

The Semi-Weekly Telegraph is issued every Wednesday and Saturday by The Telegraph Publishing Company, St. John, a company incorporated by Act of the Legislature of New Brunswick.

Subscription Rates
Sent by mail to any address in Canada at One Dollar a year. Sent by mail to any address in United States at Two Dollars a year. All subscriptions must be paid in advance.

Advertising Rates
Ordinary commercial advertisements taking the run of the paper, each insertion, \$1.00 per inch.
Advertisements of Wares, For Sale, etc., one cent a word for each insertion.
Deaths, 50 cents for each insertion.

Important Notice
All remittances must be sent by post office order or registered letter, and addressed to The Telegraph Publishing Company.

Correspondence must be addressed to the Editor of The Telegraph, St. John. All letters sent to The Semi-Weekly Telegraph and intended for publication should contain stamps if return of M.S. is desired in case it is not published. Otherwise, rejected letters are destroyed.

Authorized Agents
The following agents are authorized to canvass and collect for The Semi-Weekly Telegraph:

H. CECIL KIRSTEAD,
MISS V. E. GIBBERSON.

THE DAILY TELEGRAPH THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH THE EVENING TIMES

New Brunswick's Independent Newspapers

These newspapers advocate:
British connection
Honesty in public life

Measures for the material
progress and moral advance
ment of our great Dominion.

No graft!
No deals!
"The Thistle, Shamrock, Rose and Wine,
The Maple Leaf Forever."

Semi-Weekly Telegraph
and The News

ST. JOHN, N. B., JANUARY 14, 1914.

ANOTHER CONSERVATIVE MEETING.

The Conservative party has been holding an uncommon number of meetings in St. John of late. These meetings are supplementary and wholly independent of those other meetings held by the citizens of St. John at large to protest against the diversion of the steamers from this port. These spontaneous meetings deal with subjects which the speakers at the Conservative meetings are disposed to avoid.

St. John read a speech by Hon. Mr. Pelletier a short time ago, in which he intimated that the government would stand pat on the tariff this year, making no concessions in the way of the removal of duties on necessities.

Hon. Mr. Hazen, in a recent speech here, practically repeated what Mr. Pelletier said on this issue, and conspicuously avoided any reference to certain disturbing local questions which he was expected to clear up.

Hon. Mr. Foster also spoke of St. John matters a short time ago, and suggested that St. John people would do well to "keep their hats on."

Hon. Mr. Crothers was another visitor. He was asked about the high cost of living, and he said that at the time when gold was plentiful in the Yukon men had to pay \$15 a plate for ham and eggs. Mr. Crothers therefore sagely argued that there could be no connection between the tariff and the high cost of living.

It will be observed that St. John has not profited greatly by the words of wisdom falling from the lips of Hon. Messrs. Pelletier, Hazen, Foster and Crothers.

On Wednesday evening there was another Conservative meeting at the speakers being Mr. Fowler, M. P., the Hon. J. E. Wilson, Senator Daniel, and Mr. H. W. Woods, M. P. Mr. Fowler confirmed the position taken by Mr. Hazen and Mr. Pelletier with respect to the government's course in regard to the tariff. If Mr. Fowler is correct the duties will remain on wheat, flour, and other necessities. The Standard gives us a report of Mr. Fowler's speech from which the public will see at once how deeply Mr. Fowler has pondered these questions and how valuable his advice to his party and the people is at this juncture. According to the Standard Mr. Fowler said of the Liberal party and the tariff:

Now they are harping on free food? That has a melodious ring. It sounds good to a man who is hungry. But the people of Canada, particularly of New Brunswick, are not hungry.

A voice—The Grits are. They'll be hungry for office for a long time.

What do they mean by free food? During the Mackenzie administration we had free soup kitchens in Canada. Is that the kind of free food they are going to give us?

In Canada the people produce their own food. They don't want free food. What will the farmers do if the people are to be given free food? And where will the Liberals get their free food? Not in the States? Free food is not free. Will they get free food in England? Certainly not. This talk of free food is simply absurd. If the Liberals are able to give us free food—if it is a good thing for us—why didn't they give us free food when they were in power?

