

that the slightest attempt on the part of his Ministers to impose upon him unreasonable or unnecessary duties would have been instantly and effectively resisted by his subjects, and the Ministers themselves placed under the ban of popular disfavour.

This power was as effectively felt in the Dominions Overseas as in the United Kingdom. During the few years of his reign Imperialism assumed a new and larger scope. It had larger aspirations and took a more aggressive attitude. Can it not be fairly said that this means simply "King Edward"? Among all nations thousands have stood up loyally and drunk the health of the sovereign who inwardly cared little for his personality. Is it too much to say that from Canada to South Africa every subject when he raised the glass to his lips felt in his heart that King Edward represented everything he wished to honour, and embodied his beau-ideal of kingly functions? So long as he sat upon the throne and there emanated from his person the qualities which appealed to the national pride and illustrated the patriotic sentiments of the Empire, it was idle to talk of dismemberment. Who could be induced to renounce his allegiance to Edward? The Imperial propaganda rested to an enormous extent upon Edward's popularity and the universal regard

he evoked from all classes. Most monarchs are mourned when they die, decently mourned; but not in all cases is their death regarded as a national loss. Not one of the four Georges enjoyed this tribute of a nation's regard. But what Briton did not instinctively feel that all would go well while Edward reigned? At his death all mourned, not conventionally, but truly.

There is another thought in this connection, which it is not wholly agreeable to obtrude, but it merits consideration. Did Edward bring the power of the Crown to a point that in any way menaced the fundamental principles of British Government? This power of the Crown is an important factor in securing the stability of our national institutions, but should it ever grow so great that it might destroy the power of the tribunes of the people? Only a thin partition divides the tyranny of arms from the absolutism of a great personality in its ultimate effects.

Under Edward VII. there is no room to even imagine that he would use his power for any personal end. He gave clear tokens that his sole aim was the peace, happiness and glory of his country. But there is a limit to which the power of the Crown can be safely exercised, and popular government

is in danger when a sovereign can venture to dispense with the services of a Liberal Ministry with every reasonable assurance of popular support. Under our system, in these enlightened days, no sovereign will acquire this tremendous power unless he is worthy of it and can be permitted to enjoy it without imperiling the interests of the people. The King who seeks to exercise any such power unworthily will find he has it not.

All Britons feel the warmest attachment to the present King, have high hopes of the discharge of his exalted and delicate functions, and perfect assurance that he will always be a constitutional sovereign. It is no reflection on his worth to say that he can never perform the functions of his father in European diplomacy—probably no man lives who could. King George will command the fealty and regard of all his subjects wherever dwelling, but will he be such a factor in creating an Imperial spirit in all parts of the Empire? Will the Imperial idea fade or grow fainter when the fascination of Edward's personality is no longer felt? The ardent Imperialist will answer warmly, "No, it will go on and flourish just the same." Perhaps it will, but we shall wait for the answer of the thinker and the philosopher. What think you, sage reader?

AMERICAN RECIPROCITY

WHAT IT MEANS TO TWO GREAT COUNTRIES

There is an adage about plain living and high thinking. Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, K.C., in his address to the Economic Club of New York on May 10th, put into one proposition high living and plain thinking; to which he also added plain speaking. He spoke his mind much more freely than Canadians are wont to do when talking to United States audiences. He used language which in a Cabinet Minister sent from Ottawa as diplomat to Washington would have been regarded as rather dangerous.

In his capacity as private citizen and student of public affairs he set forth the truth about the little end of the stick at Ottawa and the big end at Washington. He noted the turn in the stick; the rise of Canada as a great producing country alongside the United States as the great manufacturing country; each needing the other in its business. He made it very clear that henceforward in all matters affecting mutual trade relations Canada has a mind and a policy of her own.

PLAIN TALK TO SOME OF THE BRAINIEST CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.

By WALLACE NESBITT, K.C.

THE plain truth must be told, that at the beginning of this year the united feeling of Canadians was that since 1866 they had received nothing but the most distinct and studied rebuffs from Washington, notwithstanding that they entertained at the same time the feeling

that individually the citizens of the United States felt in the strongest way the ties of kinship and of language with ourselves. I confess that Canadians in general feel that this country has been a little rough in its treatment of their Government.

One great weakness in your Constitution is that your Executive makes a bargain and then somebody in the Senate kicks it over. After learning all the other fellow is

mercantile independence was recognised by President Taft, who in a message to the people of the Dominion said:

"I am profoundly convinced that these two countries, touching each other for more than three thousand miles, have common interests in trade and require special arrangements in legislation and administration which are not involved in the relations of the United States with countries beyond the seas."

