

A Tale of Two Cities

By W. A. CLARKE

PRY a Montreal man away from his city and put him in Toronto; he pines for Montreal. Cut a Toronto man's ties for his city and make his post-office Montreal; he sighs for Toronto. Yes, there are exceptions in both instances, but, generally speaking, the rule holds.

The people of either of Canada's first and second cities are, when placed in the other, like fish out of water.

"Montreal is noisy and dusty," says the man whose work is in that city, but whose heart is still in Ontario's capital.

"Toronto can't compare with Montreal for business, and it is dead on Sundays," declares the man who has moved to the big city on Lake Ontario, but who still loves the bigger one on the broad St. Lawrence.

A former Montrealer, who had "endured" Toronto, and a Torontonion, who was "existing in Montreal in the hope of getting back to Toronto," met in Toronto recently and in more or less amiable fashion—and by means of more or less truthful statements—aired their preferences as follows:

"We do more business in Montreal in a day than you do in Toronto in a week."

"Rubbish! And business is all you think of in Montreal. Your millionaires are your gods. Montreal is a dirty-looking city except when the rain washes it or the snow covers it."

"Toronto is clean, but dead."

"Montreal is noted for infant mortality."

"Take care that it doesn't get you. Better stay in your mediaeval Ontario."

"There's atmosphere and character about Montreal's streets and buildings. A child with building-blocks could make a Toronto."

This last remark somewhat "got the goat" of the man who belongs to Old York, and this was his come-back: "Do you remember the parody of the escaped Montrealer on the 'Back to Montreal' poem at the time of the 'Old Home' celebration? I wish I had saved his verses. He said he would always make sure to keep his back to Montreal, and he ended his parody with, 'I'd rather go to Hades than go—back to Montreal.'"

The disputants found plenty of other alleged facts to bolster up their cases. The Toronto man played his city's lake location and lake trips against Montreal's mountain and her St. Lawrence outing places. And the Montrealer declared that the Georgian Bay Canal would put Toronto off the map. The former said that Montreal is poorly governed and knows but little about handling street traffic. The latter stated that he wouldn't care to live beside "a bay full of sewage" and under the pall of smoke in the business section of "the Queen City." They talked sports and manners and everything else that either could think of in praise of his own city and in disparagement of the other.

PEOPLE who are less emphatic in praising or "knocking" either city sometimes agree that Toronto is preferable in summer and that Montreal is the better city in winter. Montreal is said to resemble English cities more than Toronto does. The former is declared to be the better place of residence "if you have plenty of money." And Toronto folk often get the reputation of being "more sociable" than the people of Montreal.

The Torontonion in Montreal wonders "why there are not more people killed" in the latter city, for he has trouble in keeping out of the way of vehicles that dash in any direction with apparently no traffic rules to obey. The Montrealer in Toronto is made homesick by the "newness" and lack of variety in the looks of the city on Lake Ontario. Each feels as if in a foreign country, and while the exile in Toronto finds Sunday slow, the transported Torontonion—especially if he be a member of the Lord's Day Alliance—is shocked to find cigar stores, billiard parlours and moving-picture theatres open on the first day of the week.

Years from now, these two cities probably will still be disputing as to which has the better—or worse—street car system, and no doubt each will still be finding something to crow about over the other in the matter of sport.

The general feeling one gets in Toronto will always be different from the feeling one gets in Montreal. So the topic, "Which is the better city—Toronto or Montreal?" ought to be, for many years, a better subject for debate than the old favourites such as "Resolved, that summer is preferable to winter," or "Which is the greater agency for good—

the pulpit or the press?" And if the debaters want to obtain material calculated to crush each other let them hunt up the Toronto bank clerk who has a hearty grudge against his institution because it moved him to Montreal or the Montreal man in similar work who is bemoaning the fate that shipped him to Toronto.

TORONTO and Montreal are both good cities, yet if they would stop comparing their virtues and vices, Winnipeg might possibly begin to talk out loud. In fact, Winnipeg is already wondering just how soon it will be able to say, "Look out, there, you old-fashioned dubs." Already, it is counting its gold and its factory hands. As for climate, every Winnipegger knows that it is preferable (if you live there) to either Montreal or Toronto.

Then Montreal should not forget that even Port Arthur has a shipyard and is building ships while Montreal has been talking. Also St. John and Halifax are to have millions spent on their harbours. But there, I am talking as if I lived in Toronto.