If Mr. Fowler will continue this line of profound argument, and if the lead-

ers of his party will but continue to maintain the attitude disclosed by Mr. Hazen and Mr. Pelletier, and now by Mr. Fowler, the Liberal party will be content, whatever may be the feeling of the public. The Standard newspaper, from which we take this portion of Mr. Fowler's speech, says that the audience received it with marked enthusiasm. If the Standard is right the facts constitute an exceedingly grave reflection upon the intelligence of the audience; but no doubt the Standard is wrong. We cannot think it possible that any representative assembly of St. John Conservatives could regard with approbation any such "discussion" of the tariff as that which the Standard credits to Mr. Fowler.

In another part of his speech Mr. Fowler said that he "had not any use for a man who, being interested in politics, was afraid to oppose his party when he conscientiously believed it to be in the wrong because somebody might call him a turncoat." No doubt this is a direct endorsement of the course of certain members of the Borden Club who recently left that organization because it would not insist upon the government doing its duty with respect to the steamship question. If Mr. Fowler's words carry weight in the Conservative party here they will encourage some of the younger men who believe that the public interest should be set above partisan regularity.

Senator Daniel also spoke. The managers of Conservative meetings appear to make use of Senator Daniel as a sort of ponderous curtain-raiser or as a filler-in between acts. Mr. John E. Wilson, who was conspicuous at the public meetings held to protest against the diversion of the direct mail ships, praised Mr. Hazen and dwelt upon the importance of Imperial naval defence. Mr. Wilson is not the man he was three months ago. Borrowing some of the wisdom of Mr. Fowler, Mr. Woods said of the free food issue that "he did not think the people of St. John would expect the farmers to bring food here and give it to them for nothing." Mr. Woods, it will be perceived, has given the fiscal question profound study. His words prove it.

Set down in cold type in the Standard, much of what was said at this last Conservative meeting really looks rather foolish.

THE PANIC OF THE ALARMIST.

The excitement and nervousness that caused the panic in Dreadnought building in Britain, beginning in 1898, has almost completely subsided, and the reaction has set in. The excitement over the naval plans of Germany offered a rich field to the traders in war scares, and the agents of the armament ring found it possible, through the passion of the public, to lead governments into excesses.

But the condition has changed. Today there is no passion, and no panic. There is no fear of Germany, and certainly there is no disposition to pass estimates without subjecting them to the cold light of reason and critical intelligence. In Great Britain there is a general public protest against the engineers of panics which promises to go so far that the government is somewhat perturbed over it, and the officials and parasites who are interested in armament extension have themselves been thrown into a positive panic which is much more real than those they have been steadily engaged in manufacturing.

Mr. Borden's attempt to exploit the people and to lead the country into the wild dance of European militarism, is completely discredited. Even the itinerant showman with his lantern and his false pretences cannot galvanize it into new life. The attempt to use the Canadian Clubs to give Mr. Borden's panic a new lease of life is sufficiently impotent, but it has only revealed to the party leaders the need of a new shibboleth. The horrible picture of the German menace which shadowed the whole sky of Toryism has been eclipsed by returning sanity, and Mr. Borden's "medium" can catch no reflection of it.

The condition is rather hard on the men who "have mistaken a coffee-hall war for a social revolution," but these patriots will soon find themselves equipped for a new task, however subversive it may be of former tasks.

Now that the people of Britain are being called upon to pay for the excesses of the past few years of "scarcity," politicians are finding that the movement of the sensation-mongers has been like that of a man who uses a blunt knife with a sharp handle. In employing it upon a supposed enemy he severely wounds himself. This condition is brought out very clearly in the leading article of the Nation for last week. It says: "These estimates correspond to nothing in our policy and no great error in our diplomacy. They represent the megalomania of our Admiralty, and nothing more. What has happened during the shifting phases of this long controversy is that every intelligible standard of naval strength has disappeared in the effort by one formula or another to justify the continual increase. The Two-Power Standard had a meaning when we were building against France and Russia. Mr. Churchill's own standard of sixteen to ten against the next strongest power had a meaning while we were engaged in a duel with Germany. But this formula was hardly drafted before it was modified with reservations which withdrew the estimates from any possibility of measurement, and exposed us in Germany to charges of bad faith. First of all, the Colonial ships, even when they were offered as an integral part of the Imperial fleet, were put outside the reckonings. When the Canadian contributions became doubtful, a further step was taken by hinting that we should have to make it good. Three of this year's ships were accelerated on this pretext, and the same logic may lead, if the Canadian controversy is not promptly settled, to a proposal to build

