—I know we are all at one on this—there is only one way to end this war, and that is, to go and finish it, and fix it, in such a way that it never can happen again!

(*December 11th, 1916.*)

Guarding a City's Health

By Dr. Chas. J. Hastings.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 11th December Dr. Hastings said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—There has never been a time in the history of the British Empire in which human life and human efficiency have been held at as high a premium as at present, and consequently at no previous time has there been occasion for such efficient safeguarding of human life and human fitness. Almost as far back as history carries us, there is evidence of those in authority having had some conception of the necessity for sanitary regulations. We find this among the early Egyptians and, in fact, in all civilized nations. In that admirable code compiled by Hammurabi 2,200 years before Christ, which was unearthed in 1902 in the Acropolis Mound at Susa, one recognized that he had in mind the necessity for the adoption of sanitary measures in order to safeguard human life. However, it was given to Moses to codify these sanitary laws and regulations, which were subsequently enforced more or less efficiently until the early part of the present era. But unfortunately, in the early ages, a set back was given to public health administrators on account of superstition and the doctrinal delusions that disease and pestilence were visitations of divine wrath, in consequence of which the attention was diverted from preventation to cure, to the building of hospitals, alms-houses, and so forth. It was this, no doubt, that Ruskin had in mind when many years ago is referring to public health work he said, "Any reforms which tend to improve the health of the masses are looked upon by them as unwarranted interference with their vested rights in inevitable disease and death," so that it was not until 1847 that the first health officer was appointed in Great Britain, and even then little advance could be made until the establishing of the germ origin of disease, which placed preventive medicine or public health administration on a scientific basis. Previous to this, it was thought that the different communicable diseases were transmitted by means of sewer gas and decomposing house-

*Dr. Hastings is the Medical Officer of Health for the City of Toronto. His outstanding success in this work qualifies him admirably for the discussion of this subject.

hold wastes such as garbage, etc., and most of the time and money of departments of health were devoted to the abating of nuisances, plumbing inspection, garbage collection and disposal. It is now known that diseases are practically never contracted in this way. These duties constitute the æsthetic side of public health work, and can probably be better done by departments of health than by any other department of a city's administration, but should not be charged against the prevention of disease. Diseases are only contracted by coming in contact, directly or indirectly, with one suffering from the disease, or with a carrier. Disease germs do not generally live long outside of the human body.

Now, with a knowledge of our common enemies and their haunts and habits, and the ways and means by which they gain access to the body, and also with the knowledge of the resisting powers of the body, it became apparent that any well organized campaign against these diseases must be directed along two distinct lines—in the first place preventing these disease germs from gaining access to the body, and secondly, the building up and maintaining of the resisting powers of the body. To this end it is essential that we take into our confidence the citizens, tell them what we are doing and why we are doing it.

The two most outstanding sources of the transmission of disease in any community is their water supply and milk supply. This must be apparent from the fact of the innumerable possibilities of their contamination and also their universal use, so that the safeguarding of the city's water supply and milk supply must be first established. Toronto's water supply, while not at all times as palatable as we would like to have it, is at all times absolutely safe. But, inasmuch as only about one-third to one-half of Toronto's water supply is filtered, it has been imperative to chlorinate our water constantly in order to keep it safe.

When we began our campaign to improve our milk supply, we found that 40% of the milk sold in the city was being watered, and the average amount of water put in the milk was 20%. This meant that the citizens in 1911 had been paying $275,000 for water, thinking that it was milk. With the increased consumption of milk in 1915, Toronto would have been paying $322,000 for water, if the same conditions had existed, but in 1915 there was no milk permitted to be sold in Toronto that was watered. Hence the citizens in food value alone were saved $322,000. The entire expenditure of the Department for 1915 was $309,000, so that we had $13,000 to our credit on this item alone. Obviously, the same organiza-

tion that was necessary to bring about this improved condition, is necessary to maintain the condition. Eternal vigilance is the price we have to pay for our pure milk supply. To this we have to add what we have done to safeguard our citizens against milk-borne diseases, such as the various forms of infantile diarrhoea, typhoid, diphtheria, septic sore throat, and bovine tuberculosis, by the system of the veterinary inspection of the dairy farms and rigid supervision of the dairies in the city and the use of the sedimentation test by which we can determine whether or not milk is being produced under sanitary conditions. We thus succeeded in securing for Toronto a milk free from barnyard contamination, but this milk, though clean, was not bacteriologically clean and the only means by which this can be accomplished is by scientific pasteurization. This means a heating of the milk to 145 degrees and holding it at that for thirty minutes. This does not interfere in any way with the chemical composition, the nutritive value or the digestibility of the milk but it does destroy all disease-producing germs.

An effort has also been made to safeguard citizens against communicable diseases by a rigid supervision of all of our food supplies. For instance, our restaurants are all required to have in addition to the sink for washing all drinking and eating utensils, proper facilities for the sterilizing of all, and are not granted a license until they are equipped to carry out these requirements. In bringing about these reforms, we were submitted to all sorts of criticism and abuse, but criticism has about as much effect on me as water on a duck's back. When I went to the Department, I knew I had a duty to perform and I went determined to perform it though all hell should order me silent. We have endeavored to follow the precepts of Wellington, "Be sure you are right and then go ahead."

In order to accomplish these reforms, we have had to secure the co-operation of those with whom we have to deal. This means education. We are fortunately living in an age when people no longer want to be treated as machines. When they are told to do things, they want to know why. Therefore, the first duty of the Department of Public Health is to educate the public. We are consequently endeavoring to enlighten the public through the press, health bulletins, public addresses, leaflets, and in every other way that we can hope to reach them.

But, inasmuch as there are tens of thousands in every large city who cannot read, or for various reasons do not read, it became apparent that in order to reach those who are obviously the ones most requiring education, we would have to get

nearer to them; we would have to get into the homes and in that way democratise the knowledge that has for years been kept within the precincts of our universities and laboratories. This knowledge had to be translated into terms that could be understood by the man on the street and the house-wife in the humblest home.

This, it was apparent, could best be accomplished through the medium of our public health nurses. The duties of the public health nurse embrace tuberculosis, child welfare, prenatal child hygiene, and social service. They attend all the tuberculosis clinics, the well-baby clinics and the clinics in the various hospitals in the city. Tuberculosis cases attending the clinics are followed to the homes and instructions given there as regards the prevention of the spread of this disease. The people in the home are instructed as to the ways and means by which this disease is spread and all those in the homes, who have come in contact, are encouraged to go to the clinics and undergo an examination. The advanced cases are sent to the hospital for advanced cases. The early cases, if they cannot be properly cared for in the home, are sent to one of the sanitoria, and the smaller children who have not any clinical symptoms are sent to the preventorium. While in the home, the nurse ascertains what the revenue of the home is, and, if it is found insufficient to nourish the family properly, the cases are referred to the proper social agencies in order that this revenue may be reinforced. It is made clear to these people that the instructions given in regard to the prevention of the spread of tuberculosis in the home applies equally to any form of communicable disease that may invade that home.

But the problem of education is, for obvious reasons, a very difficult one. You will recall that Cobden, when endeavoring to repeal the corn laws, stated in the British House of Commons that he had come to the conclusion that in order to get anything through the heads of the British people, you require to repeat it over and over again in just a little different language, and, not long since, Sir Wm. Osler, when addressing a meeting of the New York Academy of Medicine on the subject of Education, stated that the essence of successful teaching consisted in "re-iteration, re-iteration, re-iteration," to which one of his colleagues added, "without irritation." We will all agree that the essence of our teaching is re-iteration without irritation, and there is no other medium through which this can be so well accomplished as that of our public health nurses, who are rendering a service in the home, and who have gained the confidence of the people in the home. No one wants sickness nor, much less, does he want death in his home.

Therefore, when these facts are made plain to them in heart-to-heart conversations with the nurses, they are likely to listen to them, appreciate them, and endeavor to profit by them.

Notwithstanding all efforts that we can put forth to save ourselves against the invasion of disease-producing germs, they will occasionally get by us, and to this end it is most essential that we build up and maintain the resisting powers of the body. Consequently, we find that behind all outbreaks of disease, and in fact with most sickness, there is a social problem that the revenue of the home has not been sufficient to secure for the inmates of that home sufficient nourishment or proper housing and clothing. Consequently, the vitality has been lowered and they have been rendered more susceptible to disease. Hence the necessity in any well organized department of public health for a division of social service. The chief of this division does the social diagnosis, which is sometimes even more important than the medical diagnosis. All complex social problems coming under the notice of the nurses are referred to him. In connection with this division, our nurses do the social service follow-up work of all but one hospital in the city, and in this way assure the anxious patient in the hospital that his home and children are being cared for. Public health administration means not only the saving of human life and the prevention of disease, but also all that goes to build up and maintain a fitter race. The control of communicable diseases is only a part of the duty and responsibility of departments of health.

We have also the industrial diseases, the wasting diseases of middle life and venereal diseases, all of which have been sadly neglected. Sir Thomas Oliver in a recent address pointed out that the aggregate cost of illness due to occupation alone in the United States amounted to $792,892,860 per annum, and this is for the most part preventable, but will not be prevented until our legislative bodies realize that the people and the physical fitness of the people represent the most valuable asset of the nation or the municipality.

Having recognized the dangers of industrial diseases, we organized in connection with the Department, two years ago, a Division of Industrial Hygiene. A careful survey was made of all the industries, and instructions were given as regards the necessary installation in order to control the trade fumes and dust, and secure proper and efficient ventilation. In this way we have met with most gratifying co-operation from the proprietors of practically all the industries in the city. Few employers of labor realize that they are ofttimes losing from 10% to 15% of the efficiency of their employees from improper heating and ventilation.

Another lamentably neglected field in preventive medicine is the control or an attempt to control the ravages of venereal diseases. These diseases constitute probably the most important factor in the degeneration and depopulation of the world. What these diseases represent in the lower working efficiency of our population, to say nothing of the increasing mortality, it would be difficult to estimate, and yet little has been done thus far to control them.

Then there are the degenerative diseases of middle life. It is difficult to understand the lamentable disregard that people have for their own bodies as regards degenerative changes which so frequently begin in early adult life. No man owning an engine, automobile, or a limousine that he has much regard for and in which he has a sum of money invested, will neglect having it carefully overhauled at frequent intervals. At the same time he fails to recognize the importance of having his family physician give him a careful examination once or twice a year in order that any degenerative change may be detected and got under control. The strenuous life, the mad rush for the almighty dollar, intemperance in eating, as well as in drinking, is largely responsible for these degenerative changes, and in this group of diseases alone lives could be lengthened from 10 to 15 years. One cannot but feel impressed when reading the Psalms, of which David is alleged to have written part, at least, that he had some conception of the possibilities of preventive medicine when with prophetic vision he wrote the following lines: "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night, nor for the destruction that wasteth at noon day, nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness." The Lord Bishop, Canon Plumtree, and other theologians present may not agree with my interpretation, but the "terror by night" points very markedly to malaria, which, previous to the plague, was one of the most destructive diseases in the East. It was thought to be due to the miasm in the air in low-lying swamp districts where there was stagnant water. This was always considered to be most dangerous at night—hence the fallacy in years gone by of the dangers of night air. As a matter of fact, night air is purer than day air, and in most cases, in large cities, more desirable inasmuch as it is much freer from dust, smoke and other contamination. However, in recent years it has been fully demonstrated that malaria is not conveyed in this way, but through the medium of a species of mosquito known as anopheles, and that this is the only means by which malaria is transmitted from one person to another. This is quite consistent with the observation always made that malaria existed only where there was stagnant water

—consequently where there was a breeding place for the mosquito. It is interesting to note in this connection that of over four hundred varieties of mosquitoes only one is responsible for the transmission of this disease, and one other species, the stagomya, is responsible for the transmission of yellow fever. General Gorgas and his staff of workers spent tens of thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands of dollars in endeavoring to get rid of malaria and yellow fever in Havana and Panama by a rigid carrying out of general sanitary principles, but this was a decided failure. However, it was just at that time that the fact was revealed, through Sir Patrick Manson and Sir Ronald Ross of the British Royal Commission that was appointed to investigate the transmission of tropical diseases, by Lavarand of France, and by Reed and his colleagues at Washington, that these two diseases, malaria and yellow fever, were only transmitted from one person to another through the medium of these two species of mosquitoes. Attention was immediately directed toward the control of the breeding places of these mosquitoes, and, in the meantime, to the protection of all citizens from being bitten by the mosquitoes, they being assured that they might better and safer be bitten by a mad dog. In brief, these two species of mosquitoes have practically been exterminated in Havana, Panama and the Panama Canal District, with the result that there has not been one case of yellow fever develop in any of these places for the past four years This is an outstanding demonstration of the possibilities of the control of these communicable diseases when we are sure of the means by which they are transmitted.

Then there is the Psalmist's observation in regard to the "destruction that wasteth by noon day,"—the wasting diseases of middle life, which are lamentably on the increase; and, thirdly, "for the pestilence that walketh in darkness,"—the venereal diseases, or let us call them "social diseases." These constitute but a few of the rocks and shoals upon which administrators of public health are required to place beacon lights to guard our people against untimely physical wrecks.

The question naturally arises, "Is the amount of money expended in Toronto on public health warranted?" We can only answer this by referring to the results that have been obtained. Those as are shown on the chart are as follows:

> In 1910, the mortality from a group of the more acute diseases,—diphtheria, scarlet fever and typhoid fever, was 107 per 100,000.
>
> In 1915, it was only 19 per 100,000.
>
> For diphtheria alone, the mortality was 41.9 in 1910, and 10.3 in 1915.

In 1910, for scarlet fever, the mortality was 24.7. In 1915, 2.6 per 100,000.

In 1910, for typhoid fever, the mortality was 40.8 per 100,000.

In 1915, for typhoid fever, the mortality was 1.9 per 100,000.

Toronto was particularly fortunate in 1915. We can hardly hope to maintain as low a death rate as that from typhoid, as it is practically 4 per 100,000 lower than any other city of 300,000 or more on this continent. The mortality this year from typhoid will be somewhat higher, though no doubt as low as any other city on the continent, if not lower. Our infant mortality under one year of age in 1915 was 33% less than in 1910 and 37% less than the average in the fourteen years previous to that date. In other words, our infant mortality had decreased from 139 per 1,000 births in 1910 to 93 in 1915. This means that if the rate of infant mortality in 1910 had continued, there would have been 2,050 deaths of infants in 1915 instead of only 1,374, which represents the saving of 676 babies last year alone.

We hear the question asked from many sources, "How will the world be repopulated after the present war?" If we compare the mortality from all causes in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces since the outbreak of war, two and a quarter years, with the mortality from typhoid fever and tuberculosis alone in Canada, it will throw some light on a possible means by which the population can be restored. Deaths from typhoid fever and tuberculosis in Canada, since the outbreak of war two and a quarter years, are 17,350. Deaths from all causes in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces since the outbreak of war, two and a quarter years, are 15,766. Therefore, there were 1,584 more deaths from typhoid and tuberculosis in Canada than occurred among Canadian soldiers from all causes during the same period. Again, if we take the entire group of preventable diseases—typhoid fever, diphtheria, scarlet fever, whooping cough and tuberculosis, to say nothing of our preventable infant mortality and the mortality from preventable industrial diseases and degenerative diseases of middle life—the comparison is even more striking. The deaths from these preventable diseases in Canada since the outbreak of war have been 22,560. The fatal casualties in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in the same period have been 15,766. The excess of deaths from preventable diseases over the fatal casualties amongst our soldiers in the two and a quarter years since the outbreak of war has been 6,794. It must be obvious then that if we put forth more strenuous efforts in the Dominion and

throughout the Empire to prevent the appalling sacrifice of human life from preventable diseases, the Empire will soon be repopulated.

Probably the principal reason why we have not been able to make more rapid advance in the science of preventive medicine is the inability of people to recognize a personal responsibility—to recognize the fact that no man liveth unto himself. This is very well illustrated by an incident that occurred in the State of Georgia where, in a small town, they had erected a building as a home for wayward boys. The Governor of the State, having heard of this, was sufficiently interested to consent to deliver the opening address. In doing so, he eulogized them, dwelt on the importance of the institution and what it would meant to the community, and in this connection said: "Ladies and gentlemen, if this institution is only a means of saving one boy, you will be amply repaid for all that you have expended in it." The convener of the committee, who had been responsible for the funds collected for this building, and, in addition to having contributed freely himself, had given a great deal of time, said to the Governor in coming out, "Governor, I enjoyed that address immensely and we are very grateful to you for it. but there is just one statement that I thought was a little far-fetched." "What was that?" said the Governor. "You said that if this building was only the means of saving one boy, we would be amply repaid for all we have expended on it. You know, Governor, this is a small place, and this building has cost us over $10,000, and don't you think that that was a little far-fetched?" "Not," said the Governor, "if that were my boy." It is only when we bring these matters home to ourselves that we can realize what the saving of one human life means; what the saving of one case of sickness in a home means, and we must not forget that the infant and the little boy and the little girl in the humblest home in Toronto is as precious to their parents as our infants and children are or ever have been to us.

(*December 18th, 1916.*)

Munitions in Canada

By Mr. J. W. Flavelle.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club, held on the 18th December, Mr. Flavelle said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—May I ask, as a matter of privilege, to make a statement in response to an item which appears this morning in one of the papers?

I had a friendship, which I still hold and prize, with the Minister of Finance, which commenced with our association together in the National Trust Company which continued in an unbroken period for twelve years. When he assumed the responsibility of a Minister of the Crown I thought it was my duty to cease to see Mr. White except when he sent for me, and to take no advantage of the close association of years or the friendship which had grown between us, as a basis for influencing him in his public duties. During the five years that he has been a Minister of the Crown I have not called upon Sir Thomas, either on public or private matters, except when in rare instances he has asked me to confer with him upon some matter of fact in reference to the Board with which I have the honor to be identified. If Sir Thomas White has political aspirations other than in serving the country in the capacity in which he has served it so efficiently, I know nothing of them. One of the things that is difficult for those who are identified with Ottawa is to believe that the obvious thing is true. They seem to fail to realize that a man may have convictions governing his views upon public questions which he holds honestly and because they are views which he has reached as the result of his own mature consideration. I am not in the confidence of the Govern-

*Shortly after the war began Mr. Flavelle was appointed Chairman of the Imperial Munitions Board and on the King's Birthday, 1917, was honored by being made a Baronet.

ment of Canada. I have been treated in my official relationship in connection with the Imperial Munitions, Board with great kindness and have had the invaluable assistance of the Prime Minister. He has never by suggestion, never by question, nor in any other way sought to interfere with the freedom of action which belonged to the members of the Board. He has rather on all occasions given his time freely when he received an intimation that we desired his assistance upon matters which we thought of sufficient importance to claim his attention. I desire to say to the correspondent of the paper in question that as far as private telegrams passing between gentlemen are concerned, I neither say I sent telegrams to the Prime Minister or received them from him for the simple reason that if I telegraph to any gentleman in connection with matters which concern him and me alone, it is not the business of the press or anyone else, but our own business. If on the other hand it is intimated that I am intriguing for the purpose of advancing some one's interest, or in some way interfering with the government of the affairs of Canada, I owe it to myself, I owe it much to the Imperial authorities whom I am representing, as well as the Canadian Government, to give it an unqualified denial.

I cannot believe that any man who was present at the meeting in Ottawa and heard me speak can have been responsible for the item which appeared in the paper this morning. I said then what I will say now,—that if an election is held in Canada at an early date, it will inevitably mean the raising of the red rag of racial differences between the English speaking people of this country and the French-Canadian people of Quebec. I said in Ottawa that I believed such a condition would be a calamity. I said there as I repeat now that every effort should be made to live together, to understand one another's point of view, and with all patience and reasonableness seek to interpret what our own mutual responsibility may be. I told the members of the Canadian Club at Ottawa that we cannot put the French-Canadians into the St. Lawrence River and remove them from the country, and

our French-Canadian friends cannot put the English speaking people to one side and say: "We will not respect your feelings and your views," nor can we get rid of the representation which both communities are legitimately entitled to have in the Dominion Parliament. I conceive it therefore to be the duty of public men to discover means whereby we shall avert a calamity of this character. I said further, which I repeat here, that it is inconceivable that a Government dependent for its majority upon constituencies where the German and Austrian votes determine the result, and, under the unfortunate conditions which have developed in French Canada, dependent upon the support of the French-Canadian representatives in Parliament practically *en masse*—it is inconceivable when we are asked to sit around the table with representatives from the other Overseas Dominions to determine what will be the future relation of all these Dominions to the Empire that a Government which depends on this support for its power will be permitted without civil strife to carry out this service. Civil strife on one side and racial differences on the other, should make every thoughtful man stop and ask what are the remedies that are to be applied and what action should be taken to avoid such conditions.

The Board with which I have the honor to be identified is responsible to the Imperial authorities. The Government of Canada does not seek to interfere with our freedom, and has not, as I have indicated, sought to direct our policy. I am speaking to a body chiefly composed of business men. I fancy few of you realize the extent of the detail or the remarkable character of the operations which are carried out by this Board. When you undertake to do a million to a million and a half dollars of business every day; when you carry it on in five or six hundred factories separated as far as Newfoundland on the East and Victoria on the West; when you reflect that we are responsible for all the raw product that enters into the shell in two hundred and twenty of these factories—that we buy the steel, we arrange to forge it, we ship the forgings one thousand, fifteen hun-

dred, two thousand, three thousand, four thousand miles to the factory where the machining is done; that we supplement the forgings with the various component parts entering into a shell, purchasing them as far South as Florida, and are dependent upon railways to deliver the product on time and subject to delays through weather conditions, you will understand some of the difficulties of this business.

You will understand too the difficulties which at times manufacturers had to meet because other manufacturers who had promised the Board to make deliveries of steel or forgings or component parts failed to do so and the machining and assembling plants were idle for want of material. For this reason the manufacturers have suffered a good deal of hardship.

What we have accomplished could not have been done were it not for the remarkable body of men who have gathered together to support us. We conceived it to be our duty to seek first to do the business which was entrusted to our care sufficiently well to warrant new business. We had the sense to consider it was stupid to act on the commercial traveller idea of going to England to secure a greatly added quantity of business when we were utterly and hopelessly congested with what we had. We tried to gather men about us who would help us to administer the greatest single business carried on on this continent, with the exception of the Steel Corporation of the United States and the Standard Oil Company. We started from zero point with no organization, and we may be pardoned if we have a reasonable sense of pride that at the end of twelve months with between six hundred and seven hundred men at the head office, between four and five thousand inspectors over the field—I say we may be pardoned if we have a reasonable pride in the assurance which has been given to us from England, "You have done well." In all this business from the day that our activities commenced we took the ground that we were trustees for the State, and that neither personal friendship, nor busines relationship, nor party, nor church, should influ-

ence us in placing orders. These hundreds of millions of dollars of orders have been placed and these hundreds of millions of dollars of shipments have been made and not a farthing of the whole business has been carried on on any basis other than on our intepretation as to what was just to the State.

There are men in this country who are studying Imperial problems and who are deeply interested in the question, "What will happen after the war?" for I suppose we are all agreed that there must be some change in the relations between the several Dominions which make up the Empire, and I repeat here what I said in Ottawa and what I thought —though the newspapers did not—what I thought was the most important single thing that I said. Does this rather interesting accident of having a body of men administer a great department of State in an Overseas Dominion, working in harmony with the Government of the Overseas Dominion, but independent of it, furnish any illustration of the possible conditions which might be set up if in place of the Imperial Government as at present representing England only, it became a Government representing all the Dominions within the Empire? It is rather interesting to note that by this accident there has been administered in Canada without friction or misunderstanding with the members of the Government of Canada a volume of business, practically under Deputy Ministers, which in extent is two and one half times greater per year than the usual expenditure of the Overseas Dominion itself in Government service. That is to say,—the expenditures of this Board responsible to an outside Government amount annually to two and one half times as much as the normal expenditure in this country for Governmental purposes.

The work which the Board has sought to do has been only possible through the co-operation of the manufacturers of Canada, and that they have done well can perhaps as well be said in the remarks made by Mr. McKenna at a luncheon given to Sir Thomas White in London when he stated: "Who

would have supposed before this war that it would have been possible that an Overseas Dominion such as Canada would gather together, send to the Front or have in training for the purpose of sending to the Front, a body of men greater than all the forces which we trained and prepared and sent to South Africa to a war which sixteen years ago we thought taxed the Empire, or who would have supposed that Canada would have become a country to produce munitions in greater quantity than were produced in any other country in the world except Germany prior to the war?" That is the service which the manufacturers of Canada have accomplished during two years' time. I said in Toronto the other day that I had seen when I was in England samples of shells from manufacturers in Canada so bad, so unsatisfactory, that if there had been any reasonable kind of factory inspection they would not have gone forward. I was speaking to a specific subject. I do not blame the newspaper reporter, but with the faculty he has of desiring to make a headline state a lot, he put in: "Shells from Canada are a failure." If I had been asked I would have said to the newspaper reporter that in the same bonded warehouse where I saw faulty shells from Canada, I saw faulty shells from the Unitel States and from Great Britain. The human element will never be removed, human weakness is ever present, and we will never reach a point where we automatically produce everything of high excellence. But this is the gravity of the situation; there are no averages in munitions. If you break a dozen eggs to make an omelet or to make scrambled eggs and there are eleven fresh but one not quite as good as you would like it, but still there it is. If the unsuspecting man at the table does not know of it he takes his scrambled eggs or his omelet without much comment; but take that stale egg and put it before him separately and he will say to the waiter, "Waiter, take it away." Now, bear in mind every shell is an individual shell performing its own service and discharging its own function, and if a manufacturer makes nine hundred and ninety-nine excellent shells and every one performs the

service that was intended, but if through carelessness, through oversight, he fails to make the thousandth as good as the other nine hundred and ninety-nine, and if in consequence there is a premature explosion in the gun that blows the gun to pieces and kills the gun crew because of it, that is the kind of thing that every manufacturer ought to know that he might have heart searching in his works to discover what carelessness had been present whereby the faulty shell had been produced.

It may be a surprise to you to learn that in England where there are four thousand odd controlled factories that the Government goes to a manufacturer and says: "We want you to make that article," specifying it, "and we will pay you that price for it; we will supervise your accounts and your profit and loss sheet; we will permit you to write off for depreciation that percentage, and when your profit and loss sheet is struck we will deduct fifty, sixty, or eighty per cent. of the profit for the State." I would like to say to my manufacturing friends here where we have a condition of absolute freedom to do as we please and where the profits of the business except that portion of it which is claimed by the Dominion Treasury is entirely in your own hands—I would like you to compare your position to that of the British manufacturers. Some of you who have made money to so great an extent that you have permanently put your business on a satisfactory basis and left an important margin for distribution besides, I would like you to realize the different conditions under which the British manufacturer operates, and the different sense of responsibility which he possesses, first as interpreted to him by his Government and afterwards as interpreted by himself through his own desire to discharge his responsibilities.

