

The Semi-Weekly Telegraph is issued every Wednesday and Saturday by The Telegraph Publishing Company, of St. John, a company incorporated by Act of the Legislature of New Brunswick.

E. W. McCREADY,  
President and Manager.

**Subscription Rates**  
Sent by mail to any address in Canada at One Dollar a year. Sent by mail to any address in United States at Two Dollars a year. All subscriptions must be paid in advance.

**Advertising Rates**  
Ordinary commercial advertisements taking the run of the paper, each insertion, \$1.00 per inch.  
Advertisements of Wares, For Sale, etc., one cent a word for each insertion.  
Notices of Births, Marriages and Deaths, 25 cents for each insertion.

**Important Notice**  
All remittances must be sent by post office order or registered letter, and addressed to The Telegraph Publishing Company.  
Correspondence must be addressed to the Editor of The Telegraph, St. John.

**Authorized Agents**  
The following agents are authorized to canvass and collect for The Semi-Weekly Telegraph, viz:  
MRS. E. S. McROY,  
W. D. GOUGH,  
ELLAS K. GANONG,  
C. K. GANONG,  
H. CECIL KEIRSTEAD.

**THE DAILY TELEGRAPH  
THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH  
THE EVENING TIMES**  
**New Brunswick's Independent  
Newspapers**  
These newspapers advocate:  
British connection  
Honesty in public life  
Measures for the material  
progress and moral advance  
ment of our great Dominion.  
No graft!  
No deals!  
"The Thistle, Shamrock, Rose and the  
Maple Leaf" forever.

**Semi-Weekly Telegraph  
and The News**

ST. JOHN, N. B., AUGUST 14, 1912.

## THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND THE CANAL

The United States Senate yesterday defeated an amendment the object of which was to remove discrimination in favor of American ships in the matter of Panama Canal tolls. Senator Cummings, who led the Senate forces in favor of discrimination, charged those senators who favored the amendment with "giving an interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which they knew the American people would not observe."

Of course this matter is not concluded by yesterday's action at Washington, nor will it be ended even if the Senate votes to discriminate against the vessels of all nations but the United States. The United States will not lightly tear up a solemn treaty with Great Britain and throw the pieces in the face of a friendly and powerful nation. National obligations are not to be so treated without the gravest consequences, and, no matter what action Great Britain might take, the fact that the United States had deliberately repudiated its treaty obligations would injure it immensely in the estimation of the other great nations and would convict it in the eyes of the world as guilty of flagrant national dishonor.

With the circumstances which led to the conclusion of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty the present situation has little or nothing to do. That the treaty was signed is not disputed. Nor can it be successfully disputed that the treaty provides for equal treatment for the ships of all nations, including those of the United States. This interpretation of the treaty is not made by Great Britain alone; it is so interpreted by the foremost American students of international law, notably Elihu Root, and by such reputable public journals as the New York Evening Post, and the New York Journal of Commerce. Indeed, the American authorities who can be cited in favor of the British interpretation are sufficiently numerous and high in reputation to place yesterday's action by the Senate in a most unpleasant light.

This indication that the United States Senate intends to stand pat will cause little surprise and no excitement in Great Britain. There are several countries which Britain may adopt without danger or loss of prestige. If the United States persists in the attitude foreboded by the Senate, a proposal to send the matter to The Hague Tribunal is probable. Should that be rejected by the United States, Britain has at its command many methods of commercial reprisals which would result in convincing the Americans that their decision to disregard the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was one marked by exceedingly bad business judgment as well as an astonishing disregard for the international proprieties.

## AN INCREASING PERIL

A jury has been investigating the recent railroad wreck at Cornish, New York, on the Lackawanna Railroad, in which forty persons were killed and many injured. It was found that the engineer had reported for duty while he was drunk. As a consequence of the jury's verdict, the Lackawanna has adopted new rules, under which all classes of employees connected with the moving of trains are forbidden to make any use of their time such as might unfit them for the safe, prompt, and efficient discharge of their duties. They are forbidden to play cards, or to drink, even when off duty.