substitutes ourselves above the sixteen to ten ratio. More elusive still was Mr. Churchill's statement last March that the Mediterranean and the Pacific lie outside this reckoning. Arrived at this point, we seem to be committed to the policy of building for each of the world's seas a separate fleet which can hold its own against any adversary within it. If our main fleet is confined to the single duty of confronting Germany, there is nothing to prevent the logical armistist from reminding us in turn not only that Austria and Italy are building Dreadnoughts, but that the United States is also a naval power, and that Japan is an ally pledged to us only till 1915. This reasoning, if it means anything at all, means a world standard, and a nearer reductio ad absurdum of the whole theory of armaments it would be impossible to invent."

THE CHURCH AND AMUSEMENTS

Lord Macaulay said that the Puritans hated beer-baiting not because it gave pain to the bear but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. Whether this correctly states the reason for their opposition or not, there is no doubt that they vigorously persecuted and condemned all amusements as sins against the soul.

While we have been busy confessing the sins of our ancestors in this we have worked our way to no clear opinion on the subject of amusements. From the churches a particular voice is raised occasionally in condemnation of the theatre and of dancing, to be followed by another in justification of the one or the other, or of both. Some churches are attempting to meet the deep and universal craving for impersonations of character and life by giving shows of their own—frequently awkward and cheap. Others condemn the stage and the green room without restraint, but the condemnation is generally uncritical and lacks authority. Church rules and social standards on the subject are in a state of confusion, full of contradictions and weaknesses.

The same uncertainty does not exist on the subject of books and reading. No one dares today against all novels without critical measurement. The wholesome are selected; those useful for children are indicated, and the mighty art of story-telling is used with sanity as a vehicle of noble sentiment. We scatter wide the products of the press, consign it to the express companies and mail carriers of the world, scatter it wide to the winds of heaven, like the seed-sower of the parable—falling, some of it by the waysides, some of it on stony ground, some of it among thorns, some on good soil where it brings forth a hundred-fold. We hunt down the polluted printed matter and consign it to the flames, and the conscience of the people justifies the most summary methods.

There is no reason why we should not arrive at just such clear and definite standards in relation to dramatic art. To condemn the stage wholesale is as reasonable as it would be to condemn the printing-press. At any rate, condemnation without discrimination reaches upon the speaker and robe him of moral influence. If the criticisms of the stage were given the same quality of study that has been given to fiction and dramatic writings, an intelligent and defensible standard could be built up that would command the respect of men and women everywhere. At present we have little consistent to say to youths, and our appeals are too often uncritical and without authority.

The world owes much to its great actors. Teachers with good taste and high purpose have been at work in every generation ministering to aesthetic enjoyment, and interpreting the meaning of form, color and expression. The heirs of the Puritans never quite forgave Shakespeare, the greatest soul since the prophets, for being an actor. But to try to picture the influence of Shakespeare for good, we would, in his own words, "need to borrow" Gargantuan mouth parts. His is a word too great for any mouth of this age's size.

Among the means toward a higher civilization the cultivation of wise amusements is a principal one. The evils of our life are great and increasing, but they do not lie altogether in the multiplication of pleasures. There is no doubt but that a great many men and women grossly mismanage their pleasures; and the amount of amusement expected by all classes has greatly increased in our generation. But the man who realizes the paths of human life and the variety of tastes, temptations, and characters, will hesitate much before attempting to abridge the sum of human enjoyment. He will even look with indulgent eye upon pleasures which are neither cultivated nor refined, provided they are not vicious. Life cannot be understood without much charity, and it cannot be lived without much charity. The first duty in the premises is not to condemn or to praise, but rather to understand. Lamp preached better sermons asking "What are trumps?" as he played cards with his father, than Coleridge asking: "What is truth?" The world itself is a stage, but unfortunately the actors cannot choose whether they will appear in tragedy or in comedy, whether they will suffer or make merry, laugh or shed tears.

