

LLOYD GEORGE'S ARGUMENT FOR CURTAILING LORDS' VETO

How the Government's Programme Was Wrecked by the
Partisanship of the Upper Chamber—Was It Fair Play?
Absurd Talk of Socialism—The Case of Lord Torphichen.

Speaking in the House of Commons recently, in reply to Mr. Bonar Law, and in support of the anti-Lords' resolution, Mr. Lloyd George, chancellor of the exchequer, said:

The right honorable gentleman (Mr. Law), made great play of the budget. He was very much concerned about the attitude of the Irish members to the budget. A Unionist member—So were you a week ago, (Lloyd laughed). The Chancellor of the Exchequer—I think, if I may respectfully say so, that is a legitimate remark which I fully appreciate, but the honorable member, with the usual Unionist argument, says: "You must analyze the votes." This is the party of one vote one value. If the Irish members vote against the budget, then it is the will of the people, because the whole argument of the right honorable gentleman was that the House of Lords was justified in throwing out the budget since the result of the general election showed that the people were with them. The Irish vote represents the will of the people whenever it goes into the same lobby in the House of Commons, but the moment it comes on our side you must analyze it. The right honorable gentleman said this was a "wail and see Government" thing. I might retort that this is the first Opposition that will not wait and cannot see. He is perfectly wrong in saying that it is only within the last fortnight that we made it clear that we would not fall by the budget. We never had any doubt that not merely for the sake of the budget, we were bound to put the test question whether the Government had or had not approved of its rejection. (Cheers.) The Irish members have never opposed the budget in their speeches in the country on its merits. Oh, and here, returned the speaker, Mr. Redmond the other day made it perfectly clear that he supported the land clauses which caused the Lords to throw out the bill. (Cheers.) Members opposite were quite ready to receive the support of the Irish members in 1885, and to be kept in office by them for six months.

Is It Fair?
The real difficulty is that you have a permanent majority belonging to one party in the other House. Is that fair? Suppose there happened to be in the Lords a solid majority of invertebrate free-traders. Now honorable members opposite are looking forward to a tariff "reform" ministry. (Ironical laughter.) I do not recognize any note of triumph on the Opposition benches. (Laughter.) Supposing this free trade majority in the Lords threw out the tariff "reform" ministry, would members opposite take the same view of the fairness of the present conditions? (Cheers, and a voice: Dissolve.) Somebody says they would dissolve on the issue. It would be perfectly fair, then, that the Lords should throw out the budget, although the country had pronounced in the most emphatic manner in its favor. (Laughter.) "No," I do not believe honorable members would really take that view. The leader of the Opposition has said something about Costa Rica and single chamber government. I think he was prime minister when he had ten years of Costa Rica. (Laughter.) It was only corrected by the despised House of Commons in 1906—that is what put an end to Costa Rican government. (Laughter.) In the period between 1900 and 1906 (Mr. Lloyd George pointed out), the Conservative Government passed the Education Bill, which was in defiance of strong assurances at the election that the issue was purely the South African problem, and that the Government was seeking to be re-elected on questions of contentious domestic policy. On the education bill, by the way, they received the support of the Irish members. What (he continued), did the House of Commons do? Did they act as an impartial second chamber? Honorable members opposite said: "All the House of Lords have done is to compel the Government to consult the people." I suppose in 1902 they compelled the Government to consult the people, did anyone imagine for a moment that there would have been a majority for the education bill? (Ministerial cheers.) There is no consultation of the people when Tory measures are sent up.

What Happened in 1906?
What happened in 1906? Both parties followed the usual course of placing their alternative programmes before the country, and the country decided for the Liberal programme. There were at least six bills in that programme which were mentioned in every election address and in every speech delivered by every candidate. There was not one of these bills that had not been submitted by Liberal members to the judgment of the previous Parliament, either in the form of bills or amendments to bills. First there was the education bill. Not merely did we present our alternative point of view, but popular control and abolition of tests. Then there was the

FARMER TELLS INTERESTING STORY

WHETHER SICK OR WELL, IN
GOOD WEATHER OR IN STORMY,
HE IS OBLIGED TO WORK ALL
WAYS.