Where buyers and sellers meet there will always be differences of opinion. The Board when it assumed its duties checked over the orders that were on hand to ascertain what had been the development, and the likelihood of deliveries later. We conceived it to be our duty to say to the manufacturers: "These prices were given to you for early delivery; you have not succeeded and it is not fair to the Crown while they are buying product at dollars per shell less, and when we are able to give deliveries to the Crown of shells of the same character from other manufacturers who have succeeded, that you should continue to have the old price as though you had made the deliveries. We want you, therefore, to sit down and tell us what in fairness should be taken off

your contract so as to be just to the Crown." With the exception of four or five or six cases every settlement that was ultimately effected was effected with the co-operation and at the figure which the manufacturer himself named—after there was a reasonable conversation. When I tell you that the aggregate of the amount written off the contracts that were delayed in delivery amounted to some $4,000,000—$2,000,000 of it in Canada, and $2,000,000 of it in the United States—you will recognize that the manufacturers acted well when they were asked to assist in fixing a just settlement. In the matter of price for renewal contracts we have sought to be governed by the same principle. We do not always carry the judgment of the manufacturer that we are as just as we think we are, but after all we have information which is not available to the individual manufacturer, and when we have fixed the nenewal price we have done it not for the purpose of being smart or clever, but for the purpose of giving a just price and a just return to the capable manufacturer. You will bear in mind that all the material is supplied by the Board. The manufacturer supplies plant and labor and the needed organization.

It is very easy to cultivate a spirit of anger against profiteers; it is very easy to cultivate a spirit of anger against Governments, and to find fault with them. But why? They at least are doing the thing that is needed; they are turning out the munitions that are necessary. May I ask during this time when you have been somewhat censorious or cross against the profiteer or angry with the Government, what have you done? How far have you served the State by intelligent, constructive criticism, and what help in this respect have you given the Government of this country or the Opposition whereby they have reached saner conclusions in the discharge of their duties? I have returned from a country so deeply moved by the war,—a country under ordinary circumstances so contentious for its individual rights that men are ready to scrap at any minute in defence of them—that has developed a temper which will make possible in two or three months' time that every man in the country will be doing what he is told, and will accept the dictation. They will eat the food both as to type and as to quantity they are permitted to eat; they will reach a position, I doubt not, where the manufacturer will be told: "Stop making that article; it is not needed." Before they are through with it merchants will be directed: "Stop selling that product and buy no more

of it, for all the energies of the nation and all the activity of the nation, and all the resources of the nation are needed for things which are necessary." Does this country realize it is at war? Are we drunk with prosperity? Have we lost the capacity of moral earnestness? I cabled from London a few weeks ago at the request of the Imperial authorities saying that it was vital to the production of a type of steel which was urgently required that certain material produced in Canada should be secured and for which the Imperial authorities had contracts, but the contractor stated he could not make deliveries because he could not secure the requisite electric power, and that there was a greatly increased demand because of Christmas trading. My God, Christmas trading! What difference does it make whether my friend Ryrie sells a dollar's worth of jewelry or not during this time? What difference does it make whether my friend Fox closes up the William Davies Stores so as to sell goods only in daylight? What odds is it if my friend Fudger finds his profit and loss sheet affected because there is not light enough to spare to light people who come to trade? Why do we do this? We are not mean. We are anxious to respond to any call made upon us, but why expect that the call will only come from some Government circle? Why do you not call yourself? Is this Canadian Club to be a place where men will come to have their fancy tickled by an address every few weeks and fail to assume responsibility for activity which will cost something? There is enough dynamic force in this Club this afternoon if you had the necessary moral earnestness that knew no reserve to turn this country upside down. It is not true that you are out of politics any more than I have been out of politics because politics are dirty. It is because neither you nor I have been willing to pay the price. Things are too comfortable with us. We rather pride ourselves in saying it is business as usual. We are gratified in finding our balance sheets, and our profit and loss sheets, the best in our record, and we have the spirit, although we are not quite so honest in stating it as the good woman I heard of in Earlscourt yesterday who said "This war do bring a lot of good cheer."

If you go to the Front you will be struck with the most amazing spectacle that you could conceive possible. No words that I could attempt to give you would give an adequate picture of the astonishing activity back of the lines, of the movement of traffic, of the wondrous tonnage of material, and above all of the character of the men who ungrudgingly

undertake their task day by day under conditions of the most trying and depressing character.

If you go shooting or hunting or fishing and you get wet to the skin, you make a great effort to return to camp that you may remove your wet clothes and dry out. You tell your freinds after you come home of your experience and claim the sympathy of your wife. Do you realize, gentlemen, that while you are sitting here in comfort there are hundreds of thousands of men who have had hardly a dry stitch on them for weeks; who have been wet to the skin, not while they were fishing or in sport, but while they have been under fire, in the presence of possible death, or grievous wounds any minute during night or day! I saw thousands of men on the Somme returning from the trenches without a square inch from the top of their steel helmet to their heels which was not literally covered with mud, and with the horses that accompanied them in a mess of mud from their fetlocks to the back of their ears. When you see these men who have been in the trenches for 48 to 72 hours, weary to the point of exhaustion; when you think that the sleep they secured was while leaning against the side of the trench subject to a call at any moment for defence or offence; when you see and hear the batteries of guns planted in the midst of the camp; when you see all the activities of these wondrous camps of men including every kind of shack or tent or dug-out as each Company's fancy or resources, directs; when you see mixed up with these the great batteries of guns: 4.5, 60 pounders, 7 inch, 8 inch, 9.2, and occasionally off by themselves the aristocrats, the 12 or 15 inch gun; when you see the activities of the camp go on as though hundreds of shells from these guns were not screaming over men's heads as they whirl by on their terrific message two or three or four or five or seven miles distant; when you go to a forward dressing station and see the conditions under which the men are treated as they are brought in at night, for they are mostly brought in at night, and you see the condition of the ground over which they are carried, not a square yard of it that has not been affected more or less by shell fire and by destructive influences—full of holes, full of trenches, full of tangled pieces of wire and every conceivable thing to make it difficult to move,—through pelting rain or winter's snow as the case may be, dark as Egyptian darkness, for there is no light—there is no Christmas trading there, gentlemen!—there must be no light, and the young doctor in charge who had taken care of two hundred and fifty poor

fellows the night before told me that through the exhaustion and the weariness, caused by falling into holes, with the slipping and slithering and sliding as they carried them, they had to have relays which required in some cases as many as forty men to bring a wounded man from the field where he lay to the dressing station. There came to me the thing which I sought to say in Ottawa, and I seek to say it to you now—What have these men done? What have these men done that they should bear this burden and this trial while we at home are in comfort and at ease? What thing is there that we can do at home that we may be worthy of the heroism of these men? I ask you, gentlemen, I ask you in your activities, whether it be as voters in the election or employers of labor or living at home, whether you have bank accounts available to take up war loans, or whatever may be your circumstances, I ask you in place of scolding Governments and finding fault with profiteers to ask yourself what part have I placed in the game to be worthy of the men who are over yonder?

There was a lad who years ago I saw in Sunday School; I knew him since he was a baby. I saw the boy grow up through the knicker-bockers' stage, and the awkward time when he did not know what to do with his hands or his feet; I saw the lad in our own office 19 years old, tall and straight and comely; and I saw him when he came into the office to shake hands with me and bid me good bye. I saw him three weeks ago last night lying in the hospital with both feet off, and I learned on the Tuesday night before that because there had been difficulty with the bone in one of the legs, they had to operate again and cut it off up by the thigh. What do you think the lad said? "It makes me proud to have you come and see me, sir." Think of it. I told the congregation in Sherbourne Street Church last night I wasn't fit to live in the same room with the boy. And what else do you think he told me? Of the nurses and doctors and of kind friends, and of the fight—"It was a great fight, sir." This lad that I saw as a baby the other day talking about taking a man's place and a good fight!

The other day after I spoke to the manufacturers a man who was present came to me and said: "That was a very nice Sunday School talk you gave us." I never in my life wanted so much to forget I had been brought up respectably. I have known that man for years as a liar; I have known him for years to be without political morals or business

morals. He is the type who thinks he has stated a great truth when he says elections cannot be won by prayers. That is the type, and is the time, gentlemen, not far past due that this class should be less influential in both Liberal and Conservative ranks and that during these grave times he should not be so much in evidence?

My time is over-shot.—Voices: Go on; take all the time you want.

Long ago, on a great day a body of disciples waited for their Lord, and when he came from the Mount and there was a poor unfortunate possessed of a devil that they had not been able to exorcise and when He commanded the devil and it came out of him, they in their amazement asked "Why could not we cast him out?" he said unto them: "This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting." And, gentlemen, the principle laid down by the great Teacher is true in the simple things in life as well as every great emergency in life—it is costly to do a good piece of work—are we willing to put up with discomfort? The serious things in life that matter come under the class—this kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting.

Have you reflected on the profit and loss sheet for this war? It will cost 100,000 or 125,000 or 150,000 of the cream of the young manhood of this country either as killed or as wounded, and when we get through with the job we will have an annual charge for debt and for sinking fund and for pensions that I judge will not be much short of $100,000,000 per year. What is on the other side of the account? Nothing but character, and if this nation is in danger of failing to secure the only asset that is possible for them out of the war—the asset of character reflected in acceptance of responsibility with courage and patience and fortitude—if we miss that asset we miss the only asset that belongs to this war. What we need is a spirit "not of fear, but of power and of love and of a sound mind."

(The meeting adjourned with the singing of "God Save the King!" suggested by Mr. Flavelle.)

(*January 4th, 1917.*)

A Canadian Derby Plan for Recruiting the Army Without Conscription

By J. M. Godfrey.*

AT a special luncheon of the Club held on the 4th January, Mr. Godfrey said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—Most speakers, in fact all speakers, desire an appreciative and sympathetic audience; I especially desire your sympathy to-day, as I am troubled with the rather common complaint of a bad cold. But more than that, I should like you, the Canadian Club, to give to the plan which I submit to-day the acid test of the critical mentality for which this Club is so famous.

Everyone engaged in active recruiting for any length of time soon becomes a conscriptionist. He sees that the voluntary plan is unfair, unequal, unjust, inefficient, undemocratic, wasteful, and really not British. But when he tries to campaign for conscription, he soon finds himself face to face with what seems to be insurmountable obstacles. He soon is told what he has almost forgotten, that the life of Parliament was extended only after the leaders of both political parties had declared against conscription. He is told that conscription is not possible because forty per cent. of the people of Canada are either apathetic or antipathetic to the war. Also, he is told that with our great unguarded boundary of almost four thousand miles it would be impossible to keep in this country anyone who wished to leave it to avoid conscription.

More important than all other objections he is also told that no party government would dare bring in a policy of conscription which would thereby solidify behind an opposition all the many antagonistic elements in the country. Incidentally he will be told about Australia, and warned of the danger of an Anti-War Government.

If this war is to last another two years, it cannot be finished without conscription, but it is going to be imposed upon us

*Mr. Godfrey is President of the Canadian National Service League. He has been one of the most active forces in the work of recruiting in the military district of which Toronto is the centre. He is also Vice-President of the Bonne Entente.

not by a party government but by Germany, that is to say, by military necessity.

To those of us who seriously regarded the Premier's New Year offering a year ago of half a million men, the situation is alarming. To fail in our solemn pledge is to stamp this country with dishonor. If Canada does not go the whole way in this war she can never again hold up her head among the great self-governing democracies of the Empire. The confidence with which she is now regarded will be changed to distrust.

What is the situation? While there have been about 385,000 enlistments in Canada, of that number over 60,000 have been discharged, while in Canada, for medical unfitness and for other reasons, and instead of the 100,000 men usually mentioned as being our outstanding obligation, we require at least 175,000 more to pay our promissory note to the Empire. To raise these men we have only broken down and inadequate methods which disregard the vitalities of the situation.

We are told to expect a good deal from the National Service Commission. I don't want to criticize National Service; I am not here to criticize anything or anybody; but, as far as recruiting is concerned, are we justified in expecting great things from the National Service Commission? No good purpose can be now served by criticizing the Commission on account of its party composition, or by reason of the peculiar circumstances surrounding its inception, or the inadequate character of the National registration which it has proposed. The patriotic citizens of Canada have given loyal support to the Government in every measure it has proposed for the better carrying on of the war, and they should and will no doubt do so again for National Service.

But it must not be forgotten that the primary purpose of the Commission is to estimate man-power for the industries of the country, and that recruiting is only indirectly connected with its campaign. Speaking at Montreal the Prime Minister expressly disclaimed making a recruiting speech. It must be expected that the slacker who has for more than two years resisted every patriotic appeal will simply throw in the waste paper basket the registration card which he is invited but not required to fill in.

We have been sending troops overseas at the rate of 15,000 a month. By the time the names of the eligibles have been tabulated at Ottawa the Canadian reserves will have been generously depleted. The problem of maintaining adequate reinforcements in Canada will remain unsolved. The country is entirely without assurance that it is being faced.

While undoubtedly the campaign for National Service if vigorously pushed will be of great value in awakening patriotic sentiment, it must not be forgotten that the Commission has assumed no sort of responsibility for a new and effective plan for recruiting.

Before discussing the plan I have to present, let me discuss briefly the recruiting plan adopted in the 2nd Military Division, with the idea of showing that the voluntary plan is exhausted.

As you know, the 2nd Military Division is the largest in Canada. It has a population of 1¼ millions, one-sixth of the population of Canada. Its quota of the half million promised is about 79,000, based upon the eligibles according to the last census. We have enlisted 85,000 men, but of them over 12,000 have been discharged here in Canada, for unfitness, etc., so we have 6,000 more to raise before our quota is obtained. The plan we have adopted is simple, based upon the plan used by both political parties in general elections. First, there is a Central Civilian Recruiting League for the entire Division, with branches is each Dominion constituency. The Division comprises the cities of Toronto and Hamilton and seventeen counties in Central Ontario. The campaign was in the hands of the Central Committee, composed of men of both political parties,—and, incidentally, Mr. President, we had a lot of decent people who did not belong to either political party. The campaign was similar to that followed in a general election. The office of the Speakers' Patriotic League was made a central bureau, from which organizers and speakers were sent forth to assist in carrying on the work in the different counties. They organized each county, with a county association, and that association organized in each polling subdivision a local committee.

As, in an election, the polling subdivision is the active unit, so in this campaign. We held recruiting meetings, hundreds of them, largely on the plan of a sort of big general election and Methodist revival combined, going on for several months. Splendid results followed, and a great many volunteers were secured in this way. These local committees after the meeting usually made a registration of all the eligibles in the subdivision for the recruiting officers, who would then canvass them. Strong pressure was also brought to bear by public opinion.

This campaign commenced in November, 1915, and was vigorously conducted until the following May. When it began the enlistments in the 2nd Division were about 35,000, and

when the campaign faded away at the beginning of June they had been increased to about 80,000. Thus it was an entirely successful campaign.

But just as you can't carry on a general election forever, and just as a Methodist revival if continued too long burns itself out, so this campaign had to come to an end, and it did, with dramatic suddenness, by the middle of the summer. I want to say to you this: that campaign can never be revived in this country! The methods are obsolete, and any attempt to revive it would be simply flogging a dead horse. You will realize that if you should try it.

What was the next step? The plan I wish to submit to your critical intelligence was submitted to Sir Robert Borden last April. We suggested that out of this Central Recruiting League, with its lecturers and organizers of the Speakers' Patriotic League, a Government Commission be constituted to undertake the whole work of recruiting in the Division, with certain powers, one being the right to appoint in each Dominion constituency in the Division a local Board, say of seven men. This local Board of seven men would be empowered to make at once a compulsory registration of all persons, men and women, in the Division between the ages of sixteen and sixty-five, following British precedent. The returns—I want you to note this—the returns in the first instance, of this registration, would be made, not to Ottawa, but direct to the local Board.

Now when this registration was completed,—and it could be done in this way in about three weeks,—the local Board would have the right to hold sittings in every polling subdivision in the constituency. And it would have one other power, a very important power, the right to compel by subpoena the attendance of any person in the Division at this sitting.

Let me show you how it works out. Let us suppose that you have had a registration, and the local Board is sitting, say in the village of Cooksville, in the Town Hall. They know the names of all the eligibles in the subdivision and the names of their employers. Take some concrete cases:

John Smith, aged twenty-one, works with his father on a hundred-acre farm. The father comes in and says, "If you take him for the army, I can't carry on production, and the farm will have to go to grass." Production has to go on, so the Board, if they are wise, will say to John, "You go back to the farm and serve in production; we will exempt you from military service, and give you a badge showing that you are doing your duty."

On the other hand, next the Smith farm is the Jones farm, on which there are three boys, all of military age, none of whom has answered the call. The Board might tell two of them that they should enlist,—I should say to be sent to farms on which there is no one to work. I think we have gone far enough in taking men from the farms. On the other hand a young man working in a factory or a store selling shirts and neckties, or a man working where a woman could take his place,—these will be told that they should enlist.

You ask what would happen if they don't join? Of course, my plan being to recruit without conscription, they would simply be turned out without a badge. The whole question is, how many of these men could stand the obliquy of leaving the Town Hall and walking out with the whole neighborhood knowing that they have been at an investigation, which tells those who should to go into the army? Very few young men would, in my opinion, dare refuse to accept the judgment of a local Board under this plan.

We hear about confirmed slackers. There are very few confirmed slackers. The trouble is, the confirmed slacker does not think he is a slacker, and very often he is not,—he knows his own circumstances better than anybody else.

You say, "This involves compulsion." I did not say we could raise an army without compulsion, but without conscription. It involves two elements of compulsion: registration, and attendance before the local Board—both compulsory.

But why this sudden tenderness on the question of compulsion? How many of you gentlemen would pay your taxes if you were not compelled to do it? When the decennial census is taken in the piping times of peace, you are compelled to answer and to answer correctly. If you don't clean the snow from your sidewalks the police can compel your attendance before Magistrate Denison. Which is the more important—to keep the sidewalk clean or to do your duty in this war?

It may be said that this plan involves moral compulsion, and that it would be much better to have conscription. On the streets of the city all last winter there was ignorant moral compulsion. But this would be the compulsion of an informed opinion. It would have as its basis a thorough knowledge of the situation in connection with the individual who comes before the Board and whom it is desirous to compel to enlist. And for the first time compulsion would have behind it the dignity and force of Government authority.

This plan has been worked out with special reference to Military Division No. 2, but I think with a little consideration you will see that it will work out all over Canada.

The first question you are going to ask is, "Will it do for Quebec?"

The question of the recuiting situation in Quebec is altogether too complex and involved to be considered fully here. But I want to say to you,—and I have had some little knowledge of Quebec in the past few months,—the more I know about Quebec, the more I am inclined to let the people of Quebec express their own opinions about Quebec. I am not quite so sure about Quebec as I was before I was connected with the Bonne Entente movement. There is too much talk about leaving Quebec out of this or that, and refraining from action in eight Provinces because of this danger or that in Quebec. That talk is deeply resented in Quebec. Speaking with a number of French-Canadians prominent in recruiting, I have been told that they think this plan would work well in Quebec. But whatever you do with Quebec, let the French-Canadians themselves attend to their problems. It is not for us to criticize them or tell them what to do.

This plan could be introduced in Quebec, with the same organization and the same powers. Personally I would leave to the Divisional Committee and the local Boards to say to what extent this plan could be enforced, and where. There are two distinct classes of recruiting in Quebec. A great many say that all Quebec needs is more knowledge about the war, and that a great campaign of education is required. On the other hand, many prominent French-Canadians state that the one thing you can't make the habitant understand is voluntaryism. He, however, will obey the law and for this reason, they say, Quebec is ready for conscription, and for six months they have been urging, "Bring on conscription!"

Let me read you a leteer from one of these men:

"My Dear Mr. Godfrey,—

"I need not add to our already stated opinion, that this Province is more ripe for conscription than is known to the outside world.

"You have seen refuted by the Quebec Labor Unions the statement that they would not answer the questions of the Service card. On the contrary they have plainly stated they would do so, and advise every member of their Unions to do so.

"No doubt Col. Mulloy has advised you that in August last the Council of Labor of Quebec passed a resolution that they would accept the form of conscription the Government might adopt. We have no Socialists here, thank God."

Now he gives a very interesting historical incident which he

thinks proves that Quebec is ready, as he says by nature, for conscription. "At the time of the Trent affair, as you know, there was considerable excitement in Canada. Two volunteer regiments were formed, the 8th and 9th, and when the 9th was being raised Col. Charles De Salaberry, first Colonel of the 9th, and son of the hero of Chateauguay, was asked to raise a company in Chantilly, his native and seigneurial county. He posted notices throughout the country asking for volunteers and proceeded to enlist the men. Upon the day of his arrival he was met by a delegation of farmers from all parts of the country, and their spokesman, addressing the Colonel, stated that they would not enlist under the volunteer system. Their ancestors, grandfathers and fathers, had been enlisted by 'drawing lots.' The man so drawn (the system of France) had to serve. It was the system used by his father, Col. De Salaberry, in 1812. Why not now? Why should his son serve and his neighbor's son remain at home? If his son was drawn by lot, then he would see that he served." My friends, that is practically the situation in Quebec to-day.

Let me ask you something else. We have heard something about bloodshed and riot in Quebec. Who would be likely to lead it? Most of you men, practically all of you.—Well, I have seen correspondence with Mr. Armand Lavergne—am I a good guesser? Here is what Col. Armand Lavergne says:

"You know how I feel about this war and what are my opinions: right or wrong they are sincere, and I do not go back on them. I have always believed, and do still believe, that our participation, the way we did it, was a mistake from a Canadian point of view; more from an Imperial point of view.

"I claimed and claim yet that we should not have assumed new obligations towards the Mother-country without being granted equivalent rights.

"But, wisely or foolishly, we stepped into the war and now have reached the point where we must state whether we are going on or getting out.

"The public men of to-day or the Government, in my mind, seem to lack the courage of their convictions. They tell the Canadian people: 'This is our war; it is Canada's defence; it is our duty, more, our necessity, to take part in it.' And that is all. Well, as long as the individual's participation is voluntary it implies the right to refuse, and no blame ought to be brought on him for it.

"To have an apology for a milk and water policy, they

blame Quebec, and give our Province out as an excuse for their own cowardice. I, for one, am tired of seeing my Province made the scapegoat for the sins of imbecility of Israel. I would be very grateful to you if you would tell our Ontario compatriots that such are not the facts, that Quebec is not that hotbed of disloyalty to Canada, but that it is only used as a pretext, a mere excuse. There would be no more riot and bloodshed in Quebec than anywhere else. Quebec people are lawabiding, and obey the law even when the law is wrong, until they have had it repealed. I have opposed Canada's participation in this war and am still of the same opinion; but, for God's sake, since we are in the war, let us be in it like men, or step out of it, before being dishonored!"

What does that mean? Is it not a reasonable inference that Col. Lavergne would welcome an opportunity afforded by patriotic men to whom the taint of political partisanship does not cling, to find a basis of unity for the war about which there could be no cavil? You can forget Armand Lavergne's opposition to participation in the war; the important thing is, he says: "Let us be in it like men!" Some way there should be found to get men from all over the country to thrash out this whole situation, regardless of the political considerations which are our bane even after two and a half years of war. Surely we can see in the present situation a great opportunity to achieve the national unity of which many have despaired. The Canadian Club exists for the purpose of promoting Canadian patriotism. The last speaker you heard was Mr. Flavelle. He told you there was enough dynamic force in this room to achieve the unity that is essential to our most honorable emergence from this war. Do you agree that something ought to be done to put beyond all doubt the question whether the second largest Province of Canada will take a national view of the nation's war? How many of you would join in an effort to bring that about?

The plan which I have attempted to outline to you is really a Canadian adaptation of the plan so successfully carried out in Great Britain by Lord Derby, which has in essence the purpose of bringing every Canadian citizen face to face with his individual responsibility in this war. And while the Derby plan had as its chief objective the recruiting for military purposes of men by classes, this plan goes still farther; it will not only get recruits for the army but also for other branches of National Service. It will answer that question which many of you have asked. "What can I do? Tell me and I'll do it!"

Mr. Bennett, you remember, in his National Service speech at Massey Hall, divided the population into three classes, the fighters, the workers, and the payers. The ideal system will be one which will get every man into his proper class. I ask you this, not in a spirit of citicism, is that going to be done by sending a few tons of cards to Ottawa? In order to do this, you must find out what every man can best do; this can be done by local Boards, as has been shown; secondly, you must get the man into his right class; that can be done in only two ways, either by legal compulsion or by moral compulsion. Mr. Bennett says we can't have compulsion. I submit this plan would be the most unobjectionable kind of moral compulsion.

There are two ways in which this plan is an improvement on Lord Derby's plan—because Lord Derby's plan can be improved, as you will improve my plan—the returns must be made in each constituency direct to the local Board. In Britain they were all made to the President of the Local Government Board in London: the result was that it was three months before the names were tabulated and available, and by that time the information had become inaccurate and stale. Mr. Bennett has told us it will take four months to tabulate the names under the National Service registration scheme. I claim that the local registration could be completed in three weeks.

The second important improvement is the power to compel attendance before the local Board. This power, which was not employed in the British Derby plan, will be of great value in the effective working out of the scheme.

Gentlemen, I should like to say one or two words in conclusion. A friend of mine received not long ago a letter from a member of the present British Cabinet. This gentleman took occasion to say how grateful Great Britain was for the help which Canada was giving in this war to the Motherland. My friend, in replying, told that Right Honorable gentlemen that he was entirely mistaken: Canada was not helping the Motherland; she was fighting Canada's own war!

The Premier's message the other day in reply to Lloyd George's inspiring message stated that Canada would continue to fight side by side with the Motherland. Is that really the case? Have we been fighting side by side with the Motherland? Have we not, rather, been lagging away behind? On August 15th, 1915, they had compulsory registration in Great Britain. At the end of 1916 we have no absolute registration in Canada. In 1915, Lord Derby was recruiting his great

army. We are only now beginning to talk of employing those methods in Canada. They are having conscription in Great Britain. We are told we can't have it.

Isn't it about time, Mr. President and gentlemen, that Canada began to fight this war as a nation, as an ally of Great Britain, rather than as a vassal and a flunky?

Is there an alternative? There is. We have raised an army of some 375,000 men, probably 325,000 effective soldiers. We have suffered nearly 100,000 casualties. We have 100,000 men on the firing line. The discharges for unfitness in Canada and the casualties have for several months exceeded the additions from recruiting. Our boys are being wounded and patched up after a fashion, and are being sent back to the front. That is done a second time, and a third time. It is done until at last they make the supreme sacrifice.

There is an alternative. We can let our boys be broken down under the terrible nervous strain of the frightfulness of modern warfare, through lack of reinforcements to give them the rest and relief they must have. We can desert the boys who have taken upon themselves the awful burden of fighting our battles. We can let our army dwindle until it ceases to be a fighting unit. We can, if we want to, let our boys break down. We can default on our bond. But I don't think we will!

(January 8th, 1917.)

Recruiting in Quebec

By Mr. O. S. Perrault.*

At a regular meeting of the Club held on the 8th January, Mr. Perrault said:

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Members of the Canadian Club, —Some few months ago Quebec Province had the honor and the distinction of receiving a great number of you and of bringing you into close intercourse with its citizens. To-day, we of Quebec are here renewing old acquaintances with our former guests of Ontario. With all the sincerity of which I am capable, may I state, in my opening remarks, that I am most happy to be here and to help, within the modest limits of my powers, to the getting together of the two great races which go to make up the population of the two Provinces.

Several who are here present have seen, and have even told their fellow compatriots, how the people of two races, in the neighboring Province of Quebec, have stood shoulder to shoulder, whether in business, or socially, or in other fields of human activity, without infringing upon the sentiments or the state of mind possessed by either one section or the other; how both races work in harmony for the prosperity of the common heritage.

Now, my good friends, therein we have an example. If two races, as I have stated, are able to live together side by side in the truest spirit of union in one Province, why should not the same condition prevail in the case of two races located in a larger area, when it is pointed out that these races are divided by only an imaginary line? Why should not these races be animated by the same spirit of harmony and work for the common good of both?