In the inspired vision of that Paradise which men are seeking through the centuries, it is said: "The Lord made to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food." Evidently He recognized that beauty and aesthetic pleasure are at least as necessary as animal satisfaction.

It is the same thought that Sidney Lanier expresses when he says to trade, "the king of modern days," "Change thy ways, Change thy ways; Let the sweaty laborer lie A little while; Where art and nature sing and smile."

Conservatives who give thought to the fiscal question are not to be misled by the publication of wages paid in certain trades in Great Britain. They know that the value of a dollar is measured by what the dollar will buy where it is earned and spent. If the Standard will compare what a dollar will buy for the average workman in St. John and for

THE TROUBLE IN THE WEST.

While Canada generally is satisfied that the financial outlook has improved considerably during the last few weeks, and is likely to improve even more rapidly in the next few months, stories of lack of work and tightness of money continue to come from the western Canadian provinces. From several cities reports are telegraphed telling of trouble with the unemployed, in some cases including threats of violence and intention to destroy extensive public property.

Some little time ago the Manitoba Free Press reported that at Aberdeen, a town thirty miles from Saskatoon, the farmers had raised a fund to pay the fine of any farmer in that district found guilty of assaulting any agent of farm implement companies. The Free Press found that some agents had returned from this district, and refused to go back to it. Two or three cases of assault were reported, in which the assailants were found \$10 and costs, and the fines were paid out of a common fund. This trouble was said to have been sharpened by the case of a threshingman who bought an outfit from an implement company and had to pay his whole season's earnings on account of a judgment brought against him. His men sued for their wages, and as he had money he went to jail in default of paying up. The implement company is said to have paid these men's wages, which resulted in the threshingmen being set at liberty. Tight money and poor business evidently were responsible for this trouble.

Instances like this one, together with information recently published concerning the large number of farms in the West that are under mortgage, give the East some idea as to the conditions prevailing "out west" to-day. Tight money halted a great many speculative and semi-speculative transactions from the east-Manitoba line right through to the Coast. In the end it probably will be found that this interruption of speculation, while it is a present hardship, will be of benefit to the country.

These reports about trouble in the West do not mean that the Canadians of that district will not recover from the present setback. The West is a good country in many respects; it is receiving a great stream of immigration, and its people are energetic, optimistic and enterprising beyond most. They will shake the West an even greater country than it is.

At the same time, it is well for people living in the East to examine with care the advantages and disadvantages of this part of Canada before jumping to the conclusion that the West offers anything which cannot be had here in the same expenditure of energy, courage, or capital. The East is going to have its turn, full measure. Never doubt it.

SOME CONSERVATIVE LOGIC.

Probably the readers of the Standard are, on the average, nearly as intelligent as other New Brunswickers. Assuming that they are, it would seem to be a mistake policy for the Standard to address to them day after day arguments so evidently fallacious or dishonest that they cannot deceive the average person of average intelligence. For example, the Standard, after citing that low wages are paid in many trades in Great Britain, argues that these low wages explain why food prices are lower in Great Britain than they are in Canada, and asks the Canadian workmen how they would like to receive wages as low as those paid in the Old Country.

What the Standard should do is to explain to its readers why Canadian food, made in this country from Canadian wheat, is sold in Great Britain cheaper than it is sold in Canada. When it has done that, frankly and satisfactorily, the Standard might explain to its readers why Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, when he proposed a tariff for Great Britain, decided not to put any tariff on bacon since it was so largely used by the poorer classes who were unable to pay high prices. Mr. Chamberlain thus admitted (1) that the introduction of a duty would raise the home prices of such articles, and (2) that the tariff charges fall upon the consumer at home and not upon the outsider.