The verdict has resulted in the publication of some alarming information regarding the operation of trains in the United States. The Wall Street Journal mentions

that on one railway in the eastern states thirty engineers who were discharged for disregarding signals, and who were subsequently reinstated through the action of the unions, proved that the warning was of little avail. Within eighteen months of their restoration to duty three of these men were killed as a result of repeating the offence for which they were suspended originally, and others of the number were discharged because they had again been detected in running past their signals.

The Railway Commission has approved of a rule adopted by most Canadian railways, which rule calls for the discharge of employees found intoxicated, and which permits the dismissal of men known to frequent places where liquor is sold, even though they may not have been detected in over-indulging.

## OLD MEN AND WISE

Wisdom may come with age, but not all old men are either wise or venerable. Often the world discovers an old man whose great age is in an admirable thing, and when it does it is likely to be proud of him and to study his history. For while age may be a burden the lesson of which it is constantly necessary to remind the world is that there must be some preparation for old age if the latter years are to be good for the individual and for the society in which he lives. The Montreal Witness has been considering the example of Lord Strathcona, who recently completed his ninety-second year.

"We shall all live the longer because Lord Strathcona has lived long and is still under high pressure at ninety-two, because his doing so helps us to expect to. Any insurance man will tell you that a man's own unconscious expectancy is one of the most important symptoms from which to determine how long he is going to live. Old age is more desired than it is in many cases worth. It was an old world desire to retire and no longer have to work—a sure path to the grave. The only bliss of living, and the only condition of healthy living, is in living for men. To live into a condition of non-productive dependence is not to be desired; but to be found working and serving mankind at ninety-two—that is a prospect that few of us would not welcome. The period of life is steadily growing longer, and what is rare today will be common in days to come when men have learned to live aright and when they shall inherit good conditions from those who have lived aright."

The Witness, in the foregoing observations, repeats several truths worthy of being remembered. Perhaps the greatest of these is that the short way to unhappiness, and probably to death, is for a physically capable man past middle age to give up work of every kind. The average human life is considerably longer than it was twenty-five or fifty years ago, and it is believed that the average will still be extended considerably, as men grow to understand better how to live. The normal man, Dr. Osler has reminded the world, is unconscious of his death as of his birth.

## LAND AND JUSTICE

There is a discussion of increasing sharpness in the United Kingdom over Lloyd George's proposal to extend his land tax principle with the idea of creating a large class of peasant proprietors. "Confiscation" is a word frequently thrown at the Chancellor. He is not the sort of man, however, who is deterred by epithets. In a recent issue of The Nation, Mr. H. W. Massingham, the editor, gives a picture of conferences at the time of the infamous Enclosures Acts, which were passed, not in dark feudal times, but in the days of the parents of some who still live in the English villages. Mr. Massingham's words may give Canadians a fresh idea of the land question in England. He says, in part:

"Land-owning members of Parliament crowded into the open commons, where the Enclosures Acts were rushed through, to back each other's schemes, or to pit one private interest against another. The Church joined the game, and scrambled for its ample share of the plunder. . . . The spoilers involved religion, science, the idleness or drunkenness or pride of the people to excuse their deed."

"They threw little holdings into great pulled down cottages; raised rents; ploughed up the pasture, and drove the small holder to cross the sea or to feed the towns industries. A more than Puritan gloom settled on the countryside. All hope of a career of rising in the social ladder was cut off. Those who remained, remained as slaves, on a scale of dismal and futuristic equality, contrasting widely with the variety of occupation and interest that marked the earlier type of English village."

Since in that way the land, or much of it, was taken from the people, it cannot be thought probable that they will regard the Chancellor's extension of the land tax as "Confiscation." Rather are they likely to see in it a belated but necessary instalment of justice.