I do not know that people generally have recognised the importance of this statement. As I understand the President, he is enunciating a new continental doctrine relating to trade, an important innovation as the political doctrine known as the Monroe doctrine relating to political conditions on the continent. If your country will recognise, as President Taft has indicated, that geographical propinquity involves a different treatment of tariff matters, I think a new era fraught with great blessings to all parties concerned on this continent may be at hand.

The United States has a territory of 3,025,000 square miles, including Alaska and Hawaii, which between them make about one-fifth of that territory, Alaska having 590,884 square miles. Canada has an area of 3,653,946 square miles.

I do not think that the average citizen of the United States has any idea that we have only touched upon the southern fringe of the great wheat belt; that since 1905 the immigration from the United States alone amounts to over half a million, who have brought in with them over \$350,000,000 in cash and settlers' effects; that the Grand Trunk Pacific, now under process of construction, at one point opens out a wheat growing belt of one thousand miles in length and three hundred miles in width; that the Province of Tobolsk in Siberia, which is one of the great wheat-growing provinces of Russia, super-imposed on the map of Canada would be wholly north of the wheat-growing and inhabited part of Canada to-day, and that, therefore, the agricultural possibilities are practically illimitable. There is now in operation a mill grinding the best quality of No. 1 hard wheat grown as far north of the International boundary line as Mexico is south of it.

I venture the statement, with some hesitation, that taking the total area and taking the present arid and swamp lands of the United States, there will be found within the next fifty years a greater total

productive, habitable area within the confines of Canada than in the United States, and you know that the northern climate is supposed to breed a more aggressive race.

This future population has advantages in the way of inland waterways and waterpowers for the cheap development of electricity, which I think I may say without boasting are unrivalled in the world except in one or two provinces in China, and what that means in the way of industrial development I need not dwell upon.

So much for the area.

The population of the United States is, roughly speaking, over ninety millions; that of Canada eight millions, or about eleven to one. In 1910, taking the returns for the last three months, the total imports from the United States into Canada I estimate will be not less than two hundred and forty millions. The total exports to the United States for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1910, were \$113,145,727. In 1909 they were eighty-five millions. From this you will see that every man, woman and child in Canada purchases from the United States \$30 worth of goods. Every man, woman and child in the United States purchases from Canada \$1.20 worth of goods.

High Living in the United States.

When you couple this with the knowledge that you are the most expensive livers on earth, you will see that while we are probably the second or third largest purchasing customer you have in the world, we do not sell you much per head. My analysis of the figures leads me to the conclusion that Canada is your largest customer for manufactured goods, Great Britain and Germany taking in their imports largely food products. In other words, what we buy from you is a most important economic consideration in your foreign trade. What you buy from us is to you a mere drop in the bucket. What you buy from us should have very little effect upon your tariff; while if our own people could manufacture what we buy from you it would mean new cities and towns and villages springing up in every direction; a new local market for our farmers; new attractions for the homesteader from your country to settle with us and bring with him his cash and effects, and, what we prize most of all, his virile and aggressive citizenship. Or, we may so regulate our tariff that if our own manufacturers are not able to manufacture in the limited market, at least the manufacturers of England by a differential tariff in her favour can supply us the same goods as cheaply, or more cheaply, than the United States. In so doing we would thus be assisting England, our banker and best customer. The Mother Country has loaned us for the purpose of developing our country six hundred millions of dollars within the last five years, and is, next to our local market, the great market for all our agricultural products. Increasing her manufacturing would enable her to have better purchasing ability and to continue the banking supply, neither of which benefits can we hope for under our present relations with yourselves.

So much for the size and purchasing power of both countries. What is the future likely to be? If one may read the signs of the times in your country, the masses are beginning to realise that the cost of living is altogether too great; that the population has increased so that you have practically little food for export; that in the near future it will become a matter of interest to every householder that there should be a producer at his door from



Mr. Wallace Nesbitt, K.C.

willing to do the Senate throws down the agreement and makes a new proposal based on what it has learned. This is a weakness that makes us very timid in our dealings with you. A treaty of reciprocity between us will never be made as long as your Executive is powerless to control certain special interests in the upper house of your Congress.

I can put this in a single sentence, "We dislike your Government but we love your people!"

When a tariff war recently was threatened through conflict between widely different American and Canadian tariff systems, it was only natural for Canadians to feel they had for forty years already been at commercial war with the United States, although the steady increase of the volume of trade testified to the power of propinquity. A situation fraught with the gravest commercial disaster was averted by the exercise of friendly spirit and business sense. Fortunately there were real statesmen at both Ottawa and Washington. Canada's com-