The main reason why food and many other necessities are cheaper in Great Britain than they are in Canada or the United States is that Great Britain draws its supplies from the world, buying in whatever market it can get the cheapest, and introducing its imports into the country without those charges at the gate which are imposed by Canada. The United States, taking a leaf out of Great Britain's book, recently reduced the duties on many articles of food, of clothing, and of building material, the idea being to dispense with unnecessary charges upon the daily lives of the people. Some Conservative journals have copied from protectionist papers in the United States assertions that the reduced duties have not in any way lowered the cost of living. These assertions are refuted by low tariff journals in the United States, though the precise results of the changes in the American tariff are not yet clear. A longer trial of the new system will be necessary, naturally, before the results can be analyzed correctly. Still, this fact already emerges, that the change in the tariff resulted in no such dislocation of business and no such national disaster as the protectionists predicted. It is clear, also, that the duties were useless, that there was no national necessity for them, and that they represented vicious class legislation.

The Standard is not to be misled by the publication of wages paid in certain trades in Great Britain. They know that the value of a dollar is measured by what the dollar will buy where it is earned and spent. If the Standard will compare what a dollar will buy for the average workman in St. John and for the average workman living in a town of similar size in Great Britain it will give its readers some idea as to the comparative value of wages there and here. Also, we do not notice that anyone has proposed to reduce Canadian wages to the general level obtaining in the United Kingdom, or to change the standard of living existing among Canadians.

The Standard publishes from the Toronto Globe part of an editorial commenting upon the number of live cattle entering the United States from Canada, and says that the Globe "sees in the new movement a great danger to the agricultural industry of Ontario, and to the Dominion in general." What the Globe really said was that the situation could only be redressed by Canada following the example of Great Britain and of the United States in permitting its consumers to buy articles of necessity without penalizing them through the tariff. In other words, the Globe is merely repeating what Mr. Chamberlain said when he proposed exempting bacon from his tariff.

Liberals everywhere will be pleased to note increasing evidence that the government of the day intends to stand pat on the tariff. This is bad for the country, but only temporarily. From the government, which is a creature of the protected interests, no tariff relief was to be expected. The sooner the government makes known in Parliament its decision to continue the duties on necessities, the sooner will the country see the wisdom of calling to office men who will do justice in tariff matters to the whole population. The harder Mr. Borden stands pat the quicker he must fall. On the one big issue in Canadian politics today he and his backers and associates are fighting against the common good. As the proof of this becomes plainer the government cannot live.

The next stage in the development is going on at present. The laborers, abandoning all hope of improvement, are taking revenge on their masters by leaving the countryside and escaping to the city, or to foreign countries. There is a heavy exodus of all young and able-bodied who possess confidence in themselves. They pour in an ever increasing flood from the deserted fields into the streets of the town. Land is passing from arable to pasture, from pasture to scanty sheep runs, and changes radical and drastic are creating an England today different from anything the past has known. Of one thing, the present government is convinced, that is, of the necessity of restoring the people to their lands, on which at present they move as aliens. This appears to be the most inconsistent note of all social advances.

NOTE AND COMMENT.
Toronto street railway earned (gross) \$8,024,408 in 1913, or \$856,908 more than in 1912. The city's share was \$994,070.

The new dry docks at Levis and Esquimaux are to be 1,150 feet long. An Ottawa dispatch says one of this length is to be built at Halifax.

When the tax bills come—and they are coming soon—citizens will be reminded that tax reform has got sidetracked once more. No Somers system of valuation; no decision to drop the old plan; no movement toward the exemption of improvements.

Winter has begun in earnest; but it will be a short winter. The mild weather up to Christmas time produces that effect. The days are already gaining length, and sixty days more will bring signs of spring. A mild December in this region leaves us with a short three-months winter ahead, and it flies.

Have the Mayor and Commissioners sufficient influence with the street railway directors to bring about the use of colored lights at night to indicate the routes of the cars? In cold or rainy weather citizens have to halt one car after another at night in order to learn its destination. The expense of making the change would be trifling. To remove the flat wheels from some of the cars would not cost much more.

It is estimated that during the past year American men and women have given for educational and philanthropic purposes in sums exceeding \$5,000 a total amount of \$80,000,000. While rejoicing in such generous outpouring of wealth, one cannot help feeling that it would be a good deal better if some people did not have so much money to give away, and others did not depend upon such benefactions. There must be an economy screw loose somewhere.—Ottawa Citizen.