Market people complain about prices they have to pay for farm produce. They forget that rain or shine, warm or cold, the farmer must keep at it or else the narrow profit, his bare living, will be lost to him.
A well-known Haldimand farmer, Mr. J. P. Pelletier, writes: "For nearly three years I was in poor health. A drenching storm caught me in the fields and wet me to the skin. I got home only to find I was threatened with inflammation of the bowels and never got over it until I took Dr. Hamilton's Pills. They are mild, healthy and certain to cure. Sold in yellow 25c boxes, all dealers, or The Catarrh Company, Kingston, Ont."

abolition of plural voting, the licensing bill—a much more drastic licensing bill than the one which was introduced—the taxation of ground values including valuation and reform, especially in Scotland, and the reversal of the Taft Vale judgment. These six questions were dealt with in the shape of bills produced on the authority of the Government, and carried by huge majorities. What happened? Five out of the six were rejected by the House of Lords. (Ministerial cheers.) In the previous Parliament two bills introduced by the Government in spite of pledges were allowed to pass by the House of Lords. I ask honorable members opposite is that fair play? (Ministerial cheers.) You cannot find in the whole history of Parliament any case as bad as that of 1906. In 1885 Mr. Gladstone came in with a great programme of reform. Some of his bills were thrown out, and some were undoubtedly mutilated, but in the main the bills which he put in his program were carried through Parliament. In 1906 five-sixths of our programme were thrown out, although the country had been consulted upon it. I ask for is fair play. (Ministerial cheers.) Every Tory Government is allowed to develop its programme as a whole, and present it as a whole to the electorate. And we are ever allowed to review their programme, and to say, although we have consulted the country? On the contrary, our bills are simply mutilated, soiled, fragments, because the House of Lords tears them, rends them, and flings them out. (Ministerial cheers.) Is that fair as between the two points of view, which, after all, are permanent points of view in connection with the Government of this country? Take those bills. I mentioned five. I am told, "Oh, but you can go to the country, and if you are returned a second time you can carry these bills." Would the plural voting bill go through the House of Lords now?

Mr. Balfour (leader of the Opposition) interjected a remark which was not heard in the press gallery. The Chancellor of the Exchequer—I should have been rather interested in that interruption if I could have heard it, because I know that whatever the right honorable gentleman says with regard to what happens in the other House is authoritative. (Cheers.) So even his gentlest whisper on a matter of that kind is of the most authoritative importance. Here is a bill carried by the late Parliament and thrown out by the House of Lords. Undoubtedly there is a majority for the same bill in this Parliament. (Cheers.) I am told, "Oh, but you can go to the country, and if you are returned a second time you can carry these bills." Would the plural voting bill go through the House of Lords now?

An Opposition Member—No. The Chancellor of the Exchequer—That really shows what an imperative demand there is for settling this question. (Cheers.) Because the claims of the Lords and their friends are growing. Then we had an education bill. That was thrown out. Appeal to the country. Next year, Scottish land bill thrown out. Appeal to the country. Valuation bill thrown out. Another appeal to the country. Then the budget. This is not an annual Parliament proposal, but when the Liberals are in it is to be a quarterly Parliament. (Cheers.) The position is perfectly intolerable. (Cheers.) The Liberal party, representing more than half the electorate of Great Britain, are bound to bring it to an immediate issue. Any hesitation or indecision or procrastination would be fatal. Better for the Liberal party to be out for ten years fighting this than going on with the sham which was inevitable so long as our bills were sent to the Lords. We picked up the crumbs that fell from their table.