Are we not all Canadian? Do we not live beneath the same flag? Do we not breathe the same spirit of liberty, beneath the folds of that self-same flag? As British subjects, are we not all on the same footing? Are we not brothers?

Yes, I say! and I think that no one here present will rise to rebut me. We are a young and vigorous people filled with ambition. We have been set down by nature in a land endowed

*Mr. O. S. Perrault, one of the leading French Canadian business men of Montreal, came up with the "Bonne Entente." Throughout the war he has been one of the leading spirits in the movement to stimulate recruiting in his province.

to the highest degree with riches. We are a people composed of races renowned for their energetic spirit, for their tenacity, and for their intelligence. What one lacks, the other comes forward and supplies. Then, I ask, why should we not get together and try to assimilate, each the ideas, the principles, the one of the other? Why should we not try to help each other? Why should we not try to better each other?

But, it may be asked, how are we going to do this? As far as my opinion goes, two factors can improve the situation: we must know each other; we must understand each other better. Here we are—two men of different mentality,—how are we to esteem each other? How are we to have regard for each other if we do not understand each other? And how are we to understand each other if it be not through personal contact,—through getting together? If we are to keep ourselves apart, if we are to wrap ourselves up in our prejudices, well, it means our own destruction. We will have lost all the object or end of existence itself; for, if I understand aright this object or end, it is that we get together and unite for the greater benefit of the greater number.

On the other hand, if we get together—if we try to reach an understanding one with the other, there will ensue an exchange of ideas, there will most assuredly be a union between the two races. I do not mean by this that there will not be some little misunderstandings; but I do mean to say that there will result some attitude of mind whereby each will endeavor to reach a common ground of understanding. And from this common ground, I feel sure, there will arise a greater spirit of union between the two great races which go to make up the population of this country. Needless for me to elaborate upon the question of bringing about greater solidarity between two individuals. What is it, I ask, which assures the success of a commercial enterprise? What is it that is at the bottom of success in business? Is it not union? Is it not the common interest? Is it not a good understanding between those engaged in such business?

Just as it is undeniable that some nations present vastly different temperaments, so is it assured that each race possesses its own mental state—may I call it, its own mentality? But it does not follow from this that there is incompatibility of temperament between these different races? (I had to translate this from French into English.) Two races can at the same time present different temperaments, different characteristics and understand each other, have regard for each other and stand shoulder to shoulder with each other when

it is a question of entering upon the defensive. And the greatest proof we have of this is that, during the past three years, the Allies, composed of thousands and thousands of people of different temperaments and characteristics, are shoulder to shoulder fighting for the one and the same ideal—civilization!

What supernatural power was it that impelled them to battle, making them despise machine guns, making them disregard wounds, making them even pay no attention to death? What is it that makes them accomplish heroic deeds in comparison with which the exploits of the middle ages appear as insignificant? What is it, I ask, if it be not that these soldiers, rising from different races, have a common ideal? The ideal which compels them to mete out punishment to those who have cast under foot, dragged in blood the most sacred principles of Justice and Right, which, after all, are the pillars of civilization. It is incumbent upon us all to say what the future of our country will be. Each section of the population has its own responsibilities in the matter. One is bound up in the other. Upon us here present is incumbent the duty, in a most especial manner, of carrying on the campaign of wiping away all the prejudices which are the curse of a nation, and which hold back its development on the path of progress. Upon us is incumbent the duty of making each know the other better.

And our reward? Well, it will be given to us to see Canada growing better, with the union of the two great races going to make up its population. We will see these same races working together in harmony for the prosperity of our great country.

Your President has asked me to mention an incident which happened a few months ago in the Province of Quebec in connection with the recruiting. When Hon. Sam. Hughes sent a wire to Armand Lavergne to offer him the command of an overseas Battalion, and Lavergne refused, I immediately took up the telephone and called up Oliver Asselin, who was the founder of the Nationalist party and Bourassa's right hand man, and said: "I have got a car at the door, and I am sending it over to you to bring you here. I will keep you ten minutes, and I will send you back, so you will only lose half an hour. I can't tell you on the 'phone what I want." He said: "All right" and I sent the car. We talked about the matter a few minutes and I said to him: "I want you to enlist. Will you do that? I know it is a big sacrifice. You have a wife and children, and you are not a rich man; but I

think you have a great opportunity of doing a great thing for Canada." Asselin asked me which way I wanted him to do it. I said: "I don't know whether I can do it, but I will try to get you the command of a battalion." He considered a moment and finally said: "I will." He wrote me afterwards a letter,—I wish I had it here with me—in which he agreed to enlist. I took that letter up to Ottawa personally, and Brigadier-General Labelle, a flour merchant of Montreal, came with me to introduce me. The command was offered to Asselin. He refused and said he would take second place if the command was given to a man who was at the front, who had proven his worth, or who had come back from the front and who had experience.

Before I left, Hon. Sir Sam Hughes informed us that he had cabled to recall from France three officers of the 14th Battalion: Captain Roy, Major R. De Serres and Colonel Henri Des Rosiers. Asselin did all the drudgery of recuiting, and he recruited the battalion inside of five months. They were sent to Bermuda. People said their going there was a joke, and they would never go to the front. But a little while ago I saw that battalion off, and now they are at Bramshott Camp, in England. awaiting orders to go to the front.

Your President wants me to blow my own horn, but I won't do that. Thank you very much, gentlemen."

(*January 15th, 1917.*)

How Canada Must Pay for the War

By A. C. Flumerfelt.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on 15th January, Mr. Flumerfelt said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—I feel myself honored to have the privilege of appearing before such a distinguished and I know aggressive and progressive body of business men. For some months I have been endeavoring to preach through the different parts of Canada a gospel with which I think you will all agree, the principle that all real wealth must come from the ground. A little, of course, comes from the sea, but speaking broadly, the wealth of any nation is derived from the soil.

I take the position that we can never be permanently prosperous until we are populous, and we cannot be populous unless we cheapen living, and it is impossible to cheapen living except and until we increase our production. And that, gentlemen of the Canadian Club, is my message to you this afternoon. And I will endeavor to point out in the few minutes allotted to me the debts that Canada has, and, I hope, to show that the only way these debts can be met and this obligation liquidated will be by increasing our production.

Now, in the first place, we have the question of our enlistments. These men who have gone from us, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, will come back to us as a definite, distinct liability. Many of these men will be unable to follow their former vocations, and many of the positions in which they were occupied will be non-existent. I shall endeavor to point out how some of this difficulty can be met, and leave to your imagination the working out from your own minds of this particular, big, splendid national problem. And if I can impress upon your minds the thought that is in my mind, and if we get our wills working, we shall have accomplished something. And in this connection I am most anxious that the papers should criticise me, not that individually I care a but-

*Mr. A. C. Flumerfelt is a Canadian of very extensive interests. As a citizen of Vancouver he is particularly interested in the development of the West. He has, however, studied closely the problems of production and population in all parts of Canada.

ton, but "words are living things and a small drop of ink falling like dew upon a thought produces that which makes thousands, perhaps millions, think."

Coming to the first point, I have to say that we shall have a very heavy pension fund. Various estimates and tabulations have been made in the Press, but from my point of view, making the best calculations I can, I think the pension fund will reach somewhere about $25,000,000. According to the best statistics available and the calculation of the Federal Government, the percentage of soldiers and their dependents to be taken care of under the pension fund is something as follows: Killed, 15%; totally disabled, 3%; seriously injured, 6%; slightly injured, 9%; and based upon the figures upon which the Department is making disbursements, it will cost the Government, for each 100,000 men, $5,184,181 per annum. Now, assuming the full complement of 500,000 is secured, the total annual outgo for pensions, upon the present basis, will aggregate $25,420,905. In addition to the foregoing the public expenditure in respect of the war at the present is roughly one million dollars per day. Should this conflict continue for another year or more, it is not unlikely that we shall have a public debt of $1,000,000,000.

In passing, let me say that at the close of the Civil War in the United States the pension fund was fifteen million dollars; while in 1914, fifty years after the war, when most of the men who had been in the fighting had passed away, the pension fund was ten times as great, and now it is $172,000,000. And when I tell you that for years the expenditure on this pension fund has been growing and growing, and hundreds of thousands of dollars are paid out for medical examinations you will realise that we must be wide awake respecting this matter, and see that proper legislation is enacted, and that our pension fund is not made a political football in the Dominion of Canada.

Then I would call your attention to the accumulation of the Dominion's public debt in the years from 1867 to 1914, aggregating $378,000,000. Since that time the Dominion Government has voted $412,000,000 for general purposes; therefore it is fair to assume that if the expenditures go on at the present rate, we shall soon have a debt of $1,000,000,000. You may be interested to know that the net debt of the United States is only about one billion dollars. Of course, this would not be a net debt on the Dominion of Canada, because there are a great many assets. But including the interest upon this, together with the annual cost of administration of government, and estimate that it will take annually $100,000,000,—

that is, pension fund 25 million, interest 50 million, and maintenance of government 25 million,—a very serious charge upon the Teasury of the Dominion. Now, gentlemen, that must be provided. The question is, how are we going to provide it? My answer is, there is only one way of providing it, namely, production.

Again, we have a very heavy obligation with respect to our railways. In 1886, when the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed, we had 12,184 miles of railway; the obligations outstanding then, in stock, bonds, and debentures, were $486,501,254, or a capitalization of $39,921.31 to every mile; at the end of 1915, we had 35,582 miles of railway, and the aggregate debt per mile had increased by one-third, to $52,717.07 per mile. Between these two years the capitalization of these two railways had increased over one-third. This, gentlemen, is an obligation Canada cannot avoid. We are obliged, whether we will or not, to pay interest upon outstanding securities and to lay charges upon the business in the country to carry on these enterprises. You will be interested to know that in 1886 the obligation rested upon 420 people to the mile, calculated upon a population of five million; while to-day it rests upon the shoulders of 205 people per mile. This obligation we as Canadians cannot afford to ignore. We must be prepared to maintain it, and how are we going to maintain it? No other way except by increased production.

Canada cannot disregard the moral obligation for the continuous operation of her railways, for three definite and distinct reasons: first—by the granting of the charter the world is informed that the company is justified and that its objects are within the possible; this obligation is increased by the second thought, viz.: that the Government specifically endorses and confirms the selection of the right of way for such railway; and the third point is even stronger: the world is informed that the Government of the country approves of the company and its right of way, and justifies the existence of the railway by large guarantees, cash subsidies and land grants, and to my mind this moral obligation cannot be evaded. Railway transportation is said to be the sap of the industrial tree of any country; it is the speedometer of all industry; it is the regulator and distributor of all production, and therefore its stability, its prosperity and its development have a very profound influence upon any nation. Recognising the financial obligation—the people's money already invested—and the relation of population to railways of Canada, trade must be so developed and commerce so strengthened as to

enable the different transportation companies to earn the interest upon their outstanding securities. Otherwise, as I have already hinted, the moral obligation must be assumed and some other method devised whereby such charges can be met. We must so direct enterprise as to maintain business at the high water mark. Otherwise, what will result? If the Dominion of Canada is obliged to assume this obligation and carry all this load, it must simply go back and be a charge upon all industry and commerce. My answer is, the only way to minimize this danger is by increased production.

And further, it will interest you to know—I have taken some time to tabulate this, but it does not affect for the moment the main problem,—the guarantees of Canada to railways, except the Intercolonial, which is not in this calculation, aggregate $290,115,972; grants in bonuses, subsidies and cash, $301,916,639; loans by the Dominion Government, $68,000,000; acreage of land given to these different systems, 43,613,949 acres. You will find that there is a billion dollars of Canadian money invested in these railways. Surely it is worth everybody's consideration that this should be preserved. How can we preserve it? I again emphasise, by increased production.

Now, gentlemen, I should like you to consider the question of population. This map shows that a line drawn north and south passing through the city of Peterboro' divides the population of Canada about equally into halves. Between Peterboro' and Hamilton you find one-eighth of the population residing, between Hamilton and Port Arthur another eighth, and one-fourth from there to the coast. You know the proportion of the production of Canada east of Peterboro'. But I am told you have thousands of acres alone between here and Peterboro' that are lying idle, and I know there are millions of acres in the Province which are non-productive. This ought to stop!

Notwithstanding that fact, I call your attention to the fact that with seven million population we have, for the year ending 31st March, 1916, produced in agriculture for export $250,000,000 worth. And I direct your thought to the fact that with so sparse a population there was sufficient production in Canada for such export, together with maintaining ourselves in a good degree of comfort and luxury. I will ask you to look at this map of Canada that represents the land under cultivation and what is not cultivated. Of course I won't say how much of this land ought to be cultivated, but we should endeavor to bring a much larger proportion of it into productive state, and we can do so if we lay the foundation

properly, wisely, deliberately, and we must keep it thoroughly British in every part.

Enough said of population for the moment. Now in 1913, —and I take '13 as an average year, and shall speak of '13 generally in speaking about production—in 1913 one-sixty-eights of the Dominion of Canada was under cultivation. It produced, including animals and cheese, $1,015,000,000. We produced a variety of grains, as you know. I want to have set aside for these returning soldiers, as a first consideration, 50,000,000 acres. And if you take 33 million acres out, presently under cultivation, and add to that, as I proposed to the Government, and am insisting in season and out of season, the 50 million acres, and cut the remainder in two we still have over a billion acres. Cut that in two, and cut it in two again, and you still have two or three hundred million acres or more available for cultivation.

The three prairie Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba alone have a combined area of 485,000,000, and in 1913 there were under cultivation 19,033,000 acres. Assume thirteen times this area were under cultivation, (which would then represent only 246,495,600 acres, and about one-half the total area of the three Provinces), and that the yield per acre were approximately the same as for 1913, it would represent 2,720,406,000 bushels of wheat, 3,151,369,000 bushels of oats, and 403,780,000 bushels of barley, in addition to a large quantity of flax and mixed grains. The International Institute of Agriculture published, in October, 1914, the total production of grains to be as follows: wheat 2,697,000,000 bushels, oats 3,286,000,000 bushels and barley, 1,164,000,000. Thus a little more than half the area of the three prairie Provinces, if put under cultivation, could produce approximately the same as the total of the whole world yield for 1914. Within my memory the most sanguine did not believe that wheat could be grown even in the vicinity of Moose Jaw or Regina, but increasing knowledge, together with the development of dry farming and the application of irrigation, has fully demonstrated that within the areas hitherto considered unsuitable or incapable of producing various grains, also at such points as Fort Vermilion and Chippewayan Mission, Fort St. John, in the valleys of the Peace and Smoky Rivers, and in the prairies west of the Smoky River, crops have been successfully grown. Away above the 60th parallel, in the region of the Great Slave Lake there are thousands of acres, probably a million, that will grow wheat. In the Peace River Valley, to which the McArthur Railway goes, there is a block of land which has grown wheat for seventy-five years without a failure. Away up

toward the Arctic Circle, vegetables are grown in abundance. Who can say what proportion of this is suitable for cultivation? These acres the Government ought to open to the settler. And we must make this land productive. And I again repeat, we can never be prosperous until we do increase this production.

We pose as an agricultural country, we are supposed to be primarily an agricultural country. Yet we produced last year, or rather in 1914, 14,200,000 pounds of wool. In the same year we imported from the United States for slaughter 131,931 sheep (to say nothing of imports of mutton from Australia), and also imported 9,516,579 pounds of wool, or about two-thirds as much as is produced in all Canada. Our duty to ourselves and the Empire is plain in this particular respect, as the London *Statist* estimates 36 pounds of new wool per man is needed per annum; therefore the British market will require 180,000,000 lbs., or 60,000,000 lbs. in excess of the total British production. Why should we not grow our own wool? Again, we consumed in 1916 700,000,000 lbs. of sugar; we raised 37,000,000 lbs. Yet all the way down through Ontario, along the St. Lawrence River, in Manitoba and in British Columbia, beet root will grow, and you can grow 18/20 tons to the acre. Cultivate and put this product into factories at a cost of $35.00 per acre, and get $6 or $7 per ton for it, and you can grow sugar profitably. Why not grow our own sugar?

Why should we, the Canadian nation, be importing dried eggs from China, and eggs from Texas, vegetables from the United States, apples and butter from Australia and New Zealand? Is there any reason? Well, I will show you the reason, gentlemen. (Producing a chart indicating the distribution of urban and rural population). There is the reason. Just take a look at that map. Too many people in our cities. Forty odd per cent,—forty-six I think it is approximately—of the people of Canada are urban. That is the reason we are obliged to buy so many and so much of the necessaries.

A few years ago—four or five—we were exporting from 30 to 50 million eggs per annum to Great Britain; in the winter of 1912-13 we imported from the United States 24 million eggs, paying duty of $60,000; and we are to-day importing from one to one and a half million eggs monthly. Great Britain imports about two and a half billion eggs, and that market is open to us. The poultry of the United States, one of the greatest industries—it stands third or fourth—aggregates in value about three hundred million dollars per

annum. It is possible for us to produce and grow all these things necessary to our maintenance.

Now, gentlemen, in 1913—I go back to that as an average year—there were nineteen million odd acres under cultivation (19,033,000) in the three prairie provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan. There are in these combined provinces 485,000,000 acres. But taking the crop of 1913 as a basis, as it was an average crop, and if you multiply by thirteen, or in other words put one-half of the area, as ordinarily productive, under cultivation, and it produces the same average yield, you will have as many bushels of wheat, oats and barley as are grown in the entire world. These tables and calculations of acreage, gentlemen, can be confirmed; I could give you the details, but I can't afford to take the time. Now, assuming that we have the same population, with additions in Western Canada, the grain is being increased, the hopper is being increased, but the spout is the long haul by rail, and it is not increased. This is a necessarily divided country. All the grain grown west of Swift Current can and must be shipped by way of the Pacific. That means developing the country, giving these people mills in which this business is produced. That means more business for all the manufacturers in Ontario. It means more boots and shoes, more clothing, more sets of furniture, more articles of all kinds from all these busy centres. These are the results it will bring about, results making for the continued and permanent prosperity of our manufactures, particularly if we have our own people. This we are not doing, in many cases.

This will also develop a merchant marine on the Pacific. I am proud to say that a gentleman sitting here is one of the pioneers in building ships in the West. Now there are twelve vessels under construction in British Columbia ports. These vessels are calculated to carry about one and a half billion feet of lumber, and have auxiliary power, built to take advantage of the weather as well as to use power. We hope and expect in the not distant future to double our lumber cut, by reason of the vessels we are building in British Columbia. If we increase our lumber cut by one billion feet and double our wages, that in turn will flow back here for boots and shoes, clothing, and so on.

This opens up again a very important subject: have you studied, are you giving consideration, to the wonderful opening of the Pacific doors by reason of the development of the great nation of Japan? She stands ready to-day to take millions of dollars' worth of goods from Canada, if we had

the bottoms to carry the same. And have you given consideration to the openings of great trade with Russia? Hitherto Russia's trade has always gone by the Black Sea and the Baltic. Asiatic Russia, however, borders on the Pacific, and a large part of the trade of that territory enters preferentially by way of Vladivostok. One order given to a firm in Toronto is for 18,500 mowing and reaping machines to go to Russia, the biggest single order yet given. This indicates what we might get of that trade once it is opened up. The Americans will do their utmost to cross the Pacific in order to get that commerce into their hands.

Then, gentlemen, they grow no fruit in Russia. Canada should supply the whole fruit consumption of that great country if we had the vessels to carry the trade. Then, too, they want all classes of iron work, engines, boilers, and so on. There is a great trade at our doors, if only we take advantage of it, if we develop a Pacific marine, and we must have it; we can have it, and we cannot expand wthout it.

Coming down to the concrete problem, Canada has a threefold duty: we must keep open door to all who will come within our borders; we must have a broad, liberal splendid, well-regulated immigration policy, such as will bring the right type of men into our country in order to help us build up this great nation. Our second duty is more insistent; that is, we must make every provision to receive in the best possible way, and receive even if at some expense to ourselves, the ex-service British sailor and soldier; but a more insistent duty yet is that we devise some way of recognising the service of those who have gone from our own land to fight our battles in this war. We never can pay them, but we can indicate our appreciation of the boys who have left us and gone across the waters. Gentlemen, let us make the only payment left possible to us, and not be guilty of the most base ingratitude.

My plan is to form a General Commission, headed perhaps by the Federal Government, with representatives of all the Provinces. This general plan would provide for every man, and would be carried out by the Government. These lads never hesitated to go forward and loyally put their bodies between the enemy and us, ready to stand in defence of us and to take what came. Follow their career from Valcartier to Salisbury Plains, on through Flanders, down the crimson lane to Gallipoli,—we have to take care of these men, do not let our Government forget we owe them a debt we cannot pay.

Now, gentlemen, I have a general plan in mind: I want a general, non-political, non-approachable Board formed, which

shall have complete direction and selection of these lands. My plan is to have some lands, contributed or purchased,—I don't care how they are got—in every Province of the Dominion, so that when these boys come back they shall have the right of choice whether they shall settle in the Province of Alberta or Saskatchewan, or in any other Province, and not be compelled to locate in any particular district; but I would give the Board the power of making a selection of the lands for the men. Many of these will be unable to follow their former vocations, therefore I want to give them a chance. I propose that that can be managed if they are settled in communities.

This plan has been suggested to the Dominion Government, (showing a diagram). Instead of roads running around the townsites, have roads running through, grouping the families in the centre. Thus the women would have companionship, and the little kiddies would have playmates. The people could gather together for companionship. Only one-eighth of the machinery would be required to work the land which would otherwise be needed, and the work could be done for one-eighth of the expense. (Showing another chart.) This would represent a settlement of sixteen sections, with eight families to a section. In the middle would be the village, with its butcher shop, clothing store, boots and shoes store, and whatever else would be necessary. There would be the church, and the school. The young men and young women would not be more than one and a half miles anywhere from the centre. From 380 to 400 persons would be grouped within one and a half miles. This plan would overcome and take away the danger of the isolation of farming life, and would give opportunity to have educational, social and religious advantages.

Now just one other word and I have done. There will be a great many of these men who will perhaps be unable or perhaps unwilling to accept the grants of land. So I want this Commission to be empowered to use the land set aside as the foundation for a bond issue, and if, we will say, a great number of artisans can be found, say 100,000 of these men would be artisans who are not able to go back or for some reason do not want to go back to their former vocations, then let the Commission set up enterprises in various parts of the Dominion of Canada such as will not unfairly compete with existing industries. Suppose the Government could say, "All right, we will do this," the Commission could establish great marine works on the Pacific, and on the Atlantic they could be established co-operatively, and this principle would accom-

plish three good results: first, the returned man would be employed; second, he would be in part his own employer; third, it would build up great industries for the Dominion of Canada. You will lose, you will say. But let them lay down vessels to carry the commerce and get the products out of the country; would it be very long till such an industry would enjoy a Dominion subsidy? Therefore isn't it better to give it to your own men? You might go on and establish a sugar refinery; you could produce sheep and grow wool to make clothing. In this way you would furnish employment.

And if we provide a choice of four, five or six occupations, and we can't please a man, we shall at least have made the effort, and there will be no further obligation resting upon us to do what we are unable to do.

I think I have shown you that it is impossible to compensate our returned soldiers in cash, or to pay them with anything we have; but we can at least show them an indication of our appreciation of their heroic service.

(*January 22nd, 1917.*)

David Lloyd George

By Rev. Prof. J. Hugh Michael, M.A.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 22nd of January, Prof. J. Hugh Michael said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I wonder if you would think it very cowardly if I were to begin by disclaiming all responsibility for my presence here to-day? If you feel disappointed when I have finished you must vent your wrath upon the Chairman—he is the culprit! I have no special qualifications for speaking on Mr. Lloyd George: the only qualifications I possess are, first, that I happen to be a Welshman, second, I have lived longer in one of the Boroughs which he represents than in any other place, and third, I can honestly say that I have never felt the slightest desire to shoot him.

I know you will pardon me if I manifest some Welsh pride during this half-hour. I think Welsh pride is permissible just at present.

For the first time in history a Welshman—and a Welsh-speaking Welshman to boot—has become Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and never was the advent of any one to that high office hailed with such joy and expectation.

It would be superfluous to state that Mr. Lloyd George's accession to the Premiership has been greeted with especial delight in the Principality of Wales. Wales has followed his great career with affection as well as interest. With pardonable pride his compatriots regard his elevation to the Premiership as the coping stone upon the most romantic career of modern times; for without the aid of wealth or noble birth, without social influence or academic distinction, he has reached the most commanding position in the Empire. And it is matter of no small gratification to the *Cymry* that one of themselves should take the helm in this great storm. It is peculiarly appropriate that in a war waged on behalf of small nations the smallest of the four nations which constitute the United Kingdom should produce the man who is beyond all doubt the great driving power in the Allied cause.

*Prof. Michael is a native Welshman and so is particularly competent to speak about his great fellow countryman. Prof. Michael has just recently joined the staff of Victoria College.

The delight of his countrymen found expression in numberless congratulatory messages which were showered upon the new Premier. The Mayor of Pwllheli (one of the Boroughs represented by Mr. Lloyd George) conceived the happy notion of sending his congratulations in a telegram couched in pure Welsh. In the exuberance of his patriotic zeal he decided that not even the address should contain one word of English. The message was duly despatched from Pwllheli addressed *Y Prifweinidog, Llundain,* which being interpreted means "The Prime Minister, London." On the Saxon side of Offa's Dyke, however, the Cymric missive came to grief, and eventually found its way back to the sender, marked: "Not known in the Post Office Directory"! Futile also were the efforts of the President of the Toronto St. David's Society to cable the Society's congratulations in Welsh. The post office authorities suspected that the message was a code, and refused to transmit it!

Specially gratifying to the new Prime Minister must have been the resolutions passed by the Welsh Liberal Members of Parliament. The party not only offered its "most cordial congratulations," but also pledged itself "to give its active support to the Government of Mr. Lloyd George in the vigorous prosecution of the war." Nor did the Welsh Radicals in their delight on the accession of one of their number to the highest office in the Empire, and in their determination to stand by him through thick and thin, omit to express their "deepest gratitude to the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith for his great services to the Empire, and to Wales in particular." The pledge of the Welsh members to support the Government in the prosecution of the war is in thorough keeping with the attitude of the Welsh people as a whole. At first Wales was somewhat slow in coming into line, for to no people is war more abhorrent than to the Welsh. "Gallant Little Wales" did not, however, long remain undecided. The uncompromising attitude of Mr. Lloyd George himself helped her to cast off her indecision with the result that before the days of conscription Wales sent to the colors a larger number of recruits in proportion to the population than any other part of the Empire.

Mr. Lloyd George's latest biographer, Mr. Beriah Evans, in his well-informed *Life Romance of Lloyd George* remarks that a certain prominent statesman, when asked how he would account for his marvellous success, replied that in his opinion it was to be attributed to four main causes, namely, courage, oratory, astute use of the press and supreme smartness. This opinion is correct so far as it goes, but these four

items cannot be said to exhaust the list even of main causes. However, it is interesting to note that all four were exemplified in a striking manner immediately upon the formation of the new Government.

The new Premier showed his usual courage. Throughout the crisis he received the support of the Northcliffe Press, but although the proposed appointment of Mr. Balfour as Foreign Secretary was most virulently opposed by the Northcliffe papers, Mr. Lloyd George paid no heed to their thunderings, and included his erstwhile antagonist in his government. Nor is Mr. Balfour the only member of the government whose appointment failed to commend itself to the Northcliffe Press. The story goes that, in view of this opposition, three or four members of the new administration offered to resign their posts if in the opinion of their chief that course would add to the strength of the government. Needless to say they are still in the government. There is no virtue that so readily excites admiration as does courage, and it is chiefly because he never allows his courage to desert him that Mr. Lloyd George has such a powerful hold upon the imagination of the people.

