

SIR WILFRID LAURIER COMPARES CONSTITUTIONS

Contrasts That of Great Britain With That of United States—Britain's Has the Advantage of Making the Will of the People Directly Felt—Thinks Britain Would Be Better With a Federal System Like That of the United States—An Interesting Study.

Following are extracts from Sir Wilfrid Laurier's eloquent and thoughtful speech recently before the Canadian Women's Club, Montreal, in which he compared the British and American constitutions:

The British constitution is the result of a process of evolution, the application of a few leading principles, supplemented by maxims, rules and precedents too long to enumerate— which have grown with the ages, determined one time and all tending towards one single object, the government of the people by the people themselves. How true are the words of Tennyson, in his estimation the most English of all the English poets since the days of Shakespeare, when he summarized the benefits of England's free institutions:

You ask me why, tho' ill at ease
Within this region I subsist,
Whose spirits falter in the mist,
And languish for the purple seas.

It is the land that freeman till,
That sower Freedom chose;
The land where, girl with friends or foes,
A man may speak the thing he will.

A land of settled government,
A land of just and old renown,
Where freedom slowly broadens down
From precedent to precedent.

Where faction seldom gathers head,
But by degrees to fullness wrought,
The strength of some diffusive thought
Flath time and space to work and speak.

No better definition of the British system has ever been written than is contained in these beautiful lines. During the last century the great American statesman, Daniel Webster, was a visitor in the old city of Quebec. At that time there was a detachment of the British army doing garrison duty in the Gibraltar of the American continent. One evening the officers of the detachment, saluted by the tattoo of the English troops, and a thought crossed his mind, which shortly afterwards, in a speech delivered in Congress, he expressed in these words, while speaking of England:

Webster's Tribute.

"On this question of principle, while actual suffering was yet afar off, they raised their flag against a power, to which, for purposes of foreign conquest and subjugation, Rome, in the height of her glory, is not to be compared; a power which has spread over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

This beautiful language graphically expresses the pride which has been reached by the small island whose modest beginning has just been explained. If today Webster were to speak upon the same subject, if he could gaze upon the globe with his own eyes, and were he to descend upon the same subject, with what images could he describe the power of England? He could speak of her, not as encircling the globe with her garrisons, but as the centre of a group of daughter nations who have found the adoption and application to themselves of the British constitution not only a charter of liberty, but a closer bond of union with the motherland. Proud as we may be as British subjects of these achievements of a country to which we belong, there is another respect in which, as compared with our own, the British subjects can derive still greater pride. The British constitution in another way encircles the globe. It has been carried by the hands of the friends and lovers of liberty. During the last century all the nations of the continent of Europe have been converted by revolutions in the struggle of the people for liberty, and they found it at last in the application to themselves of the British constitution.

Imitation That Is World-Wide.

France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Greece, Denmark, Norway, Sweden—all these countries have adopted, in whole or in part, the British constitution. At all events, those which have not adopted it entire have adopted those two cardinal principles: "No taxation except by the consent of the people, and ministerial responsibility." Nor is that all. These great principles have crossed the farthest oceans, and by them the dormant civilization of the Orient has been awakened to life. Japan has adopted it, and by doing so, it has jumped at one bound into the highest rank in peace and war; and even the Empire of Turkey itself, the recent power of the East, has been urged to call it in seeking Palmerston used to call it in seeking and may find in the British constitution regeneration. And, ladies and gentlemen, there is one power that has also adopted the British constitution, and it is the most illustrious of all, that is the American Republic.

INDIGESTION, STOMACH GAS, HEARTBURN AND HEADACHE FROM STOMACH VANISHES

A Little Diapiesin Makes Your Out-of-Order Stomach Feel Fine in Five Minutes.

If what you just ate is souring on your stomach or lies like a lump of lead, refusing to digest, or you belch gas and eructate sour, undigested food or have a feeling of Dizziness, Heartburn, Fulness, Nausea, Bad taste in mouth and stomach, headache—this is Indigestion.