Unionist Talk About Liberal Bills.
The honorable member says we are bound to have a second chamber in order to maintain the rights of property and the foundations of society. Really we have always had that sort of talk about every Liberal bill ever introduced into this House. We had it about the Budget of 1853. It was rather interesting the other day, when I began to think of all the violent things said about me and my budget, to consider what happened about the budget of 1853. This is the sort of language used by the Tory party then—"The whole budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a war against property." That is not mine, but Mr. Gladstone's budget of 1853. "It must be popular in some quarters, but he was sure it would be productive of hardship and injustice. He warned the right honorable gentleman who he struck a blow at public confidence, the effects of which might be felt to an extent of which he had no present conception." As to the reform bill, it was a "blow at the foundations of civilized society." That was the declaration given by Mr. Croker, and the cranks of the Tory party use exactly the same language. The leader of the Opposition made an interesting speech upon the land act of 1881. He said it was Socialism. The right honorable gentleman, I know, is very consistent. I was amazed to see in reading that speech how consistent he was. There is a remark there about a peasant proprietary which, I think, is relevant. He said that from the economic point of view he did not think it was any good, but there was a great deal to be said for it from the political point of view. (Laughter.) He said that if we were to be governed by a mob it was just as well to have a mob on both sides. (Laughter.) All these arguments about socialism, confiscation, and destruction of the foundations of society are simply the stock in trade of every Tory Opposition to every Liberal bill, from the reform bill downwards. (Cheers.) After all, there is no real dread or fear of confiscation. Confiscation may be the dream of the extreme Socialist and the nightmare of the extreme Tory. (Cheers and laughter.)

The Danger of Spoilation.
The honorable and learned gentleman the member for Kingston (Mr. Cave) said he had consulted an in-

genious friend in the temple who had drafted four budgets for him. The first taxed away the whole landed property of the country. The second taxed away the mines. The third taxed away the railways. The fourth taxed away the church, the laity, and the liquor followed. (Laughter.) But that is supposing that you get a party that will—I will not say drive its principles to an extreme—a party that will go right over the precipice. I might do the same with the honorable and learned gentleman and his party. Supposing the House of Commons were bitten with the rabies of reaction, he may depend upon it that the House of Lords would be made of more of the same material. (Laughter.) It would not be necessary to employ his friends in the inner temple to draft the measures necessary for the repeal of the various acts. Any ordinary barrister's clerk could frame all the necessary bills. (Laughter.) There was no real danger of the Liberal party doing anything of the kind. When the people of this country are bent on revolution and are prepared to abolish private property in mines and land and other kinds of property they won't resort to the cumbersome method of budgets. If a revolutionary temper of that kind breaks out in the country, what would the House of Lords be? What was the use of the veto of the King in France? Its mere exercise simply exasperated and inflamed the revolutionary spirit. If there was a temper of that kind in this country the veto of the lords would be no more use than if we set up a wooden fence against a river of molten lava. There have only been three or four great confiscations in this country, and all have been confiscations that have enriched the aristocracy and impoverished the people. (Loud Ministerial cheers.) If you talk of the danger of spoliation we must go to the experience of history in this country. The great acts of spoliation have been spoliation of the monasteries where the property was given to the House of Lords (Ministerial cheers), the settlement of Ireland (Nationalist cheers) and the inclosure of the Commons. There was nothing which I thought more significant or entertaining than see men protesting against my poor halfpenny tax in the budget who had inherited the whole of their fortune from these great acts of public spoliation. (Loud Ministerial cheers.)

