

Messenger and Visitor

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
VOLUME LXV.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR,
VOLUME LIV.

Vol. XIX.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1903.

No. 42

Whatever methods tend to diminish friction and to promote good feeling between employer and employees are certainly worthy of attention. The British Columbia Electric Railway Company of Vancouver appears to have found that it is a good thing for the management to take the employees into its confidence in respect to the conditions of the business and give them a share in its profits. This company has at the end of its year distributed \$7,500 among its employees. This amount represented a surplus, after a reasonable dividend had been paid on the capital invested, and was distributed equally among the employees as a recognition of faithfulness in service, which was presumed had been equal in all, so that the office boy received as much as the manager. Before the affairs of the company came under its present management, it was not a paying concern, and there was more or less friction between the employers and employees. The present experience of the company seems to indicate that the hope of sharing in the profits of a business operates in some instances at least to promote good feeling and efficiency on the part of the employees, to the mutual advantage of themselves and their employers, and incidentally of course to the advantage of the public as well.

Mr. Charlton's Bill.

A large part of a day was devoted recently by the Dominion House of Commons to the discussion of Mr. John Charlton's Bill designed to secure greater purity in elections. Unfortunately, as it seems, the attention of the House was devoted almost entirely to one clause in the Bill—that namely which proposes to compel the elector to go to the polls on election days on the penalty of disfranchisement for six years. This clause has been described somewhat incorrectly as involving compulsory voting. It does not appear that in connection with the secret ballot an elector can be compelled to vote. He may be compelled under penalty to cast a ballot, but it would still rest with himself whether his ballot should represent a vote or simply a blank. There was much difference of opinion, in which both sides of the house shared, as to the value of the compulsory clause. A number of the members favored the clause on the grounds that every elector ought to exercise the franchise and that the proposed law would do away with the bribing of electors to stay away from the polls. On the other hand it was argued that the principle of compulsion in connection with the exercise of the franchise was not wholesome and again that to disfranchise a man for six years, because he did not vote, would be to perpetuate the very evil it was sought to remedy. Finally the Premier said that he approved of a number of the provisions of the Bill, which ought to become law at this session and to which there would be no objection. The only part on which there was any contention, so far as he could see, was that which had been inaccurately described as compulsory voting. Upon this clause there was a lack of unanimity on both sides of the House. The discussion had been valuable, and he would ask the Minister of Justice to give attention to the clauses regarding which there was unanimity, and he would himself give attention to the clause on which there was contention and take it up again at a later date.

Great Britain and France.

What is called an arbitration treaty is about being concluded between Great Britain and France. It is said, however, that the treaty does not positively bind the two powers to arbitrate all questions arising, but provides generally that, whenever possible, disputes shall be settled in this pacific manner, either by submission to the Hague Arbitration Court or by reference to a special tribunal. This is certainly a step in the right direction, and a very gratifying outcome of the more friendly feeling that of late has prevailed between the two nations. It is to be hoped that the treaty foreshadows a settlement of that long-existing and vexing question as to French rights on the shores of Newfoundland. The maintenance of friendly relations between Great Britain and France, is especially to be desired by Canada in view of the fact that so large a proportion of the population of this country is of French origin, and the French Canadians are so warmly sympathetic towards the

land of their ancestors. For this reason, if for no other, a war between the two nations is something which we must ardently hope will never take place. There is certainly no good reason why there should be other than kindly feelings between the two peoples, both in the new world and the old. Each doubtless has the defect of its qualities, but both have characteristics to induce not only mutual toleration, but mutual respect and admiration, and the world is wide enough to afford a field for every laudable ambition of both nations.

The Anglo-French Treaty.

Since the foregoing paragraph was written the despatches have announced the signing of the treaty on October 14 by Lord Lansdowne on behalf of Great Britain and M. Cambon, the French Ambassador. The text of the treaty is as follows:—"The Government of the French Republic and the Government of His Britannic Majesty, signatories of the convention concluded at the Hague, July 29, 1899, for the peaceful settlement of international disputes: Considering that by article 19 of that treaty the high contracting powers reserve to themselves the right of concluding agreements with the view to have recourse to arbitration in all cases where they shall consider it possible to submit thereto: Have authorized the undersigned to agree to the following provisions: Article One—Differences of a judicial order, or such as relate to the interpretation of treaties existing between the two contracting parties, which may arise between them and which it may not be possible to settle by means of diplomacy, shall be submitted to the permanent court of arbitration established at The Hague by the convention of July 29, 1899, on condition, however, that they do not involve either vital interests or the independence or honor of the two contracting states, and that they do not affect the interests of a third power: Article Two—In each particular case the high contracting parties before addressing themselves to the permanent court of arbitration, shall sign a special arbitration bond setting forth clearly the subject under dispute, the extent of the powers of the arbitrators, and the details to be observed as regards the constitution of the arbitration, tribunal and the procedure: Article Three—The present arrangement is concluded for a term of five years from the date of the signature.

