

hour; but the evil habits produced by bad laws are apt to be handed down as legacies to succeeding generations. One of the difficult problems that England has still to deal with, is the proper management of her professional paupers, who have been created and fostered largely by her Poor Laws.

In spite of all the wonderful advancement that has been made in the instruction of the people, there are many popular errors which may any day become embodied in the statute books of the nation. Allow me to give an example:

In the word *work* there lurks an ambiguity. A workman asks an employer to give him some work. What the man really is looking for is not *work* but *wages*. He offers the use of his muscle and his brain which we call *work*. The employer offers him in return what we call wages, so many dollars, pounds, or shillings as the case may be. The labourer now takes these dollars and with them obtains such commodities as he wants, and then, and only then, does he really obtain what are his actual wages, viz., his food, clothing, shelter and what not, which he receives in exchange for his money. But so much are people accustomed to associate work and wages, that time and again the two things are confounded as if they were one and the same thing. You are well aware that one of the standing resolutions of trades-unions is a protest against prison labour; because, as they assert, prison labour takes away the work from the honest workman, and, therefore, it takes away his wages. I am willing to admit that it does take away his work; so does the horse drawing a load of bricks take away the work from the brick carrier; but I most emphatically deny that it deprives him of any portion of his wages. To suppress prison labour would be just as wise as

to shoot the horses and compel men to carry the loads, or to make woodmen work with dull-edged axes, or even without axes at all, for then would their work be infinitely increased; while wages would be proportionately diminished. Keeping in remembrance that men work to get commodities—then we can easily understand that by increasing products, by prison or any other labour, we increase wages, and by diminishing products we diminish wages.

Take another example: No word in the English language is more frequently used than the word money; and I may add, no word in the English language is more frequently misused than the word money. You are all aware that a piece of gold of a certain weight and fineness has a certain value, just as a bushel of wheat, a cord of wood, or a coat, has a certain value. Now, the Government takes this piece of gold and stamps it. What does that stamp mean? Simply this: it certifies the weight and fineness of the gold; that is all. It adds nothing to, it takes nothing from, the value. Gold had value before ever Governments thought of stamping it. As one writer has aptly remarked: "The Government stamp saves the merchant the trouble of carrying about a pair of scales and a bottle of acid to weigh and test the gold." For the sake of economy the Government issues notes. The face of the note says: "The Dominion of Canada will pay the bearer the sum of One Dollar." A note is simply a promise to pay a certain weight of gold, just as a baker's ticket promises to pay a loaf on demand. But because the promise and the thing promised are both called "money," they have been confounded as the same thing, and because we effect all our exchanges by means of "money," some people think that a mere increase of the means of exchange will