"Sheer Intolerance."
The present system is essentially an unfair one. The Lords have the average human nature, and they are strong and leading party men, and it is too much to ask them to exercise judicial functions. I treat them as if they were worse than other people may be poor democracy, but at the same time to say they are above party bias is utter snobbery. (Ministerial cheers.) Look at the case of Lord Torphichen. It is a case of extraordinary importance, in view of the claim that the Lords are an impartial body. Here is one peer who voted for the budget. Although Scotland declared by a majority of 11 in favor of the budget, they would not allow a single peer to vote for it. They are worse than the Moderates of the London County Council. (Ministerial cheers.) At least there is excuse for them, they had no majority, and therefore they had to get an artificial one. Here they had a majority of something like ten to one in the House of Lords, but they won't allow a single man from Scotland to come and vote for the Liberal Government. Why, that is sheer intolerance. If that is the "impartial" body to which we are to submit measures which the House of Commons has approved of by an enormous majority, why are we expecting too much. The honorable gentleman in front of me said: "What are you going to do about reform?" He said: "You are going about it in the wrong way. You ought to bring in your reform measures first." I do not agree with the honorable gentleman. What sort of reform will we get in the House of Lords, unless we had really power in the end of carrying through our reform? (Ministerial cheers.) It is the sort of reform suggested by the noble lord, the member for Oxford University (Lord Hugh Cecil), and the noble lord of the 400 (Ministerial cheers). I can assure the honorable gentleman that we are going about it in the only way in which we can get a fair reform of the constitution. I think it was either the right honorable gentleman or the member for St. George's, Hanover Square, who protested against the charge that because they were criticizing the House of Commons they were traitors to the House. I have heard some very severe things said about this House—nothing more severe than the tone and temper of the honorable member. What did it all mean? He had the trust of the people of this country. (Ministerial cheers and Opposition dissent.) We have heard about the tyranny of the House of

DOCTORS CONDEMN OILY LINIMENTS

THE PUBLIC ARE WARNED TO BE
CAREFUL OF THESE STRONG-
SMELLING, OILY LINIMENTS
CONTAINING HARMFUL ACIDS,
AMMONIA, ETC.

Many people have clung to the old-fashioned idea that a thick, greasy liniment is the best kind. Doctors say not so. Recently a number of these white, oily liniments were analyzed, and they were found to contain an enormously high percentage of harmful acids, and such irritating chemicals as ammonia, etc. For the moment they may cause a warm sensation when first applied, but their continued use never cures rheumatism, and only deteriorates the skin, sets up inflammation and causes endless trouble.
When a doctor warns you to quit using a white, oily liniment—do so. He knows that a thick liniment can't penetrate, can't sink through the pores and reach the seat of the pain.
When asked his opinion a few days ago, Dr. Roberts stated that he considered a strong, penetrating, pain-subduing liniment, such as "Nerviline," to be superior to any of the white and greasy liniments. He has 15 years of practice he had witnessed cases of rheumatism, sciatica and lumbago that he simply would not respond to ordinary liniments. He said that he had seen the same physician also spoke of the great advantages of keeping a preparation like Nerviline in the houses all ways, because of its power to cure stomach disorders, earache, toothache, headache and such minor ailments. Nerviline is a first-class cure. There is no need of it, and it is not an external, that Nerviline won't cure. In thousands of homes no other pain-relieving medicine is used. Fifty years' continued success and the endorsement of the profession are proof that Nerviline is the liniment for the home.
Any good druggist or dealer can supply the large bottles of Nerviline, 50 cents; trial size, 25 cents.

THE SUBSCRIPTION LIST WILL OPEN AT THE OFFICE OF THE GUARDIAN TRUST COMPANY, LTD., TORONTO, ON MONDAY, APRIL 25, 1910, AND WILL BE CLOSED ON OR BEFORE MONDAY, THE 9th DAY OF MAY, 1910, AT 3 P. M.

CAWTHRA MULLOCK & CO.

OWN AND OFFER FOR SALE

AT PAR, \$100 PER SHARE

\$2,000,000 of the 7% Cumulative Preferred Stock, with a bonus of 25% Common Stock, of

Maple Leaf Milling Company

(Incorporated under the Laws of the Province of Ontario.)

LIMITED

HEAD OFFICE - - - TORONTO, CANADA

CAPITAL STOCK, Issued and Fully Paid Up.