## CANADA AND THE AMERICAN ELECTIONS

Woodrow Wilson's speech in accepting the Democratic nomination contains much of interest to Canadians. The Democrats already control the House of Representatives, and that body recently refused to follow the Senate's lead in repealing the reciprocity legislation of some months ago. The Senate represents at present much Republican voting strength which believes it well to condemn reciprocity in an attempt to hold the American farmers' vote for Taft. The action of the lower House, which indicates that the Democratic party will stick steadfastly to a programme of real tariff reduction, finds confirmation in Governor Wilson's speech of acceptance. Now that his chances of election seem excellent, his utterances with respect to tariff revision and relief from combines and trusts take on additional interest. "The tariff question," he says, "as dealt with in our time at any rate, has not been business. It has been politics. The tariff has become a system

of favors, which the phraseology of the schedule was often deliberately contrived to conceal, like those in love with a theory."

"It is obvious that the changes we make should be made only at such a rate and in such a way as will least interfere with the normal and healthful course of commerce and manufacture. But we shall not on that account act with timidity, as if we did not know our own minds, for we are certain of our ground and of our object. There should be an immediate revision, and it should be downward, unhesitatingly and steadily downward."

That sounds like sane but resolute tariff reduction, and if the Democrats win, we may expect that President Wilson will have at his back in Congress a powerful majority committed to precisely the policy he has outlined in his speech.

Our Conservative friends are telling us now that as both political parties in the United States are promising tariff reduction Canada will secure, without sacrifice on our part, all the benefits which will follow the adoption of reciprocity by both countries. They are hoping against any such result. Protectionists in this country do not believe the Republicans will really lower the tariff if they win the coming elections, and they do not believe the Democrats will reduce the duties materially, or at least they strongly hope they will not. But not only is it probable that a Democratic victory will mean real tariff reduction, but Democratic success and the elevation of Wilson to the presidency will certainly mark the beginning of a strong reaction against high protection, and will make it exceedingly difficult for a protectionist government in this country to raise the tariff, or even to resist successfully the inevitable popular demand for lower duties.

A convinced protectionist like Mr. Taft is unable to see, or unwilling to admit, that it is useless to make war upon the trusts until the tariff which protects them has been reduced to a point where outside competition would prevent them from exacting undue profits from the home consumer. The Democratic campaign bids fair to explode the Taft idea of protection, and Democratic success is pretty certain to introduce an active war against the trusts and combinations, using tariff reduction as the chief weapon, a political expedient which is bound to influence public opinion in Canada, particularly if it produces the good results which many believe are certain to follow its adoption.

So much for Woodrow Wilson's attitude on the tariff and the interest it must awaken in the Dominion. Canada is interested also in his very frank reference to the Panama Canal. He says: "The very fact that we have at last taken the Panama Canal seriously in hand and are vigorously pushing it towards completion, is eloquent of our re-awakened interest in international trade."

"We shall not manage the revival by the mere palsy device of tolls. We must build and buy ships in competition with the world. We can do it if we will, but give ourselves leave."

This last declaration will be shocking to American protectionists and American jingoists. But it is sound, and it rings true, and gives the world some idea of the manner of man Governor Wilson is.

## THE COST OF BAD ROADS

Canadian leaders of the movement for good roads are making use of a striking set of statements regarding the financial loss annually to defective highways, the author of which is Professor R. W. Neil, a celebrated American economist. He estimates that \$337,600,000 is lost every year in the rate and mud holes over which the farm produce of the United States is hauled in carts and wagons. The losses are the farmers who sell that produce and the consumers who buy it. Here is a summary of this particular good roads argument:

"Tons of freight hauled annually by farmers over earth roads, 250,000,000.  
"Average length of haul nine miles.  
"Cost per ton per mile of haul 23 cents.  
"Total cost of haul per ton \$2.07.  
"Total cost of hauling 250,000,000 tons \$337,500,000."

"Cost per ton per mile on improved roads, eight cents, total cost per ton nine cents, total cost per ton per nine miles haul, 72 cents.  
"Savings in cost of haul per ton per nine miles over improved road, \$1.35.  
"Total savings on 250,000,000 tons \$337,500,000."