A full case of Diapiesin costs only 50 cents and will thoroughly cure your out-of-order stomach, and leave sufficient about the house in case someone else in the family may suffer from stomach trouble or Indigestion.

Ask your pharmacist to show you the formula plainly printed on these

When the thirteen colonies violently rent themselves from the motherland they paid her the compliment of incorporating in the constitution which they afterwards adopted for themselves, almost in its entirety, with few exceptions, the principles of the constitution of the old country, as far as they could apply them to their new conditions. During those four years in honor bound to say that wherever they departed from it they did not improve but rather weakened their condition, and I claim for the constitution of Great Britain that it is more elastic, more practicable, more amenable to the public weal, and, therefore, more democratic than the constitution of the United States. In so far as legislative power is concerned there is absolutely no difference at all; it is the British constitution entire, under different names. They have a Parliament, the British Parliament is called Congress; it is composed of two Houses, not, of course, the Lords and the Commons; there are no Lords in the United States, except the moved lords, the moneyed barons, perhaps, but they have the House of Representatives and the Senate. The head of the nation, the President, is elective, and all legislation must be consented to, to be effective, by the House of Representatives, the Senate and the President. This is exactly the same as legislation by the King, the Lords and the Commons.

A Radical Departure.

In so far as the executive power is concerned it is vested in the President, but here arises the first radical departure between the American constitution and the British constitution. There is no ministerial responsibility in the United States. The President is elected for four years, and during those four years he is the head, the executive power; he is absolutely beyond the control of Parliament; the people who have elected him have no control over him, and the Congress, which is made up of laws, has no power over him; he is absolutely supreme, and if he does anything wrong in the eyes of the nation there is no force whereby he can be set right. Now, I am very sure in this respect that our constitution is far superior to the American constitution. The American publicists, however, have an answer to this; they tell us that the theory of their constitution is different from ours; that their theory is that the whole scheme of government is divided into three distinct branches, the legislative, the executive and the judicial, and that each one is absolutely independent in its own sphere. Well, one has to recognize that the noblest idea is not to be compared; a power which has spread over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England."

A Striking Contrast.

I understand that in a speech of the kind I am now delivering I must eschew everything which would be even approximate to politics, but I do not think that I will not defend my reference to it, that the result in each country was that the party in office was defeated. Well, in Canada, within three weeks after the verdict of the people had been recorded, a new administration had been called and installed in office, whereas in the United States the verdict was rendered in the first week of November, but the new administration was not installed until four months after. It took four months in the United States, where they have the reputation of being prompt, quick and sharp to do what we did on this side of the pond in three weeks. Now, if the object of the constitution, both in Canada and the United States, is to have a government of the people, by the people and for the people as Lincoln called it, if the object is to have the will of the people carried into effect, everybody must admit that our system, ministerial responsibility, is far more effective, more prompt, and far less liable to friction than is the American system. This, I admit, is a time of peace, in times of war, under ordinary circumstances, where no irritating question is before the people, might not indeed present any very great inconvenience, except that it would, perhaps, lay a little upon the shoulders of the victors, but when there is before the people some question which has wrought great excitement, when popular passions have been aroused to a very high pitch, I submit that all due deference for the opinion of our American friends, that their system is liable to very serious danger.

How Lincoln Was Fettered.

And, here again, I will give you a complete example, perhaps the American publicists would differ with me, but there was a time, I may say, when they might have thought different, and that was after the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860. That election had been fought upon the question of slavery. The programme of the Republican party, who carried the election, was a very moderate one; it did not propose to deal with slavery where slavery existed then; it proposed a programme was confined to this: that they would not allow any extension of slavery beyond those limits in which it then existed. To such a pitch, however, were the passions aroused at that time that the slavery power in the United States, in the south, to which it was then confined, threatened during the election, that if Abraham Lincoln were elected they would rend the Union, and after the election had taken place they proceeded to put their threat into execution. State after State seceded from the Union, and the outgoing President, James Buchanan, was an honest man, but a weak character. He was surrounded by traitors, who took advantage of the last days of the outgoing Government to facilitate the conspiracy of the slave power. The President-elect, Abraham Lincoln, was absolutely powerless to interfere; he was an impotent spectator of the work which was being done, and he could not so much as lift a finger to prevent it. I cannot but believe that at that time the American statesmen regretted that they had not the system of ministerial responsibility which prevailed under the British constitution, under which Abraham Lincoln would have been placed in office in three weeks. And how much blood and treasure would have been saved had Abraham Lincoln been more promptly placed in the position to which the voice of the people had called him? There is another and still more striking example to be found in the period of reconstruction which followed the civil war.