PREFERRED, 7% Cumulative	\$2,500,000
COMMON	2,500,000
	\$5,000,000

THE COMPANY HAS NO BONDS ISSUED OR AUTHORIZED.

GUARDIAN TRUST COMPANY, Limited

Is prepared to receive subscriptions for \$2,000,000 of the above seven per cent cumulative preferred stock at the price of \$100 for each share, with a bonus of common stock equal in par value to 25 per cent of the par value of the preferred stock allotted, to be delivered on payment of subscription in full.

The dividends on the preferred stock accrue from April 5th, 1910. Subscriptions will be payable as follows:

10 per cent on application, and	
90 per cent on allotment.	
100 per cent.	or

In instalments as follows, in which case interest at the rate of 6 per cent will be charged.

10 per cent on application.
15 per cent on allotment.
25 per cent on 1st June, 1910.
25 per cent on 1st July, 1910, and
25 per cent on 1st August, 1910.

100 per cent.

The right is reserved to allot only such subscriptions and for such amounts as may be approved and to close the subscription book without notice. Application will be made for the listing of the securities of the company on the Toronto Stock Exchange.

Bankers of Company: Imperial Bank of Canada and Bank of Montreal.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

D. C. CAMERON, Winnipeg, President.

President Rat Portage Lumber Company, Limited.

CAWTHRA MULLOCK, Toronto, Vice-President.

Director Imperial Bank of Canada, Director Confederation Life Association.

HEDLEY SHAW, Toronto, Managing Director.

Vice-President and Managing-Director The Maple Leaf Flour Mills Company, Limited.

JOHN I. A. HUNT, London.

President Goderich Elevator and Transit Company.

Vice-President, Hunt Bros., Limited, Millers.

CHARLES WURTELE, Toronto.

Vice-President National Iron Works, Limited.

JOHN CARRICK, Toronto.

Secretary The Maple Leaf Flour Mills Company, Limited.

CHARLES W. BOND, Toronto.

Vice-President James Carruthers Company, Limited, Grain Exporters.

NEW COMPANY A GOING CONCERN.

Maple Leaf Milling Company, Limited, is a new company which has taken over the whole undertaking as a going concern of the Maple Leaf Flour Mills Company, Limited, including therein that of the Hedley Shaw Milling Company, Limited. The company has mills at Kenora, Thorold, St. Catharines, Welland, and Port Colborne (the last named in course of construction), in the Province of Ontario, and at Brandon in the Province of Manitoba. When the construction at present under way at Port Colborne is completed, the company will have a total milling capacity of 12,800 barrels per day. The company has at present thirty-five elevators situated throughout the Western Wheat Belt, and fifteen additional ones are being added at the present time. A million-bushel elevator is being constructed next to the new mill at Port Colborne. The company has also warehouses and offices at Toronto, Winnipeg, Kingston, Ottawa and Montreal.

MARKET FOR OUTPUT.

The rapid growth of the business of the two companies taken over has long made apparent the necessity of additional milling capacity. Further, the tremendous increase in the total output from the Western Wheat Belt makes it absolutely necessary to have more mills in Canada to handle it. Last year the output of the Western Wheat Belt amounted to about 125,000,000 bushels, and men who have made a close study of the development that the western country is likely to see, estimate that by the end of the year 1920, Canada will be producing at the rate of fully 500,000,000 bushels annually. As in the past, a great proportion of this large production will of necessity find its way into Canadian mills. Larger demands are bound to come as the population of the country increases, and the inquiry for the Canadian product will come from Great Britain and from the foreign markets of the world, will increase. The chain of mills that is now controlled by the new company will enable it to go ahead and secure its full share of the trade of every section of Canada, as well as to obtain even a very much larger proportion of the export business to Great Britain and to foreign markets than it has up to the present time.