"For every mile of unimproved road which he must haul his produce over, the farmer must pay an excess transportation cost of 15 cents. For every mile of unimproved road over which the produce that he buys has been moved the cost to the consumer has increased 15 cents.  
"At \$5,000 a mile for building 67,300 miles of improved road could be built each year with the \$337,500,000 that represent the difference in transportation cost between good and bad roads—ten improved highways across the continent and back."

"It is cheaper to build good roads, or to haul to market over money."  
"New Brunswick is perfecting its railway transportation, and will soon be well served in that respect throughout nearly every county. We have paid heavily for our railroads, but in most instances the investment has been good. We shall never secure the full benefit of the railroads, however, until we have learned to build and maintain really good wagon roads. The wonder is that the province has so long neglected a work of such immense importance."

## THEODORE AND ARMAGEDDON

Colonel Roosevelt has made himself the target for lively criticism by his assertion that he and his followers are fighting the battle of the Lord, and by introducing "Armageddon." A note of levity runs through some of the newspaper references to the Colonel's pose. The New York Evening Post recalls Diderot's reference to "Armageddon." It says Mr. Roosevelt is a jolly crusader, or essays to be, and that a jolly crusader is almost a contradiction in terms. "He thinks it 'bully' to be

in the political struggle," says the Post, "and his obvious love of excitement and joy in combat necessarily shake one's faith in his entire sincerity as a crusader. He repeats in Chicago his magnificent blague about Armageddon, but one can't help but feel him capable of saying cynically, after it is all over, as Diderot did on one occasion, 'They call it the Battle of Armageddon—but let us go to lunch.'"

The Post refuses to believe that Mr. Roosevelt is sincere. The true crusader, says the Post, "must have a fanatic strain in him; but Mr. Roosevelt is wholly without it. He does not rush forth as one impelled by an inward revelation; he plots and calculates and poses. The true crusader is self-forgetful; his cry is: Let my name not be lost, but let the thing itself be done. What a glutton of the limelight Theodore Roosevelt is, everybody now knows."

A cause without himself at the front of it is to him unthinkable. The genuine, historic crusader, finally, is a man who has a certain austerity of bearing. He is not forever hobnobbing with people and clapping them on the shoulder. He moves among them, rather, as one whose life has been touched by a live coal from off the altar."

The New York Sun attacks the Bull Moose leader more savagely, saying:

"Warned by the suave-quietude of so many of his Republican followers since the Republican convention, Mr. Roosevelt throws himself, directly and indirectly, upon ignorance, credulity, the selfishness of class, social disquiet, with vague, half-articulate fantastic promises and hopes he seeks to allure many sorts of people and especially farmers and laborers; he is for woman suffrage, a reformer of some weeks, although in 'conservative' States he would have a petticoat referendum on it; he mixes State and national concerns intricately and displays much of his characteristic backing and filling; but the sum, tendency and purpose of his proposals is nothing less than the destruction of the American polity as it is under the Constitution and the creation of a monstrous socialist despotism. State, State whose supreme law is the fifth occasional plebiscite."

Both these newspapers, of course, are with Mr. Roosevelt's opponents. The Post is giving Wilson enthusiastic support, and the Sun is for Taft. So far as newspaper comment affords any guide, the weight of opinion in Canada, particularly if it seems to indicate that the Roosevelt movement is not going to attain serious proportions, or at least that there are no signs that he will be able to create any approaching a political revolution. Nevertheless, in some quarters there evidently is uneasiness lest he may develop unexpected strength. It is at once natural and significant that this uneasiness appears more marked in Republican than in Democratic circles.

## NATIONAL HONOR

Senator Gorman of New York is providing entertainment for the world at large by his interpretation of that clause in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty which says that the canal "shall be free and open to vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality."

Mr. Gorman's contention is that these words mean that the vessels of all nations are to be treated equally—after they have observed the rules of traffic imposed by the United States. Or, as an amused reviewer suggests, Mr. Gorman says that two articles shall be said for exactly the same price—except that one shall be sold for one dollar and the other for five.

