

London Advertiser

The Advertiser was established in 1863, and is published four times daily by London Advertiser Company Limited. The subscription rates are: London, 15 cents weekly, 25 cents monthly, 50 cents quarterly, 1 dollar 50 cents yearly; in the United States, 25 cents weekly, 50 cents monthly, 1 dollar 50 cents quarterly, 5 dollars yearly.

The Advertiser is represented in Toronto at 95 King street east, and in Montreal at 117 Transportation Building, by J. B. Hathorne, in New York at 247 Park avenue, in Chicago at 122 South Michigan avenue, and in Boston at 224 Washington street, by C. H. Eddy Co.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 12, 1924.

SUNSHINE AND SHADOW.

Rt. Hon. Arthur Meighen at London, Jan. 11:

"Capital is timid; business is in a case of stagnation and we have retrogression instead of advance."

John J. Scully, general manager of the C. P. R., at Toronto, Jan. 11:

"More business will be done by the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1924 than the splendid record of 1923. Business conditions at present are quite satisfactory. I believe, in addition, that we will shortly see an improvement. I do not hold with those who prophesy business depression in this country. There is too much of that sort of thing. What we need is more confidence and more co-operation."

Mr. Meighen the Same.

The Meighen banquet in London was a success. The crowd was large and enthusiastic, the speeches fiery and to the taste of the Conservative school of thought.

Mr. Meighen has not changed; he cannot. He is the best nagger in public life in Canada. High priest of the school of blue ruin, he had nothing constructive. His whole plea was "If you do not elect a Conservative government in Canada, you will be ruined."

One or two of Mr. Meighen's statements are typical of the burden of his address:

"The tariff situation is at the bottom of the commercial stagnation that today pervades the country. Our tariff every session is determined by a process of log-rolling and bargaining designed to get Progressive votes. Capital is timid; business is in a case of stagnation and we have retrogression instead of advance."

The answer is that the Progressives voted almost to a man against the government on the budget. Mr. Meighen knows that; he was in the house when it took place.

He pays a mighty mean tribute to the people of Canada, who, facing a huge debt, the consolidation of a railway system that was bankrupt, but now fighting its way back to success, are able to show increasing trade returns month after month.

"Business is in a state of stagnation." That is the message that this Jeremiah of the Conservatives has inscribed on the banner he has been trailing from province to province. That is the whine that he harped on until the people of Western Canada were longing for the day when he would close his campaign of gloom and depart. That is the message he brings to Ontario. "Business is in a state of stagnation." Ontario will thank Mr. Meighen heartily if he will hang his crepe elsewhere.

Statement No. 2 from the Conservative leader:

"This Dominion under free trade would be a mere commercial servitude to the great republic to the south, and the vast mass of the people of this country know it now."

Mr. Meighen is the one person talking free trade.

The King government is not talking free trade.

Mr. Meighen has sat across from its members in the house for two years, and he cannot, dare not, say that they are free traders, or that they have moved in that direction. And yet, for political purposes, addressing a body of men who are inclined toward a high tariff, he seeks to leave the impression that there is a free trade movement on by the government at Ottawa.

Mr. Meighen is capable of better things. He has a wide knowledge of Canadian and world affairs, an easy command of good language, and the faculty of presenting a case well. With these qualities he should be able to speak constructively and advise positively. But he does not, and therefore we take it that he cannot. His only cure is in the following:

"The Conservative party, which in days gone by has been called upon, and never in vain, to rescue Canada from conditions such as this, will soon come to office, and come to office unhampered, unshackled, unburdened by dishonest commitments which it cannot fulfill, but free and able to serve the people of this Dominion."

Old political clap-net. This apostle of "business stagnation" has nothing new to offer. He has not budged from the path he travelled when the people of Canada turned him out bag and baggage in December of 1921.

Not Selling Out.

An effort is being made to show that the Liberal party at Ottawa is prepared to hoist the free trade flag in order to get the Progressives to come over and support the government. There is hardly a despatch leaving Ottawa that does not try in some way or other to stress this point.

An effort is being made to create a feeling of misgiving in the mind of the business world that there will be a quick move at tariff readjustment in order to satisfy the west.

Premier King made it very plain in his election addresses that any industry making a legitimate profit had no reason to fear his ministry. He has lived up to that promise, and there is nothing to indicate that he has any intention of departing from that position.

At the basis of any tariff there must be common sense, and a facing of actual conditions. Whether political parties say so or not, a tariff comes into existence to raise revenue, and revenue is necessary because money is being spent.

A tariff for revenue becomes a tariff of protection. The more taxes a government finds it necessary to take from the people, the greater the protection afforded.

