

physical. The Methodist church in Canada crucified Professor Workman and now proposes to crucify Mr. Jackson. The Presbyterian church came near to crucifying Dr. Macdonell. Each church has had its own particular victim.

The world is making progress but it is still somewhat intolerant of the advanced thinker, the experimenter and the propounder of new ideas. It is quite right for us to be careful of our ancient faiths and our tried constitutions. It is indeed necessary that we should beware of the man who advocates wrong principles and departures from safe and sound methods. But who is to decide whether a new suggestion is an improvement, an advance in human knowledge or intelligence, or whether it is a wicked innovation? Surely it is best to be content to argue and reason and investigate rather than to resort to crucifixion. If Professor Workman and Mr. Jackson, and the other critics of the theological doctrines have not reason and justice on their side, their opinions are not likely to flourish. There is surely plenty of evil to fight without trying to give battle to those who are also fighting evil though not quite orthodox in their methods. Twenty-five years ago, some people would have crucified General Booth if they had been able; to-day the world recognises his great ability in reformatory work. Surely after two thousand years, the chief priests and the elders should have acquired more wisdom and tolerance than their Jewish predecessors!



REGULATION vs PROHIBITION

SHALL we regulate or shall we prohibit? This is a question which is seriously discussed in several departments of our public life.

Shall we regulate the liquor traffic or shall we prohibit it? This is one form which the question takes and it leads to endless discussion. Some people would let only a few licensed dealers sell liquor and would charge no fee, simply regulating the quality of the liquor sold and the conditions under which the business shall be conducted. Others would put the traffic under government control and make it a government monopoly so that there should be no inducement, in the way of private gain, toward developing the sales. Others would prohibit the traffic entirely.

Shall we regulate combines or prohibit them? This is another form of the question. In this connection, the *Toronto News* remarks that "In the United States it is now recognized that legislation setting the mark of illegality upon all business combinations is both futile and unjust." According to Mr. Herbert Knox Smith, commissioner of corporations at Washington, prohibition has practically failed and the Anti-Trust Law must be repealed. Many leading commercial specialists on both sides of the line are advocating regulation instead of prohibition. This regulation to prevent the public being fleeced by trade combinations would, they maintain, be more effective because it would distinguish between good and bad combinations and would fight only the combinations which are selfish and grasping.

Shall we regulate companies operating public utilities or prohibit them by putting all such utilities under government ownership? This is another form of this question. The Dominion Government answered it by putting all railways, express companies and telegraph companies under the regulating supervision of the Railway Commission. The provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have answered the question, so far as telephones are concerned, by prohibiting private companies and allowing only government-owned lines to do business. Sir William Mulock, when Postmaster-General, was anxious to follow the British precedent and have the government take over all telegraph and telephone companies, but his ideas have found root only in the progressive West.

This question of regulation and prohibition is a large one and no general rule may be laid down with any degree of accuracy. Much depends on local conditions or on national conditions as the case may be. Nevertheless it may be safely asserted that the general tendency is towards regulation rather than towards prohibition.

HOOK UP THE INTERCOLONIAL

THE future of the Intercolonial Railway has once more become a question of practical politics, just when some journals, that are usually wise, were saying that the last had been heard of the idea of departing from the form of government control which has given us forty-year-long deficits. The Intercolonial will vex parliament every year so long as it is a party political asset. It will be a party political asset as long as it belongs to a government department. Behind every demand by a Maritime member of the House

of Commons for its retention in the government family there is the sinister power of patronage, and the prospective value of votes.

The budget speech of the Minister of Railways was a singularly courageous deliverance. Mr. Borden was quick to point out that, by inference, he threw overboard the arguments which induced parliament in 1903 and 1904 to act as if it believed that the National Transcontinental would parallel the Intercolonial without damaging it. Mr. Graham virtually admits that Mr. Borden was right. He talks like a man who is prepared to take the consequences of his words. He has only to continue in that temper and he will find himself a remarkably strong Minister of Railways; for he will convince the country that, given the backing of public opinion, he will furnish a business-like administration of his Department.