His oratorical powers have also been exemplified since he assumed the responsibilities of his great office. Never did man speak to a larger or more expectant audience—never was a speech fraught with such momentous significance—as when he spoke in the House on December 19th in answer to the peace proposals of Germany. His oratory is not that of the platform only: his eloquence is eminently effective in the Committee or Conference room. He has none of the tricks of the demagogue. He does not attempt by means of wild gesticulation to increase the impressiveness of the spoken word. And where did he acquire his style? The only school he attended was the village school of Llanystumdwy, and there has been no period of his subsequent career that was not brimful of action and incident. The plain fact is that style is a subtle something which cannot be acquired: it must be born with a man. He has a perfect genius for putting things in a concrete and telling form. The Balfour Education Act, for example, was described in one of his speeches in the following succinct statement: "The Parson appoints the Teacher; the public pays him." One might have spoken about the Act for an hour without saying more than is contained in those few words.

I was only a school-boy when I first heard Mr. Lloyd George speak. It was in the Penrhyn Hall at Bangor. The

thing that impressed me most of all on that occasion was his complete mastery of both Welsh and English, and the perfect ease with which he passed backward and forward from one language to the other. For some reason or other a speaker who can manipulate English and Welsh equally well is a *rara avis*. Mr. Lloyd George is one of the few who can address an audience in both languages with the same ease.

It was once my privilege to be a member of a Nonconformist Conference held in Carnarvon to meet Mr. Lloyd George. At that time he was not in very high favor with Welsh Nonconformists. He had just been appointed President of the Board of Trade, and it was feared in Welsh Nonconformist circles that in office the erstwhile fervid Nationalist did not manifest the same enthusiasm on the all-important question of Disestablishment as had hitherto been the case. The temper was one of mistrust of the Government. That was the temper of the delegates at the Conference at Carnarvon. Mr. Lloyd George spoke in his most persuasive manner, and we departed feeling that in regard to Welsh Disestablishment we could place implicit trust in the Government! Years passed before the Anglican Church in Wales was disestablished. The Act is at last upon the Statute Book, to come into force when the war ends. Recently an attempt was made by the opponents of Disestablishment to defer the coming of the Act into operation for six months after the declaration of peace, in the hope that some contingency might arise to bring about its repeal before it actually came into force. Strange as it may seem, Mr. Lloyd George gave his powerful support to the Disestablishment Postponement Bill. He argued that the passing of the Bill would not imperil Disestablishment, whereas it might tend to conciliate opponents. The Welsh members, however, displayed unwonted firmness, and backed as they were by the bulk of the Welsh Nation compelled the withdrawal of the Postponement Bill.

These digressions may, I fear, obscure the fact that we are following the list of four main causes of Mr. Lloyd George's success as given by the statesman quoted by Mr. Beriah Evans. After courage and oratory came "astute use of the press." Mr. Evans himself indorses to the full the statement that Mr. Lloyd George owes much to his tactful attitude to the press and the shrewd use he has made of it. "No public man of the age," he declares, "is more indebted to the press, or knows so well how to use it." He has always taken pains to be accurately reported, and one of the first steps he took after his election to Parliament was to secure proprietary

rights in certain Welsh and English papers in his constituency. These papers did much in the early days of his Parliamentary career to establish his hold upon his own constituents. In keeping with all this was the purchase of the *Pall Mall Gazette* by Sir Henry Dalziel immediately upon the advent of Mr. Lloyd George to the Premiership, the object of the purchase being, of course, to secure that influential journal for the support of the new government. It was unfortunate that on the very first day under the new régime there should appear a cartoon which seems to have given great and just offense—to Liberals in particular. In the next issue there appeared an ample apology for its publication.

Mr. Lloyd George is not himself an easy writer. He has never written much. Writing has always been distasteful to him, and letter-writing in particular. It is said that in his early Parliamentary days—before he could afford to employ a private-secretary—his locker in the House was full of unanswered letters. It was no easy task to obtain a reply from him. Some of his correspondents realized that their only hope lay in enclosing two stamped post-cards in their letter, one having inscribed upon it the word *Yes,* and the other the word *No,* and requesting him to return the one that was appropriate. Even this plan, however, sometimes failed, for on several occasions *both* cards were returned to the sender!

And what shall we say of his "supreme smartness?" He is beyond all doubt one of the cleverest men in his generation. Of this also a striking example has been forthcoming since his accession to the premiership. For some time before Mr. Asquith's resignation Mr. Lloyd George had strenuously advocated the formation of a small war-council, from which the Prime Minister was to be excluded. The Premier, he contended, was too busily engaged with other things to be able to attend the meetings of the war-council. Naturally there was a great deal of surmise as to what Mr. Lloyd George would do when he himself became Premier. No one of course imagined for a moment that he would remain outside the war-council. It seemed inevitable that he should expose himself to the charge of inconsistency. He disarmed criticism, however, by means of a clever and adroit move—he made one of his subordinates Leader of the House! He would thus be free to devote himself to the war-council.

It is a source of no small satisfaction to me that a Methodist has been included in this small war-cabinet. Mr. Arthur Henderson is a true, live Wesleyan Methodist. For years he has been a devoted and trusted statesman of his Church.

It is not my purpose to trace the career of Mr. Lloyd George. His whole life has been one incessant conflict. "He is never happy," said one of him, "except when he is up against a brick wall." He is endowed with an amazingly abundant fund of energy. How else could he have emerged triumphantly out of his many conflicts? When Oxford made him an honorary D.C.L., his energy was specially emphasised in the speech of the Public Orator, who thus described him:

"Vir valde impiger, perfervido Celtorum ingenio ardens, Cambria parva attamen forti in imperium magnum missus." I will not insult you by translating these words.

His energy and the other traits to which reference has already been made do not, however, supply an adequate explanation of his successful career: we must not overlook his unbounded confidence in himself, his unfailing tact and his wonderful magnetism.

His life may be arranged in a series of sharply defined periods. We may divide it first of all into the Pre-Parliamentary and the Parliamentary periods. The former extends from 1863 to 1890. The latter may again be divided into the Pre-Official and the Official periods. His official career before the outbreak of war consisted of a time of comparative peace at the Board of Trade, and a period of storm and contention as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Since the war began he has occupied in succession the offices of Chancellor of the Exchequer, Minister of Munitions, War Secretary and Prime Minister.

Ardent Welshman as he is, Mr. Lloyd George was not born in Wales. His birthplace was the great city of Manchester, where his father was a schoolmaster. David, however, was but four years of age when his father died, and his widowed mother betook herself to the small village of Llanystwmdwy, near Criccieth in North Wales. There dwelt her brother, Mr. Richard Lloyd, the village shoemaker, and with him she made her home. With splendid and untiring devotion the uncle consecrated himself to the upbringing of the little family thus thrown upon his care. Mr. Lloyd George is never weary of acknowledging the debt which he owes to his uncle, who still hale and strong in spite of his eighty-three years has been spared to see his gifted nephew occupying the highest position in the Empire. No ordinary man was Richard Lloyd: with physical strength and mental acumen he combined moral force and spiritual insight. The home which thus opened its hospitable door to the future Premier was a typical Welsh village home. There was no poverty. Mr. Lloyd George has described the home in his own way by

saying that they scarcely ever had fresh meat, and that the children's greatest luxury was half an egg on Sunday mornings! The lad soon gave evidence that there burned within his breast a spirit of strong antagonism to every form of oppression, which was fanned into flame by his early environment. The land laws were oppressive. Nonconformity was disparaged by the upper classes, and the Welsh language was to a large extent regarded as a badge of subjection and inferiority. Small wonder that even in his boyhood days he was filled with a spirit of revolt, which his uncle did nothing to suppress. We soon find him as a young solicitor refusing to be brow-beaten by haughty magistrates, long accustomed to have their own way in the courts over which they presided. It has been remarked that his office became a Cave of Adullam for the oppressed. He developed into an enthusiastic Nationalist. His love for small nations has always been intense. That was the explanation of his attitude at the time of the South African War; it is also the explanation of his attitude in the present war. It is a matter of history that at the time of the South African War, and immediately afterwards, Liberalism was at a very low ebb in England; it may safely be said that the firm and courageous stand taken by Mr. Lloyd George did as much as, if not more than, anything else to save Liberalism.

He was in Canada at the time of the outbreak of the South African War, having come at the invitation of the Minister of the Interior to study immigration prospects. He had come on the S.S. *Bavarian,* and the organiser of a charity concert on that trip had insight enough to ask Mr. Lloyd George to preside. The speech which he delivered from the chair was so telling that it drew a large collection from the audience—surely a forecast of his Budget days! The passengers had been watching some whales sporting in the ocean that evening, and it is on record that Mr. Lloyd George began his speech by remarking that if the large whales were spouting outside, there was no reason why Little Wales should not spout inside!

The famous Llanfrothen Burial Case made the young solicitor a hero in the principality. He was only twenty-five when he was selected as Liberal candidate for the Carnarvon Boroughs, and in less than two years he was elected to represent that famous constituency in Parliament, and he has continued to be its member to this day. His first majority was only 18! When all the circumstances are considered, perhaps it is surprising that he had a majority at all. His opponent was Mr. (now Sir) Ellis Nanney, the Squire of the village in which Lloyd George was brought up.

I will forbear to enlarge upon his Parliamentary career and his great measures of reform. The question now upon the lips of all is, will he see us through this terrible war? We are encouraged by the thought that he scarcely knows what failure is! And our encouragement is heightened by the evident chagrin with which the German Press has heard of his advent to the premiership. Some of the German papers, it is true, see in the recent crisis only the grave of Liberalism, whilst others, such as the *Berliner Tageblatt,* have given unstinted expression to their recognition of the strength and ability of Mr. Lloyd George. But the prevailing tone of German comment is one of abuse. "The barefooted son of a Welsh teacher," says the *Hamburger Nachrichten,* "who, as a young lawyer, could not find £3 to buy a black robe, has now reached the highest position in Great Britain. He governs as a dictator. What is he going to do? England, and above all the neutrals, will soon see." And the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* says: "The crazy Welshman, Lloyd George, is Prime Minister. The former Coalition Cabinet was, from the English Parliamentary point of view, a monstrosity. Lloyd George's government is far more monstrous." Such comments give us hope.

And after the War? He has qualifications which will make him of inestimable value to the cause of the Allies in the perilous period of settlement—and not least is his understanding of the value of Nationality.

And after the coming of peace—what? Shall we have a Federated Government binding together the various parts of our scattered Empire? Will Mr. Lloyd George be the first Prime Minister to preside over the Cabinet of a united Empire?

For the present we pray that he may be the instrument in the hands of God to bring us safely out of our present distress into a lasting and satisfying peace. And may he long be spared to carry out great measures of social reform in the manipulation of which he has shown himself to be such a master.

Let me conclude this brief sketch of Mr. Lloyd George by reminding you that he is a simple Christian. On Christmas Eve he worshipped at the Castle Street Welsh Baptist Church in London. At the close of the service he made a speech in which he said that he had come through the fog from his home in Surrey because he was anxious to spend the last Sunday evening before Christmas worshipping with his own people. He expressed his confidence in the ultimate triumph of the Allied cause, but declared that there would be much more

suffering and sacrifice before victory would come. He requested the congregation to sing two Welsh hymns. One of them was a great hymn which describes the vision of this life from the Everlasting Hills—when all its perplexities and problems will have been solved. I wish you could understand the Welsh words. The hymn begins:

O fryniau Caersalem ceir gweled
Holl daith yr anialwch i gyd;
Pryd hyn y daw troion yr yrfa
Yn felus i lanw ein bryd.

He spoke of a statue of the Virgin which he had seen on the Continent facing the Germans, with the Christ Child in her arms. "The spirit of Christ," he said, "is facing them today." We are confident that the new Premier will see us through this war not so much because of his great ability, not because he is a man of such brilliant parts, but because he is animated by the spirit of Jesus Christ.

(*February 5th, 1917.*)

The War

By Dr. Michael Clark, M.P., of Red Deer, Alta.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club held on the 5th February, Dr. Clark said:

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—Permit me to thank you very sincerely for the kindness of your invitation, and the far too generous warmth of your welcome. When I at last found I was able to respond to what was not the first invitation I received to address the Canadian Club of Toronto, I thought I simply would deal with some economic problems of a purely Canadian description; however, as the time approached when I had to fulfil my engagement, the feeling which has animated me entirely for the last two and a half years retained possession of my soul, the feeling that there is only one problem before Canada to-day, or rather that this one problem is so big that it precedes and swallows all others. It is not only ours, but the problem of our Empire and our Allies. The problem is the War—why it should have been, how it is going on, how it is going to finish, and what is coming out of the finish of it.

The problem, I need not say, was not of our making: it confronted us. You know how it arose: how in a crush at a railway station a student shot down the Crown Prince of Austria and his consort. But that was in the town of Sarajevo, the capital of the Province of Herzegovina. Most of you remember—it is elementary now—the Crown Prince and his consort were visiting that portion of their dominions, which at that time for exactly five years had been a portion of the Austrian dominions. You know the way it was annexed—we should say, it was stolen if we were talking of cattle in Western Canada, where I come from. This fact, that in the year 1909 Austria stole Bosnia-Herzegovina,—annexed it, that's what statesmen do when they steal, gives another lurid light on the chequered history of Austria.

I wonder how many remember the words in which one of the greatest men I ever saw described what the Austrian Government was. Mr. Gladstone, forty years ago, said: "Aus-

*Dr. Michael Clark represents Red Deer, Alberta, in the Federal House of Parliament. He ranks high among Canadian political thinkers and speakers.

tria trod Italy under foot; Austria never lifted a finger for the regeneration of Greece; Austria opposed the original constitution of Belgium; Austria opposed the consolidation of Germany. It is impossible to put your finger upon any spot on the map of Europe and say, "Here Austria did good." That is the kind of characters we are fighting in this war. It is the kind of character we are going to restrain very much in the process of the war, if I am not much mistaken.

Serbia was at once blamed by the Central Governments as having instigated the murder of the Crown Prince of Austria and his consort. An ultimatum was sent, in the name of Austria, but really by Germany. None of us believes that Serbia instigated the murder really.

It has been very well said as to this war, that while great wars, in the majority of cases, might be termed political wars, this war, so far at least as one side is concerned, is one in which moral issues are paramount. Germany thought to get quickly to France across Belgium, to race with swiftness over France, and to get back before Russia could attack on the east.

Now this is the problem that confronted us. It is a problem that goes to the very roots of civilization, the moral consideration of the sacredness of international law, the rights of small nations, the equality of opportunity of development according to their size and possibilities with the greatest empire that is on the face of the earth.

Germany, nerved by an untrue philosophy, misled by false teachers, was led to believe that the greatest thing in the world was power. Power could be exercised only by restricting the freedom of other people. Germany, as described by one writer, sought to exercise the Will to Power by the Path of Frightfulness.

Germany equally with Britain guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium, but she trod Belgium under foot; in her mad strike for power she regarded a solemn treaty as a scrap of paper. The British Empire's rôle was the nobler one, of standing in the gap and saying, "You can't do this thing! Ours shall be the nobler task of lifting up the people you tread under foot; our ideal is the Path to Justice by the Path of Freedom."

Now that was the issue, described at as great length as I can describe it in the limited time which your business interests impose upon speakers. If I talked ever so long I don't know but that I might spoil the good quality of what I might say.

History will record that never a finer spectacle struck the eyes of man than when the "indomitable little island," as

Israel Zangwill has called it at the beginning of the war, in a marvelously fine testimony by that most cultured of living Jews—than when that "indomitable little island" stood in the gap for freedom, and she was joined at one bound by her daughters beyond the seas. And how nobly she has performed her task! Yes, and how nobly we have performed our task! —for I am one of those who believe that this country has done well in this war.

You know how we used to hear that Germany was famous for organization, while poor Britain was a totally unorganized country. Being a Britisher with a taste for controversy, I have never been free to admit that without a struggle. What is the test of an organization? The way it fulfils its purpose. Germany's organization is a huge military machine constructed for offence. When she marched through Belgium, trod it under foot, subjected it to all those processes of conquest which could not conquer it, she invaded Northern France, she had a time table. Very good! So has the C.P.R., but the C.P.R. doesn't always keep it. Germany planned to be in Paris six weeks after starting; but she isn't there yet, and this is two years after! What would you think of an organization which planned when a train started that it should reach its destination in six weeks, and two and a half years after it had not reached it, and wasn't going to get there to all eternity!

Then, if not Paris, Calais, at all costs!—But they did not have the costs, in men, the millions of men, they needed. And then the Canadians at Ypres—the little thin line of British troops held the line with the Canadians at Ypres. He didn't have the costs, and he has not now! Then he aimed to reach Moscow, and Petrograd, but in the Pripet swamps I think his train got stuck. I don't know that these are the marks of a great organization! I don't want to depreciate a foe who is rapidly failing, but if the German organization is good, it should get results; all it has done, as a matter of fact, is to lay low, bleeding, trampled, and crushed one small country; when it comes to the big fellows it has failed.

Britain's organization was formed for defence. That is significant. She didn't have an army—she was forced to fight in four realms—one was on the sea, for defensive purposes.

How did she get on there? You know what silent guard is kept by the Grand Fleet. We don't know much of what it does. They keep it silent. They don't publish every time they catch a German sub, and where. Mr. Balfour said the peculiar feature about the great German victory claimed by the enemy was that the faster they sank British ships the

faster they ran away. There never was a greater piece of pretence than this, that Germany won a victory over the British fleet. Britain's organization stood the test, and the boys in blue still command the ocean wave.

The next realm that Britain had to fight in pretty early was the realm of business. That was a pretty grave hardship. I don't see how other countries, with more enlightened fiscal policies, could have looked for much help from a country—but I won't pursue that line—I see you get my point. I hope it will stick well into you. You know what she has done in finance. Britain stood the test in financing.

And then she took to the air, and I think to-day it is stated on reliable authority that for every one German aeroplane that comes over our lines ten British machines cross the German lines. Three-fourths of the whole occupancy up there is with Britain and France on the western side, which in the east, Russia is establishing the mastery quickly. This gives us the guarantee for final victory.

Compare this organization with what Germany has done for the organization of Britain and the British Empire. Canada, let me repeat, was a magnificent daughter of the old Mother, and has done well. Some people think they see some little signs of failing. I don't think so. I don't see it in this audience. True, we heard an echo—only an echo, but it has died away as all echoes should. The question was asked—and I am sorry that it should have been asked by a young Canadian anywhere, whether we are going to bankrupt ourselves for England. I know I am on dangerous ground, but I can't help it, I have a habit of saying what I think. That question did not raise in me a feeling so much of indignation as of pity,—pity that any young Canadian anywhere should fail to grasp the magnitude of the issues for which we are fighting; and pity, in the second place, that any young Canadian anywhere should fail to have gone over the history of Britain in this war and found out that the real truth is just the other way, that Britain is going very near the verge of bankruptcy for the world's freedom!

That seems to be a piece of political truth which commends itself to your mind. Bankrupt ourselves for England? One of my boys has written me that in my native city of Newcastle-on-Tyne thirty thousand women are going out every day on the suburban railways of that city to work in the munition factories. There are six hundred thousand of them doing that altogether; about one in fifty of the women in Great Britain are munition workers. I need not take time to tell Canadian people what the people of Britain are doing along

this line. You know what they have done. I submit I have put this question which in justice and fairness ought to be put and in accordance with the truth; how has the British Empire done what she has? I will tell you in a sentence: it is because though from time to time she has changed the external form of her government she has maintained absolute national unity.

Now the lesson is obvious. If there be any faltering, any indifference arising, we have got to get rid of it, and I see the power in this audience to go out through the whole country and say it shall be got rid of. I don't think the grumblers are numerous. I don't think they are. Personally, since I came here fifteen years ago, I have formed the very highest opinion of the average type of native Canadian statesmanship. But I never went on the platform anywhere to say what I didn't believe. Canadian statesmen have, I believe, as a rule, exalted patriotism, a high sense of duty, lofty ideals. There are grouchers and grumblers; yes, and there are profiteers and political partisans, and I would send the whole four groups to —some place where they wouldn't be so likely to be run over by steam engines!

Do you grasp the principle I want to impress upon you from a brief history of the war? If you grasp it and are in accordance with it, my mission to-day will have been fulfilled. I have tried to increase your attachment to it by a brief reference to the greatness of the cause for which we are fighting, and further, by giving the salient facts about the great example our Mother Country is giving to us concerning this great conflict.

May I appeal to you along the lines of your business instincts?—You have these pretty well developed in Toronto, Canada cannot attend to her own business until she has cleared this war off the slate,—that is our first business. Win the war, then reconstruct Canada afterwards, if you like, with all the political differences within our own borders; but win the war first!

May I appeal to you on the ground of national honor? Canada has in this war done well.—Her sons are in it. Eighteen thousand of them have died, they will never return, but are lying in heroes' graves in France and Flanders. They didn't do much calculating about bankrupting themselves; they were not restrained by the extra stamp on letters; but animated with the spirit of our men in the Old Land they emptied themselves of everything but supreme self-sacrifice; and they carried that sacrifice to the last supreme point. We have got to imitate them. That is the kind of spirit—the spirit of the men who have died for it; and that is the kind of spirit that will win the war.

The course of events will in all probability be modified by the course of events in the past few days. But it does not matter very much to John Bull who comes in or who stays out, but we are glad to invite decent fellows into the best of company, and to receive them properly.

I cannot but think, Sir, that it will be an enormous gain if the United States does not receive the necessary provocation to take her in farther. It is a great advantage, nevertheless, that the great Republic to the south of us has definitely aligned herself on the side of civilization against barbarism. The President writes as if he had got a surprise, and spoke in his speech to the Senate as if Germany had been drawn on to a sudden withdrawal of the solemn assurances. Well, he did not know anything up to that about German ways. That was just the trouble with Great Britain until the war broke out two and a half years ago. When told by Germany that she would break the treaty and strike at Belgium, Britain said, "You won't do that, so long as John Bull has a drop of blood in his body." So we are not surprised, as the President seems to be, at the sudden breaking of other solemn assurances. You could not expect to prevent Germany withdrawing her assurances if it seemed to her advantage.

But when the terms of the Allies were stated the world never saw anything brighter than the spirit in which the terms of settlement were expressed; brighter for this reason, that when we demanded reparation for Belgium, and Serbia, and Montenegro, and France, restitution of territory, and demanded the right for the small countries in the various portions of Europe to live and develop, we demanded nothing for ourselves; that is an Empire worth living in and worth living for!

I would like to add to the terms, if I might, and then leave you. Forty years ago Mr. Gladstone, in a famous phrase—excuse me for quoting him again, but there is no politics in Toronto just now—said that they should "turn the Turks, pashas and Bashi-bazouks, bag and baggage out of Europe"; I stand on the Allies' note, but I would love if I might conclude in such words this address to this most distinguished audience of the Canadian Club of Toronto, with the suggestion that when the Turk goes out of Europe, as go he will, the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs should go with him!

(*February 12th, 1917.*)

Equality of Service

By Lieut.-Col. John A. Cooper.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club held on the 12th February, Lt.-Col. Cooper said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—You have certainly paid me a great compliment in asking me to come here and speak to you on what the Executive has termed the twentieth anniversary of the Canadian Club. It is an honor, and one which I prize very highly, to have been the first President of this organization, and I am not sure that I am not even more pleased at being requested, after going in and going out among you for twenty years, to come here to-day to say something to you. It seems to me that perhaps after all that is the higher distinction. In being honored further by having around the head table to-day all the Past Presidents who are within call, I feel that the distinction is one that is really worth while.

And before touching upon the subject under discussion, I would like to say just a word to you if you will let me about the Canadian Club idea. There is always some sort of question in the minds of some people about the exact origin of the Canadian Club. It did not originate in Toronto. Four years before we started to think about it,—while we arrived at our own idea and need for it independently,—four years before we started to do that thinking here, there had been formed in the city of Hamilton by six young men, a Club, founded as the Canadian Club, "having for its object the encouragement of the study of the history, literature and resources of Canada, the recognition of native worth and talent, and the fostering of a Canadian sentiment." This clause is not quite the same as that which was finally adopted as the constitution of the Canadian Club of Toronto, which afterwards was adopted as the one for all the Canadian Clubs in Canada, but certainly they had the idea. They combined with this the club room idea. We decided that the club room idea was not advisable, and that what we required for the city of Toronto was a sort of non-partisan debating club. While we were forming

*Lieut.-Col. John A. Cooper was the first president of the Canadian Club of Toronto. His services to the Club during the twenty years of its existence have been of inestimable value. Lieut.-Col. Cooper went overseas in command of the 198th Battalion (Canadian Buffs).

and getting our ideas in concrete shape here we got into correspondence with Mr. W. Sanford Evans, then in New York, who was coming to Toronto shortly, I believe in connection with negotiations with *The Mail and Empire*. We waited till he came, because he had been the first President in Hamilton, and was very enthusiastic. When he arrived he joined forces with us, and the Canadian Club was formed in that way. I was elected President and he Vice-President. While therefore we can take credit for arriving at the Canadian Club idea independently and giving it a launching as an organization, and while those twenty-six men who met together that night in the upper room of the King Street warehouse of Mason & Risch, were the ones who really deserve the credit for their foresight and patience; yet we must give to Charles R. McCullough, of Hamilton, and W. Sanford Evans, the most credit for the name and to a large extent the idea.

Now for this subject of to-day. You will not mind if I refer to my notes. When a man is in uniform he is not quite as free to speak as when in civilian clothes, so if I appear to be guarded at certain moments during this speech I hope I will have your sympathy.

Speaking of "Equality of Service," you will not connect it with the question confronting Canada within the past two years and a half, that of raising, equipping and training an army of some say three hundred, some four hundred, some five hundred thousand men for the great struggle which has been inflicted on us. Let us discuss it from the soldier's point of view, the relation of the soldier to the State, to society in general, and perhaps to the larger element of international relations.

I think I am better equipped just now to discuss this question than I was some time ago, because during the past fourteen months I have been rather close to the Canadian soldier, and some lessons I have learned have come with considerable tribulation, and some difficulties, and certainly a considerable amount of thought. When I was looking among my papers during the past few days—they were ancient manuscripts, because I did not visit my library for fourteen months—I came across a set of the "Proceedings" of the Canadian Club of the city of Toronto. I went over the index page of each one of those volumes to see if I could find some lecture on this subject, and I am very sorry to have to report to you that during the twenty years of this Club's existence no one has ever delivered to you an address on the Canadian Soldier or the Canadian Militia, so far as I could discover. So anything

I may say is absolutely new, so far as regards the Canadian Club. In December, 1914, after war broke out, you did have an address by Lieut.-Colonel William Wood, of Quebec, in which he dealt with "War—The Neglected Factor in Canadian Problems for a Hundred Years." Certainly the record thoroughly bears out the title of his address.

I went over the Empire Club's record, and found very much the same condition of affairs; although they did have two addresses which might be called addresses on military subjects—one in 1906 by Lieut.-Col., now Brig.-Gen. James Mason, and another by a man who has had perhaps more influence along the line on which I am going to speak than any other man I know of in this country, Lt.-Col. Wm. Hamilton Merritt. I think the condition I have indicated is typical of Toronto and of Canada as a whole. During the past twenty-five or thirty years we have certainly neglected our militia problem. We have had, of course, scattered throughout the country, a number of men who thought the militia problem was important, and the time might come when Canada might have to raise an army for defence or for service of the Empire. A great many of these men kept up their military training, and kept up their study. It is not necessary for me to name them; most of them went over with the first Canadian contingent; most of them are found to-day among the most advanced positions; some of them, I am very sorry to say, sleep in heroes' graves in the soil of Flanders.

