

patriotism of the Liberal leaders of our country, whilst it would be expected in some cheap country paper, it is not looked for in a family magazine and no other magazine would stultify itself by printing such cheap stuff."

Such is the viewpoint of a leading business man of the city concerning our remarks. They do credit to the loyalty which he feels to Canadian leaders whom he regards as having been chiefly criticized.

That they don't do so much credit to his knowledge of Canadian affairs may perhaps be proven and it may be shewn that he has rushed with more zeal than discretion to champion the cause of the criticized ones.

The writer is not an Old Country Conservative but a Canadian born, proud of his country, intensely interested in its welfare and a firm believer in the great destiny of that country and of the Empire of which it forms a part. He looks to see the British Empire under God play a most magnificent part in the creating of a world which shall give to men some faint conception of what Heaven may mean.

It is his dream that as a part of that Empire never to be riven from it, Canada shall take a part commensurate with her extent, her resources and her strategic position.

The Wayside Philosopher had no idea of anything approaching patronization when he spoke of the loyalty of the rank and file of the Liberals of Canada. Whatever he may think of the attitude of their leaders it is a matter of heartiest congratulation and pride to him that the great mass of Liberals in Canada have been just as loyal and just as devoted to Canada and the Empire as the writer. Of that there can be little doubt.

Coming now to the question of whether or not the writer's criticism of the attitude and political convictions of Canadian Liberals in respect to the relationship of Canada to the Empire was and is cheap or not, the Wayside Philosopher makes this offer to his critic. He invites his critic to give the readers of this magazine through these columns the day, occasion and speaker of every such speech as that made by Graham in New York—made by any Liberal leader of rank and standing from 1885 down to and including the present day.

In reply the Wayside Philosopher agrees to give a criticism of it and of all the speakers quoted, and lest it be thought he is writing from an unfriendly standpoint he will agree to select his criticism from Liberal journals only, and further, that the criticism shall not be taken from journals which might at the moment have some particular or peculiar objection to the party criticized but that the criticism shall be from journals of standing written at times when it should be evident they are expressing real convictions regarding the person discussed.

We trust our critic will take advantage of this offer and we will welcome his contribution at any time.

#### Another Communication

We have been also handed a letter signed by the Secretary of the Disabled Veterans' Association sent in response to the February invitation in these columns for replies to the question, "Who is a Canadian?"

The writer, who states he is British born and whose sentiments on the question of "Who is a Canadian" are very creditable to him, after referring to legal replies which might be given to the question, correctly states, "If the question is meant in its highest possible sense having in mind the real responsibilities which no true Canadian can escape, it is probably easier to define, 'Who is **not** a Canadian?'"

As it is only from the standpoint of the realization of the responsibilities referred to by the writer of the letter that we wish the question answered, we wonder how many there are in Canada who find themselves forced into the position that they find it easier to define "Who is **not** a Canadian?" than "Who **is** a Canadian?" yet it must be apparent to all that there must be a definition which shall clearly, concisely and exactly define those qualities, characteristics, abilities and aspirations which are to be recognized as distinctly and exclusively Canadian and to designate whenever used, a Canadian and a Canadian only.

Such a definition we purpose later to attempt. Meanwhile we welcome all further replies especially when the writers can show as much by the general tenor of their letters as by the facts set forth that they are, like the writer of the letter referred to, real Canadians.

#### More About the Vaccination Question

General Odum in his paper asks, "Why the fuss about Vaccination?" We would reply that the fuss is not over vaccination but over the needlessness of the vaccination agitation. Whether Dr. Underhill was desirous of proving his value as a public servant, or his zeal outran his discretion, he labored, in season and out of season, endeavoring to arouse the people to some line of action regarding smallpox.

Dr. Worthington, either because it meant a commercial profit to him by reason of the vaccine to be supplied or because he didn't take time to consider the situation, aided Dr. Underhill's efforts. The result has been inconvenience to a large number of citizens and a considerable unpleasant advertisement for the city in the neighboring republic, if not elsewhere.

What was the situation which caused all this to-do? A perfectly normal situation containing nothing of special importance to warrant any fuss.

Established 1893

**CENTER & HANNA LTD.**

*Perfect Funeral Service*

Seymour 2425

1049 Georgia Street West

Vancouver, B. C.



**Your Telephone Bill**

The most convenient way to pay your account is to mail us a cheque.

**British Columbia Telephone Company**

**Lamatco**  
3 PLY COTTONWOOD VENEER PANELS

**LAMINATED MATERIALS CO., LTD.**

New Westminster, B. C.