

pessimists to use the words "degenerate" and "decadent" with regard to modern physical and moral conditions in the British Isles, and it is not a manly course of denunciation to overwork either adjective. **It is not well for either a nation or an individual to hear constantly about failure, and wrong-doing, for there is a point where humiliation becomes enervation and blank discouragement.** Let us look on the bright side of our civilisation if we want to get strength for the day's work. It is better to look to the Milners and Cromers than to dwell upon the Unemployable. Admit our shortcomings, by all means, but make a national fit of the blues of wholesome brevity.

THE DICKENS' PENSIONS.

PERHAPS the fact that the British Parliament has granted a pension of two-dollars-and-a-half a week to each of the four grand-children of Charles Dickens—Mary Angela Dickens and her three sisters—will do more than any abstract discussion to amend the copyright laws. There is no British writer whose works are dearer to a great community of readers than Charles Dickens. His characters are more real to us than the people whom we meet every day, his "fellowships" are known wherever the Anglo-Saxon has set up a tent. Some years ago, an edition de luxe of the Dickens' novels was published, for the first set of which Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan is said to have paid one hundred thousand dollars. Yet the grand-daughters of the novelist are none the richer for the immense yearly sale of these books of world-wide fame. Had Charles Dickens owned real estate, instead of becoming proprietor of castles in the Dreamland of Letters, his descendants would hardly have been pensioners on parliamentary bounty. The situation is such as to rebuke poignantly the legislators who have regarded the copyright laws with indifference. Had these been of proper scope there would have been no necessity for the pension which looks more like an act of charity than an act of justice. While everyone will feel that this sum is rightly appropriated, there cannot but arise a resentment at the circumstances which give the works of such writers as Dickens over to the publisher. We are eternal debtors to the author of "David Copperfield," and the impoverished state of these descendants looks like a public reproach.

FRITH.

THE HAND BOOK

AMONG the unadulterated curses of modern horse-racing the hand book wins by a city block. It is worse than the old-time pool room. It permeates every fibre of the social and business structure. It shows its ugly head on the glossy as well as the seamy side of life. It bobs up serenely just where you least expect it, and there is not a

single phase of city life that is not affected directly or indirectly by it.

With the late lamented Mr. Tweed, it is in order to ask: "What are we going to do about it?" Under the circumstances (the more's the pity) we can only say, "The best we can." There is nothing to be said, morally or in any other way, in favour of the hand book, except, perhaps, that it exists, like many other undesirable things, **because there is a public demand for it.** People want to bet their money on horse-racing as well as on the rise and fall of stocks or wheat. More than this, the percentage of the game is so overwhelmingly in favour of the layer of the odds, that human cupidity is aroused to a more than ordinary pitch. There always will be a certain contingent which keeps chasing the spectre of "getting something for nothing" through the moral and financial graveyard.

Horse-racing is dead to stay dead in Chicago, erstwhile the best racing town in the world. The war between the pool rooms and hand books on the one side, and the race track managers on the other, killed it. When it became possible for any whippersnapper of a clerk to plunge into a cigar store and get his bet down at "ticker odds," the tracks started a war. The pool rooms and hand books joined the issue, the track gates were closed to stay closed and the open pool room went out of commission also. But the hand book stayed and flourished. When the lid was supposed to be clamped down so tight that not even a ten-dollar note could be slipped under it, there were dozens of places where money might be bet at any hour of the day or night. Occasionally some deluded loser would "squeal," or the police would get wise all of a sudden, and then there would be a raid, a ride in the waggon, a fine next morning, and the game would go merrily on as before. It goes that way to-day, and what one municipality can do with it another can, no more and no less. It is a factor to be dealt with by the police. Public sentiment is the only weapon at all competent to cope with the hand book.

At least partial suppression of this curse of sport is within the power of the police, when backed by public sentiment, and within that alone. If the police make a business of locating the hand books and the magistrates inflict the penalty of imprisonment—not fine—on those who are brought before them charged with handbooking, the evil will be reduced to a minimum. If the strictures in the public press are well founded, the police force must know of the hand book in Toronto. If it does, let it be held to a strict account. History tells us that many raids on betting rings on race courses have originated in the hand-booking fraternity, invariably a dog-in-the-manger, rule-or-ruin sect. In the British House of Commons, Sir Boyle Roche once remarked: "I smell a rat; I see him brewing in the air, but, mark me, I shall yet nip him in the bud." It will be well if public sentiment aids the police to "get" the hand book before the hand book "gets" the sport of horse-racing.