Apart altogether from the theory of taxation, Canada has to consider her own case. She came out of the war with a debt, the size of which few appreciate. In order to provide for that and the expenses of administration it is necessary to have very positive methods of getting the money, and so it is that Canada has both direct and indirect taxation.

Living as we do beside United States, our choice in the matter of tariffs is somewhat taken away from us. If we had no tariff and the United States maintained its present wall, it would mean that nearly all our purchasing would be done in United States. Even as it is, in form produce we are trading on an unequal basis. Canada ships a pound of butter to United States, and the tariff is eight cents per pound; a pound of butter comes to Canada and we levy four cents. Cheese from Canada entering United States is subject to a tax of five cents per pound, and this must be equal to 25 per cent of its value; cheese coming from United States to Canada pays three cents, regardless of its value.

When Canada ships wheat across the line it is taxed 30 cents per bushel, and there is a demand to make it 45 cents. Were Canadians to bring in wheat from the States the levy would be 12 cents per bushel. If the wheat is made into flour it goes to the market to the south at 78 cents per hundredweight; in case it were coming north we would let it in at 60 cents.

The extent to which the United States tariff has hurt us can be seen in figures. Take cattle, which prior to May 27, 1921, entered United States free. In November of 1921 Canada exported \$9,577,067; in November of 1923, \$734,204. The difference is between a free market and one that now levies a tax of 1½ cents per pound on animals of 1,050 pounds, and two cents over that, amounting to about a 25 per cent rate. In November of 1921 Canada sent to the U. S. market 26,952 sheep, duty free; in the same month of 1923 we sent in 9,096, less than one-quarter of the 1921 shipment. The reason is a \$2 per head tax instead of a free market.

Ottawa is pledged to be ready to discuss a mutual trading arrangement with Washington when the latter is ready. Until that time arrives, there is little she can do in that direction. We cannot take down bars while United States piles them up.

Back of it all stands world conditions. Europe—sick, tired, hard up to the point of starvation—cannot buy. She hands out her crumpled and discredited currency, but it means nothing to us—it has no power.

In such circumstances it would be easy to start tariff changes on the poor policy of doing something. The King government is not to be caught up with any such ill-thought idea. The premier himself knows world conditions, and any tariff change he sanctions will certainly be in the direction of giving relief to Canadians without working a hardship on any section of them.

For Sick Animals.

The movement for the establishment of an animal hospital in London in connection with the Humane Society is commendable.

At present there is no place for a sick dog, horse, or other animal, where it can be left and properly treated.

The result is that those who own them, and know little of such matters, do the best they can, which may be good, bad or indifferent.

The cost of such a building should not be excessive, and it should be almost self-supporting after started.

CAN EUROPE HOLD TOGETHER?

Chapter V.: "England's Problems."

This series of articles is a simple but accurate explanation of world conditions, from the point of view of a distinguished specialist. These articles are the result of his most recent tour of Europe, made especially for securing the data—a trip on which he visited sixteen countries, talked with the premiers of half of them and the finance ministers of twelve, and in field observations secured a mass of facts. Mr. Sinclair says finance and economics can be told so simply a child can grasp them. His articles prove his claim.

By JOHN F. SINCLAIR.

England was king in the international trade of the world in 1913. Sixty-two per cent of the total trade was with other countries. Her currency was sound and inflexible. By this I mean her total governmental expenditures were paid each year by receipts from taxation. She had a density of 371 people per square mile, against 313 for Italy, 311 for Germany, and 191 for France, yet in 1914 her per capita income was \$243, as against \$181 for Italy, \$146 for Germany and \$185 in France. She had then outstanding 223 millions of dollars of bank notes, and 144 millions of dollars of gold reserve. In other words, for every dollar of notes outstanding she had 64 cents of gold to pay with.

During the war she increased her circulating bank notes to 2,333 millions of dollars, while her gold reserve was only increased to 383 millions of dollars. To put it in another way, her circulating bank notes increased during the war 10½ times, while the gold reserve increased only 1½ times. For every dollar of bank notes outstanding at the end of 1913 she had only 16½ cents in gold to pay with. On July 1, 1914, the circulation was equal to \$184, for every person in England. On October 15, 1919, it was \$50.62.

What happened? With a far greater increase in money than of goods, the prices of articles went up and the purchasing value of the money went down. Taking the average wholesale prices in July, 1914, as 100, we find that the prices for the same articles averaged in 1915, at the close of war, 232. That is to say, and due chiefly to inflating the currency, an article which cost \$100 in 1914 cost \$232 in 1915.

War Cost 75 Per Cent—Borrowed.

In spite of the fact that England during the war raised more money than any other European belligerent by taxation, still she was forced to borrow money for 75 per cent of her total war expenditures. To put it more concretely, Britain spent 41,900 millions of dollars exclusively for the war, and raised 7,730 millions of dollars by taxation. Every dollar spent for war she raised 23 cents from total taxes. The difference, 34,170 millions, plus another 1½ millions of dollars for expenses of government other than for war, she raised by borrowing money and by inflating her currency.