While a disposition of the canal question has been marked by much dishonest and otherwise unfortunate logic in the United States, it has been a pleasure to record the straightforward and honorable statements regarding the matter put forward by journals as the New York Evening Post, the New York Journal of Commerce, and the Boston Transcript. This latter journal makes an earnest plea for national honesty. It points out that the question under discussion is not a simple matter of national expediency, "for," it says, "the settlement of it will show either that the other nations of the earth or put ourselves in a position to incur their resentment and all the disadvantages that such a situation would involve."

To grant free tolls to American vessels, or to rebate the tolls charged, the Transcript says, would clearly make the American nation guilty of sharp practice; and such action in connection with a solemn treaty would sacrifice the world's respect. It condemns the argument that the matter of tolls is a domestic one and therefore not properly open to discussion by any other country. It says that unfortunate view of the matter might mean a refusal to submit the dispute to The Hague Tribunal, and it points out that this would be a performance which might bring in its train consequences of the gravest and most far-reaching character.

"It has been even intimated, and it is by no means improbable, that such an attitude would mean the end of The Hague Tribunal. Such a result would lack little of the proportion of a world calamity. It would put back for a score of years the gratifying progress we have made toward minimizing the arbitrament of force and lifting international controversies to the higher plane of judicial consideration and settlement. How can an interpretation of a treaty, especially when that interpretation should be challenged by one of the parties to it, be regarded as entirely within the permissive province of the other party to act under its provisions as it saw fit? This is not an American matter. It is a world matter and in its narrow limitations it is a matter between the United States and Great Britain."

"Were the action that has been indicated to be finally taken, even with the acceptance of the risk that would be involved if sent to The Hague Tribunal, it would mean that we were ready to accept the fruits of bad faith, provided we could get away with it. In other words, it would show a willingness to be as dishonorable as the circumstances would permit. But to withhold the whole business from a world court which this country has just foreman in helping to establish to fit just

such cases, would spell infamy in the judgment of the world's critics. Some of the defenders of the free-toll clause have confessed that the tribunal would decide against us on this point, and that confession carries with it the conviction, whether admitted or not, that the terms of the treaty have no opening for such an act of national perfidy. It is true that the platform of the Progressives favors it, but that is another story."

When we remember that the language quoted is that of one of the most thoughtful and respectable of American newspapers it may reasonably be inferred that there will be found in the United States a great body of conservative opinion which will condemn, and discredit, the attitude of the American Senate. If the British protest is disregarded at Washington, the matter clearly becomes one for The Hague. American refusal to submit the case to arbitration would be a proclamation of national dishonesty such as has not shocked the world for many a day.

## THE PROFIT FROM IMMIGRATION

During the last five years, January 1, 1907, to January 1, 1912, immigrants from the United Kingdom and from the United States brought into Canada more than \$24,000,000 in money and goods. These are government figures. According to the census in cash from Britain, \$37,540,000. Brought in cash from U. S. . . 157,260,000 U. S. settlers' effects, value . . . 110,892,000 British settlers' effects, value . . . 18,773,000

Total . . . \$324,561,000.  
The American settlers, having a shorter journey to make, were able to bring much more property than those who crossed the ocean. Besides, many of the Americans were men who had recently sold their farms south of the boundary to buy land in Canada, while many of those from the British Isles had been farm laborers and possessed little money. The fact that immigration from two sources alone enriched the country directly by more than \$24,000,000 in five years is a somewhat impressive one. Regarded from another standpoint, that of prospective value, this immigration has been worth a very much greater sum to Canada.

The Boston News Bureau, a reliable financial journal, tells its readers that a representative of Dow, Jones & Co., who has been investigating crop and financial conditions in the Canadian West, has just completed the first section of his report. The News Bureau publishes a summary of this report, and dwells upon the fact that the average American who takes up land in the Canadian West becomes a British subject, likes British institutions, and rears children who become good Canadians. The News Bureau has a word to say of the value of these settlers to the country of their adoption:

"The movement of farmers from the United States into the Canadian prairie provinces—Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—continues and increases. Last year more than 131,000 men, and immigrants have come to Canada, and it is not to be less than 175,000. Immigration, banking and railway officials estimate that the average American settler brings at least \$1,000 in cash, and this seems a conservative estimate."

