

ALL THINGS CONSIDERED

By PETER McARTHUR

HAVE you noticed the number of men who are being written up in the papers? Magazines, weeklies, dailies and publications of all kinds are overflowing with pictures of the great and the still greater, accompanied by biographical sketches tracing them from the cradle to the pinnacles they now occupy and setting forth the cunning ways of their childhood as well as the benevolence of their maturity in phrases that would be fulsome if there were any reason to suspect that these men are not all that is claimed for them. As for myself, I try to believe all the good things I read about my fellow-countrymen and it is a matter of regret that I have on several occasions heard men repeat Robert Buchanan's bitter observation, "I have known too many great men to envy them, and too many rich men to respect them." Still I cannot help thinking that there was policy as well as honesty in Cromwell's instruction to the painter to paint him as he was and not to leave out the warts. People do not as a rule disparage or abuse a man's portrait if it is already a libel on humanity. It is at the combination of Little Lord Fauntleroy, the Admirable Crichton, and Andrew Carnegie that the ordinary man's gorge rises. It is hardly possible that anyone is so good, so great and so fascinating as some of our prominent men are being made to appear—at space rates. In fact there is a danger that these over-luscious biographies may tempt some one to put on record some things that would be better left unsaid. Unpleasant and disquieting as it may be it is undoubtedly true that the historian of the future when sizing up our contemporary great men will scan as earnestly Bob Edwards' *Calgary Eye-Opener* as he will Fred Cook's "Who's Who." This would not be necessary if our great men in revising the proofs of their own biographies would see that things are set down with the honesty shown by good man Pepys. If this cannot be done they should at least try to look at these verbal and pictorial counterfeit presentments of themselves with a normally active sense of humour.

* * *

MR. ANDREW McPHAIL is unfortunate in his friends. After the death of Goldwin Smith, some of them rushed into print to acclaim Dr. McPhail as the natural successor of the dead publicist. The time for instituting such a comparison was inopportune and in any case it is doubtful if any one will ever figure in the public eye as the successor of a man of the peculiar and varied attainments of Goldwin Smith. I confess it is my misfortune that I have read little of Dr. McPhail's writings and have been disposed to agree with little

of what I have read. Having a lively sense of my own limitations and shortcomings I am willing to bear the full burden of blame for this state of affairs. However, I trust I shall not incur the wrath of his friends if I suggest that a sentence like the following lacks something of the cold, intellectual aloofness expected of a great publicist. Speaking of the United States he said: "The population is increasing at the rate of a million a year by immigration; and there must be sufficient increase by the natural process of procreation to offset the number of deaths by lynching, railway accidents, and other methods of destruction." This is undoubtedly meant to be humorous but it has a tinge of spitefulness that suggests the fulminations of an inbred descendant of the United Empire Loyalists rather than the well-considered utterances of a public man. The same article, which deals with the question of Reciprocity, closes with the following paragraph:

"Reciprocity is quite unnecessary if each country would follow the sound political rule of considering independently its own interests. If the people of the United States in their own interests desire lower import duties there is no power on earth to prevent them having their own way, excepting of course their own legislatures. We beg of them not to think of us. If we desire lower import duties we shall have them and we shall have them soon, since our legislatures were not constructed originally for the purpose of thwarting the people's will."

Possibly this is also meant as a jest. If it is I have read many a merrier one. If it is meant as a serious utterance I have seldom read a more foolish. Dr. McPhail seems to be labouring under the delusion that the powerful interests that exploit the public for their own benefit are less successful in Canada than they are in the United States. Moreover, he appears to think that Reciprocity treaties are negotiated for the benefit of the consumers—the people who want to buy. It is because they want our markets and not because they want our goods that our neighbours to the south are talking Reciprocity.

* * *

ALREADY reports are beginning to come in from all parts of the country about the manner in which fruit is being packed for the market. Berries of inferior quality are being offered in partly filled baskets and the highest prices charged. This is a continuation of the offences that came to light last season in the packing of apples. Surely it will not be necessary to demand legislation to make the farmers and fruit-growers see the advantage of common everyday honesty in such matters. Ontario produces some of the best fruit in the world but there are indications that the soil and climate are unsuited to the raising of old-fashioned consciences. One would not be disposed to blame the guilty so very much if they made any real gains by their practices. The motto of the age seems to be: "Get money; get it honestly if you can, but—get money." But these people get only a few cents by their dishonesty while they spoil the market for years to come. It is too bad they cannot be made to understand that it doesn't pay. If they once realised that no legislation would be required.

A DOUBLE QUARTETTE OF CHAMPION BOWLERS FROM LONDON, ONTARIO



The Bowling Tournament at Niagara last week brought out some sensational surprises—if Bowling can ever be sensational. In the trophy final the Thistles of London, Ontario, consisting of Messrs. J. Marr, C. Brown, A. Scott and C. Abbott, Skip, combined with another London Four—Messrs. J. Connor, A. Fraser, J. Wood and A. M. Heaman, Skip—to clean up the Tournament and put London at the apex of the Dominion Bowling Association.