Where is the explanation of this? Of course Canada was a new country, with a great deal of territory to develop, and a great deal to think about before the question of war or the question of military organization. But it is not necessary that I should apologize, because after all I don't know that I agree with Canada or that my record agrees with that of the Canadian people as a whole. Personally I had served about twenty years in the Canadian militia, but I didn't say much about it those days, because I must admit I was a little afraid to tell my friends what kind of militia work I was doing, lest anyone should say I was spending my time and my money foolishly. Fortunately in those days we could get down to the Armories at night, for most of our drilling was done after dark, and we could take the horse cars or get down by side streets. I remember distinctly how, when we had Sunday parades, I have often and often gone with my good friend, Capt. Robert Rennie, now Brig.-Gen., who has made such a distinguished mark at the front. We used to chip in together and get a one-horse closed coupe. We have all had our

awakening. A man can wear a military uniform on the streets nowadays without feeling that anyone despises him at least.

The question has been forced upon us, what are the primary principles on which our military system should have been based before the war, and should be based now? I am egotist enough to think that the principle embodied in the phrase which I have chosen to-day as the title of my address, "Equality of Service," is that principle. We have tried the voluntary system; we have tried it in probably the very best form in which the voluntary system could be tried; but we have found it a failure; we found it uncertain, unreliable, and inadequate; it puts a burden upon the patriotic citizen, and lets the unpatriotic go free. It takes four sons from one man's home, and leaves four sons in another man's home. It is expensive, because it presses married men into service when single men should be doing the work. It is wasteful; it takes men from industry who should not be taken from industry, and leaves men in industry who might better be on the firing line.

This principle of Equality of Service, which we have overlooked, is the simple one which underlies practically all our citizenship. It is the basis of our taxation,—equality of burden, equality of service. It is the basis of our franchise, whereby every man is entitled to have a vote, even in the Canadian Club, white or black, Roman Catholic or Protestant, no matter what his stripe or class, each man has the same equality in power. In the courts the principle is absolutely primary. Only in the militia service the principle is lost.

I say "lost," because those of you who know Canadian history, and some of you know it better than I do, know that there was a time when this principle obtained in the whole of Canada. Before Confederation, the principle was established in every Province that every citizen was a soldier. In Nova Scotia in 1866 the general law was that every man between sixteen and forty-five trained for five days in the year and trained without pay; only the staff officers and some instructors were paid,—practically only the staff officers and the officers had uniforms. But every man had to go out and do his little bit every year so as to be prepared for the defence of his Province. It was the same in New Brunswick, and the same in Quebec, and it was the same in Ontario till 1859.

How did that work out? In Nova Scotia—I am quoting Senator Power, who is certainly one of the best authorities on Canadian history—in 1866 58,000 men were eligible for five days' drill, and 45,767 men performed their five days'

drill. That was in 1866. In 1913, in this great wonderful and majestic Dominion of Canada, there were less than 45,767 men who did their annual drill! So that was the progress we made between 1866 and 1913! The cost, Senator Power states, of drilling these men five days in the year, and drilling an army larger than Canada ever drilled as a Dominion, was less than $100,000. And he also states in this article that if Canada had embodied the same principle in Dominion legislation that Nova Scotia did in her legislation, she could have trained 800,000 men annually at a cost of $2,000,000.

But we lost the principle, and apparently we in Ontario were the people who lost it, because in 1859 we abolished voluntary service and passed an Act ordering every citizen to drill six days each year and providing for paying them a dollar a day for that service. They say that money is the root of all evil—until to-day we have never seen again the principle that every man owes it as a duty to the State, to his family and to himself, to give himself sufficient military training to prepare him for the day of trial and the day when his services may be needed.

I would like to say something to you on the line of what some other countries in the world have done in relation to this. Three countries that stand out prominently as having lost this principle are China, the United States, and Canada. All other countries seem to have kept it. Australia and New Zealand lost it for a time, but to the credit of Australia—I don't know the date when New Zealand won it back, but between 1903 and 1909 by a series of Acts Australia got back the principle we lost, and made it obligatory upon every man between 18 and 26 to do a certain number of days' drill each year. In consequence, in 1913, the year before the war, when the Australian system had been working in full for three years, there trained that year 53,000 Junior Cadets and 90,000 Senior Cadets, that is those from 16 to 18, and about thirty or forty thousand militia. Australia trained in the year 1913 about four times the number of men that Canada trained in the same year! True, some of these were young, but they are old enough by this time to go to Europe, and if their system had started a little earlier they would have been in a position to have a strong army.

Enough on that point. Enough on organization. The principle has broken down. We have lost the principle, a principle embodied in nearly every country except the three I have mentioned.

Then, of course, the practical question is, how shall we

establish the principle again, and will the principle meet our present needs? That, after all, is the important point.

So far as the law is concerned, the Militia Act of 1868, which is on our statute books, and practically has never been used, provides all the machinery for military service and for equality of service, but only in case of war, and that Militia Act is likely to be our refuge and our strength during the next few months. There are no more recruits coming forward. During the past six months there have been no more than enough to keep up with the wastage.

Let me show how the Militia Act works out. Every male inhabitant of Canada capable of bearing arms shall serve his country in time of war. I should say that in the first place the Act divides the citizens into four classes: young men and widowers without children, between 18 and 30; they are the first class to be called; secondly, the same classes between 30 and 45; thirdly, married men, and widowers with children, from 18 to 45; and fourthly, members of Canadian Clubs, etc., including all gentlemen between 45 and 60,—they come last.

Of course there are exemptions: Judges are exempt, clergy, professors in colleges and universities, teachers in religious work, keepers of penitentiaries and asylums, persons disabled by bodily infirmity, and the only son of a widow being her only support.

The machinery for the enrollment of citizens in case of a levée en masse is provided for; it is very simple: Canada is divided into ten military districts, each district into brigades and battalion divisions, and the battalion divisions into company divisions. The captain of a company is really the genius of the Act, that is, when it is worked. He must go to every house in his district and enroll all the men for military service. When he has made up his roll for the district he gives a call for volunteers; if he can get enough men as volunteers, all right; if not, and if there are more men in the district than are required, which is likely to be the case, they ballot for who shall go. In that there is equality; every fellow has an equal chance; in fact, he has more than an equal chance, for if balloted for and taken he can provide a substitute if he is eligible for military service and has not himself been called.

Now, then, is there any alternative before us? Is the Militia Act our only solution? The only alternative I have heard of is conscription. Conscription is not such a very hideous thing after all. In our case it would be a form of necessity.

But conscription in Canada if it were acceptable would have to be by Act of Parliament. But compulsory service would introduce a thing into this country which I don't think the country is prepared to accept. While the cities are prepared, and certain parts of the country are prepared, for anything, to win the war, I doubt if the rural population would submit to anything of that name or akin to it.

It is, however, a question whether the Militia Act—it has never been decided in the courts—compels a man to serve outside Canada. If the Militia Act is brought into force and men are accepted, this is a question for jurists to decide, whether the Militia Act contemplates service outside of Canada or not.

But in any case, supposing Canada is going on to help win the war, that is for you, gentlemen, to decide. So far as the 198th Battalion is concerned, their decision has been made. As to whether Canada is to contribute another hundred thousand men, and whether she is to contribute the men she has been training and raise another hundred thousand for home defence, she is face to face with the Militia Act or conscription, and it is for public opinion in this country to decide.

Personally I would just like to say this, born of my experience of the past year,—it does not make much difference which you do, but the sooner we come to Equality of Service the better it will be for the future of the national life of Canada as well as for our success in the war.

We are to-day sowing the seeds of discord. Any man with his eyes open is very sure of it, as the recruiting officer is bound to be as he goes down street. In this house live Mr. and Mrs. Jones, who have given four sons to the army. Mr. Jones and Mrs. Jones are old; their four sons are away; and they have not much to live on, and perhaps what little they have stored up in the savings bank is being used to keep themselves supplied and to send their sons the things they think necessary for them to make them more comfortable. Next door to them live Mr. and Mrs. Brown, who have four stalwart sons working for my friend Mr. Irish in a munitions factory and getting—what is it? $5 to $8 a day? They have all the luxury there in that home. This is, perhaps, an extreme case, but this case is an example—Mr. and Mrs. Brown with their luxury, and Mr. and Mrs. Jones with only the blessing of the memory that they have given four sons for the Empire, one of whom, perhaps, has an injury that has invalided him, and two, perhaps three, of the sons have made the supreme sacrifice.

Now, gentlemen, if you think that after the war is over the

people who have made sacrifices are not going to have something to say to the people who have not made sacrifices, then you are mightily mistaken!

Then this word in conclusion: don't go away with the notion that my idea of Equality of Service is confined only to men in khaki. I have stuck only to the narrow sense of the militia to-day, because the other subject is too broad. I am aware that there are a great number of men in the city of Toronto and elsewhere in this broad Dominion up to the present time who have done probably greater service for their country, King and flag during this war than I have done. They have given their service freely; they have given of their talents; they have given of their money, of their thought, and heart, and brain. And I say all honor to these men, because they are doing their work without having the glory of putting on a khaki uniform. And all honor to the thousands of women, who have made even more sacrifices as a class, who have labored early and late, and who have given up their five o'clock teas and their sewing bees without a murmur. I say all glory to these people. Let us not forget, if you agree with me, that Equality of Service applies to every man in the time of war especially, that he shall have the one thought, that is, "I am a soldier of my country; I am willing to do my duty, implicitly, promptly, fully, and whether my country glorifies me with a uniform or keeps me in a back office, I am prepared to do everything which my country demands of me, in order that this great struggle for liberty and for freedom shall go on to a successful conclusion."

This is the broad idea, Equality of Service. I have, though, discussed only the Militia Act, and overlooked the broader aspect of the subject.

I thank you, gentlemen, fellow members of the Canadian Club, for this opportunity of being with you, and I hope you will show the spirit that I would look for in it. I thank you for the honor you have done me to-day. I hope you will remember me occasionally in your thoughts, and some of you in your prayers when the 198th Canadian Buffs have gone overseas; that you will think as kindly of us as you can. And if you hear that the Lieutenant-Colonel has been reduced to a Sergeant-Major, you will remember that the motto of the Buffs is, "To do the best that it can under all circumstances."

(*February 19th, 1917.*)

The Fight at Gallipoli

By Sergeant-Major Middlemiss.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club held on the 19th February, Sergeant-Major Middlemiss said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—I cannot see your beautiful city or the sight of your faces but I am deeply conscious of the great honor that has been accorded me in being privileged to address you this afternoon. The subject of my address will be the concentration for the operations at the Dardanelles; a little about India, where I was stationed when the war broke out; and the part my own battalion took in the fight at Gallipoli. The failure of the Dardanelles operations has, like all other failures, been the subject of much adverse criticism. Most people now are of the opinion that the attempt never should have been made. Others say the failure was due to incompetent leadership. While still a third party maintain that it was a purely strategic move on Britain's part to withdraw and let the rich prize of Constantinople fall into the hands of the Russians. It is not for me to express my thoughts about the rights or wrongs of the case. It will be a long time till those on whom the blame rests will be found. Whatever is done now, it cannot recall or replace the many thousands of brave men who gave their lives so freely to uphold the rights and liberties we are battling to maintain. The memorable landing under General Sir Ian Hamilton on the 25th of April, 1915, has been acknowledged by most experts to be the greatest feat of military arms ever accomplished. To any one who has visited that part of the world, or who has made a close study of the strong natural features in that section of the country, it becomes all the more incredible that such a landing from the open sea, in small boats, against a well organized and well armed enemy, should ever have been made.

I was stationed with my battalion at Lucknow when the war broke out. Like a great many other people, I thought that it would last only a few months and that a large part of the British garrison of India would not be required. It

*Sergeant-Major Middlemiss, as a member of the King's Own Scottish Borderers, took part in the original landing at Gallipoli.

was not long, however, before we heard rumors that such and such a brigade had mobilized and was on the way. But it was not until the middle of September that my battalion received orders to mobilize, and, then, with the usual lazy indolent way of the Orient (where the motto is "never do a thing to-day that can be done next week") it was not until the latter days of October before we received our final marching orders.

The withdrawal of the large British garrisons from India, which in ordinary times consists of 75,000 men, was not looked upon with much favor by the white population. Their minds reverted back to the horrors of the Indian mutiny and another such rising was feared. This view was supported by the fact that large numbers of Indians had been returning from British Columbia, California and South Africa, bribed by the German gold and fine promises to cause a riot and rebellion throughout the country. Several small outbreaks did occur, but the Government was quick to act and they were rendered abortive.

Anxious eyes were also turned to the northwest frontier; here lay Afghanistan with its wild and warlike people; for many years the Afghan army had been trained by Turkish officers and a large section of the people were known to be bitterly opposed to the British rule in India. This was a fine field for the German propagandists and they did not fail to try to inflame these wild border tribes to make raid upon India, but the Ameer of Afghanistan was not to be persuaded and the confidence reposed in him by the Indian Government has not been misplaced. Probably the advice of his father, the old Ameer, may have had something to do with his decision. His father's advice was, that it would be useless to try and drive the British out of India, for no matter what hardships, or what defeats they suffered, they would send their last man and spend their last shilling to obtain the victory in the end.

On the 27th of October, 1915, leaving our wives and children and all our personal belongings, we entrained for Bombay and embarked on board the S.S. *Sardinia* of the P. & O. line. On the 2nd of November we sailed, in company with forty other vessels, under sealed orders, not knowing to which part of the great battle line we were being sent. A few days out from Bombay we were joined by an additional eight vessels from Karachi, our escort being the battleships *Duke of Edinburgh,* the *Swiftsure* and two auxiliary cruisers of the Indian marine service. Despite the fact that the German light cruiser *Emden* was still playing havoc with the

shipping in that part of the world, there was no restriction on lighting up at nights, and the effect of this large fleet of liners, sailing in regular formation, was very remarkable. We sailed in lines of five, half a mile between ships and a half mile between lines, and that night it was like looking down upon the deserted streets of a brilliantly lighted town on a very wet dark night. We called at Aden, and from there part of our force, with the battleship *Duke of Edinburgh* as escort was sent to dismantle some guns which had been causing trouble from the small Arab village of Sheik Said on the coast of Arabia on the Red Sea. Our force was landed, destroyed the guns and defences, inflicted a few casualties and then re-embarked, and we proceeded on our way to Port Suez. Here the whole force was disembarked and we proceeded to Ismaillia, which is midway on the canal between Port Said and Port Suez, and for a month we were kept busy building defences on the north bank of the canal against the threatened invasion of Egypt by the Turks.

About the middle of December we were recalled to England, to re-clothe and re-arm for service in France. Calling at Gibraltar on the way, we had a fine view of the Australian light cruiser *Sidney,* which was undergoing repairs after the glorious action, in which she had sunk the German light cruiser *Emden.*

We landed in England on the 29th of December, and proceeded to Warley in Essex. After a short stay there, we were moved to Rugby in the Midlands and posted to the 87th Brigade of the famous 29th Division, which afterwards became known, like Napoleon's "Old Guard" at Waterloo, as the "Old Guard" of Gallipoli. The battalions comprising this Division were the last battalions of the regular British Army, which had played such a conspicuous part in the battles of Mons and the Marne.

After re-clothing and re-arming, the preparations for the Dardanelles having taken shape, we were ordered to take part in that attempt. On the 16th of March, we stole away from Rugby in the middle of the night and entrained for Avonmouth on the Bristol Channel and embarked on board of the S.S. *Dongola.* We sailed that night about ten o'clock without any escort and proceeded direct to Malta. Our entrance into the grand harbor there was very inspiring. A large part of the French Mediterranean battle squadron was in harbor and also six transports, crowded with troops bound for the same place as ourselves. The band on the flagship *Paris,* struck up the National Anthem—the French sailors and the British

soldiers crowded the decks of their respective vessels and cheered and cheered again as we slowly came to anchor. After coaling, we continued on our way to Alexandria. Here we disembarked and went into camp to await the arrival of the other troops from England, and for the next twelve days we were busily employed loading up stores, munitions and water for the army detailed to make the landing. The water difficulty was one of the hardest problems that had to be overcome. It was known that there were but few wells on the Pensinsula and that before we could get there they would be destroyed or tampered with. Therefore, all the drinking water had to be carried from Egypt. For the 29th Division alone, we had to fill 10,000 tins, each of which held 3 gallons, seal them up and pack them, two in a case, so that they could be easily handled.

On the 12th of April we again embarked on board the SS. *Southlands* (since torpedoed) and proceeded to Lemnos, one of the large islands in the Greek archipelago, which on account of its large, well-sheltered inner harbor, had been selected as the base of concentration for the Navy and the Army. The story of the islands of Lemnos may be of some interest to you. My own Biblical knowledge on the subject is rather hazy, but it was told me by a regimental chaplain and I suppose he ought to know. He said that the island of Lemnos was the spot where the devil alighted when he was expelled from heaven as a wicked angel, but he was not in residence when we arrived, but I think we have all a very good idea where he had taken up his headquarters.

There were many battleships and transports in harbor when we arrived and they continued to arrive until, on the 23rd, it was known that the concentration was complete and that, come what may, the long awaited attempt would take place at daybreak on Sunday morning, the 25th. During our stay in the harbor we were daily practiced in drawing and climbing up and down ships' ladders, with and without accoutrements, so that we could abandon ship at a moment's notice if necessary.

On the morning of the 24th a message from Lieutenant General Hunter Weston was issued to every officer and soldier of the 29th Division. His message was "the 29th Division, which I have the honor to command, has been selected to make the dangerous and hazardous attempt to land at Cape Helles and Sidal Bar. You will be called upon to face death by shots, by shells, by mines and by drowning. Remember the glorious traditions of your brothers and comrades in France and Flanders. With the help of God and the British Navy a landing will be made. In Nelson's day it was England, now it is the

whole British Empire that expects every man of you to do your duty."

The scene in that lonely island harbor on that spring afternoon was one of the most magnificent that any one could wish to look upon. Just picture in your minds a large harbor about three miles long and two and one-half miles wide, surrounded by a ring of low hills just becoming green in the early spring. A very quiet and peaceful spot in normal times, even quiet and peaceful on that spring afternoon, but within that hill-ranged harbor, lay one of the mightiest combined naval and military forces that has ever been collected in one spot. The British fleet was represented by the giant *Queen Elizabeth,* the *Triumph, Swiftsure, Goliath, City of Dublin, Duke of Edinburgh, Amethyst* and *Sapphire,* many smaller cruisers and battleships, a host of torpedo boats and several submarines, while the transports lay so close together that it was impossible to count them. Crowding the deck of these transports was the flower of the manhood of Australia and New Zealand, about 50,000, the last Division of the British Army, about 18,000, and one Division of the Naval Reserves of Volunteers, about 12,000.

Shortly after two o'clock a general movement was noticeable; one by one the ships picked up anchor and moved to their stations. Here the soldiers were transferred on to the battleships; half of my battalion was taken on Board the light cruiser *Amethyst* and the other half on the *Sapphire.* The *Amethyst,* as some of you may remember reading, was the battleship which ran the gauntlet of the Turkish forts in the month of March. Her mission was to cut the cable which connected the two Turkish forts of Kahid Bar and Chenect; the narrows at this point are a little less than a mile wide. She had accomplished her object, but was detected on return and came under a very heavy fire. She was hit 20 times and her steering gear was damaged, but she managed to return in safety. One shell, however, penetrated the side of the ship and landed in the men's bathroom where the stokers were cleaning up after coming up from below. This shell bursting in that confined area killed every man to the number of 20.

We sailed at six p.m. and arrived opposite the point selected for our landing about 2.30 in the morning. The battleships lay about 2,500 yards from the coast and in the darkness we could see the flash of the searchlights from the Turkish Forts, but the intervening cliffs prevented them from getting us in range. At Cape Helles there were five points for land-

ing beaches; they were the only possible places where any landings could be made in a rough and rocky coast line for about ten miles. These landing places were designated on the military maps by letters, commencing on the inside of the peninsula with the letter "S", "V" beach represented Sedd-el-Bahr, "W" was Cape Helles, "X" about half a mile around the north coast of the peninsula, and "Y" beach, where we were detailed to land, was about three miles on the north coast from Cape Helles. Mine sweepers were brought up, each of which had three boats lashed to either side, and we were transferred to these mine sweepers. Just at the first gray streak of dawn we made off for the shore. When about half way the guns on the battleships opened fire over our heads; anwering reports came from the southwest at Cape Helles and from the northeast at Anzac, which told us that the great attempt had at last been begun.

As we drew close in shore, we jumped into the boats when the mine sweepers grounded, the lashings were cut and the boats shot into the beach. When they struck, we jumped into the water, which took us up nearly to the chest. I cannot say with any truth whether any of our men were drowned at that time, but many of us fell and had a nice wet bath before clambering on to the narrow ledge of beach, which, at the most, was about 50 yards long and about 30 yards wide. Every man carried full accoutrements, 250 rounds of ammunition, sufficient food to last him 5 days, if necessary, and his water bottle filled, a total weight, including the rifle, amounting to about 75 lbs.

The enemy had evidently thought this point too difficult for a landing to be attempted and left the tops of the cliffs undefended. The cliffs at this point fell a little back from the general line, forming a shallow re-entrant and rose abruptly to a height of about 250 feet. The first men ashore were sent immediately to climb the cliffs; they were halted a few yards below the sky line and given time to divest themselves of their heavy pack, then at the signal they cleared the cliffs with a rush, doubled inland about two or three hundred yards, and lay down in the low bushes which covered the ground in this vicinity. The enemy had now become aware of our presence and we came under a very heavy shrapnel fire, but he had much over-estimated his range, and most of his shells went harmlessly over our heads into the sea.

The first set to make this landing consisted of my own battalion, the Plymouth battalion of the Naval Reserve Volunteers, and one company of the South Wales Borderers, in

all about 2,200 men. After our Commander had brought his force up to within a few yards of the sky line, he decided to advance half of his little force inland to cause a distraction and relieve the pressure on the other landing points.

We had advanced inland, about three quarters of a mile, when the aeroplanes which were directing the fire of the battleships informed us that the enemy had detached a large body of his reserves to intercept us, the strength of which was estimated in the ratio of six to one. Our little force was compelled to retire to the line we had taken up about 200 yards inland from the edge of the cliffs. The battleships supporting us at this time were the *Goliath* (since torpedoed) the *City of Dublin,* the *Amethyst* and *Sapphire.* Information was sent to the commander of the 29th Division asking that reinforcements be sent as soon as possible, and they were promised at four o'clock. Four o'clock came, but no reinforcements. The enemy by this time had got the range much better and we began to suffer casualties. Orders were given to dig in with the small spade every soldier carries, and to make the best of our positions for the night. At six o'clock every man who could use a rifle was put into the firing line. When darkness fell the guns from the Turkish forts and the battleships ceased, but the machine gun and rifle firing was very heavy all night.

I was sent with a party of sixty men to reinforce the left side of our firing line. While making my way up the side of the cliffs, I heard orders shouted out to retire, but not recognizing the voice as belonging to any of my own officers, I halted my party and sent two men forward to reconnoitre. They found the officer in charge of that section of the line who stated no such orders had been issued and the next morning it was discovered that a German officer, attached to the Turkish Army, had either been hidden in the bushes all day, or had broken through the line when darkness fell and had shouted these contrary orders to cause confusion. Getting on toward Monday morning, the enemy had sent forward his bombing parties under cover of the darkness and they threw their deadly missiles into our thin line—our casualties from these were very heavy.

Reinforcements were again requisitioned, but they could not be sent in time and we were ordered, if it was impossible to maintain our position to withdraw, reimbark and join the main body at Cape Helles—a very difficult operation—in the face of a vastly superior enemy. Our casualties by this time amounted to about half the entire force. Of my own battalion

we had lost our commanding officer, the adjutant, five captains, seven lieutenants and about 500 men killed and wounded. The senior officer left was a man who had seen much hill warfare in India, and he decided to adopt the same tactics on this occasion; selecting the strongest and most active men he could find, he withdrew them back to the very edge of the cliffs, separated them at wide intervals, gave them a plentiful supply of ammunition with orders that as soon as their front had been cleared of the wounded, they should keep up a rapid fire and deceive the enemy as to our intentions. By this manoeuvre the whole of that little force which was left alive was safely taken down the cliffs, put into boats and taken back on board the battleships.

The landing at "Y" beach had been forced to withdraw, but it had in the main achieved its object. During the whole of the Sunday and Monday morning, it had held back a vastly superior number of the enemy and had relieved the pressure on the other points, where a footing had been gained by the Monday morning—a foothold which was fought for yard by yard, until at last a firm grip was maintained on the peninsula, and when any one can but dimly realize the enormous difficulties that had to be overcome, that three parts of the army sent to make that landing were but partially trained men, fighting 3,000 miles away from their base, that in the month of June the enemy was so badly battered that success was almost a certainty, but owing to lack of munitions and men our commander could not push home his advantage, it becomes all the more pitiful that such a glorious page in the history of the war should have to be turned down as a failure. If there were not many rewards given for personal bravery to the men who made that landing, it was not because there were no brave deeds done, but because so many officers had been killed that no recommendations could be sent in.

The following instances will show you the spirit which animated these men:

In my own vicinity during the night, I know of one officer, one sergeant and two men who had received severe scalp wounds, which, if they had wanted to, would have kept them out of further danger, who, after having their wounds attended to, voluntarily returned and took up their positions on the firing line.

I regret to say the officer and sergeant were killed early Monday morning.

The hand bombs set fire to the bushes in many places and the men in the vicinity of where these fires occurred got up

without orders, beat out the flames and lay down and continued with the fighting,

The regimental chaplain, whom I told you about, was indefatigable in his efforts to succor and help the wounded, but he became so excited and indignant that for a moment he forgot himself and started to swear, but he suddenly remembered, knelt down in the middle of all the firing and prayed.

It was just previous to the retirement being ordered, I was in the firing line and had come down to reload my rifle, when a Turkish hand grenade, landing on the ground close to my head, exploded and deprived me of my sight. At first I did not know my eyes were injured. Very fortunately for me, I did not lose consciousness. I managed to rid myself of my accoutrements, tie my bandage over my face and calling out to my superior that I was wounded, I crawled back through the bushes to the edge of the cliffs and waited there until I was found and assisted down to the beach. I was then taken back on board the ship *Amethyst* and that same evening transferred to the hospital ship *Guilford Castle*. After 12 days, I was landed at Port Said in Egypt and later transferred to Cairo, where I underwent several operations, some with the hope of saving the sight of my left eye, but unfortunately they were not successful. After a total period of five and one-half months in hospitals, I was discharged as permanently blind, and went to St. Dunstan's, the Training School for Blinded Soldiers in London. I have come from there to the United States to assist in the work of raising funds to alleviate the conditions of those, who, like myself, have been blinded in this war.

(*March 5th, 1917.*)

Practical Methods of Training the Returned Soldiers

By Mr. E. G. Cooley.*

AT a regular meeting of the Canadian Club held on the 5th March, Mr. Cooley said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club,—It it with a great deal of diffidence that I attempt to discuss this question. I feel that no one knows exactly what should be done in all its details; that I certainly do not. I am interested in it for two or three reasons: in the first place, because I am the the son of an old soldier, who went through the Civil War, and I have heard the problems of pensions and of old soldiers discussed ever since I was eight years old; in the second place, I am very greatly interested in studying vocational education, having visited most of the countries of Europe and having followed what they have done. Since this war began I have been very greatly interested in the information which I have obtained both in Germany and in other countries. I am especially interested in what they have attempted to do in Germany, accounts of which I have read in German technical school periodicals. I hope you will be, like true-born Britons always are, ready to learn from anybody, even from the enemy.

