

things of perhaps deeper and more general import which I wish to get said before leaving.

But first let me brush aside in a word or two that use of the phrase Canada for the Canadians in which it is the parrot-cry of a stupid provincialism. We in the University often catch an echo of it in connection with new appointments. Now I have had something to say in the selection of several colleagues who have brought great distinction to McGill; and I can tell you that the only consideration which weighs with the present authorities is this, to find the best man come he from where he may. That is how we brought Professor Callendar from England and Professor Rutherford from New Zealand. And when we felt that in Dr. Barnes, a Canadian, we had the best possible man, we were the more delighted to make the appointment without troubling to look abroad. That is a policy to be supported at all costs. Canada needs and must have the best. It is poor patriotism to fob her off with the second best because of the local accident of birth. It may be necessary to protect manufactures in a young country; but for heaven's sake, gentlemen, don't put a tariff on brains. You will not even succeed in establishing a monopoly by it!

No, gentlemen, the sense in which I intended to use the phrase was far different. As I read it, it should be 'All Canada for all Canadians' to the exclusion of monopoly in the interests of individuals or limited classes. Take this admirable sentence from the first paragraph of the Report:—

"We recognize as natural resources all materials available for the use of man as means of life and welfare, including those on the surface of the earth, like the soil and the waters; those below the surface, like the minerals; and those above the surface like the forests." Doesn't it sound like Genesis? "We agree that these resources should be developed, used, and conserved for the future, in the interests of mankind, whose rights and duties to guard and control the natural sources of life and welfare are inherent, perpetual, and inalienable.

*We agree that those resources which are necessities of life should be regarded as public utilities, that their ownership entails specific duties to the public, and that as far as possible effective measures should be adopted to guard against monopoly.*"

Now you see how I meant to work it. Why, gentlemen, this, as I ventured to tell the minister, is the best kind of socialism; and mere common sense into the bargain. But what a painful contrast is there between these admirably expressed ideals and the policy of our present governments!

Take the forests. 'We believe that systems of fire-guardianship