Railroad Development.

Recent experiments in Germany have shown that a speed of 125 miles an hour is attainable on electric railways. This is interesting in the line of experiment, but there seems no immediate probability that trains will actually be run at any such rate of speed, not only because of the added risk, but because of the large additional expense involved in such an increase of speed. But whether or not the speed now attained by the fast express trains shall be greatly increased it remains true that railroading is one of the most surprising and significant developments of modern times. A hundred years or more ago men were experimenting with locomotive engines, but it was not until 1830 that Stevenson produced a locomotive which demonstrated beyond a doubt the practicability of the application of steam as a motive power for railroading. There had been railroads before this but the cars were drawn by horses. The first American railroad was built in 1826. It was three miles long and was built for the purpose of hauling granite for Bunker Hill monument. The first railway in the United States built for steam cars was the Charleston and New Hamburg line in South Carolina. It was 137 miles long, and was for some time, it is said, the longest line in the world. As soon as the practicability of steam power as a locomotive agent had been fairly demonstrated, the business of building railroads began in earnest, but it is within the last thirty or forty years that the greatest development in railroading has been seen. In 1865, at the close of the civil war, no American railroad had 1000 miles of track. Now there are eight great systems with over ten thousand miles each, and the railroads of the United States make up a total of nearly 200,000 miles. . . . Though the express trains of to-day travel at much greater speed than was attainable in the early history of railroading, yet the increase of speed has been much less remarkable than the increase of power. Stevenson's first locomotive made 29 miles an hour, but in the size and power it was little more than a toy compared with the engines of to-day. Even 50 years

ago a train load of 200 tons was considered heavy. Now loads of 2,000 to 2,500 tons are hauled.

The Honorable Artillery Company of London.

The Honorable Artillery Company of London which came to the United States as the guests of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston, has met with such a reception in that city and other cities of the country as to leave nothing to be desired on the score of cordiality and enthusiasm. The tour of the distinguished company has included a visit to Washington and a reception by the President. Last week they paid brief visits to Toronto and Montreal, being accompanied by their hosts, the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Boston. The English visitors who number about 150, are under the distinguished command of Lieut. Colonel Lord Denbigh, who joined the Royal Artillery in 1878, and served with distinction in the Egyptian campaign of 1882, and in India in 1886. The Honorable Artillery Company is not exclusively an Artillery regiment, but is made up of two batteries of horse artillery and six companies of infantry, numbering in all 1,000 men. It claims to be the oldest military body in the kingdom, dating back to 1537, when it was incorporated by Henry VIII, and at the present time is endeavoring to establish the right to be regarded as the one military body which has taken part in all the wars in which England has been engaged since the days of the Spanish Armada. Ever since its incorporation it has enjoyed the distinction of having a member of the royal family as its Colonel and Captain-General, a position now held by King Edward. It shares with the Guards, Marines and Buffs the privilege of marching through London with fixed bayonets. The corps is composed mostly of men holding responsible positions in banks and professional men, such as stockbrokers and bankers. It is not a volunteer organization, and although it takes part in volunteer contests, refuses to accept badges or medals such as is conferred on the ordinary volunteer forces.

The Alaskan Boundary Decision.

At present writing, there has been no official announcement of a conclusion in the Alaskan Boundary case. But if the despatches of the Associated Press on the subject are to be accepted as correct, an agreement has been reached by a majority of the Commissioners to grant all the American contentions except that having reference to the Portland Canal which goes to Canada. This is generally regarded as confirming in the main the United States contention. As the despatch states that it is unknown whether or not Messrs. Aylesworth and Jette will consent to sign the decision and thus make it unanimous, it appears to be implied that the deciding majority is made up of the three United States commissioners and Lord Alverstone. Whether the Canadian commissioners Messrs. Aylesworth and Jette agree or dissent will not affect the validity of the decision, since, according to the terms of the treaty, a majority of the commissioners could render a decision binding on both nations. While it is a matter of fact that the United States would not submit the decision of the case to any method of settlement that did not keep the matter in its own hands, and while there is good ground for holding that no decision strongly adverse to the American contention would have been accepted by the United States commissioners, it would be unwise and wrong to charge that, assuming the report of the decision reached to be correct, Lord Alverstone has deliberately taken sides with the American commissioners in order to avoid friction with the United States. And it is only in the light of a knowledge of the facts and principles involved, such as can be had only by persons who possess the highest ability and who have given the most exhaustive study to the whole case, that it could be charged that, even unintentionally, the British commissioner in deciding for the United States has done an injustice to Canada. At the same time it will be said, and no doubt believed in certain quarters, that the interests of Canada have again been sacrificed by the mother country for the sake of placating the United States. It is certainly hard to believe that British statesmen would consider it good policy—to say nothing about the justice of the matter—to offend Canada for the sake of pleasing the United States, but it is certainly to be regretted from a Canadian point of view that the settlement of the Alaskan boundary could not be secured by reference of the question to an impartial and neutral tribunal.