This war is being fought by citizen soldiers, who must, at its close, be gotten back into the social organism, not as mere pensioners, but as active members of the producing class. In order to secure this, the returned soldier must be placed, physically and economically, as near as possible in the position he occupied when he enlisted.

In the States we often read eloquent descriptions of the famous review of Sherman's army in Washington at the close of the Civil War. We see the long files of these veterans as they pass for the last time in martial review before their absorption into the occupations of civil life. We usually fail to see, however, that it took years of preparation to make this an effective army, and that preparation was necessary for

*Mr. E. G. Cooley was Superintendent of Schools for Chicago for years. More recently he made a study of the vocational education systems of the leading countries of Europe.

its absorption into occupation of civil life, an absorption that is always accompanied by much maladjustment and by much unnecessary loss and suffering. This loss and this suffering it is the duty and the interest of society to avoid so far as possible. In other words, preparation is not a process limited in its application to times of war, but is fully as necessary for times of peace.

In 1862, my father enlisted in an Iowa volunteer regiment for a three-year term of service, returning home for the first time in August, 1865. When he enlisted he was a sawyer, owning a small sawmill. When he returned, the mill had been lost, and he was compelled to find a new job in which he could support his family. A pension system for disabled soldiers had been instituted, but he returned unhurt. Subsequent changes in the pension system made it easy for him to obtain a pension, but for nearly twenty years he was too proud to avail himself of it. When he finally applied, he was immediately granted a pension of fifteen dollars a month.

In the meantime he tried manual labor in the harvest field, but found himself unable to stand it. He tried work at insurance and selling machinery with some small success, and served as village postmaster during the last ten or twelve years of his life. My share of his estate was $83.50. Still, he was more fortunate than most of the members of his company, as he was able to support his family decently, send his children through the village schools, and lived to the ripe old age of seventy-six.

Many of his comrades came home, however, with impaired health, with no business prospects, and were unable to care for their families in a satisfactory manner. Their pension was not large enough to support them, they had lost precious years without developing business or industrial aptitudes, and sometimes became public charges. They were an easy prey to rascally pension agents and equally rascally politicians who obtained their suffrages, not by advocating measures for the public good, but by promising increases in pensions. These abuses continue to this day. Organizations of old soldiers continue to agitate for increases of pensions. They feel that they have made sacrifices for the public good, and that substantial recognition of this is due them at the hands of the country they saved.

I believe these men are right is demanding this recognition, but I also believe that their country owed them something more than a pension system that was often subject to abuse and an element of demoralization. A system of mere money

payments for such services was heartless and mercenary. There should have been added some systematic plan for enabling the returned soldiers to regain their positions in civil life under as favorable conditions as possible.

What more could have been done, or, better still, what can the countries now engaged in war do to recompense fairly those who are jeopardizing their lives, their health and their families for the public good? I shall not deal in abstract speculation but I shall call attention to measures now taken to meet the situation by countries involved in the present war. These plans involve ideals that received little or no recognition during our Civil War. Some of these plans may seem socialistic, but that will not scare us to-day when governments are throwing to the winds their former individualistic ideals and are engaging in socialistic operations that include almost all departments of economic life. I need not enumerate them.

Germany naturally was the first to engage in these plans, but the other nations soon followed. Through German periodicals on vocational education I have been able to learn something of their method of dealing with this problem.

The German people regard it as a debt of honor to give especial care to the soldier who returns home with limbs lost or health impaired. They cannot pay this debt by providing merely a well-deserved pension, a government job, or both. They must consider both the future welfare of the man and of the State. They must manifest their personal interest in the future happiness and efficiency of the returned soldier as well as care for the problem of conserving the still usable knowledge, skill and experience of the worker. They must attempt to return these men to civil life as fully equipped as possible to perform their functions as breadwinners, as producers, when their services as destroyers are at an end. The future happiness of the man and the welfare of the nation will be conserved by such measures.

The Germans are attempting to secure again for returned soldiers the possibility of earning an honest living through his own personal efforts, and without in any way impairing his pension rights. The pension is to be regarded as a handicap to enable him to compete in the battle of life, not to induce him to give up the contest without an effort;—as a stimulant, not as a narcotic.

They attack this problem while the soldier is still in the hospital. They provide good medical care, orthopedic treatment of injured limbs, special committees for vocational

guidance and employment, and well organized courses for vocational instruction.

They regard the period of convalescence as a danger if the patient is encouraged to think and talk only of his misfortunes and his disabilities. The patient must be shown that his injured limbs may still be of use if he has the *will* to use them. He must be given incentives to work, and be shown how he may again become a useful member of society.

In the hospital, in addition to the usual medical care, the patient is provided with orthopedic treatment designed to restore the use of the injured portions of his body. They aim to both heal the wounds and restore the usual functions of the body. They call the attention of the patient to the advantages of artificial limbs, special tools and apparatus for the partially crippled, and enable him to secure them.

Many of the injured soldiers will ordinarily give little attention to the question of their future employment. They believe the State will and must provide for them. They fear, too, a loss of their pension rights as soon as they begin remunerative work. The Committee on Vocational Guidance attempt to remove this fear by governmental assurances that they need not be unemployables in order to secure a pension, that the pension is meant to overcome a handicap, not to keep the pensioner out of competition with his fellows.

The committees intercede with former and other employers to supply work to the soldier that he is able to do efficiently. They advise the soldier as well as the employers as to the man's capabilities, and thus make it easier to secure the proper kind of work. In some cases the soldier has been so badly injured that he can do only some special kind of work, work that will require special training in special tools or machinery. For this as well as the ordinary work in their vocation special courses of instruction are provided without cost to the patient. They seek to compensate him for his loss of physical power by technical training. I shall outline the courses given in the hospital school at Aachen. Similar courses are given all over Germany.

I. Courses which may be entered at any time:
   1. Courses in writing for those who have lost an arm or a hand, 10 hours a week.
   2. Courses in geometrical drawing for similar cases, 6 hours a week.
   3. Courses in civics, 6 hours a week.
   4. Courses in industrial design and correspondence, 6 hours a week.

5. Arithmetic and geometry, 6 hours a week.
6. Commercial arithmetic, 6 hours a week.
7. Commercial law and correspondence, 6 hours a week.

II. Shorter courses (6 to 7 hours a week):
1. Courses in business bookkeeping, 4 hours a week.
2. Industrial cost calculation, 4 hours a week.
3. Industrial bookkeeping, 6 hours a week.
4. Stenography, 8 hours a week.

III. Technical drawing for different branches of work.

IV. Workshop practice for 16 different trades.

V. Light employment in gardening and agriculture—various phases of it according to what a man is still able to do. This course is only one of hundreds.

Two features of these plans are of special interest. The first is the importance they attribute to inducing the patient to continue in the line of his former employment, if possible. They seek to avoid the loss of skill, knowledge, and experience that would result from a change of occupation, a loss both to the individual and to the community. The second feature is the importance they ascribe to keeping the patient from rushing to the city after some clerical job. This would also mean a loss of technical knowledge and skill, a loss that would be felt when the war was over and business competition begins again. The welfare of the individual as well as of the community would be jeopardized by such changes of occupation and changes of home. When changes of occupation are inevitable the committees seek to secure a wise choice. In such cases the courses of instruction are especially important. I may say that they have found, in dealing with the problem of the returned soldier, that the unskilled man presents the most difficult problem. If he was in a factory, the loss of physical power makes it impossible for him to maintain his original job. They have undertaken special training in a school at Düsseldorf, where they give a course of six or seven weeks, which is able to turn out a man who can turn out a valve or run a lathe; then they have gone to the employer who is in great need of skilled men, and they have induced him to reorganize his shop so that specially trained men can be employed. The problem still presses very hard, but they think they are on the way to a settlement of it.

The plan so far seems to be mainly for the man who works for others and for those who have suffered of limbs or health. The Germans do not admit that the day of small industries is over. The plans for the returned soldier should therefore include help for the small independent shopkeeper, small

mechanic and small farmer, both for those who return well and for the injured. Usually, in time of war, the man, like my father, finds his business gone when he returns, while his competitor who stayed at home has become rich, partly on account of the war in which he has lost his all. He usually finds his capital gone or seriously impaired, his special knowledge of conditions inadequate. Something should be done to remove his handicap and to enable him to resume his former independent status. One effect of this great war, as of every other great war, is to increase the number of mere wage earners, and reduce the number of independent men, on the farm, in the shop, and in the store.

In Germany they are proposing to provide a system of long-time, low-interest loans for such returned soldiers, as well as courses of instruction and other forms of assistance. The whole plan—pensions, vocational and employment committees, courses of instruction, and loans,—is dominated by the ideal that the returned soldier shall suffer no unnecessary handicap in his efforts to resume his place in active life. Is this not the wisest plan, from the standpoint of the community, and the fairest to the man who has suffered for the public good?

I am assuming that you will provide an adequate system of pensions— all governments do this. You can not fully compensate the disabled soldier for his losses and his sufferings, but by pensions, by bureaus of vocational guidance and employment, by orthopedic treatment, by courses of vocational instruction and by loans you can do much towards putting him on an even footing with his more fortunate brother who has stayed at home. You should aim not merely to support pensioners, but to secure happy and efficient citizens of the commonwealth.

You will need some new machinery to do this, and I learn that you have it already. Many will take advantage of your college and secondary course of instruction; some can not. Your system of continuation schools is a most practical instrument for this purpose. In Germany these practical schools are already being used for the instruction of the injured soldiers.

In Germany preparedness has meant far more than mere military training. The same instrument for training men to manipulate artillery and the machinery of a submarine, or build an emergency road or bridge, is now being used to train the convalescent for the coming times of peace. Unless the world wakes up, she will "get the jump on them," just as she "got the jump on them" when the war began.

Perhaps it will not be untimely to describe one of these continuation schools. The spirit of the continuation school is adaptation. Its aim is to put at the disposal of the worker in shop, office, or on the farm, what the individual most needs for mastering his life's work, whether as a clerk, an apprentice, or a farmer. This is the sort of question the continuation school faces every day and does much towards answering. It combines theory and practice as needed; its course of study is worked out by persons in the vocation itself, employers and workingmen; it is managed and supervised by persons from the trade with the advice and aid of educational experts. It is proving a splendid instrument for meeting the new problem, preparing the returned soldier for his re-entry into civil life. Its spirit of adaption enables it to meet the new problem as it met the old one.

I am very happy to learn—and it made it seem almost unnecessary for me to read my paper—that you have already undertaken nearly everything I have put down here, as well as other things. It is a great satisfaction to know that you have attacked these problems so vigorously, and I hope successfully. I want to thank you for the honor and privilege of addressing you, and for the patience you have displayed in listening to my little talk.

(*March 12th, 1917.*)

Fifty Years of Confederation

By Mr. John Lewis.*

AT a regular meeting of the Club held on the 12th March, Mr. Lewis said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,—I have been somewhat embarrassed since entering this hall by the presence of so many gentlemen who are really well acquainted with the history and the constitution of Canada. I shall have to repeat a good many things which to them will be quite an old story but will be necessary for the presentation of the subject. I must also make the explanation that I can cover only a small portion of the ground. The reward which I hope for is that some one will hear me and think how much better he could have done it, and will act upon that and address some gathering and so help in the celebration of the anniversary of Confederation. I hope, too, that my imperfect presentation will produce an immense run upon Mr. Locke's Library and add to the troubles of him and his staff.

The particular part of the history of Canada which I shall discuss is the history of that union of the Canadas,—or Ontario and Quebec, as I shall call them for convenience—which preceded Confederation. Confederation, of course, was not the beginning of the free institutions of Canada; and without going back as far as Magna Charta I may say that before Confederation we had achieved a very great measure of reform, namely, self-government in Canada. I am not going to tell of the long controversy and struggle for that reform; but everyone admits that self-government has worked well. I shall take the liberty of quoting from a little book, by Woodward, on "The Expansion of the British Empire," which says: "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."

*Mr. Lewis is one of the editors of the Toronto *Daily Star*, and is the author of a "Life of George Brown" in the "Makers of Canada" and of "The New Dominion" in the series known as "Canada and its Provinces."

That having been done, self-government having been achieved, and our relations to the British Empire at that time at least being perfectly satisfactory, the Fathers of Confederation had to deal not with relations between Canada and Great Britain, but with the relations between one Canadian Province and another. That leads me to a part of the Union not so satisfactory as that which conferred self-government. Before Union the Provinces were all absolutely separated, having no connection except their connection with the British Crown. Lord Durham proposed a union of the two Canadas, leaving the other parts of British North America untouched. Against Lord Durham's protest, Canada was gerrymandered. Quebec had then a much larger population than Ontario; but in spite of that the representation was artificially arranged so as to give the same representation to each part of Canada. Lord Durham said that this was unjust, and that the time would come when Upper Canada would complain, because, "by immigration Upper Canada would have the greater population, and would insist upon representation by population." Well, that happened, and that was the basis of George Brown's famous demand for representation by population, known to your fathers, and perhaps to some of you, as "Rep. by Pop."

Brown was right, but, to be frank and fair, this must be said: We made the rules of the game, and when the rules began to work against us we kicked and insisted on changing them. However, the old system was wrong, and the reform was needed.

A Legislative Union, as distinct from a Federal Union, was peculiarly unsuited to Ontario and Quebec, with their different races, religions, general customs, and ideals. The politicians and statesmen of that time have been accused of being small-minded factious men. I for my part have a good deal of sympathy with them in their efforts to work a wrong system. Sir John Macdonald in the Confederation debate said that the Union, though legislative in name, was Federal in practice.

There was an Attorney-General East and an Attorney-General West; there were separate volumes of statutes for each Province; and as the two Provinces were unable to agree on Sabbath observance the stricter law was enacted for Ontario alone. They also at one time adopted another device, called the double majority, by which certain Government measures required a majority not only of the whole Legislature, but of each part.

However, in spite of these compromises the Union went on from bad to worse. The two parts of Canada were equally

matched; the two parties were equally matched; the leaders, George Brown and John Macdonald, were personal enemies. At last a deadlock ensued, which Goldwin Smith says was the real Father of Confederation; and that is partly true.

There were some humorous incidents. A government having a majority of only one or two members was said to have a "drinking majority"; for if two members went out to indulge in a drink, the Government might be defeated in their absence. At a later and more enlightened period the device was adopted of sending out a page to bring in a glass of something that looked like water. Another story is told by Hon. James Young, in a book entitled "Public Life and Public Men in Canada": Two members of the Opposition invited two supporters of the Government to go out for a drive into the country. Any suspicion that they might have as to the good faith of their entertainers was lulled by beverages obtained at the various roadhouses on the way; after partaking of a number of these beverages they found that they had been betrayed by false friends—they were gone, the carriage was gone, and the victims were ten miles from the Parliament Buildings, where their votes were urgently needed. Anxious and footsore, they turned up just in time to save the Government!

In 1864, just at the time when the sky was darkest, light broke. The Government, one of the numerous ephemeral governments, some of which lasted only a few months, had fallen, and that same day the report came in from a committee headed by Mr. Brown, favoring Confederation as a solution of the difficulties arising out of Union. Long negotiations followed, and finally Brown and his Conservative opponents co-operated, and Brown joined a coalition Government.

There has been much controversy about who the Fathers, the chief Fathers, of Confederation were. As to that, I am not much concerned; I am content that each of you should pick out your own,—select some man in that famous picture "on whose brow deliberation sits and public care" and take him for your "Father." Confining ourselves to two men about whom controversy rages, perhaps it would not be unfair to say that Brown was the driving force and Macdonald the directing force, Brown was the engine of the ship of State, and Macdonald the rudder. The country was astonished to see these two old enemies sitting together in the same Government. Sir Richard Cartwright relates this story:

"On that memorable afternoon when Mr. Brown, not without emotion, made his statement to a hushed and expectant

House, and declared that he was about to ally himself with Sir George Cartier and his friends for the purpose of carrying out Confederation, I saw an excitable elderly little French member rush across the floor, climb upon Mr. Brown, who, as you know, was of a stature approaching the gigantic, fling his arms about his neck, and hang several seconds there suspended, to the infinite joy of all beholders, Pit, Gallery, and Box included."

Public men and historians have approached the question from two different angles, one Federalizing the Union, getting rid of a cumbersome system of government; and the other territorial expansion, the bringing in of the Provinces on the Atlantic and the Provinces on the Pacific. These two questions were related, because if Ontario and Quebec could not live under one Legislature, still less would one Parliament serve for all the Provinces. Federalizing was necessary to expansion. Perhaps one might lay down the principle, that the larger and more scattered the area the looser must be the organization. The organization of the British Empire must be looser than that of Canada, and if there is a World Federation its organization would have to be still more elastic, and would have to make still greater allowance for different forms of government.

There were other conditions, pointing to the necessity for Confederation. The need of defence was emphasized by the coming withdrawal of British soldiers from Canada, and by certain differences with the United States, arising out of incidents in the Civil War to which I need not now refer. I take the liberty of repeating here a passage from the life of George Brown:

"Canada was also about to lose a large part of its trade. For ten years that trade had been built up largely on the basis of reciprocity with the United States, and the war had largely increased the American demand for Canadian products. It was generally expected, and that expectation was fulfilled, that the treaty would be abrogated by the United States. It was feared that the policy of commercial non-intercourse would be carried even farther, the bonding system abolished, and Canada cut off from access to the seaboard during the winter.

"If we add to these difficulties the domestic dissensions of Canada, we must recognize that the outlook was dark. Canada was then a fringe of settlement, extending from the Detroit River to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, having no independent access to the Atlantic except during the summer.

She had been depending largely upon Great Britain for defence, and upon the United States for trade. She had received warning that both these supports were to be weakened, and that she must rely more on her own resources, find new channels of trade and new means of defence. The country lay in the midst of the continent, isolated from the west, isolated in part from the east, with a powerful and not too friendly neighbor to the south. Upper and Lower Canada, with their racial differences as sharply defined as in the days of Lord Durham, regarded each other with distrust; one political combination after another had failed to obtain a working majority of the Legislature, and domestic government was paralyzed. Such a combination of danger and difficulty, within and without, might well arouse alarm, rebuke faction, and stimulate patriotism."

I won't take time to go over the history of the next three years, and the various difficulties that were overcome, but I will summarize by saying that Confederation was achieved. Its results have far exceeded expectations. It has given us access to the Atlantic and the Pacific. It has opened up the prairie lands of the West. It has more than doubled the population. Railway mileage has been increased sixteen times, trade ten times, manufactures five times.

Confederation has stood the test of peace and of war. A country lacking defence at Confederation has sent 300,000 men to take part in a war in Europe, something not anticipated by anyone at the time of Confederation. Sir John Macdonald did express the hope that Canada would add to the strength of the Empire, but he was evidently thinking of some danger upon this continent. During the present war large Parliamentary grants have been voted without dissent. Taxes are paid cheerfully. Patriotic funds are raised with ease, and war loans are over-subscribed. All these are the results of co-operation, not of compulsion.

There is, however, much work yet to be done. We must unify Canada. At the time of Confederation our Canada was compared by an unkind critic to a combination of fishing rods tied together at one end, and in that there was an element of truth. There is still a great gap between Old Ontario and the West. A still more serious condition is the gap between Ontario and Quebec, caused very largely by the barrier of different languages. We don't read Quebec newspapers regularly, or hear the speeches of Quebec public men. Usually only sensational things are reported. Firebrands in each Province excite each other. The fires are kept burning, and the witches' caldron is kept boiling. The only remedy for that,

in my view, is not a change in the constitution, but the very simple one of greater knowledge and understanding. That, it may be said, would not at once solve such a question as bilingualism; but even in the case of bilingualism, the trouble is very greatly aggravated by suspicion. We approach each other in an atmosphere of suspicion. We regard the French coming into Ontario as if they were invaders, and they suspect us of a desire to suppress their language.

We must find some way of living amicably together. We are both here to stay. In Quebec there are more than two millions, and in process of time there will be twenty millions. We, in Ontario, will number twenty-five millions. We are like man and wife, without the possibility of divorce. We have got to live together, and might just as well agree to live in peace and friendship.

We are told, in this day of growth of Imperialistic ideas, that we shall be consulted in Canada as to very intricate racial questions arising in other parts of the Empire and in Europe. Imagine ourselves consulted upon such a question, and asked for the results of our Canadian experience. "Here," it would be said, "is a difficult racial question. How did you settle the relations between the French and English in Canada." Imagine our being compelled to reply "we did not settle it. We are still quarreling."

Much work remains to be done. Canada is nearly as large as Europe; its population is less than eight millions, about the same as Belgium; but it is destined some day to contain at least fifty million people. Grave problems will tax our highest statesmanship,—immigration, the relation of the various races, social problems, problems of city and country, and tasks arising out of the war.

The development of a country nearly as large as Europe is a great work. We are told that as a result of this war we are to undertake other duties. We are to help to govern India and Egypt and to guide the policy of Europe. It is well to broaden our outlook and our sympathies. But let us make sure of two things. First, that we really seriously mean to undertake our share of the work of governing India and governing Europe, and second, that in the pursuit of a shadow of new power we do not give up the substance of liberty.

Take the case of India. Are we really prepared to undertake our share of the duty of governing India and influencing the life of its three hundred million people? It is not sufficient to construct new machinery of government. It is not enough to send some so-called representatives of Canada to an Imperial Council charged with the government of India. These

representatives may go to London and hear the stereotyped globe-trotter's view of India—what fine fellows the Indian officials are, and what a trial the three hundred million native Indians are—always bothering the officials. But that will not broaden our outlook or deepen our sympathies. No, if we are really ready to take up this duty, we must think not of India but of Indians. At present India to us is a mere abstraction, a red patch on the map, and so it would remain, no matter how much creaking machinery we create, unless we have a genuine human sympathy with every man, woman and child in India, and a burning zeal for their welfare and advancement.

The great Indian poet says: "But we who are governed are not a mere abstraction; we on our side are individuals, with living sensibilities. What comes to us in the shape of a mere bloodless policy, may pierce into the core of our very life." So I say, if you are really filled with that missionary zeal for Indians as creatures of flesh and blood and soul, by all means go into that field. But do not imagine that you can help Indians by merely making Canada a wheel in some new-fangled machinery of government.

Now consider the case of Europe. Do we really intend after this war to study Europe, its various races, its intricate politics, and try to exercise a real influence upon its destinies? I will give you a test. Mr. Flavelle and others who have visited Europe and come back to Canada, express wonder at our apathy. They say we live our lives, take our pleasures, ride about in automobiles, much as if no war were going on. Professor Leacock says, "We pause a moment in our sympathy and pass on. We go about our business. We eat, drink, and are merry, or at least not sad, professing a new philosophy of life, as our sympathies grow dull to the pain and suffering that we do not share."

I ask you if that indifference, that failure to realize the perils and calamities of Europe, if that exists during the greatest war in history, what will be the mental attitude of Canada after the war is over and we cease to read the war news and study the war map? Is it likely that our people, far from the scene, and busied in the work of developing a continent, will keep up such a continuous interest, such a careful study, of European affairs as will enable them to make intelligent decisions as to European policy or help to guide wisely the destinies of Europe. If we are not prepared to do that, we had better not pretend to do it, or play with it.

That is one test that I would apply to these schemes of Imperial reconstruction, namely, that we have a serious intention of doing the work and doing it thoroughly. The other

condition is that we shall not, in pursuing the shadow of power and responsibility, give up the substance of liberty. We must not arrest the national development which under Confederation has been attained. We must not substitute coercion and compulsion for that free and voluntary co-operation which has achieved such magnificent results in peace and war. We must not, as Mr. Peter McArthur says, substitute the hand-cuff for the hand-clasp.

We must not destroy or undermine our free parliaments, whether in Canada or in England. These parliaments are the bulwark of our liberties. As an old journalist, I say frankly that the press can never take the place of parliament as a forum of free discussion, as a place where all kinds of opinions can be heard, as a gathering place for men representing all shades of thought and sentiment. I am inclined to regard with great jealousy any effort to place such matters as defence and taxation in the hands of a council freed from real parliamentary control. That control should be maintained in Canada, and it should be maintained in England. It would be a calamity and a blow to liberty, if the greatest deliberative body in the world, the parliament that has defied kings, the parliament of Pym and Hampden, Fox and Pitt, Gladstone and Disraeli, should become a mere instrument for registering the decrees of a dictator or a council. In time of war it is inevitable that parliament should be subordinated to the executive, and the imperious demands of war may lead men to submit to a dictatorship. But that system should not be prolonged one moment after the emergency has passed. Still less should it be hardened into a new constitution for the permanent government of the British Empire. A free parliament is the very life of our free institutions.

Our watchwords in this great war are Freedom and Democracy. We have urged men to enlist in that cause, and under that banner men have fought and died. We must keep faith with them, and if we are not vigilant in safeguarding liberty, we break faith with the living and the dead.

We are pledged to the defence of liberty, not only by our own words, but by our alliance with the most democratic nation in Europe. Those gallant Frenchmen who in a hundred Waterloos rolled back the tide of invasion at Verdun, fought and died under the watchwards of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. That motto is as good for nations as for men. It may serve to remind us of the true and ideal British union, a brotherhood of free and equal nations, under free parliaments, bound together not by new and irksome legal bonds, but by a common resolve to enlarge the bounds of liberty.

(*April 16th, 1917.*)

The Relationship of China to the War

By Mr. Jeremiah W. Jenks.*

AT a regular luncheon of the Club held on the 16th April, Mr. Jenks said:

Mr. President, Brothers in Arms,—It is with a feeling of very sincere, although somewhat solemn, gratitude that I find that I am able to address you as "brothers in arms." You all know that for months now it has been the feeling of a very large proportion of the citizens of the United States that our country ought to step forward in the cause of democracy and freedom the world over and take its part in the war to the utmost. It had not seemed to the Government until lately that the fitting moment had come. The time has come. I think we may judge from that last Saturday's unanimous vote in the House of Representatives as regards war credit, that the United States expects to go into this war with the fullest preparation possible, with plans as if it were to be a long war, and that there will be no stinting of money or men in doing its duty.

I was in Washington a good part of last week, and I have spoken with many people since the declaration of war; the feeling seems to be unanimous that the United States is not to stop with money, but will put men, and fighting men, into the war as rapidly as they can be prepared.

I am to speak to-day with reference to China, and of China with reference to the war. I do that gladly because should it prove to be a long war, and it is not for us to assume anything else until it is over—China may prove to be a most important factor in the war.

Men that are used to Europe and the United States, who have not lately been in China, fail to recognize the changes, the wonderful progress made by China during the last dozen years. China is no longer an old, stagnant, backward country; China is one of the youngest and most progressive countries in the world. I wish to bring that fact very briefly before you, and then to answer these questions: Why should China

*Professor J. W. Jenks is one of the leading Political economists of America and has represented the United States upon many important international commissions, notably the ones in reference to the reform of currency in China.

come into the war (as I think she will very soon)? What can she do after she does come in? and What does it mean to us?

I have said that China is a young and progressive country. Let us remember that she has been sending to us her best young men, to Continental Europe, to England, to the United States, for the last ten or fifteen years. These young men are going back now, and they are exerting a very important influence on the government and business life, not merely in Peking but in government and commercial centres throughout the country. And that, more than anything else, has brought about the change. When China decided that it was time for the Manchus to be ejected, and when she further decided on a republican form of government, she got in step with the leading countries of Europe and the United States. China wants a republic, and will have it.

