

The Chronicle

Banking, Insurance & Finance



ESTABLISHED JANUARY, 1881

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

Vol. XXXI. No. 21

MONTREAL, MAY 26, 1911.

Single Copy 10c
Annual Subscription \$2.00

CANADIAN ENGLISH. HIS Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, addressing the graduates of the Margaret Eaton School of Expression at Toronto, pointed out that the mode of speech in Canada differed from both that of the people of the United States, and that of the people of England. This is true, 'tis pity and pity 'tis, 'tis true. But His Honour went on to deprecate any attempt to change this unfortunate state of affairs. He wanted to see young people drilled in the use of a Canadian tone of which they should not be ashamed.

We are not instituting any invidious comparison between Canadian English, American English, and English English. On the average, Canadian English is not inferior to either of the other two. But we do not think diversity of tone in the pronunciation of English is a thing to be desired. In England, there are many distinct pronunciations of English, some of them very indistinct, even to many Englishmen. We should rather aim at uniformity, and the best thing that can be said for the Canadian pronunciation is that Canadians coming from every county in England, have naturally lost some of their most aggressive and characteristic provincialisms. As a rule, the best English is spoken by the man who by contact with people from all parts of the United Kingdom, has so thoroughly divested himself of local peculiarities that you cannot tell from what part of England he comes. If it is patriotic to have a characteristic Canadian tone in speaking English, why not have a Canadian geometry to teach us that a square has five sides, and a Canadian multiplication table in which three times three will be fourteen. There is such a thing as carrying patriotism so far that it becomes petty provincialism.

A BREACH WIDE ENOUGH TO SECURE EXTENSION.

THE United States Secretary for War, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, spoke on Reciprocity before the Intercolonial Club at Boston. He said: "We of the United States do not have to be mere altruists in order to welcome changes which will develop Canada into a great industrial nation; which will remove the barrier which has artificially forced Canadian trade into an eastward and westward direction and not permitted it to follow the course which Nature so clearly intended. Even under the present unfavourable conditions, no country in the world approaches Canada in the amount of its purchases from the United States, when population is taken into account. In twenty years, imports into Canada from us have risen from \$52,000,000 to \$233,000,000. When we consider that this has occurred in spite of a comparatively slow Canadian development, and

against the obstructive force of the tariff wall between us, can we even imagine the extent of trade benefits that would accrue should that barrier be removed?"

There is certainly nothing altruistic about the American Government's Canadian Reciprocity policy. The United States has been solely responsible for the height of the tariff wall between the two countries which has for many years been high enough for a spite fence and for the fact that it has been taking as little in the way of Canadian exports as its own interests would permit. There was nothing, altruistic about that either. But Mr. Stimson went on to say:—"Ah! but our friends say this agreement does not remove that barrier on the bulk of manufactured importations into Canada. My answer is, that it opens a breach wide enough to insure the extension, and continued extension of our natural trade. Our Government has offered to Canada free trade in all commodities; the Canadian commissioners, representing a younger country, with younger industries to protect, have felt compelled to decline free trade as to these industries. But the step once taken, the tendency toward closer relations will be irresistible."

This gives the snap away pretty frankly. What a pity these things cannot be kept for home consumption. They may be nice for Bostonians to listen to; but they are hard on Canadian reciprocitarians who have troubles enough of their own. The breach, to quote Mercurio, is "not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door; but 'tis enough; 'twill serve."

RECIPROCITY AT WASHINGTON.

AT a conference between President Taft, Secretary Knox, of the State Department, and Senator Penrose, chairman of the Finance Committee, the president announced that he was unalterably opposed to the amendment proposed by Senator Root regarding the wood pulp and paper schedule of the tariff bill. He frankly gave as his reason that this would open the door to other amendments, which would kill the Reciprocity agreement. This brings Congress down to the level of being consulted only as a matter of form. Practically Mr. Taft says to the Senate, the great treaty making power of the United States: "You may talk about the Canadian Reciprocity Treaty, if you like, but you must not amend it." Senator Penrose declares that there is little hope of the Senate passing the treaty without the Root amendment. This would probably involve so many other amendments that the Canadian Parliament would not recognise it. Senator Penrose promised Mr. Taft to endeavour to get the bill passed by the Finance Committee in its original form, but did not hold out much hope of success.