The perceptions of Ottawa may have become dulled, but they are keen enough to know when a strong man has a strong force behind him. Before this writing sees the light the debates in Committee will probably have developed pretty fully the newer, more important things the Minister said. Meantime, it is worth while looking at two or three features of the debate, as far as it went last week.

Mr. Graham's proposed Board of Management is obviously a makeshift—if it is as much as that. The real importance of his speech lay in his way of facing the future, not as it may be affected by the whims and necessities of a band of politicians; but as it will certainly be affected by the changing commercial conditions of the country at large, and of the Maritime Provinces particularly. Once and for all, says Mr. Graham, it must be realised that events are fast making the Intercolonial a local road, which will not be able to live without a vital readjustment of its scheme of administration. That readjustment must come, he says, either by the acquisition and construction of branches, or by "hooking up" to a transcontinental line which, through its control of Western traffic, can give the otherwise disadvantaged districts a far better railway service than they could possibly enjoy on a "local" road.

Mr. Graham might as well have invited his Maritime colleagues to forego finally the self-gratification of saying that the Intercolonial was not built to get Western traffic, and was not expected to pay; and that, therefore, it should be kept as a milch cow for maritime people who are entitled to some perquisite left-over from the Confederation bargain. This is the year nineteen hundred and nine. Whatever Joseph Howe and lesser patriots thought in eighteen sixty-five will not pay the interest on vast capital expenditures that have been incurred during the century they did not live to see. The Maritime provinces are too big and too modern for talk such as might be endured from faded spinsters, whose minds dwell perpetually on the obvious fact that they were young once.

The idea that the Intercolonial can be saved by a branch line policy is as delusive as other ideas on which various shrewd, mistaken men have based their hopes of a successful Government railway. Acquire existing branches and build more, in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—that is the policy. Does anyone suppose that the branch lines already in existence would feed the Intercolonial more than they do now if the Intercolonial owned any of them? Under private ownership they are managed economically—they have to be in order to exist. As Government property they would be managed like the Intercolonial—jobs for political workers, leading to deficits. If new branches were constructed, by how much would they create traffic for the Intercolonial? The territory in which they might be built is already tributary to the Intercolonial; and though the increase of facilities increases traffic, the farming and timber tracts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, which remain to be served by railways, would not create enough new import and export trade to pay for the branches that would have to be constructed, and for their equipment and operation, and leave enough over to turn the existing railroad system from a loser into a winner.

Branch lines pay when they create traffic for long hauls which would not otherwise be created. A branch line in the Saskatchewan valley, for instance, not only makes it possible for farmers to grow many times more wheat than they could grow if a railway were afar off; but furnishes so much new traffic to and from Port Arthur, anywhere from 900 to 1200 miles away.

Conditions are totally different in the Maritime provinces. There is no prospect of new settlements. Good agricultural land is in small sections. Even if it were as abundant as in Southern Ontario, the imminence of salt water everywhere would make it all but impossible for networks of new branch lines to flourish. Already in New Brunswick there is a mile of railway for every 277 people. In Nova Scotia the ratio is one to 330. Nova Scotians who live out of smell of salt water are very few; New Brunswickers who live near the tide are very many; so that the railway service is even more extensive than the figures alone suggest. The Intercolonial cannot be redeemed by branches. It must be saved by securing traffic with Western territory.

That cannot be accomplished by agreement with any other line which now reaches the Atlantic. Mr. Blair, eleven years ago, agreed with the Grand Trunk to receive freight from it at Montreal, and believed that the era of deficits was ended. Mr. Graham admits that practically nothing comes to the Intercolonial from the Grand Trunk that can be routed any other way. Clearly the only way to save the Intercolonial is by Mr. Graham's "hooking up" plan.