SECURITY AND EARNING POWER—The assets of the old companies taken over as above, stand in excess of all liabilities, and without any allowance for goodwill, trademarks, etc., at \$3,770,524 11, this amount being ascertained on the basis of an appraisal by the Canadian-American Appraisal Company, Limited, as of March 17th, 1910, of the capital assets taken over, and the certificate of Messrs. Price, Waterhouse & Co., as of February 28th, 1910, as to current assets and current liabilities, with a liberal allowance for all contingencies. There has also been placed in the Treasury \$1,000,000 of additional cash, besides permitting of the completion of a 6,000-barrel mill and a million-bushel elevator and storage warehouse at Port Colborne, and of fifteen additional elevators in the west, will provide the new Company with further working capital. As per certificate of Messrs. Price, Waterhouse & Co., of London, quoted below, the earnings of the old company on the present plant amounted to:

From Sept. 25th, 1908, to Aug. 20th, 1909, to	\$218,843 38
And from Aug. 21st, 1909, to Feb. 28th, 1910, to	\$166,793 29

Being for the latter period at a rate equal to over 13 per cent on the preferred stock of the company.

The following is the certificate of Price, Waterhouse & Co.:
"Messrs. Cawthra, Mullock & Co., Toronto:
"Gentlemen—

"We have examined the books of the Maple Leaf Flour Mills Company, Limited, which include the transactions carried on under the name of The Hedley Shaw Milling Company, Limited, at Toronto and branches, from Sept. 25th, 1908 (prior to which date the company's principal mills were not completed nor in operation) to Feb. 28th, 1910, and we certify that the profits for the period, after making provision for depreciation, but before charging interest on loans, were as follows:

From Sept. 25th, 1908, to Aug. 20th, 1909	\$218,843 38
From Aug. 21st, 1909, to Feb. 28, 1910	\$166,793 29

Yours very truly,

"PRICE, WATERHOUSE & CO."

MANAGEMENT.

The properties of the old companies have been constructed and developed under the direction of Mr. Hedley Shaw, late general manager of The Hedley Shaw Milling Company, Limited, and of The Maple Leaf Flour Mills Company, Limited, and Mr. D. C. Cameron, late president of the Maple Leaf Flour Mills Company, Limited. Both these gentlemen will retain large interests in the new company, besides being actively identified with it. Mr. Hedley Shaw will occupy the position of managing-director of the new company, thus giving to it the full benefit of his long practical experience.

FAVORABLE LOCATION OF NEW LARGE MILLS.

The location of the new large mill at Port Colborne is without exception the best there is in Canada. This mill when completed, in addition to having the large capacity mentioned, will have one of the most modern equipments in the world. The company at all times will be able to keep it well supplied with wheat. In addition to its own 1,000,000-bushel elevator, which will be situated just alongside of the mill, the company will be able to make arrangements to have the last steamer, coming down from the west at the end of the season of navigation, tie up for the winter months at the elevator, and in this way afford additional storage capacity without any necessity of any capital outlay for it. Should at any time the company find it advisable to do so, it will also be able to draw from the government elevator, which will be situated on the same pier as its Port Colborne mill. The location of the company's mills is such as to provide a ready market for the by-products of each. The greater part of the milling capacity will be in Ontario, where, as the present statistics show, a smaller amount of wheat is being grown each year, as the farmers go in more and more for stock-raising. This means a brisk demand for the by-products of the mills for feed.

A complete report on the advantages of the Port Colborne site, prepared by Mr. Hedley Shaw, will be found in the prospectus. Prospects and forms of application may be obtained at any branch of the Imperial Bank of Canada, or the Royal Bank of Canada, from Guardian Trust Company, Limited, Toronto, and from Cawthra Mullock & Co., Toronto.

APPLICATIONS FOR SHARES SHOULD BE MADE UPON THE FORM ACCOMPANYING THE PROSPECTUS, AND SHOULD BE SENT TOGETHER WITH THE REMITTANCE DUE ON APPLICATION TO:

ANY BRANCH OF

THE IMPERIAL BANK OF CANADA

OR

ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

GUARDIAN TRUST CO., Limited, TORONTO.