In the United States we have been disposed to boast of the remarkable things we have been doing in the Philippines in the last dozen years. We have been doing no greater work in the Philippines the last dozen years, than has been done in China by the Chinese. I trust you will let me speak very frankly about this.

In June, 1904, as a member of a Commission, I was sent by our Government to look into the monetary system of China, and to make suggestions regarding financial conditions. That gave me important and close personal contact with practically all the leading officials both in the Provinces and in Peking. I likewise met the leading business men in Peking. Shanghai and the leading interior cities. Again, I traveled into the interior, to judge of the ability of the people to take up a new type of money, and to see what could be done to introduce a new system. I had been some time previously in the Philippines studying financial matters there, so that when I went to China I was able to compare conditions in the two countries. During the past summer I visited both countries again, although the larger part of that time I was in Peking. I stayed at Peking because I found it wonderfully alive. It was in the midst of the revolutionary changes. If I were absent one day, I might lose some great historic movement; so I stayed there at the centre of activity. In that way I was able to make a comparison between conditions in 1904 and as they existed in 1916. When I say that I saw as great changes and improvements in the city of Peking as in the city of Manila during the twelve-year interval, that has some significance.

At my earlier visit there were no horses or carriages or automobiles in Peking; it was no place for them, in the single

dirt streets. The people had to travel in the old two-wheeled carts, making ruts in the middle of the roads. I remember Mr. Coolidge, one of the leading architects of the United States, who has planned some of our greatest public buildings, speaking this summer, saying that no other city in the civilized world is on the whole so magnificently planned as Peking. The streets are magnificently wide though lined with the low Chinese houses, but the conception of the layout of the city, planned some hundreds of years ago, was right. I do not know any other piece of landscape gardening with so magnificent a conception as that of the Ming tombs; the whole great valley, miles in depth, is taken for the arrangement of these tombs, each having a mountain for its background, a picturesque scene that shows that the Chinese are thinkers and artists, and have been for hundreds of years. Now this city of Peking has all these wide avenues finished, graded and thoroughly macadamized or paved just as you find here, and much better than some in New York. And now these streets are thronged with horses and carriages, rickshaws and automobiles, every kind of vehicle, all done in twelve years.

I visited the Agricultural Experiment Station near Peking, an immense undertaking in old palace grounds though lately begun. I found there two of our former graduates of Cornell University. where I used to be, as you may know. I found the work just as well managed as that at Cornell, just as well planned, in some particulars going even farther; it is young of course, some of the fruit trees are still not bearing, but as regards management and plan the work being done is just as good in quality, so far as I could judge, as any here.

I have been teaching thirty years and of course am interested in education. I visited the Government University, and happened there during examination week, so I got the President to collect for me sets of examination questions asked in those classes; so far as I could see, they were of the same type as those asked at Cornell, New York or other American universities in economics and history, physics and chemistry, showing that the same kind of work is done in the Chinese University as in our universities. There were none of these things in Peking twelve years before.

I might go on to speak of external things, but your time is very properly limited, so I will just say that these changes, marvelous as they are, are not one whit greater than those in other matters.

In 1904 China had not one official capable of discussing monetary problems along scientific lines; to-day her Minister

of Finance is fit to be placed side by side with your Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Finance of the United States or of England or France or any country in the world. That is not merely my opinion; I could give you the opinion of leading financiers of Europe. In 1911, you recall a syndicate of bankers of the United States, France, Germany and Great Britain was preparing to make a loan to reform China's monetary system; those financiers thought it well to have the Chinese plan passed upon by financial experts not interested in the loan, to give an independent expert judgment. That group of men met in London, and stayed there some two weeks. Sir David Barbour who, more than anyone else, was active in the reform of the currency in India, was the British representative; M. De Foville, a Member of the Academy, one of their leading economists, represented France; and other countries sent on their best men. One day after the conference when I was talking with Sir David and M. De Foville, they said, "We had been wondering what kind of man China would send to this conference; now that we have seen Dr. Chen Chin-tao we know that China has sent a man who is the peer of anyone in the conference." That was the opinion of two of the leading financiers of Europe. I agreed and added that in detailed knowledge of the history of and practice of monetary systems he was "not only in the first rank, but easily the best of us; they both agreed. That man to-day, as Minister of Finance, is handling his work under tremendous difficulties. In the United States I should be satisfied if we could count upon our Secretary of the Treasury always doing so well.

The majority of China's Cabinet to-day are foreign-trained men, so were the majority of the last cabinet of the late President, Yuan Shi Kai, who wished to be Emperor. No doubt you have read Mr. Blythe's article in the last *Saturday Evening Post,* in which he speaks of him as a blood-thirsty tyrant and ambitious. I visited him for an hour a month before he died and discussed very frankly questions regarding his policy and possible resignation. I have no objection to Mr. Blythe's suggestion that he was an ambitious man, but with regard to his bloodthirstiness I should put it this way—Yuan Shi Kai was one of the old type trained under the Manchu rule; life was held cheap in China. He did not like to have anyone stand in his way; if a man stood in his way, he might have him taken out into the back yard and have his head chopped off; or in these later days he could be shot; that was all. Yuan did not like to be balked in his

plans; he did not like to kill; but he was a man of the older type. The new President is of the modern type. He had occupied the position of Vice-President two years; then Yuan died and the Vice-President succeeded him. I had the good fortune to become well acquainted with him before he became President. As soon as he succeeded to the Presidency he was urged to order that there should be no executions for political reasons. He said he could not promise that, "but," he said, "I will do this, I will see that no man is executed without a fair trial for treason." The result is that not one man has been executed for political reasons since the new President came in, and I think no man will be.

There were eight men who had been so active in promoting the monarchy and were thought to be so treasonable that an order was issued for their arrest. It was known to everybody in Peking that if there were a few hours' delay in making their arrest it might have a good effect; hints were given them, every man of them left the city, and not one was arrested. That was done on purpose; their lives were not taken because of the presence in China of a man who is not bloodthirsty, but expects to rule in the modern way.

I might go on for hours telling you of the progress made by China. We all think of the progress of Japan as marvelous; it has been marvelous, and Japan is entitled to the greatest credit, but I think it could be proved over and over again that never in her most progressive twelve years has Japan shown more sings of progress than has China in the last twelve years. These facts we want to keep in mind when thinking of China as an ally. She has the most people, and probably the greatest natural resources of any country in the world. She is a nation of republican ideals, so far as most—the large majority—of the leaders are concerned. I was surprised to find that the servants around my house, the coolies, also wanted a republic. The Chinese are not unthinking men. We judge the Chinese mostly by the laundrymen and the day laborers, the lowest coolie class. Yet even these are intelligent.

Some years ago I was studying the situation on the Pacific coast as a member of the United States Immigration Commission, and came to the conclusion that the Chinese were far and away the most desirable laborers, absolutely faithful, and honest to an extent that others are not. So, when we find an honest nation, with republican ideals, that would be an ally worth having.

Why does China want to get into the war? The members

of the Cabinet to-day think it wise to go into the war, but there is a good deal of division among them as to the method by which and the conditions under which she should go in. It does not take a very long memory for us to recall that China for the last fifteen or twenty years, particularly since 1898, has suffered losses of territory, and this one question, more than any other, is to-day in the minds of the Chinese, and of the Chinese Government. In 1898, for an offense that in your country, in my country, in Great Britain, would have been settled by an apology and the payment of two or three thousand dollars—China saw the German fleet seize her most important northern port. The result of the murder by a mob of two missionaries was that under threat of war, for which China was not prepared, China lost this valuable port of Kiao-Chau. In addition under compulsion China gave Germany prior rights for opening mines, building railways throughout this most densely populated Province of China, one of the richest and most fertile, with a population of some thirty millions of people; China was also compelled to say that in case China herself should need capital for development of that province, Germany and German citizens should have the first right, provided the terms were as good as those offered by anyone else.

At the beginning of the war, when Japan demanded the surrender of Kiao-Chau or Tsing Tau, she declared that if it were surrendered at once she would in due time return the Province of China. Germany did not see fit to surrender it. No one expected she would. In consequence Japan fought —with the aid of England—and captured it. Now Japan claims that she has over China and over that territory the same rights that China was compelled by force of arms or threats of arms to surrender to Germany.

China feels this way about it: If I, going along a street in Toronto, should be assaulted by a highwayman in the street, and under threats of a revolver pushed into my face should surrender my purse, and then the robber three or four blocks farther along is held up by another robber, and my purse is taken from him, I would not recognize that that would give the second robber a legal or moral title to my property. China feels, therefore, that Japan has no legal or moral title to its concession made to Germany.

When Japan protested against the concession made by China to an American corporation to improve the Grand Canal, an improvement very much needed, the Chinese Government responded: "The war is not yet over, and we don't

know what the result will be; it is quite possible"—I do not think China thinks it is probable—"that Germany may win, and at the Peace Conference you may have to surrender that territory to Germany; at any rate, the status of that territory is to be settled at the Peace Conference, not by you now."

Now I think we see why China wants to get into this war: she wants to sit in that Peace Conference as a member, to settle her claim to that territory and to settle many other important questions. This matter is one of more danger to China than most of Great Britain's dangers, and China ought to get into the war.

And why should not we see that she does get into the war? I think there is no doubt that you and Great Britain and the United States and France, and probably the Republic of Russia, will be glad to have China in that Conference.

Now in a word or two, if China comes into the war, what can she do? It does not take very long to tell. If Great Britain and the United States and the others wish to finance China, wish to supply her with munitions, wish to supply her with transportation, China can do these things: in the first place, she can furnish food for all the Allies—with four hundred millions, no other country in the world has so many agriculturists, the best market gardeners in the world—; then, she could supply men, if they can be transported, to release all the men used by the European nations, to dig trenches, do the work outside, to make munitions. So you can let all your able-bodied men go into the trenches, if you don't want to trust the Chinese there; still further, China has four modern well-equipped arsenals, unlimited supplies of ore, and is making very good modern guns—not of the latest pattern, because Japan, Russia and other nations have seen to it she did not have the latest pattern—but if you send over a few models of the latest design, and a few men to give instruction, she could easily turn out small guns of the best modern type; we know in the United States that you can develop manufactures fairly rapidly if you have the money and men.

Again, suppose you wanted some soldiers. China has at present half a million men, trained by Japanese, English, German and American officers. I don't suppose they are the equal of those magnificent Canadian troops, but, as I have said, China could put half a million men into Europe, trained, quicker than the United States could. Do you realize that these men have had experience in fighting in their revolution. A military attaché told me, "I was not in time to see them fighting, but I saw the troops; I saw a thousand wounded

soldiers in their hospitals; I saw their drill and I can say without hesitation that I am sure Chinese can fight under native leaders. They can furnish soldiers if you need them."

One of our statisticians has figured that on the same basis that Great Britain has furnished soldiers the United States could put in twelve million men; China could put in forty-five or fifty million! We should realize what the possibilities are if it should be a long war.

Whatever the rest of the Allies are prepared to pay for, China will be glad to do. It is a matter of paying for it, and of asking. China feels her future is at stake. China is willing.

Then again, look ahead; Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, and France, the United States, Russia, China—all great democracies; the future of the world as regards peace and popular self-government and high ideals is safe, if all these great countries get together, think together, plan together, for the future. And it is not wise to leave out or check or help anybody else to hamper a nation with that power and those ideals, of four hundred million people. Let us help China into the war, help her and use her in the war, and stand by her at the end of the war.

The President's Address

THE Annual Meeting of the Canadian Club of Toronto was held on April 23rd at one p.m. After the minutes were read and adopted, the President, Mr. George H. Locke, addressed the members as follows:

Having introduced, as your President, more than a score of men to the 8,300 members of the Club who have assembled in this room for luncheon and intellectual refreshment, and having thanked them for their messages, all of which had a bearing upon the war or the problems which are confronting us as a result of the war, the time has come, a year almost to the day, for the Executive Committee to which you entrusted your affairs, to report to you that they have completed their work.

It is no small job to provide such a program as we have enjoyed this year, but it is a job that is full of interest, pleasure and profit, because of the hearty support and kindly words of appreciation and encouragement which you have given us.

When I was a member—a simple member—of the Club, enjoying the opportunities of seeing and hearing men of distinction without any effort on my part, I thought my duty was to appreciate what was being done for me, and when I could not personally help to improve matters, it was my duty to maintain a sympathetic silence—a silent partner but always a partner and so sharing a responsibility. I have felt the force of this position during my term of office and I believe that this desire to help, this feeling of sympathy, and these expressions of appreciation of the efforts of your Executive, give the keynote to the success of the Canadian Club.

There is no such audience of interested, sympathetic and intelligent men in Canada. Sir Herbert Tree told me that his half hour with us was one of the most enjoyable experiences of his life because of just these qualities which I have enumerated, and at Christmas he sent his greetings to all the members remembering as he said "that wonderful audience."

There is a quality in such an audience which is Canadian. Just what this is cannot be analyzed. It must be experienced. It is the subtle quality that is felt and felt almost unconsciously. It is what we call "atmosphere," permeating and unattainable except through sympathetic participation. Bliss Carman per-

haps comes nearest to a description of such Canadians when he speaks of us as:

"Men of the larger looser stride,
"With a quicker catch at laughter and the outlook keener-eyed,
"They were bred beneath the tentcloth of a wider, whiter sky."

There is an alertness, a cheerfulness, an optimism, a resourcefulness, and a capacity for work which nothing can daunt, all of which qualities are being displayed by our brothers on the battlefields of Europe until the world looks on with amazement.

And to us who are left at home the duty is just as clear and insistent, and the privilege of such service is calling to us to use the same qualities in meeting the problems that lie before us every day in our homeland, so that we shall in our work here make our country as renowned for these qualities as our fellow members and our fellow citizens in our Canadian Armies are accomplishing on the battlefields.

Canada is now a nation with the banners of its regiments hanging in the great Minster where among the men who have made our Empire great through a thousand years there has come this very picturesque and practical proof of the unity of our Empire with the colors of our Canadian regiments hanging before the "dread high altar where the Abbey makes us We."

And here at home we should hang our banners on the outward walls and show to the world that we understand, appreciate and shall make true, so far as in us lies, that democracy of youth which dauntless, fairminded and energetic, sees visions and whose motto is not "go ahead" but "come on." Our people need leaders and these must come from the ranks of the Canadian Clubs where from the consideration of our national problems by men of intelligence we go into our several walks of life inspired to action and better equipped by reason of the increase of our knowledge.

And now let me leave with you a picture true when it was portrayed in undying verse, but even truer on this very day when in the heart of the Empire there is meeting the gathering of the Sons to discuss the affairs of the great British family which for nearly three years has been fighting in defence of the weak against the tyranny of the oppressor. The picture is England, the mother, receiving her Sons who are telling of their lives overseas, of their homes, and of their

endeavors to perpetuate and develop the ideals of the homeland and say to her:

"Judge, are we men of The Blood," and England with the proverbial insight, affection and prescience of the Mother answers:

"'Truly ye come of The Blood; slower to bless than to ban;
Little used to lie down at the bidding of any man.
Flesh of the Flesh that I bred, bone of the bone that I bare;
Stark as your sons shall be—stern as your fathers were.
Deeper than speech our love, stronger than life our tether,
But we do not fall on the neck nor kiss when we come together.
My arm is nothing weak, my strength is not gone by;
Sons, I have borne many sons, but my dugs are not dry.
Look, I have made ye a place and opened wide the doors,
That ye may talk together, your Barons and Councillors—
Wards of the Outer March, Lords of the Lower Seas,
Ay, talk to your grey mother that bore you on her knees!—
That ye may talk together, brother to brother's face—
Thus for the good of your peoples—thus for the pride of the Race.
Also, we will make promise. So long as The Blood endures,
I shall know that your good is mine: ye shall feel that my strength is yours:
In the day of Armageddon, at the last great fight of all,
That Our House stand together and the pillars do not fall.
Draw now the threefold knot firm on the ninefold bands,
And the Law that ye make shall be law after the rule of your lands.
This for the waxen Heath, and that for the Wattle-bloom,
This for the Maple-leaf, and that for the southern Broom.
The Law that ye make shall be law and I do not press my will,
Because ye are Sons of The Blood and call me Mother still.
Now must ye speak to your kinsmen and they must speak to you,
After the use of the English, in straight-flung words and few.
Go to your work and be strong, halting not in your ways,
Balking the end half-won for an instant dole of praise.
Stand to your work and be wise—certain of sword and pen,
Who are neither children nor Gods, but men in a world of men!"

Mr. E. C. Fox, the newly elected President, on being introduced by Mr. Locke, said:

Mr. President and Members of the Canadian Club,—The traditions of the Canadian Clubs of Canada are established on

a very high plane, and none higher than the standard set by the Canadian Club of Toronto. The new Executive accept office fully recognizing the responsibility of maintaining the high character and standard of this Club. I have no doubt that many movements owe their momentum in the country to the Canadian Club of Toronto. I say that knowing that this Club does not take any positive part in active propaganda; but I do know that ideas set in motion in this Club are influential, that they have influence of a high order. So the Executive will endeavor to maintain this high standard in the coming twelve months.

We are still at war: naturally the war, and problems arising out of the war, are questions of moment. We shall lay special emphasis upon such topics. We shall have to consider the relations of the war to our own nationhood, to our own national problems, to the problems of the Empire, and problems of reconstruction arising out of the war. We shall give ourselves whole-heartedly to these.

Speaking on behalf of the Executive, I am sure we shall do our very best to maintain the standards of the past year.

The annual meeting was then declared adjourned.

TORONTO, MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1917

Report of the Honorary Secretary

To the President and Members of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—

It may fairly be said that the season of the Canadian Club which is just drawing to a close has been uniformly successful. We were fortunate in securing as speakers men who had a story to tell, or a message to deliver. Various phases of the war have naturally been discussed, almost to the exclusion of other subjects. The war holds the minds and thoughts of our members.

In spite of the loss of a number of old members for various reasons, and the transference of several members who are on Overseas Service to the list of Honorary Members, our membership has shown a gratifying net increase. We have at the close of the season 78 more members than last year, while we have 85 members on the Honorary list.

Twenty-seven luncheons have been held during the year. This is three more than during the preceding season. None the less it has been the policy of your Executive Committee to hold meetings only when a speaker of importance was available. This policy has resulted in us holding three meetings in a little over a week, as when Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott, Sir Herbert Tree, and Ian Hay spoke; and at other times in omitting meetings for two or three successive weeks.

The list of speakers, subjects, and attendances is as follows:

Date of Meeting.	Speaker.	Subject.	Attendance.
1916			
June 19	Mr. Lionel Curtis	"The Problem of the Commonwealth"	150
Sept. 25	Mr. N. W. Rowell, K.C.	"Our Canadians at the Front"	507
Oct. 2	Professor J. J. Mackenzie, B.A., M.B.	"With the Canadians at Salonika"	247
Oct. 5	Sir Hamar Greenwood, Bart., M.P.	"The Mother Country and the Great War"	497
Oct. 10	Lieutenant Zinovi Pechkoff	"My Impressions of the French Front"	240

Date of Meeting.	Speaker.	Subject.	Attendance.
1916			
Oct. 30	Mr. Samuel O. Dunn	"Public versus Private Management of Railways"	157
Nov. 6	Sir George E. Foster, K.C.M.G., Ph.D., LL.D.	"The Economic Conference at Paris"	460
Nov. 13	Mr. W. F. Maclean, M.P.	"Public Ownership of Railways up to Date"	122
Nov. 20	Mr. Lawrence F. Abbott.	"Democracy and Social Efficiency"	238
Nov. 23	Sir Herbert Tree	"The Importance of Humor in Tragedy"	469
Nov. 27	Ian Hay	"The Human Side of Trench Warfare"	477
Dec. 11	Dr. Chas. J. Hastings.	"Guarding a City's Health"	147
Dec. 18	Mr. J. W. Flavelle	"Munitions in Canada"	503
1917			
Jan. 4	Mr. J. M. Godfrey	"A Canadian Derby Plan for Recruiting the Army without Conscription"	167
Jan. 8	Mr. O. S. Perrault	"Recruiting in Quebec"	243
Jan. 15	Mr. A. C. Flumerfelt.	"How Canada must pay for the War"	130
Jan. 22	Prof. J. H. Michael, M.A.	"David Lloyd George."	250
Jan. 29	Mr. Poultney Bigelow.	"The Hun at our Gates"	520
Jan. 31	Mr. Raymond Robins.	"The Problem of the Citizen".	175
Feb. 5	Dr. Michael Clark, M.P.	"The War."	430
Feb. 12	Lieut.-Col. John A. Cooper	"Equality of Service"	176
Feb. 19	Sergeant-Major Robert Middlemiss	"The Fight at Gallipoli"	315
Mar. 5	Mr. E. G. Cooley	"Practical Methods of Training the Returned Soldiers"	160
Mar. 12	Mr. John Lewis	"Fifty Years of Confederation.".	150
Mar. 26	Mr. Ernest C. Pye	"Turkey's Place in the War.".	258
Apr. 16	Mr. Jeremiah W. Jenks.	The Relationship of China to the War"	172
Apr. 23	Mr. George H. Locke.	The Annual Meeting	150

As indicating the interest which was taken in the meetings it is worthy of note that on six occasions it was impossible to accommodate all who wished to attend. The need of a more suitable meeting place is very apparent.

In the transaction of the business of the Club the Executive Committee has held 7 meetings during the year. In addition to this the Programme Committee has met frequently.

At the beginning of the Club year Mr. H. D. Scully resigned from the office of Assistant Secretary-Treasurer. A resolution of appreciation of Mr. Scully's long and valuable services to the Club was adopted at the first general meeting in the fall. Mr. F. P. Megan was appointed to succeed him.

All members of the Club who have gone Overseas, so far as known, have been placed on the Honorary Membership list during their absence. It is more than likely, however, that some names have escaped the Secretary's notice. It will assist in the maintenance of the Club's records if members will send in word about any member who is known to be on Overseas Service.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

HOLT GURNEY,

Honorary Secretary.

APRIL 23, 1917.

Report of the Honorary Treasurer

To the President and Members of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—

It is not always the good fortune of a Club to show a surplus on its year's activities—especially in such disturbed conditions as now prevail. I have particular pleasure, therefore, in presenting the financial statement of the Canadian Club for the year 1916-1917, which shows an income of $4,121.09, and expenses of $3,001.31, representing a net surplus of $1,119.78. This is the largest surplus in the history of the Club.

Our income exceeded that of the previous year by $251.27, while our expenses were $39.02 less. This was in spite of the fact that there were three more meetings. Our surplus exceeded that of 1915-1916, which itself was notably large, by $290.29.

Our favorable financial position is reflected in the Club's membership standing, and is, of course, largely the result of it. The active membership has increased from 1,251 to 1,329. There were 156 resignations, as compared with 243 in the previous season. Two hundred and thirty-four (234) new members were elected, as compared with 124 in 1915-1916. Our Honorary Membership list has grown from 62 to 85.

The accumulated surplus of the Club has grown to the substantial total of $4,476.50, of which $1,483.99 is invested in bonds, yielding slightly over 5 per cent. The remaining surplus is made up of Petty Cash $100 and Bank Balance of $2,892.51. Against this surplus there will be the cost of issuing the Year Book, which, on account of the increased cost of paper and the greater number of speeches, will be higher than last year, and the running expenses of the Club until the new fees are collected in the fall.

No extraordinary expenditures were required during the year. The account for Guests' Expenses is below the average. This was not the result of a disinclination on the part of the Executive to bring speakers from a distance. On the contrary, we in every case invited the best man available. It so happened, however, that the majority of our guests were Canadians, or were visitors in the city. Consequently, travelling expenses were curtailed.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. M. IVEY,
Honorary Treasurer.

CANADIAN CLUB OF TORONTO.

Treasurer's Statement of Receipts and Payments Season Ended April, 1917.

Receipts.

By Balance in Imperial Bank, May 1, 1916.....		$1,772.73
By Petty Cash on hand, May, 1916		100.00
By Investments Owen Sound Debenture, May 1916		971.07
By Investments City of Kitchener Debenture, May, 1916		512.92
Membership Fees:—		
Total Members 1915-1916:		
By Honorary Members 85, 1916-17		
By Old Members 1095, 1916-17.		
By New Members 234, 1916-17, 1,330 at $3.00	$3,990.00	
By Interest allowed by Imperial Bank.	55.59	
By Interest on Debentures.....	75.50	
		4,121.09
		$7,477.81

Payments.

To Accounts Chargeable to Season ended Apr. 30, 1916, per detailed statement	$598.45	
To Assistant Secretary-Treasurer's Honorarium	770.83	
To Printing Notice Cards, Stationery.	255.85	
To Telephone Account	59.37	
To Postage, Postcards, Petty Cash Disbursements	606.28	
To Catering	316.58	
To Reporting	129.75	
To Guests' Expenses	264.20	
		$3,001.31

Surplus.

Petty Cash in Office and Bank	$100.00	
Investment Owen Sound Debentures.	971.07	
Investment City of Kitchener Debentures	512.92	
Balance in Imperial Bank	2,892.51	
		4,476.50
		$7,477.81

CANADIAN CLUB OF TORONTO.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR FOUR SEASONS ENDING APRIL.

	1913-14	1914-15	1915-16	1916-17
	Receipts.			
Income from Membership Fees, Interest, etc...	$4704.08	$4275.94	$3869.82	$4121.09
	Payments.			
Club Expenses.....	3984.46	4446.61	3040.33	3001.31
Net Revenue earned by years.....	$719.62 Gain	$170.67 Loss	$829.49 Gain	$1119.78 Gain
Surplus brought forward from previous years..	$1978.28	$2697.90	$2527.23	$3356.72
Accumulated surplus by years	$2697.90	$2527.23	$3356.72	$4476.50

TORONTO, MONDAY, April 23, 1917.

Report of the Nominating Committee

To the President and Members of the Canadian Club of Toronto,—

The Nominating Committee of the Canadian Club, which was appointed on March 26th, has pleasure in presenting the following nominations for Officers and Committee for the coming year:

President	E. C. Fox.
First Vice-President	J. H. Gundy.
Second Vice-President	I. S. Fairty.
Honorary Secretary	Shirley Denison, K.C.
Honorary Treasurer	A. M. Ivey.
Literary Correspondent	H. J. Crawford.

Committee.

S. B. Chadsey
H. H. Couzens
R. A. Daly
Newton Brown
D. B. Gillies
Capt. E. W. Wright
R. K. Shepard
H. F. Gooderham
George H. Locke, *Ex-Officio.*

All of which is respectfully submitted,

GEO. WILKIE,
Chairman.

On motion of Messrs. Wilkie and Howell, the Report was adopted and the nominees were delared elected by the Chairman.

LIST OF MEMBERS

1916-17

C. E. Abbs, Chas. R. Acres, G. G. Adam, J. Frank Adams, Chas. J. Agar, J. T. E. Aikenhead, H. W. Aikins, John Aird, T. B. Alcock, W. H. Alderson, W. H. Alexander, W. A. Allan, R. W. Allin, A. R. Alloway, A. E. Ames, H. W. Anderson, Wallace Anderson, E. B. Andrews, G. H. Anglin, R. W. Anglin, S. E. Anglin, I. H. Ante, L. L. Anthes, F. L. Appleby, C. S. Applegath, J. W. Archibald, W. J. Ard, Robert Arkell, A. E. Armstrong J. J. Armstrong, Ed. M. Ashworth, J. J. Ashworth, T. Fred Aspden, J. W. Atherton, D. H. Atkinson, A. R. Auld, Wm. R. Austin, Hartley G. Authors, Chas. Aylett.