J. H. S. J.

LORD BERESFORD'S VIEWS

AS Lord Charles Beresford is to be in Canada in September and will speak to several audiences, it will be interesting to many persons to know his views on the present naval situation. His most recent speech was delivered in London on Wednesday, June 30th, and the *Daily Mail* reports it as follows:

Lord Charles Beresford spoke of the grave warnings given by Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, and Mr. Balfour. What the people wanted now was a definite programme to achieve the patriotic determinations expressed. "If we adopt a shipbuilding programme now I am inclined to think that the wild and insane competition now proceeding between the naval powers will cease. The position is more serious than is generally known, but that is no reason for panic or hysteria, or for small party recriminations. Our policy must be on big, broad, national lines. Party differences have nothing to do with national defence." (Cheers.)

The main causes of the serious state of affairs now existing were three in number: (1) Large arrears in shipbuilding, (2) false economies, and (3) the absence of a proper strategical department of the Admiralty to keep us quietly abreast of our warlike needs. "I deplore the ridiculous situation in which we have placed ourselves with regard to Germany. We humiliated ourselves by imploring Germany not to go on with her shipbuilding programme because we wanted our own money for social reform; then, when Germany looked after her own business we insulted her by describing her action as treacherous, cowardly, underhand, and unscrupulous."

After a reference to his former success in drafting a shipbuilding programme Lord Charles Beres-

ford advanced another, which (he says) has been drawn up with the assistance of friends whose knowledge of war and shipbuilding is supreme.

The programme, intended to be completed by March 31st, 1914, is as follows:

Battleships (including the extra four, which the Unionists are now demanding)	10
Second-class cruisers	18
Commerce-protection cruisers	18
Destroyers of a new and enlarged type	24
Docks	4
Extra men	16,000
Restoration of depleted stores, coal supply and ammunition.	
Total cost from £55,000,000 to £60,000,000.	

"This country possesses forty battleships of pre-Dreadnought types. Many of us think they are better ships than the *Dreadnought*. In any case they are excellent ships. Yet these lunatics declare that we have got to scrap them!"

"What do the wild men want? They have created this insane competition, and now they want us to lay down two *Dreadnoughts* for every one laid down by Germany. That would land us in an expenditure of eighty-four millions sterling on *Dreadnoughts* alone before the present German programme ended. And it would make not the smallest provision for other units of the fleet. Yet a fleet of *Dreadnoughts* without cruisers and scouts and destroyers is like an army consisting entirely of heavy artillery without cavalry or infantry.

"It is true that the proposal I make does not allow for the possibility of German acceleration, nor for the proposed laying down of four *Dread-*

noughts by Austria. Let us talk about those things when they happen, not before. The policy of the Admiralty is wrong. It has been dictated by false economy, and does not make your fleet efficient, or anything like it. When the controversy started this country possessed a four-power standard in big ships. At the present rate we shall scarcely have a one-power standard in 1914. But if these wild men had their way they would run us into an expenditure of 200 millions sterling and bankrupt the country."

Lord Charles Beresford spoke in detail of his other proposals. He wants fifty-two more destroyers, bringing the total up to 134. The new boats must be swift and strong, for North Sea work; many of the destroyers we possess were designed with France in our eye. Docks on the North Sea are of the first importance. By providing opportunities for cleaning keels they may make a difference of four knots in the speed of our vessels.

Seamen should be obtained at once, for it takes six years to train a seaman-gunner and a lifetime to train a capable officer. The Royal Marines, who have the admiration of the entire fleet, are broken-hearted at the prospect of being snuffed out of existence. So are the coastguards.

One resolution was carried amid applause declaring the Government programme inadequate, and another requesting the Chamber of Commerce to consider Lord Charles' address with a view to vigorous action by the chambers of commerce of the Empire. A third urged "upon the leaders of the parliamentary parties the desirability of co-operation with a view to such measures or votes being passed as will provide the necessary money, whether by loan or otherwise."