The Reconstruction Issue.

The policy of Congress and the policy of the President on the problem of reconstruction were at total variance. It is no part of my present purpose to consider who was in the right or who was in the wrong, but under the British system the policy of Congress would have easily prevailed. The first vote of the House of Representatives would have at once compelled a change of ministry and forced the policy which Congress had in mind. But, under the American system, which existed, the President was in office for four years. He was absolutely free from control, he could baffle the will of Congress, and Congress was absolutely powerless to do anything. I am sure that the leaders of Congress at that time—Sumner, Stephens and Wade—more than once regretted that the fathers had not adopted the British system, which would have made it so easy for Congress to carry out that policy.

British Constitution More Practical.

As it is, discord more akin to civil war resulted from the difference between Congress and the President. At last Congress resorted to the expedient of the Imperial Presidency against Johnson. The impeachment could not carry; it was defeated even by some of the best thinkers among the leaders of the Republican party. Hence it was felt that Johnson had committed no mistake, but was exercising the very powers invested in him by the American constitution; he was acting according to his own light, and if he was wrong, the blame was with the system. In this respect, I think, we British subjects can claim that our monarchical constitution is more practical than the Republican constitution of the United States. (Applause.) There is, however, one particular in which, I think, the American constitution is superior to our own. I should not say our own constitution, because in our Canadian constitution we have the best of both the British and American; but there is a particular in which the American constitution is superior to the British; the American constitution is a federative union, whereas the constitution of the United Kingdom is a legislative union.

No Federative Principle.

We understand by federative union a union of state entities, each one endowed with some sort of independence, dealing with local questions, and a central Government embracing and legislating for the whole, on questions which affect the whole. Perhaps at the first glance some one might think that a constitution in which there is a division of legislation has not the element of strength in the more compact legislative union. To this I would say that the experience of the world goes to show, rather, that federative union is the most potent instrument of government to unite communities which have been heretofore divided by geographical differences, geographical distance, or historic developments; and I would go farther, and say that the federative union is a counterpoise to the danger of over-centralization, and a perfectly homogeneous community spread over a large territory. The Americans adopted a federative union, and I believe they have built better than they knew. Its adoption was more a matter of necessity than of choice. It is a matter of history that after the war of the revolution, when the thirteen colonies were united into a single strong Government. They preferred to keep up among themselves the loose ties which had been hastily patched up at the moment of the war, and it was only through the efforts of the best minds of that day that they at last adopted the union. The American Republic is today so united, so strong, so proud, and so legitimately proud of its glorious past and of its colossal future that it is almost a matter of surprise that there should have been so much difficulty at the outset to unite it. This was the case, however, and it is not difficult to comprehend, if we remember the conditions which prevailed at the time of the war of the revolution. The thirteen colonies which separated in 1776 from Great Britain were not identical except in origin and in allegiance. Each one had been granted a separate charter, and each had a separate organization. There was between them very little communication and hardly any commerce. What little commerce there was was simply the ready exchange of rough commodities for the necessities of contiguous states. Great Britain forgot her own history, and attempted to tax those colonies against their will, and to tax their consent, and in so doing struck a spark which at once produced a conflagration.

An Overloaded Parliament.