It is said that the income tax, beginning with incomes of \$4,000 a year, will not affect ninety-eight per cent. of the people of the United States. If ninety-eight per cent. earn less than \$4,000 a year it may be surmised that the number earning less than \$1,000 a year is very great.

Sir John Willison, Canadian correspondent of the London Times and editor of the Toronto News, is suing the Toronto Mail and Empire for libel because it says he called a false announcement of the death of Sir James P. Whitney to London. The knight says the Mail is a slanderer, to which the Mail replies that it will be glad of a chance to substantiate its charge in court. The row indicates a previous quarrel between these Conservative newspapers. No man in his senses would cable a false report of Sir James Whitney's death; but, on the other hand, what man in his senses would accuse Sir John Willison of doing so unless the evidence at hand seemed to warrant it? There must be a mistake somewhere.

Alfred H. Fried, winner of the Nobel peace prize, who is the editor of a Vienna newspaper, says the Balkan war immensely increased the burden of the great Powers in the matter of armaments. He adds: "The problem of European armaments, however, is not the only one affected by the war. Its tremendous economic importance can be established from the fact that at the Berlin Exchange alone the losses due to a slump in the money market amounted to \$1,100,000,000 marks (\$1,000,000,000). In other words, the Berlin Exchange paid for the Balkan War with a sum exceeding the French war indemnity of 1871. The other financial centres of Europe suffered similarly."

The Westminster Gazette, which is regarded as enjoying the confidence of the Asquith ministry, denies that there is a split in the cabinet over the naval estimates. It says: "Mr. Lloyd George is not in violent disagreement with Mr. Churchill nor is he in favor of reducing the navy beyond the standard which the First Lord has laid down, the sixteen to ten standard in Dreadnoughts. Mr. Lloyd George is merely repeating what every Liberal statesman has always said. It is to be hoped the continental press will not pay too much attention to the latest attempt to create a new scare at a time when Mr. Bonar Law has been sadly reflecting upon the Unionist prospects of victory at the polls are of the gloomiest description. How lovely it would be to have a split in the Liberal party which would make the navy a Unionist asset. Mr. Lloyd George's position, as we read it, is that the statesmanship of the world shall turn the situation to the advantage of the growing taxpayer. There is not the smallest question of our doing anything to endanger national security."

A New Brunswick protectionist journal discovered the other day that the United States eats more fish than it produces, and asked with an air of triumph what possible reason could exist for moving the Canadian duty on fish. The Montreal Telegraph replies by asking two questions arising out of the other: (1) If there are no supplies to be had from the United States, and therefore there is no need for protecting the home

FAVORABLE FISH MARKET.

market, why are the duties on fish retained at a time when the government procures a surplus of \$55,000,000? (2) If there is no American fish that could be brought into Canada under a free fish policy, what can be thought of the Conservative organization, which two years ago flooded the fishing districts of the Lower Provinces with campaign literature telling the fishermen that if reciprocity carried the American fishermen would be given control of the markets of Canada and the home market of the Canadian fishermen destroyed? After hundreds, probably thousands, of fishermen on the Atlantic coast have been induced by such representations to vote against reciprocity, what will they think now when Conservative journals declare that, duty or no duty, the American fish will not come into Canada?

About the time Mr. Ames was preaching the Boykin policy to the St. John Canadian Club, Mr. Z. A. Lash took up the same question before the Toronto Canadian Club. The Toronto Globe thinks Mr. Lash was no more successful there than Mr. Ames was here. It says: "A sure sign of trepidation was the part of the Borden government was the skillful 'apology' put up yesterday by the Canadian Club for the deferred if not defeated proposal of last session by Mr. Z. A. Lash. He began with a strenuous and insistent disclaimer of partisanship, but his ingeniously constructed plea for a renewal of the thirty-five million grant was prepared and delivered by a sophisticated party pleader. His starting-point was the resolution adopted unanimously by the House of Commons in 1909, and his constant purpose was to read between its lines all that the Borden government proposed to do last session and all that it has promised to do hereafter in the way of submitting to the people of Canada a matured national naval policy. It would have been passing strange if a really non-partisan pleader to omit all reference to the agreement of 1909 between Canada and Australia to put each a fleet unit on the Pacific Ocean for the defence of the Empire in that part of the world, there was nothing strange in Mr. Lash's overlooking it because to mention it would have recalled the fact that the agreement had in 1909 the approval of the British Admiralty, and that its sanction, voluntarily given, has never been withdrawn, as well as the further fact that Australia has completed her unit, while Canada has done nothing yet but enact the Naval Service Act of 1910. Some better arguments than his will have to be found if the people of Canada are to be convinced of the expediency, not to say the necessity, of making a huge cash contribution to the enlargement of the British navy."