OR TO

CAWTHRA MULLOCK & CO.,

MEMBERS TORONTO STOCK EXCHANGE.

Royal Bank Bldg., TORONTO, ONT.

Commons. Well, I am not going to say that the House of Commons is the course of its long and great history has not been guilty of arbitrary acts, but they have not been guilty of one when they were not aided and instigated in that direction by the House of Lords, and whenever they were corrected the reaction invariably came from the people, and not from the Lords. (Ministerial cheers.)

What We Owe to the Commons.

But, take the House of Commons as a whole, the measure of popular liberty we enjoy was due to the exertions of this House, exertions in which the Lords can claim no real partnership, because there is hardly one of the great acts of the state for the successful raising of, and finally thwarted. This is the House to whose ac-

complishments and efforts we owe the right of self-government for the people, the great right of withholding supplies until redress is given, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, all due to the efforts of the House of Commons—the guardianship of the state for the protection of the aged, the greatest tribunal of justice in the world. (Ministerial cheers.) I say that any honorable member who has had his name inscribed on the rolls of this House ought to feel proud, and to attack it is treason to the democracy. (Ministerial cheers.) The noble lord (Lord Hugh Cecil), in an exquisite peroration, if he will allow me to say so, compared the British constitution to a great temple, and he appealed to us, to every member of this House, instead of destroying this great temple, obstructed, delayed, whenever it could successfully raise so, and finally thwarted. This is the House to whose ac-

complishments and efforts we owe the right of self-government for the people, the great right of withholding supplies until redress is given, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, all due to the efforts of the House of Commons—the guardianship of the state for the protection of the aged, the greatest tribunal of justice in the world. (Ministerial cheers.) I say that any honorable member who has had his name inscribed on the rolls of this House ought to feel proud, and to attack it is treason to the democracy. (Ministerial cheers.) The noble lord (Lord Hugh Cecil), in an exquisite peroration, if he will allow me to say so, compared the British constitution to a great temple, and he appealed to us, to every member of this House, instead of destroying this great temple, obstructed, delayed, whenever it could successfully raise so, and finally thwarted. This is the House to whose ac-

complishments and efforts we owe the right of self-government for the people, the great right of withholding supplies until redress is given, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, all due to the efforts of the House of Commons—the guardianship of the state for the protection of the aged, the greatest tribunal of justice in the world. (Ministerial cheers.) I say that any honorable member who has had his name inscribed on the rolls of this House ought to feel proud, and to attack it is treason to the democracy. (Ministerial cheers.) The noble lord (Lord Hugh Cecil), in an exquisite peroration, if he will allow me to say so, compared the British constitution to a great temple, and he appealed to us, to every member of this House, instead of destroying this great temple, obstructed, delayed, whenever it could successfully raise so, and finally thwarted. This is the House to whose ac-

laudable ambition, and very honorable, but after all the object of a constitution is not to shed lustre upon those who work under it. It is rather to bless the land and the people whose sacrifices have raised the edifice and maintained and extended its glory, and it is because I fervently believe in my heart that the power of the House of Lords stands between the people and the blessings of free institutions—it is for that reason that I recommend this resolution as the first step to the removing of the veto of that House from the fabric of the British constitution. (Ministerial cheers.)

With Easter perfect, more than 200,000 persons were on the board walk at Atlantic City at noon. Rolling chairs, chartered by the less active visitors, formed two lines from the Chelsea end of the walk, and the crowd on the beach gave in the appearance of midsummer. The churches were also crowded.

Sixty-one Years

Another milestone has just been passed in the making of

"1847 ROGERS' BROS."

Silverware. Everywhere this famous brand is the choice of

discriminating people.

Best quality, highest quality, and

are guaranteed.

MEIKEN BROS. CO.

1847 ROGERS' BROS. CO.

"Silver Plate that Wins"