

error and vice. The greatest need of Canada to-day is religious and racial toleration and co-operation.



JUST the other day, Mr. L. A. Rivet, M.P., addressed the Nomad's Club at Montreal on "The Dual Language of Canada" and declared his belief in the possibility of harmonising a national unity with the maintenance of two languages. In Switzerland there are three official languages, German, French and Italian; yet Switzerland is a united and prosperous nation. He quoted Earl Grey's advice to the Women's Canadian Club of Montreal last year that English-speaking mothers should teach their children to speak French and that French-speaking mothers should teach their children to speak English.

Mr. Rivet is one of the younger French-speaking Canadians who knows both languages and who is not afraid to say that he does not mistrust his English-speaking fellow-citizens. He approaches this great national problem in a broad and tolerant spirit. For a forcible assimilation or unification, he would substitute toleration and bilingual training. He believes the former impossible and inadvisable; he believes the latter educationally and nationally beneficial. His opinions are worthy of mature consideration.



THERE is manifest an increased art interest on the part of educated Canadians. Three prominent art exhibitions are now being held, the Academy show in Hamilton, a civic loan collection in Toronto, and modern British Art in Montreal. Is this not worthy of special notice? Is it not the sign of a growing feeling that automobiles and sealskin sacques are not the only recognised signs of wealth and culture?

The seeing of good pictures or even the possession of paintings by acknowledged masters is, however, incomplete evidence of culture. Many a man talks glibly of good and bad architecture who does not know the difference between a Doric and an Ionic column. Similarly a large number of people speak glowingly about the work of certain artists who have never read a single art criticism, know nothing of the history of picture painting and who could not distinguish a Turner from a Corot unless the pictures were boldly labelled.

What this country needs badly is more attention to art in the high schools and colleges. Literature is fairly well studied, but art and architecture are ignored. If there is general ignorance of art and architecture among the people, the educationists are to blame. Art galleries and civic and national collections of good pictures will not do much for the general elevation of the national taste, without some teaching of the elements of art education. The rich men and the art lovers are doing their share; it remains for the schools and colleges to do theirs.



UNITED STATES legislators are waking up to the fact that a tariff war between the United States and Canada will have mutually harmful effects. They are also recognising that Canada intends to stand firm in the matter of a pulp-wood and paper-making policy. Mr. Mann, representative in Congress from Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and a Cannonite, is preparing some new legislation which aims to avert this tariff war. He proposes either to postpone the maximum tariff schedule from April 1st, 1910, to January 1st, 1911, or to provide that pulp and paper imported from Canada shall be exempted.

Neither expedient, if Mr. Mann will allow us to say so, will be of much benefit. Postponing a war for nine months will not be a peace measure. If the war is coming, let it come now. It is no compliment to Canada to delay it temporarily. Again, to put the maximum tariff on everything except pulp and paper will not satisfy this country. We would much prefer that the maximum duty should go on pulp and paper and the lower duties on all other articles of commerce.

The United States press is certainly doing its best to avert the evil consequences of the new Aldrich-Payne tariff. The editorials in favour of preserving friendly trade relations with this country are quite numerous. The newspapers realise that if Canada decides to prohibit the export of pulp logs and pulp wood to the United States, the price of news-print in that country must inevitably rise. They also recognise that a trade war with the nearest and best American customer for United States goods cannot be beneficial.

The situation is serious, but Canada can do nothing to relieve it. Those who created the difficulty must deal with it. Our only duty in the matter is to prepare for the worst.

## THROUGH A MONOCLE

"A TILT AGAINST CHARITY."

THE Knight Errant of Canadian philanthropy is mounted again. It looks as if he were following on the trail of Don Quixote; but he has brought practical good out of quests as Quixotic before, so I would advise the scoffing Philistine to be cautious. By the Knight Errant I mean, of course, Mr. J. J. Kelso, Superintendent of Dependent and Neglected Children for the Province of Ontario. His quest this time is none other than the abolition of charity as a means to the end of the abolition of poverty.

\* \* \*

AFTER his success in creating and organising the great work among the children of Ontario—which has been the source of inspiration for similar movements in other provinces—Mr. Kelso has for some time been mourning for other worlds to conquer. He has published a number of articles in advocacy of the organisation of all charitable efforts on a common basis and with a common centre. In his last he hits out in this blunt way: "Charity," he says, "is a disease as contagious as measles and it spreads from door to door. If there were no charity there would be no pauperism. A pauper is the most despicable creature living, and yet he is created and maintained solely by charity."

\* \* \*

AS to the truth of Mr. Kelso's words, I suppose no experienced philanthropic worker would have a moment's doubt. The production of pauperism through the English poor law is a commonplace of social science. But we do not need to go so far afield to find out the pauperising tendency of charity. I have had reason to know it personally in the city of Toronto. Some years ago I made a close study of the operations of the different charitable organisations in that city which have to do with the relief of poverty. The statistics which I then collected showed, apparently, that one person in every twenty in the city was in receipt of relief. Now I did not for a moment—and I do not suppose that you will—accept that as a true representation of the facts. It merely made it clear that many persons in the Queen City were living on the charitable societies. They would get all they could from one society, and when they had drained that dry, they would pass on to another. So that it came that these paupers—for what else could one call them?—would be counted over two, three and four times, in making a census of the number of relieved persons from the records of the different organisations.

\* \* \*

A TYPICAL case will show what I mean. A pensioner of the British Government had come out to Toronto to live. His pension was not quite sufficient to support him and his family. The father was not sick and there were several grown-up children, so that it would have been easy for them to have got the rest of the "wherewithal" by working. But they found it easier to "work" the charities. So the various members of the family took turns in applying to the different societies, and when the societies were not "easy" enough, they tried begging from house to house for a change. The result was that the whole family lived in idleness and comfort.

\* \* \*

BUT I have called Mr. Kelso's quest "Quixotic." So perhaps I had better tell why. The "why" is illustrated by the last resort of the "pauper-pension" family of which I have just spoken. When they had worn out the patience and generosity of the charity societies they still had an unfailing refuge in private charity. Now just here the advocate of the abolition of charity runs up against an instinct which, though it is certainly the cause of much evil in the encouragement of pauperism, yet does unregenerate human nature a good deal of credit.

\* \* \*

THE simple fact is that we do not like to turn the beggar away empty-handed. We may know that they are often undeserving and we may be pretty sure that our particular one is undeserving; but if we shut the door in their faces, we cannot enjoy our own roast beef with the same relish. On pretty strong scientific ground, I do send them away empty sometimes; but I never feel proud of myself afterwards. And I think I am more cold-blooded than the average human.

\* \* \*

NOW I think I can give a pretty good guess why this instinctive dislike of turning away the beggar from our doors is so strong. It is because we can scarcely ever be sure that the case is not deserving. If we were perfectly sure that any man who was willing to work, could always and everywhere get a good dinner and a fair share of the pleasures and opportunities of life, we would be more willing to practise towards others the Scripture injunction that "if any will not work neither let him eat." Mr. Kelso thinks this too, for he proposes as part of his plan for the abolition of charity, that the money usually spent in charity should be spent in making "a careful study of the underlying causes of poverty" and in the remedy of "whatever evils law can remedy."

THE MONOCLE MAN.