THE SPADE AND THE SWORD.
In the report of the English Land Inquiry Committee, Dr. Gilbert Slater says that private ownership in land rests ultimately on one of two claims, the claim of the spade or the claim of the sword. Right through the history of England these two claims have competed for recognition.

In a most interesting historical outline of the development of land ownership in England, he indicates the different phases of this double struggle. The principle of private ownership is associated with intensive cultivation, and the ancient European home of this principle is in Italy, where the sides of hills and mountains are fashioned into rectangular ridges with stone walls supporting the treasured soil. It rests there clearly on the fact that cultivable land is the product of skilled and toilsome labor. The principle of collective ownership is associated with pastoral life and the great plains of the north. In Russia the large community still practices the principle of periodic redistribution of the land, held fields in spite of the pressure of the Imperial Government in the direction of individual ownership.

At the time of Domesday, the size of the holdings of individuals in land was determined by their ability to cultivate. The owner of two oxen was entitled to about thirty acres of arable land with a proportionate share of pasture; the owner of one ox, to but half as much, and the man who possessed but his own hands to five or six acres. Only a small minority of villagers were wealthy enough to equip their ploughs without the assistance of their neighbors, accordingly ploughing was a co-operative enterprise, and the various village ploughs, under the charge of the village ploughman, day by day turned over the soil for the ploughmen in rotation. In consequence, each man's holding consisted of a series of few or many in number, of acres or half acres, each a furrow long (furlong) and two to four rods wide. The owner of a strip of land was the owner of the crop on it only. After the corn was harvested it became a common pasture, while the fallow field was a common pasture all the year.

The interesting question is as to how the lord of the manor acquired his position of influence and importance. The Norman Conquest did not create the lord of the manor; it simply substituted Norman for Saxon lords. The answer is that he acquired it chiefly through war. It was the necessity of providing for the defence of the country, in the terrible struggle with the Danes, that made the institution of manorial lords almost universal under the Saxon kings. The peasants then made a bargain whereby they gave half their labor, and in consequence half the products of the village lands, to obtain protection from foreign enemies and internal disorder. "Either as defender or as conqueror, then, the lord of the manor held land by the claim of the sword, while the villagers, right was based on his ability or willingness to till the soil."

The lord of the manor in these early days was not simply a holder of property—he has become that through historic development. He was a man holding an important office, and the products of the soil which he received were simply to enable him to discharge his duties. He was responsible for local administration, for the maintenance of roads and bridges, for the execution of justice and the prevention of crime.

Step by step the grip of the peasants on the land was loosened, and the basis of their prosperity was made more insecure. The lords of the manor neglected the duties that first attached to their position, and regarded themselves as mere landlords exacting rents from their tenants. In the eighteenth century they found themselves strong enough to begin the great series of private acts of enclosure by which many millions of acres were enclosed and made private property—some through acts of parliament and as much more without any act

or legal justification whatsoever. The next stage in the development is going on at present. The laborers, abandoning all hope of improvement, are taking revenge on their masters by leaving the countryside and escaping to the city, or to foreign countries. There is a heavy exodus of all young and able-bodied who possess confidence in themselves. They pour in an ever increasing flood from the deserted fields into the streets of the town. Land is passing from arable to pasture, from pasture to scanty sheep runs, and changes radical and drastic are creating an England today different from anything the past has known. Of one thing, the present government is convinced, that is, of the necessity of restoring the people to their lands, on which at present they move as aliens. This appears to be the most inconsistent note of all social advances.

NOTE AND COMMENT.
Toronto street railway earned (gross) \$8,024,408 in 1913, or \$856,908 more than in 1912. The city's share was \$994,070.