God forbid that I should enter, on this occasion or any other occasion, on anything which might be ever so remotely connected with the question of British politics; but we are all British subjects, we have all the interests of the Empire at heart, and we can look across the water and

seek for possible remedies to these momentous problems which come before the nation, not of actual politics, but in the high realm of speculative thought. There is one thing which always strikes me in the position today of the Parliament of Great Britain. It is understood that it is congested, loaded and overloaded with petty interests and trifling questions. You may have one day in that august assembly—the most august the world has ever seen—a discussion upon the fate of empires, or the destinies of nations, or the highest concerns of war or peace, the following day a debate upon a road ditch in Wales, a loch in the Highlands of Scotland, or a piece of bog in Ireland. The greatest possible proof of that is that the attention of the legislature is so engaged the most petty, trifling interests alternate to engage the attention of the same men. There is something in this, it seems to me, which is a serious sphere of action which ought to be reserved to an Imperial Parliament such as the British Parliament. I would not go further in this direction at present, perhaps some time or other some federative system dividing legislation with regard to England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales may be devised for the United Kingdom.

The Written Constitution.

Ladies and gentlemen, you will ask me, "Is there not a great advantage which the Americans have over us in the fact that theirs is a written and the British an unwritten constitution?" For my part I must say that I do not attach any great importance either to one form or the other. Whether it is a written constitution or an unwritten one, after all, it is the will of the people which must prevail; example to the contrary have a written constitution, their history shows that it is possible, without changing a word of that constitution, to vary the spirit of it as to effectively amend it. The case in regard to the election of Presidents. By an enactment of the constitution as it was originally framed and supplemented by the twelfth amendment, the President is elected by what is called the Electoral College. Well, you would suppose it was the intention of the constitution that the electors, selected for that purpose by great and eminent men, should proceed to the election of a President. Nothing of the kind. They have that task assigned to them, but they are not free agents; they are simply have to record the will of the people as it is expressed at the polls. You are all familiar with the manner in which a Presidential election is carried out in modern days. We had such an election not very long ago, and you heard the people shouting for Taft or for Bryan. On election day we were all looking to see who was elected, was Taft or was Bryan? The modern method of selection is this: A convention of each of the two parties, the Republican Convention or the Democratic Convention, selects Taft or Bryan, or Bryan, they vote for Mr. So-and-So and Mr. So-and-So, men whom they do not know and have never seen, but who have been carefully selected by the machine. The original constitution, as contemplated by the fathers, has been completely set aside, and instead of having an election by the Electoral College, we have in reality an election by the popular vote, so that there is not much difference whether the constitution is written or not, it can be arranged quickly.

Justice Wins in the End.

Now, you will ask me, what conclusion is to be drawn from these comparisons? I will answer that question by saying that, barring the case of the American Union, as a federative union, there is no possible doubt in my mind that the British constitution is far superior to the American. But the lines of difference are very narrow, and all, in fact, are the cardinal principles of the will of the people is the supreme arbiter in one as in the other. It does not follow that public opinion is always in the right. It is often in the wrong, but the course of history has shown us that both in Great Britain and the United States, under free constitutions, truth and justice may be delayed, but they are not defeated. It is not so sudden as it is often made to appear, but from Jerusalem to Damascus, I claim that under these free institutions principles have been evolved from time to time which, though at first they may seem to be accepted as emanations from truth and justice, have in the long run triumphed in the manner in which slavery in the United States has been dealt with.

THE INDIAN FAIR HELD AT MUNCEY

New York Sun Writer Much Impressed By What He Saw.

A writer in the New York Sun, presumably Peter McArthur, thus describes the Muncie-Tecumseh fair in this country: "The Muncie-Tecumseh fair, an excellent opportunity to study the Indian under British rule. As far as could be seen he is being metamorphosed into a pale imitation of a white man. Judging from the exhibits the Indians on this reservation, who by the way are a remnant of the Six Nations—of the Mohawks and Algonquians—are becoming fatter, fatter and fatter. Pumpkins and squashes are as corpulent as the bulk-fed products to be found at the fall fairs of the white men. The value of the weaving blankets they make is small, and it was interesting to find quite recognizable imitations of the Gibson Girl done by young squaws of artistic leanings. By the way, has anyone seen a New York salt-cracker? It is believed to be the original Gibson Girl of the vaudeville managers have missed a chance. Several squaws of mail order made could easily have been cast for the part. When the horse race came off at least one of the jockeys rode in a manner which made it evident that the fame of the Ted Sten was not entirely confined to the States. As a matter of fact only the children seem to suggest anything of the primitive American. They were elfin, glowing-eyed and full of the joyousness of the wild creatures of the woods. They played about, intent on their own games of hide-and-seek, without paying any attention to the game of playing that they were white men indulged in by their elders. About the only episode that varied the orderly procedure of this Indian show of a side of bacon from the refreshment