"It seems that they brought into Canada last year upwards of \$131,000,000, and that their cash contributions to western Canada's wealth this year will be \$175,000,000. The Dominion government admits their household effects, livestock, agricultural machinery, etc., free of duty. The idea prevails in many quarters that this movement is spontaneous. This is an error. In the history of mankind there has never been a movement of people from one country to another more carefully or skillfully planned and operated."

"For the most part the settlers make new communities of their own, each male adult in many instances taking up a quarter-section of 160 acres of free land and buying as much more as he can at \$10, \$20 or \$30 an acre with proceeds of sales of Iowa, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, Ohio, and Missouri farms sold for \$100 to \$200 an acre. Much travel and observation in the prairie provinces discloses that the average American settler takes the oath of allegiance and becomes a British subject at the earliest possible moment. They like the Canadian form of government, and their children are growing up as good Canadians."

Canada still has more to offer the average immigrant than any other country in the world, and it is reasonable to think that the already great stream of settlers will continue to increase for years to come. Probably the number of immigrants will soon reach half a million annually.

## MR. BONAR LAW'S EXTRAVAGANCES

Mr. Asquith, when he rebuked Mr. Bonar Law for introducing unpleasant personalities and a new recklessness of assertion into the House of Commons, displayed a keen knowledge of his opponent's character. Canadians who heard with a feeling of pride that Mr. Bonar Law was to succeed Mr. Balfour encountered sharp disappointment when the new opposition leader began to discharge the duties of his position. Toronto-Saturday Night now devotes an article to consideration of Mr. Bonar Law's extravagances of language, pointing out that he has introduced a great deal of plain baldness, for which there can be no excuse. It says:

"Canadians who are proud of the British Unionist leader Mr. Bonar Law as a talented, follow countryman would feel more secure in their admiration if he would use less extravagant language when dealing with such a question as Irish Home Rule. In a speech on July 27th he said that the passage of the bill 'would light the fire of a civil war, which would shatter the Empire to its foundations.' In plain words this is baldness. If any one has led Mr. Bonar Law to suppose that the rest of the Empire is concerning itself seriously about the matter he is very much mistaken. Does he suppose that for the sake of a mob of malignant

Belfast ship mechanics, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand are going to abandon British connection and set up republics? Does he suppose that the native troops of India are going to turn their arms against their officers when Ulster rises—or to put it more correctly when the turbulent mob of Belfast picks up the cobble stones? Or to come to that section of the overseas dominions which is nearest to the scene—Canada—what of her? It is to be feared that Mr. Bonar Law was deceived by the cable accounts of a meeting held in Massey Hall, Toronto, when certain valiant speeches were made. But let him be informed that the gentlemen who made the speeches (just because they were asked to) had no note of indignation in their voices and have no intention of shattering the Empire for any such cause."

This is, after all, a moderate view. The Empire is not going to be wrecked by Home Rule, nor come anywhere near it. Mr. Law's sense of proportion is not nearly good enough for one who would attempt to wear Mr. Balfour's mantle gracefully.

## NOTE AND COMMENT

Mr. George W. Perkins, of the Harvest Trust, says the Progressive party has plenty of money. As it has a highly moral platform and the support of the suffragist, in addition to the coin, it should be tolerably well "equipped" for the campaign of righteousness.

"It only cost Christopher Columbus \$200 to discover America," says the Vancouver Province. "Many sporting men have paid more than that to discover what cards the gentleman across the table hold in his hands." The hoary legend that Columbus discovered America will be fully exposed in a few days at the unveiling of the Cabot Memorial in Nova Scotia," says the Ottawa Journal.

"And it is time, too."  
Queen Victoria the Good reigned sixty-three years, seven months and two days. Her remarkably long reign has now been surpassed by that of Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria. On July 5 the Emperor had reigned for sixty-three years, seven months and three days. Louis XIV. of France was king for seventy-two years, but he came to the throne as a child of five. Both Queen Victoria and Emperor Francis Joseph ascended the throne when eighteen years of age.