The new dry docks at Levis and Esquimaux are to be 1,150 feet long. An Ottawa dispatch says one of this length is to be built at Halifax.

When the tax bills come—and they are coming soon—citizens will be reminded that tax reform has got sidetracked once more. No Somers system of valuation; no decision to drop the old plan; no movement toward the exemption of improvements.

Winter has begun in earnest; but it will be a short winter. The mild weather up to Christmas time produces that effect. The days are already gaining length, and sixty days more will bring signs of spring. A mild December in this region leaves us with a short three-months winter ahead, and it flies.

Have the Mayor and Commissioners sufficient influence with the street railway directors to bring about the use of colored lights at night to indicate the routes of the cars? In cold or rainy weather citizens have to halt one car after another at night in order to learn its destination. The expense of making the change would be trifling. To remove the flat wheels from some of the cars would not cost much more.

It is estimated that during the past year American men and women have given for educational and philanthropic purposes in sums exceeding \$5,000 a total amount of \$80,000,000. While rejoicing in such generous outpouring of wealth, one cannot help feeling that it would be a good deal better if some people did not have so much money to give away, and others did not depend upon such benefactions. There must be an economy screw loose somewhere.—Ottawa Citizen.

It is said that the income tax, beginning with incomes of \$4,000 a year, will not affect ninety-eight per cent. of the people of the United States. If ninety-eight per cent. earn less than \$4,000 a year it may be surmised that the number earning less than \$1,000 a year is very great.

Sir John Willison, Canadian correspondent of the London Times and editor of the Toronto News, is suing the Toronto Mail and Empire for libel because it says he called a false announcement of the death of Sir James P. Whitney to London. The knight says the Mail is a slanderer, to which the Mail replies that it will be glad of a chance to substantiate its charge in court. The row indicates a previous quarrel between these Conservative newspapers. No man in his senses would cable a false report of Sir James Whitney's death; but, on the other hand, what man in his senses would accuse Sir John Willison of doing so unless the evidence at hand seemed to warrant it? There must be a mistake somewhere.

Alfred H. Fried, winner of the Nobel peace prize, who is the editor of a Vienna newspaper, says the Balkan war immensely increased the burden of the great Powers in the matter of armaments. He adds: "The problem of European armaments, however, is not the only one affected by the war. Its tremendous economic importance can be established from the fact that at the Berlin Exchange alone the losses due to a slump in the money market amounted to \$1,100,000,000 marks (\$1,000,000,000). In other words, the Berlin Exchange paid for the Balkan War with a sum exceeding the French war indemnity of 1871. The other financial centres of Europe suffered similarly."

The Westminster Gazette, which is regarded as enjoying the confidence of the Asquith ministry, denies that there is a split in the cabinet over the naval estimates. It says: "Mr. Lloyd George is not in violent disagreement with Mr. Churchill nor is he in favor of reducing the navy beyond the standard which the First Lord has laid down, the sixteen to ten standard in Dreadnoughts. Mr. Lloyd George is merely repeating what every Liberal statesman has always said. It is to be hoped the continental press will not pay too much attention to the latest attempt to create a new scare at a time when Mr. Bonar Law has been sadly reflecting upon the Unionist prospects of victory at the polls are of the gloomiest description. How lovely it would be to have a split in the Liberal party which would make the navy a Unionist asset. Mr. Lloyd George's position, as we read it, is that the statesmanship of the world shall turn the situation to the advantage of the growing taxpayer. There is not the smallest question of our doing anything to endanger national security."

A New Brunswick protectionist journal discovered the other day that the United States eats more fish than it produces, and asked with an air of triumph what possible reason could exist for moving the Canadian duty on fish. The Montreal Telegraph replies by asking two questions arising out of the other: (1) If there are no supplies to be had from the United States, and therefore there is no need for protecting the home

FAVORABLE FISH MARKET.

market, why are the duties on fish retained at a time when the government procures a surplus of \$55,000,000? (2) If there is no American fish that could be brought into Canada under a free fish policy, what can be thought of the Conservative organization, which two years ago flooded the fishing districts of the Lower Provinces with campaign literature telling the fishermen that if reciprocity carried the American fishermen would be given control of the markets of Canada and