How did she raise the 36,000 millions of dollars, 97 per cent of which the mighty moolah of war demanded? 1. By selling her Liberty Bonds and increasing her national indebtedness from 3,165 millions of dollars to 27,221 millions of dollars, more than 1,100 per cent.

2. By increasing her note issue, as stated above, from 230 millions of dollars to 2,333 millions.

It was easier to stretch the war than to stop inflation. Prices continued

to rise with every new issue of money. The increase in the note circulation increases the floating debt of the state, which issues treasury bills to replace bank notes, and in addition leads to the depreciation of the currency. Inflation is theft by the state. Who gets the money so stolen? The nation as a whole is neither richer nor poorer as a result of the increase of note circulation, just as in the case of the increase of the domestic debt. However, in both cases, the owners of war industries are enriched at the expense of the wage earning, salaried and bond-holding classes.

\$10,000 SHRINKS TO \$3,000.

By 1920 the wholesale index figure was standing at 307, as against 100 in 1914. Let us suppose that in June, 1914, an Englishman died, leaving \$10,000 of life insurance to his wife and three small children. She, on the recommendation of a reliable trust company, reinvests her money in a splendid high-grade municipal bond, maturing in 1920, netting 4 per cent interest. The transaction is completed and she received her money in 1920. But with the \$10,000 she can only get \$3,010 worth of goods in 1920. For her industry and thrift she loses \$7,000. This is not over-drawn. It is a true illustration of what has happened to the great majority of the most insidious ones within a nation during such times, inflation is the most disastrous.

Since the war England has been trying to regain her lost ground. She has tried deflation. She has decreased her paper currency from the high mark by almost 20 per cent, or 440 millions of dollars. But it has been accompanied by the worst industrial depression in her entire history. Appalling bankruptcies, increasing unemployment, the English social and industrial order has been shaken to its very foundation. The wage workers today, the second most successful class in the world, demand a reduction of the domestic debt by a capital levy on swollen fortunes. They declare they cannot support the overhead tax and maintenance of the standard of living. One or the other must go. Unemployment government does now equal one million dollars a day. The number of men out of work of work has increased 130,000 during the last 30 days as this is written, and winter is coming. So is hunger and suffering and death! The government, harassed by the Board of Living, and the breakdown of international trade, is faced with the greatest problem ever faced by a great power. How can she come back?

(Copyright, 1923, in U. S. and Great Britain by North American Newspaper Alliance. All rights reserved.)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Advertiser welcomes letters discussing matters of public interest. It is necessary, that the name of the writer be sent as an evidence of good faith, but not necessarily for publication.

The C. O. C. F. Rates

Londoner, a member for Thirty Years Tells What He Has To Say To Keep His Policy.

Editor of The Advertiser: Sir: Your correspondent, "Forester," throws discredit upon the statement of an earlier correspondent that the Canadian Order of Chosen Friends has raised its insurance rates for some old members to \$7 a month per thousand of insurance.

Well "Forester" is wrong. I have been a member of the C. O. C. F. for about 30 years and am now 67 years of age. I am insured for \$2,000 and my January payment, made a fortnight ago, was \$14.05, of which \$13.50 was the assessment for insurance and the remainder was council dues.

A CHOSEN FRIEND.

Our Dumb Animals.

Much Could Be Done To Alleviate Suffering By A Hospital Where They Could Be Treated.

Editor of The Advertiser: Sir:—Several letters have been published in your valuable paper on the subject of getting a hospital for animals in London.

I am open in the first place for comment by the other citizens of London who have inquired from the Humane Society about first aid, for animals, and can safely say that I have in three cases always got first class information through him, or assistance got through him, in regard to the care of animals.

But to have a proper hospital, attached to the Humane Society where animals could be taken to and attended to in a proper way, would be a wonderful advertisement for London, and it would meet with plenty of support, and people would have some place to send the animals to when sick or hurt, and receive proper treatment. It would stop such a lot of poor dumb animals that we see or the streets suffering today.

London has a splendid and first-class man in Inspector G. Tustin of the Humane Society, as everyone who owns a dumb animal knows, and we should rally round him, and the society in helping to build some kind of a hospital. Let this city show how we can be up-to-date in regards to animal care, but I would not speak for those that cannot speak for themselves.

LIVE AND LET LIVE.

London, Jan. 10, 1924.

Many Prohibitions.

The Use and Sale of Liquor Not the Only Thing Covered by a Prohibitory Law.

Editor of The Advertiser: Sir:—The question of prohibition is causing a great deal of discussion nowadays. To most people the subject has reference to governmental dealing with intoxicating liquor and that alone. It is not so.