It cost \$5,000,000 to elect President McKinley, according to Mr. Herbert Corley, whose biography of Mark Hanna has just been published. Mr. James J. Hill, according to Mr. Corley, was the leader among the financial magnates who provided the funds. This information leads one reviewer to say that "the most discouraging truth is that it is the three and a half millions, and not the man elected, that rules the United States. And the man behind the millions pulls the strings."

Fifty-seven years have passed since the United Kingdom was at war with a European power. A good many more years may elapse before a decision between England and war will have to be made. Will Canada, when she becomes a nation of twenty-five millions, be content to have her foreign relations determined by a body of men who she has no control whatever? An affirmative answer to that question seems very difficult.—Victoria Colonist.

There's no hurry. It is a good British custom not to cross bridges till you come to them. This one is a long way off, Mr. Borden to the contrary notwithstanding.

Hon. George E. Foster is overdoing it. He says once more that "Mr. Borden's declaration that Canada has irretrievably made up its mind to stay in and with the Empire has been approved by the British public." Mr. Foster is one of the men principally responsible for the use of that basest of campaign slanders, the intimation that Canada's loyalty was doubtful because half the population favor a more sensible tariff. That sort of thing is causing even conservatives to grow weary of the sort of partisanship that is ready to slander the whole country in an attempt to win by dishonest tactics.

A few years ago there was a cry that British boot and shoe industry was being crushed by American competitors. Imports were increasing, exports dwindling, and the business seemed to be in a bad way. The British manufacturers decided to scrap their old and install new machinery, and copy American styles and methods. Since then imports have dropped one half and exports have doubled, the former last year being valued at \$627,000, and the latter at \$2,355,000. But the American competition the British industry would have remained in the old rut; now it is invading the world's markets.—Manitoba Free Press.

Strange how John Bull does muddle through without protection.

The Bull Moose manifesto is the occasion for this rather mordant comment by the Boston Transcript:

Those with large leisure may take the time to read this "confession" but they will not really be enlarging their stock of wisdom and information. As a confession it is a confession of over-eating and indigestion. As a magna charta it is too long, to diffuse and very much too general. It will hardly serve the purpose of an inflamer and will fall pretty flat upon the great American public. As seems to us that this is a big damper at the start of the new party and cannot help discouraging those who have been most zealous and disinterested in its belief. The party may thrive in spite of it. Indeed in many ways the auspices are excellent, but the Bull Moose has certainly aided very little in the enunciation of the fiscal call.

Sir Edmund Walker, recently compared our banking facilities with those of the United States. Mr. H. M. P. Eckhardt, in his book "A Rational Banking System," published in 1911, says that in the cities of the United States there is one bank to every 6,700 people and in Canadian cities one to every 3,300 people. Sir Edmund says that the larger number proportionately in Canada is due to the many branches of banks in the cities. "For instance, there are 161 branch banks in Toronto, 101 in Montreal, 49 in Winnipeg and 62 in Vancouver. If we take city and country together, we find that in the

United States there are, say, 27,000 banks and 92,000,000 people, or one bank for 3,407 people. In Canada there are 27 banks with 2,841 branches, and calling the population 8,000,000, there is one bank for every 3,029 people. It cannot surely be urged that the systems of banking in the two countries have failed to provide satisfactory service so far as it can be judged in this manner."

The Conservatives at Ottawa have discovered how to raise the tariff without consulting Parliament, according to the Ottawa Free Press. While it requires a vote of the House of Commons and Senate to raise or lower the tariff on a single article, it has been found that the same thing can be effected by having a departmental official say: "In future binders and threehens coming in from the United States shall be valued at \$200 for duty estimation, instead of \$100 as formerly." This has the effect of raising the tariff on these articles from twenty per cent. to thirty per cent., which means an increase of fifty per cent. The Free Press says the government has adopted this course in order to favor Toronto manufacturers. In serving the manufacturer the government has, of course, hit the western Canadian farmer. And of this we shall hear more hereafter.