ALL AGREE THAT

SOUVENIR RANGES

Are superior to any other make. The thousands of satisfied users in Canada go to prove this. Housewives prefer SOUVENIR RANGES for their excellent cooking qualities, simple construction and handsome appearance. Buy the 'SOUVENIR' because they know it is a coal-saver and that

The best of materials and workmanship are employed in its making.

YOU CANNOT DO BETTER THAN BUY A 'SOUVENIR'

The GURNEY, TILDEN COMPANY
Manufacturers Limited
SARASOTA FLORIDA TORONTO VANCOUVER MONTREAL
Our personal guarantee as well as that of the makers goes with every stove. Call and see the Souvenir Ranges.

FOR SALE BY:
Ontario Furniture Co., 228-230 Dundas Street.
Keene Bros., 125-127 King Street.

"CEETEE" UNDERWEAR

Your outer clothing cannot look right unless your underclothing fits well.

"CEETEE" Underclothing is knit to fit the form by a special process, making the garments comfortable from first to last—also your outer clothes will look well. "CEETEE" is made from the finest Australian Merino Wool and is guaranteed against shrinking.

All sizes for men, women and children. Ask your dealer to show you "Ceetee."

THE C. TURNBULL CO. OF GALT, Limited, Manufacturers — GALT, ONTARIO — Established 1859

RADWAY'S READY RELIEF

CURES "GRIP," COLDS, ETC. PNEUMONIA, PLEURISY, AND ALL INFLAMMATORY DISEASES. SORE THROAT, COUGHS, CRIP, LUMBAGO, SCIATICA, DIPHTHERIA, NEURALGIA AND RHEUMATISM.

For over fifty years this wonderful remedy has proved itself the best, safest and surest antidote for pain in the world. In every family this invaluable Specific Remedy for all Inflammatory Diseases should be constantly kept on hand. The expense is a mere trifle, and saves more than twenty times the amount in doctors' and druggists' bills. Sold by all druggists.

25c. and 50c. per Bottle—Accept no Substitutes.

RADWAY & CO., Limited Montreal, Canada
Radway's Pills Radway's Resolvent

3 1/2%

You might better place your savings here where they will earn 3 1/2% instead of 3%. Security, \$2,000,000 assets.

AGRICULTURAL Savings & Loan Co
109 Dundas Street LONDON, ONTARIO

Was Weak and Nervous.

Mr. Paul Poull, Cascapedia, Que., writes:—"About five years ago I gave up all hope of getting better of heart trouble. I would nearly choke, and then my heart would stop beating. I could not lie on my left side, and became so nervous and weak I could not work. A friend told me to try Milburn's Heart and Nerve Pills, and before the first box was taken I felt almost well, and the second box completed the cure. I have advised many others to try them, and they have all been cured of the same trouble. I have offered to pay for a box for anybody they do not cure."

Milburn's Heart and Nerve Pills are a specific for all diseases or disorders arising from the heart or nerve system. They make the weak heart strong and the shaky nerves firm by imparting a strengthening and restorative influence to every organ, and tissue of the body and curing palpitation of the heart, dizziness, sleeplessness, anemia, twitching of the muscles, sensation of "pins and needles," general debility, lack of vitality, etc.

Price, 50 cents per box or 3 boxes for \$1.25 at all dealers, or mailed direct on receipt of price by The T. Milburn Co., Limited, Toronto, Ont.