Prohibitory laws on many other

lines of conduct have been enforced since the earliest ages. When from devouring fire on the top of Mount Sinai, the Lord spoke the ten commandments to the awe-stricken people; those commandments, so-called, were with but three exceptions prohibitions. Go over them and see. Each one, except those three, begins with, "Thou shalt not."

Years ago Bengough saw this, and published a cartoon showing Moses coming down from the mountain with the two tables of stone in his hands, and one wiseacre calling out to him, "Go back, Moses, the people are not ready for prohibition."

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

Let anyone drive down street at 50 miles an hour or anywhere near that, and our good friend the "Bobby," if he can catch him, hauls him speedily before his magistrates.

propose has lost to them many good chances of getting married.

Why, if a girl likes a certain man for a husband, let her tell him so, and if a man likes a certain girl for a wife let him tell her so. I am a bachelor and would think it an insult for a girl to tell me that she would like to have me for a husband.

The answers of "London Women" to the query of Mrs. Millson greatly surprised me, but I must not say so, and if the writers of the answers to Mrs. Millson take a broadminded view of such an important subject as marriage they will be doing good (not harm) to the cause of humanity.

I would like to reply to the letters of "London Women" separately in an effort to convince the writers that there are women who are not old saying, "convince a person or persons against their will they are of the same opinion still," might apply in this case.

There is no more in the meantime. I should have stated that the answers to query of Mrs. Millson appeared in your issue of the 24th inst. "BACHELOR."

Dundas St., London.

The City Needs It.

One Interested in Humane Society Tells of Work That Could Be Done at Small Cost.

Editor of The Advertiser: Sir:—In your papers of the last week, I have been reading your article concerning an animal hospital for the city of London, and I am very much interested in this myself.

I have been a member of the Humane Society for many years, and I have seen and dealt with a lot of the work myself, and a hospital for the suffering dumb animals is one of the most necessary things for the city of London.

There are so many cases in the city where the people do not understand the suffering of animals, and whereas if there was a hospital, they would be well cared for, and not returned to their owners until such times as they were in perfect condition.

I have also had a long talk with Inspector Tustin about the matter, and he explained many pitiful cases to me, where the hospital would be a very successful institution, and he also stated that the cost of the hospital would not be very high.

There are hundreds of citizens the same as myself, that would only be too willing to help to build up the institution.

VERY INTERESTED CITIZEN.

Want Hydro Extended.

Resident Believes That Construction Now Would Give Service and Also Aid in Giving Water to the Poor.

Editor of The Advertiser: Sir:—As a resident of this town-

justice suffered by the residents of the Bury Line, Westminster street, and Brick street in their efforts to have hydro installed in their homes at a moderate cost, especially in view of the fact that it is supplied to West-

The hydro commission claims they are building lines as fast as they are able, giving us the impression that they are unable to secure the labor, which doesn't dovetail into the item we read in the daily press about every city council being at their wits end to cope with the unemployment situation.

The immediate and rapid construction of lines in this district would meet two ends, as it would supply what is now conceded as "a necessity" to a large number of residents who are able and willing to pay for it, and would give employment to a large number of laborers needing work to keep them in Canada.

However, in the mean time we will have to abide by the powers that be, and read by the dingy kerosene lamp, while the unemployed are a charge on the already overburdened taxpayer.

A LAMPLIGHTER.

Base Line, Westminster Tp.

From a Presbyterian.

Claims Union Should Not Be Tried Until There is More Unanimous Feeling in Its Favor.

Editor of The Advertiser: Sir:—One has only to read the letters appearing in your paper for

and against church union to note the vast difference in characters.

Dr. Dickie's outstanding fairness at all times deeply impresses one, while Dr. MacGregor's modern day methods leave a whole lot to be desired. It is not taken seriously till the issue is finally decided. Had we broken faith with the boys at the front and caused a disension, such as exists in the Presbyterian Church in Canada today, our cause would certainly have been lost. Can the great portion of the Presbyterian Church be blamed for the position they have taken, when we stop to consider that it was the union side who broke faith and scrapped the solemn agreement entered into, viz., not to consummate union until there was practically unanimity—not mind you, as Dr. MacGregor would have us believe, to the last man—such was not the broad meaning of unanimity at that time, but that Dr. MacGregor apparently makes use of this as a smoke screen to camouflage the issue.

The world loves a good loser, and when one who takes in a little sail to save a situation, but when we see some of our most eminent Presbyterian clergymen, as well as some of our greatest and most successful clergymen, who have given lavishly all their lives for the upbuilding of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (and I might mention James Rogers of Montreal, John Pomeroy of Paris, and scores more if space would permit), assailed for the anti-union position they have taken, which such men have considered is their right, then I claim it is time to call