## ANNUAL SESSION OF ROYAL ARCANUM

Moncton, Aug. 10.—The annual meeting of the Grand Council of the Royal Arcanum for Maritime Provinces took place at Moncton on Wednesday and Thursday, 7 and 8. A fairly good attendance was present, among whom were the following: Grand Regent Charles A. McLennan, Truro; Grand Vice Regent H. H. James, St. John; Grand Orator, Hiram Goudy, Yarmouth; Grand Secretary, F. A. Allison, Sackville; Grand Treasurer, C. W. Burney, Moncton; Grand Chaplain, T. H. Francis, Halifax; Grand Scribe, George D. Martin, St. John; Past Grand Regent, E. H. McAndrews, St. Stephen; Grand Trustees, C. H. Perry, Sussex; G. G. Wetmore, St. John; E. F. Hart, Halifax; Provincial Medical Examiner, W. A. Christie, M. B., St. John; A. N. Charters, Moncton; W. M. Ferguson, Truro; W. H. Studd, Halifax; J. D. Lawson, St. Stephen; E. A. Charters, Sussex; J. P. Masters, Kentville; E. J. Payson, Moncton; T. J. McClure, St. Stephen; G. F. Estabrooks, Sackville; H. R. Fawcett, Sackville; C. P. Harris, Moncton.

The Supreme Representative, Dr. Chas. E. Cornell, of Ithaca (N. Y.), was present accompanied by his wife. Both expressed themselves as highly delighted with their trip to the maritime province. On a former occasion Dr. Cornell was the representative of the Supreme Council at Charlottetown (P. E. I.), in 1908. The grand council was opened in due form by C. A. McLennan, of Truro (N. S.), who has been grand regent for the year 1911-1912. The business of the council was then taken up in its usual order and it having been learned that the former Sup. Council Organizer, Bro. J. A. McQueen was ill and unable to attend the council, the grand regent and Secretary Allison were instructed to send him a telegram expressing the sympathy of the members and their sincere wishes for his speedy recovery. At the afternoon session reports of the various committees were handed in and discussed. Among them being one recommending that the grand council be memorialized to have an organizer appointed for the maritime provinces.

During the afternoon Dr. Cornell, as president, addressed the assembly, and his address was most interesting and addressed which was heartily applauded by all present. An evening session was held at which the grand regent and Secretary Allison were present and discussed business attended to. On Thursday morning the council again met when Dr. Cornell proceeded to install the various officers elected for 1912-13. Committees appointed for 1912-13 by the grand regent were as follows: Laws—H. H. James, W. M. Ferguson, J. D. McNay. Finance—W. H. Studd, Frank Wetmore, E. A. Charters. The Order—J. A. McQueen, G. H. McAndrews, E. F. Hart.

Printing and Supplies—C. A. McLennan, J. D. Allison, C. W. Burney. Votes of thanks were passed and tendered to Dr. Cornell for his kind and courteous work and address. Also to Moncton council for the invitation extended to the council to take a drive to the oil and gas wells in Albert county, during the afternoon after which the council was adjourned sine die.

The next place of meeting for the Grand Council in August, 1913, will be at Truro (N. S.), at which point all able to attend may look for a very hearty reception and a pleasant time.

The drive to the oil and gas wells though not taken by as many as was hoped for, proved a most enjoyable trip and Resident Manager M. W. Shaw did all in his power to explain matters fully to the visitors.

It is quite safe to say that all of the Grand Council visitors to Moncton during the session enjoyed themselves and the hospitality extended to them fully and bore with their pleasant memories of their visit to Moncton.

To save one's hands while blacking a stove, slip the hand into a paper bag before grasping the blacking brush handle.

Mrs. Tilford Moots's nephew has a civil service job—that is, they can't fire him unless they want to. Life is full of surprises, but the worst of all is running out

RAIN IS DOING GREAT DAMAGE ON THE