W. G. Back, C. F. Bailey, F. W. Baillie, J. E. Baillie, J. W. Baillie, W. A. Bain, H. P. Baird, E. G. Baker, H. W. Baker, J. Chas. Baker, S. A. Baker, W. H. Baker, L. H. Baldwin, R. A. Baldwin, A. W. Ballantyne, Henry Balm, E. J. Banfield, W. H. Banfield, R. A. Barber, R. J. W. Barker, Walter J. Barr, J. H. Barrett, W. W. Barrett, W. H. Barry, Gordon Bates, C. R. Battin, Chas. Bauckham, D. W. Baxter, W. G. Beamish, M. D. Beard, H. A. Beatty, J. W. Beatty, S. Beatty, A. A. Beemer, A. H. Beemer, G. Frank Beer, E. A. Begg, F. M. Bell-Smith, C. A. Bender, J. A. Bennett, E. J. Bennett, G. M. Bertram, A. B. Bethune, M. H. Bingeman, A. W. Binnie, E. G. Bird, C. H. Bishop, A. W. Blachford, Chas. E. Blachford, F. E. Blachford, H. C. Blachford, J. C. Black, R. G. Black, S. W. Black, W. A. Black, A. R. Blackburn, Herbert Blackburn, S. C. Blacklock, Hugh Blain, Thos. Bland, W. H. Bleasdall, T. Lyle Blogg, W. W. Bole, J. R. Bone, C. W. Bongard, Wm. Booth, Thos. P. Bowen, I. D. Bradshaw, Thos. Bradshaw, E. T. J. Brandon, E. A. Breckenridge, J. C. Breckenridge, W. C. Brent, A. A. Briggs, A. W. Briggs, J. R. K. Bristol, Albert Britnell, S. G. Brock, W. Brooks, J. R. Y. Broughton, A. L. Brown, B. R. Brown, C. A. B. Brown, T. Crawford Brown, F. D. Brown, H. S. Brown, James Brown, John Brown Jr., N. Brown, Richard Brown, W. E. Brown, W. N. Brown, R. M. Browne, H. A. Bruce, John Bruce, R. J. Bruce, F. S. Buck, H. L. Bucke, Wm.

Bucke, Emerson Bull, Chas. Bulley, J. W. Bundy, C. H. Burgess, John E. Burke, W. E. Burkholder, A. H. Burnett, H. E. Burnett, A. N. Burns, C. E. Burns, J. A. Burns, W. H. Burr, Robt. Burrows, Amos Bushell, A. S. Butchart, T. E. C. Butler.

D. Cameron, D. A. Cameron, K. L. Cameron, M. H. V. Cameron, W. A. Cameron, A. G. Campbell, A. M. Campbell, C. C. Campbell, E. T. Campbell, G. C. Campbell, J. L. Campbell, J. M. Campbell, W. F. Campbell, W. K. C. Campbell, C. N. Candee, C. N. Candee, Jr., A. R. Capreol, W. J. A. Carnahan, W. Carr, John Carrick, A. Carruthers, J. S. Carter, W. H. Carruthers, A. H. C. Carson, J. B. Carswell, B. B. Carter, F. C. Carter, J. S. Carter, J. A. Carveth, T. A. Case, E. Cassidy, E. S. Caswell, J. A. Catto, J. G. Caven, W. A. Cerswell, S. B. Chadsey, J. E. Chamberlin, W. C. Chambers, W. N. Chantler, A. S. Chapin, W. A. Charlton, A. E. Chatterson, P. G. Cherry, A. Chisholm, R. W. Chisholm, T. A. Chisholm, S. D. Chown, R. J. Christie, A. B. Clabon, H. G. Clapperton, Harold Clark, J. M. Clark, L. J. Clark, F. G. Clarke, G. B. Clarke, W. F. Clarke, W. J. Clarke, G. T. Clarkson, Roger Clarkson, F. A. Cleland, A. G. Clements, H. B. Clemes, G. W. Clendennan, E. T. Coatsworth, A. R. Cochrane, R. B. Cochrane, E. Cockburn, H. J. Cody, H. M. Cody, R. H. Coleman, Frank Collinson, A. H. U. Colquhoun, F. M. Connell, M. H. Cook, F. J. Coombs, J. W. Coombs, H. J. Coon, J. A. Cooper, J. E. Cooper, J. C. Coote, C. M. Copeland, J. W. Corcoran, H. C. Corner, F. S. Corrigan, W. J. Corrigan, R. R. Corson, T. Costello, D. A. Coulson, J. A. Coulter, H. H. Couzens, John Cowan, N. S. Coyne, W. A. Craick, Jas. Craig, Wm. Craig, S. Crane, H. J. Crawford, G. C. Crean, F. N. Creer, W. B. Creighton, J. W. Cringan, Wm. Croft, G. W. Crosby, E. F. Crossland, H. J. Crowe, W. C. Crowther, W. E. Cummer, A. G. Cumming, A. E. Cuthbertson, C. R. Cuthbertson, L. F. Cutten.

Edward Dagge, J. G. Dale, F. A. Dallyn, H. J. Daly, R. A. Daly, R. C. Dancy, C. D. Daniel, F. C. Daniel, G. A. Davidson, N. F. Davidson, H. A. Davies, M. L. Davies, T. A. Davies, B. N. Davis, E. J. Davis, L. Davis, W. H. Dawson, F. J. Day, F. H. Deacon, G. P. Deacon, J. S. Deacon, W. F. Dean, W. G. Dean, G. S. Deeks, A. T. DeLury, G. T. Denison, Shirley Denison, A. J. Denne, Frank Denton, A. M. Dewar, E. R. Dewart, J. T. Dickson, E. J. Dignum, R. J. Dilworth, F. B. Dineen, W. F. Dineen, C. E. Disher, Fred Diver, W. P. Dobson, K. L. Doll, J. H. Domelle, A. G. Donaldson, J. O. Donogh, P. E. Doolittle, F. W. Doran, W. M. Douglas, W. G.

Duffett, T. W. Duggan, E. J. B. Duncan, J. M. Duncan, D. A. Dunlap, K. J. Dunstan, Philip Dykes.

C. H. Easson, R. H. Easson, Sir J. C. Eaton, R. W. Eaton, Hugh D. Eby, W. P. Eby, A. E. Eckardt, A. J. H. Eckardt, H. P. Eckardt, Chas. S. Eddis, J. W. Eddis, W. C. Eddis, C. E. Edmonds, R. B. Elgie, A. Elliott, T. Elliott, W. F. Elliott, A. W. Ellis, C. Q. Ellis, J. A. Ellis, J. F. Ellis, P. W. Ellis, R. Y. Ellis, W. G. Ellis, A. L. Ellsworth, T. S. Elmore, E. F. Ely, L. E. Embree, J. Endicott, L. C. Evans, W. B. Evans.

R. D. Fairbairn, B. Fairley, H. T. Fairley, E. H. Fairty, I. S. Fairty, R. A. Falconer, D. B. Falkner, Jas. Farquharson, H. Y. Farr, W. J. Fawcett, Wm. Fearnley, R. E. Fennell, W. J. Fennell, J. B. Ferguson, J. M. Ferguson, F. W. Field, Ed. Fielding, L. K. File, G. T. Finch, Thos. Findley, Jno. Firstbrook, W. A. Firstbrook, A. B. Fisher, F. B. Fisher, G. W. Fisher, R. C. Fisher, Thos. Fisher, J. E. Flavelle, J. W. Flavelle, H. A. Fleming, J. H. Fleming, T. J. Ford, J. W. L. Forester, H. C. Fortier, A. S. Foster, C. L. Foster, J. M. Foster, S. H. Foster, A. Foulds, Wm. Fountain, R. C. Fowler. E. C. Fox, F. C. Foy, J. W. Foy, Leo Frankel, G. W. Fraser, J. A. Fraser, J. C. Fraser, R. D. Fraser, W. J. Fraser, H. R. Frost, J. A. Fullerton.

F. A. Gaby, T. E. Gain, D. G. M. Galbraith, G. C. Gale, Z. Gallagher, H. F. Gardiner, H. S. Garlick, J. J. Gartshore, John Gault, H. S. Gausby, R. C. Garvin, W. K. George, D. H. Gibson, J. G. Gibson, J. J. Gibson, J. W. Gibson, Theron Gibson, T. A. Gibson, W. R. Gibson, G. A. E. Gilbert, Jas. Gilchrist, Walter Gillespie, A. J. Gillies, D. B. Gillies, C. J. Gillooly, A. E. Gilverson, F. I. Glackmeyer, J. M. Godfrey, W. F. Goforth, F. D. Goodchild, A. H. Goodenow, G. H. Gooderham, H. F. Gooderham, A. R. Gordon, Joseph Goulding, R. S. Gourlay, Edwin P. Gower, G. W. Graham, Wm. M. Graham, E. A. A. Grange, W. H. Grant, F. C. Grassick, F. M. Gray, G. H. Gray, Wm. A. Gray, G. F. Green, H. E. W. Green, V. W. Greene, W. D. Gregory, E. R. Greig, W. J. Greig, H. B. D. Grubb, E. C. Grundy, G. A. Guess, F. C. Gullen, J. H. Gundy, W. P. Gundy, H. Gunn, R. E. Gunther, E. H. Gurney.

C. H. Haddy, D. C. Haig, Ed. Hales, Jas. Hales, A. F. Hall, H. E. Hall, J. B. Hall, J. E. Hall, E. W. Halpenny, J. W. Hamilton, R. C. Hamilton, W. A. Hamilton, W. T. Hamilton, M. J. Haney, H. G. Hanna, W. J. Hanna, F. W. Harcourt, R. B. Harcourt, C. V. Harding, H. R. Hardy, G. R. Harkness, E. W. Harper, G. D. Harper, Jas. Harris, R. C. Harris, C. A. Hart, J. S. Hart, Percy Hart, C. J. Harvey, E. Harwood,

Chas. J. Hastings, A. E. Hatch, E. J. Hathaway, A. Hawes, C. McD. Hay, E. Hay, F. B. Hayes, F. H. Hayhurst, W. J. Heaven, G. C. Heintzman, David Henderson, Elmes Henderson G. E. Henderson, Jos. Henderson, R. B. Henderson, S. Henderson, T. A. Henderson, D. E. Henry, Percy Hermant, A. E. Hessin, W. J. Hetherington, J. A. Hethrington, Arthur Hewitt, S. T. Heyes, O. Hezzelwood, A. T. Higgins, A. T. Hill, N. A. Hill, H. P. L. Hillman, W. W. Hiltz, A. M. Hobberlin, F. E. Hodgins, W. H. Hoidge, J. B. Holden, T. F. Holliday, W. A. Holliday, H. Hooper, C. F. Hopkins, J. C. Hopkins, L. O. Horner, H. G. Horton, J. C. B. Horwood, G. H. Houston, Wm. Houston, E. A. E. Howard, S. W. Howard, C. E. Howarth, H. J. Howe, L. P. Howe, D. J. Howell, G. A. Howell, G. W. Howland, Peleg Howland, C. Huckvale, H. H. Hudson, A. E. Huestis, A. M. Huestis, W. C. Huff, Louis Huffman, J. L. Hughes, S. R. Hughes, W. S. Hulbig, J. B. Hunter, W. D. Hunter, F. C. Husband, E. J. Hutchins, A. Hutchinson, O. A. Hutchinson, M. Hutton, J. P. Hynes, W. Hyslop.

J. M. Imrie, G. D. Ingleby, J. F. Inglee, W. C. C. Innes, Wm. Inrig, H. W. Ireland, M. H. Irish, R. N. Irvine, W. H. Irvine, A. M. Ivey.

D. O. Jackson, H. R. Jackson, F. A. Jacobs, W. G. Jaffray, C. E. James, D. D. James, T. B. James, W. C. James, H. T. Jamieson, P. Jamieson, N. F. Jardine, Æmilius Jarvis, E. R. Jarvis, E. M. Jarvis, F. C. Jarvis, J. B. Jarvis, C. A. Jefferis, A. H. Jeffrey, E. J. Jenking, A. Jephcott, W. C. Jephcott, H. Jewell, S. H. Johns, A. J. Johnson, F. S. Johnson, Main Johnson, M. D. Johnson, A. L. Johnston, Alfred Johnston, S. C. Johnston, C. S. Jones, H. V. F. Jones, J. E. Jones, W. A. M. Jones, D. Jordan, S. W. Joselin, T. W. Jull.

M. M. Keachie, P. A. Keeler, E. M. Keirstead, Alex. Keith, G. A. Keith, J. M. Keith, H. L. Kelson, W. A. Kemp, C. A. Kennedy, F. Kennedy, F. J. Kennedy, T. H. Keough, A. W. Kerr, A. H. R. Kertland, W. C. Kettlewell, D. R. Keys, P. G. Kiely, A. C. King, A. E. King, E. E. King, R. W. H. King, G. A. Kingston, R. G. Kirby, A. M. M. Kirkpatrick, W. A. Kirkwood, Geo. Knowles, P. D. Knowles, S. Kronick, J. C. Kyle, Jas. Kynoch.

L. A. Lacey, J. B. Laidlaw, Robt. Laidlaw, R. A. Laidlaw, W. C. Laidlaw, G. G. Laird, Robt. Laird, E. M. Lake, W. H. Lamont, E. B. Lanceley, A. E. Lang, D. W. Lang, F. Langford, H. Langlois, W. H. Langlois, A. E. Langman, W. A. Langton, P. C. Larkin, W. C. Larmouth, E. H. Laschinger, J. B. Lawrason, A. Leadley, G. H. D. Lee, J. S. Lee, W. C.

Lee, Thos. Leeming, A. H. Leman, G. G. LeMesurier, C. F. Leonard, C. J. Leonard, T. D. Leonard, C. J. Levy, E. A. Lewis, J. D. Lewis, R. T. Lewis, E. T. Lightbourn, J. Lindsay, John Lindsay, Martine Lindsay, G. G. S. Lindsey, S. L. B. Lines, W. Linton, J. E. B. Littlejohn, C. W. Livingston, G. H. Locke, J. T. Locke, R. R. Lockhart, A. E. Long, E. G. Long, W. E. Long, LeRoy Louks, J. S. Lovell, W. J. Lovering, G. C. Loveys, I. B. Lucas, Jos. Lucas, F. E. Luke, G. S. Lyon, W. G. Lyon, J. P. Lyons, W. H. Lytle, W. J. Lytle.

C. A. McArthur, J. McBride, W. A. McCaffrey, L. B. McCammon, J. S. McCannell, G. A. McCarthy, J. O. McCarthy, R. W. McClain, E. E. McClellan, W. H. McClellan, D. M. McClelland, W. J. McCrea, J. W. S. McCullough, C. S. McDonald, D. H. McDougall, N. C. McEachren, W. N. McEachren, G. C. McEwen, A. A. McFall, H. McGavin, Harry McGee, E. McGonegal, W. H. McGuire, W. N. McIlwraith, W. D. McIntosh, D. M. McIntyre, R. L. McIntyre, J. B. McKechnie, D. McKinnon, J. G. McKinnon, J. S. McKinnon, R. B. McKinnon, R. S. McKinnon, W. L. McKinnon, J. McKnight, F. S. McLaughlin, M. McLaughlin, R. J. McLaughlin, J. S. McLean, W. J. McLean, G. J. McLeod, J. A. McLeod, F. McMahon, A. R. McMichael, L. S. McMurray, W. H. McNairn, W. K. McNaught, E. W. McNeill, A. C. McPhee, R. U. McPherson, C. McQuigge, T. McQuillen, J. M. McWhinney, W. J. McWhinney, C. E. P. McWilliams, E. N. Macallum, A. T. Macdonald, C. M. MacDonald, C. S. MacDonald, D. Macdonald, D. B. Macdonald, J. A. Macdonald, J. A. MacDonald, W. R. Macdonald, A. R. MacDougall, S. R. MacEwen, J. A. Macfadden, J. P. MacGregor, B. S. MacInnes, G. Macintyre, L. E. Mack, F. D. Mackay, John MacKay, J. F. MacKay, F. R. MacKelcan, A. G. Mackenzie, D. R. MacKenzie, M. A. Mackenzie, S. H. P. MacKenzie, W. A. MacKenzie, S. Macklem, T. C. S. Macklem, J. P. MacLachlan, J. F. MacLaren, H. W. MacMahon, A. MacMurchy, J. C. MacMurchy, F. J. Macnab, G. A. Macpherson, G. M. MacWilliam, R. J. Mahony, A. G. Malcolm, W. H. Male, A. Millinson, J. P. Mallon, J. L. Mallory, C. C. Mann, D. D. Mann, W. Mansell, D. W. Markham, A. H. S. Marks, S. A. Marks, G. C. Marriott, W. J. Marshall, Wm. T. Martin, H. H. Mason, J. H. Mason, T. H. Mason, A. L. Massey, Vincent Massey, Robt. Mathison, C. A. G. Matthews, W. L. Matthews, F. C. Maw, G. E. May, J. E. Maybee, F. J. Mayo, J. Medland, Thos. Meredith, G. R. C. Merriam, E. B. Merrill, R. H. Merry, D. C. Meyers, J. H. Michael, L. G. Mickles, A. W. Miles, R. J. Millar, F. P.

Millard, R. Millichamp, W. Millichamp, Thos. Millman, W. H. Millman, Alex. Mills, J. A. Milne, W. S. Milner, J. H. Milnes, J. P. Milnes, A. J. Mitchell, A. N. Mitchell, C. S. F. Mitchell, H. E. Mitchell, J. W. Mitchell, F. M. Moffat, J. K. Moffat, W. J. Moffatt, L. F. Monypenny, T. F. Monypenny, J. T. Moore, S. J. Moore, W. P. Moore, W. S. Morden, E. R. Morgan, R. B. Morley, C. E. Morrison, A. D. Morrow, G. A. Morrow, W. B. Morrow, G. F. Morse, W. P. Morse, Thos. Mortimer, Fred Moss, J. Moss, Wm. Moss, G. L. Mowat, David Moyle, C. P. Muckle, A. A. Mulholland, F. A. Mulholland, Cawthra Mulock, Wm. Mulock, Jr., A. Munro, Hugh Munro, J. Munro, E. S. Munroe, J. Y. Murdock, J. E. Murphy, M. H. Murphy, W. K. Murphy, Jr., W. T. Murphy, C. B. Murray, W. P. Murray, J. D. Musselman.

C. B. Nasmith, H. C. Nasmith, G. H. Needler, C. H. Neely, T. A. Neely, F. Nelson, W. Nesbitt, W. H. Nesbitt, J. R. Ness, C. B. Niles, H. W. Nix, C. J. Noble, A. G. Northway, John Northway, J. A. Northway, T. W. F. Norton, C. E. Nourse, W. C. Noxon, P. H. Nowers.

J. Oakley, J. O'Connor, W. M. O'Connor, J. G. O'Donoghue, G. H. O'Hara, J. J. O'Neill, Jos. Oliver, T. R. O'Meara, H. R. O'Reilly, R. P. Ormsby, W. H. Orr, M. A. Overend.

H. W. Page, Wm. A. Page, Wm. Pakenham, O. G. Palm, E. V. Pannell, A. F. Park, G. Parker, Robt. Parker, W. R. P. Parker, R. W. Parkhill, M. Parkinson, S. R. Parsons, G. F. Parton, H. D. Paterson, J. A. Paterson, J. H. Paterson, J. H. L. Patterson, R. E. Patterson, W. A. Patterson, E. W. Paul, A. R. Payne, C. J. Paynter, E. R. Peacock, C. T. Pearce, W. K. Pearce, W. H. Pearson, F. W. Peasnell, Geo. D. Perry, O. G. Perry, W. H. Perry, G. A. Peters, Henry Peters, D. H. Pettes, J. H. Pettit, A. Phillips, Chas. Phillips, H. H. Phillips, G. C. Pidgeon, W. H. Plant, A. T. Platt, G. G. Plaxton, H. P. Plumptre, H. Polson, B. Pontifex, J. E. Poole, G. D. Porter, C. E. Potter, D. Potter, F. H. Potts, F. B. Poucher, I. R. Pounder, E. J. Powell, H. C. Priest, F. A. Prime, A. Provan, R. A. Pyne.

H. C. Rae, A. G. Ramsay, J. J. Ramsay, J. Randall, W. E. Raney, C. H. Rankin, F. L. Ratcliff, J. B. Ratcliffe, E. Raymond, A. E. Rea, D. C. Rea, H. E. Redman, W. G. C. Reed, Wm. L. Reed, R. A. Reeve, A. J. Reid, A. T. Reid, A. W. Reid, C. E. Reid, G. B. Reid, J. A. Reid, R. F. Reid, Thos. Reid, Wm. Reid, Thos. Rennie, Wm. Reynolds, A. B. Rice, Gordon Rice, E. H. Richards, C. F. Richardson, R. D. Richardson, J. H. Riddel, Geo. Ridout, E. F. Risdon, C. F. Ritchie, W. B. Roadhouse, F. E. Roberts, A. Robertson, C. S. Robertson, D.

S. Robertson, W. D. Robertson, W. G. Robertson, C. E. Robin, T. C. Robinette, F. B. Robins, B. Robinson, E. W. Robinson, M. H. Robinson, A. C. Rogers, J. Rogers, J. P. Rogers, T. G. Rogers, S. B. Rohold, E. Rolland, C. H. Rooke, H. Rooke, W. J. Rooney, L. Root, L. V. Rorke, J. J. Rose, D. G. Ross, D. W. Ross, G. H. Ross, J. F. Ross, R. Ross, R. D. Ross, Victor Ross, W. D. Ross, N. W. Rowell, F. J. Rowland, H. A. Rowland, J. A. Rowland, W. A. Rowland, F. A. Rowlatt, J. W. Ruggles, J. A. Rumgay, R. A. Rumsey, W. E. Rundle, H. S. Rupert, R. K. Russell, T. A. Russell, F. Russill, E. E. Rutherford, A. F. Rutter, F. M. Rutter, G. W. Rutter, Harry Ryrie, James Ryrie.

J. B. Saer, J. J. Salmond, H. M. Sanderson, J. Sanderson, W. F. Sangster, E. M. Saunders, H. B. Scandrett, E. M. Scarlett, E. Scheuer, E. W. Scott, J. C. Scott, J. G. Scott, J. M. Scott, R. F. Scott, H. D. Scully, E. C. Scythes, J. A. Scythes, H. F. D. Sewell, H. W. Shapley, Andrew Sharp, A. Sharp, G. E. Shaw, W. H. Shaw, J. N. Shenstone, R. K. Shepard, L. C. Sheppard, S. T. Sheppard, D. W. Sherratt, G. Silverthorn, T. W. Sime, I. Simonski, P. H. Sims, J. W. Simser, A. Sinclair, J. M. Sinclair, N. A. Sinclair, S. B. Sinclair, O. Sisley, W. J. Sisson, J. S. Skeaff, S. Small, H. E. Smallpiece, Wm. Smart, A. Smith, A. T. Smith, F. D. L. Smith, F. J. Smith, G. B. Smith, G. H. Smith, H. T. Smith, J. M. Smith, O. G. Smith, R. Home Smith, V. R. Smith, J. F. Snarr, N. Snyder, G. T. Somers, J. Somerville, R. Southam, J. M. Sparrow, J. W. Spears, T. B. Speight, B. H. Spence, J. D. Spence, H. S. Sprague, G. R. Sproatt, T. W. Stafford, B. Stage, R. L. Stailing, Frank Stanley, J. N. Stanley, A. C. Stanners, O. B. Stanton, H. L. Spark, J. J. Steele, R. C. Steele, W. D. Steele, I. W. Steinhoff, F. C. Stephenson, H. S. Steven, C. E. Stevenson, A. F. Stewart, E. Stewart, G. Stewart, H. B. Stewart, Wm. B. Stewart, J. L. Stock, E. B. Stockdale, Wm. Storrie, J. Strachan, F. W. Strathy, Stuart Strathy, P. D. E. Strickland, R. J. Stuart, A. Sutherland, D. Sutherland, Hy. Sutherland, T. E. P. Sutton, D. A. Swan, T. Swan, J. W. Sweatman, Bishop Sweeny, S. B. Sykes, D. T. Symons.

N. Tait, F. W. Tanner, J. A. Tate, H. A. Taylor, J. Taylor, H. P. Temple, W. M. Temple, J. M. Templeton, H. J. Terry, A. I. Terryberry, Richard Tew, Ira B. Thayer, E. B. Thompson, H. V. Thompson, A. J. Thomson, A. M. Thomson, H. G. Thomson, J. H. Thomson, R. H. Thomson, H. G. Thorley, J. Thurburn-Conn, W. B. Tindall, W. H. Tippett, John A. Tory, H. M. Tovell, W. J. Tow, A. St. L. Trigge,

W. C. Trotter, H. L. Troyer, C. A. Tubby, Jno. Turnbull, H. V. Tyrrell.

Thos. Urquhart.

J. M. Vale, P. A. Vale, Geo. Valentine, C. I. Van Nostrand, G. J. Van Nostrand, B. S. Vanstone, P. G. Van Vleet, R. C. Vaughan, Wm. H. Vaughan, E. C. Veitch, Harry Vigeon, W. H. Villiers.

R. O. Wade, C. S. Wainwright, C. Walker, Sir E. Walker, H. Walker, H. H. Walker, J. A. Walker, Wm. Walker, F. H. Wallace, J. S. Wallace, M. W. Wallace, G. A. Warburton, A. T. Ward, G. T. Warden, T. D. Wardlaw, C. A. Warren, J. M. Warren, R. D. Warren, C. E. Warwick, G. R. Warwick, B. Watford, G. F. Watson, G. E. Watson, Wm. Watson, John Watt, G. H. Webb, A. E. Webster, T. S. Webster, E. K. M. Wedd, Geo. Weir, Thos. West, W. N. West, J. Westren, J. E. Wetherell, E. Whaley, A. E. Whatmough, F. F. White, F. W. White, M. P. White, W. H. White, R. S. Whyte, W. C. Wickett, John Wickson, R. C. Wickware, J. W. Widdup, Wm. Wiggins, E. M. Wilcox, Geo. Wilkie, W. C. Wilkinson, J. S. Will, Ed. Willans, J. C. Willard, W. T. Willard, A. J. Williams, F. D. Williams, R. Williams, Sir J. Willison, W. A. Willison, C. H. Willson, G. H. Willson, John Willson, A. E. Wilson, C. Wilson, C. L. Wilson, F. F. Wilson, Geo. Wilson, G. L. Wilson, H. Wilson, Jno. Wilson, N. D. Wilson, S. F. Wilson, W. F. Wilson, R. F. Wilton, A. B. Winchester, A. H. Winger, F. W. Winter, L. A. Winter, C. E. Winters, C. W. Winyard, W. H. Wise, C. A. Withers, N. M. Wittet, E. R. Wood, G. H. Wood, J. W. Wood, L. M. Wood, Robt. Wood, S. Casey Wood, W. A. P. Wood, Thos. Woodbridge, C. Woodhouse, C. W. I. Woodland, J. D. Woods, J. W. Woods, J. W. Woodside, J. Woodsworth, C. P. Wooler, Arthur Worth, G. R. Worthington, W. E. Wray, C. D. Wreyford, A. E. Wright, E. F. Wright, K. W. Wright, W. G. Wright, Norman Wylie.

Frank Yeigh, T. Yellowlees, A. H. Young, D. Young, H. A. Young, M. J. Young, W. A. Young, W. E. Young, Y. S. Young.

O. H. Ziegler,

Canadian Club of Toronto
Addresses