International Unions

Second Article

By A FORMER MEMBER

WHEN some member of the International Union in Canada desires to defend the organization and to show how advantageous it is for the workmen of this Dominion, they generally take Toronto, Nova Scotia, or some single city or district and retail the amount of money paid in any particular strike or lock-out to Canadian workmen in that city or district, and show how many members of the Union are affected. This way of calculating works out so that it appears that the city or locality got a much larger amount from the International Union than they paid to that organization. This is a convenient but not a fair way of stating the case for the International. A proper calculation is to get the number of members of the Union all over Canada, the amount which they have paid to the International Union, and the amount paid out by that Union to them. Then add to these amounts the total sums paid by the various Canadian unions to the International funds, set against the total amount which the International has paid to Canadian workmen.

It is very difficult to get the exact number of International Union members in Canada, because the number fluctuates, and unless you get the report of all the separate unions there is no publication in Toronto giving the statistics, but from the figures carefully collected for several years this fact is clear that had the Canadian unions remained independent bodies, federated with the whole Dominion, pooled their funds in the same way that they do when paying to the International body, they would have had probably eight or ten millions of dollars in their treasury to-day and would have had much better conditions in the trades, which have had to fight and to depend for support on international organizations.

It is only necessary just to refer to the exposures of the dynamite gang of international workers in the States and to remember that Canadian money was paid to that organization, and for anything known to the contrary is still being paid to it. Not only is this the case, but Canadian unions are not allowed to conduct their organizations with a free hand and according to conditions in this country. They must do as they are ordered by men who do not understand Canadian matters, and whose object seems to be to show that they are bosses.

To-day it is a British union of Carpenters and Joiners, with its splendid organization, and its invaluable benefits to its members, which has aroused the greed and jealousy of the International Union, and that International Union has had the audacity to attend a Canadian Trades Congress, to demand the expulsion and crushing of a British labour organization because, forsooth, its members will not do what the alleged International Brotherhood demands.

The Secretary of the British Society of Carpenters and Joiners very aptly describes this so-called International Brotherhood, when he points out that it never was a real labour organization, that it has never shown the slightest sympathy with

labour in any of its struggles, and its one object is to humiliate and annoy British workmen. When International Unions can show that they are honestly conducted, that their hands are free from the stain of the blood and ruin associated with such organizations, when they can show that they really are trade unions, and not secret organizations urged to do the bidding of whatever trust thinks it worth while to buy them, and when United States workmen can point to improved conditions in their own ranks, and to benefits which are worth speaking of, it will then be time enough for them to take Canadians to be their colleagues in organizing labour on this continent as it ought to be. In the meantime they are simply using Canadian money for the benefit of the International leaders and not for the benefit of organized labour.

Sir George Cartier on Defence

WHILE we are discussing the problem of defence, let us hark back to Sir George Cartier, one of the heroes of Confederation. They are to raise a grand monument to him soon in Montreal. What had this great citizen to say of national defence?

On February 7th, 1865, he addressed the Legislative Assembly on the subject of Confederation. He was then Attorney-General of the Province of Canada. He referred to the fear of the colonies that they would be drawn into the American Federation, or perhaps forced in, and spoke as follows:

"We knew the policy of England toward us—that she was determined to help and support us in any struggle with our neighbours. The British provinces, separated as at present, could not defend themselves alone, and the question resolved itself into this: Shall the whole strength of the empire be concentrated into Prince Edward Island or Canada, as the case may be, in case of a war with the United States—or shall the provinces be left to fight single-handed or disunited? We were not sufficiently united. We had our duties with regard to England to perform. In order to secure the exercise of her power in our defence we must help her ourselves. . . . When we had organized our good defensive force, and united for mutual protection, England would send freely here both men and treasure for our defence."

And in the Confederation Debates, p. 55, it is chronicled that at this point there were "Cheers." Sir George Cartier stood for home-defence. He wanted all the North American colonies to confederate so that they could defend themselves. When they were able to defend themselves they could ask Britain for aid.

That should be the spirit of to-day. Let us defend ourselves. We are now able to do this moderately on land. Let us be able to do it on the sea. This confederation that Sir George Cartier helped to build must learn to defend itself and to spurn the cowards who say we can not build ships nor man them.

Mr. Morrison's Family

Canora, Sask., December 14th, 1912.

Editor, CANADIAN COURIER:

Dear Sir,—In your Christmas Number, page 21, Corridor Comment, you refer to Alex. Morrison's lonely and uncongenial surroundings in the House of Commons as member for Macdonald, and state that "he would ever so much sooner be back on the prairie farm, in the bosom of his family," etc.

This is, indeed, pathetic, in view of the fact that Sandy Morrison is a bachelor.

H. M. SUTHERLAND.

The Naval Resolution

The formal resolution of which Premier Robert Borden gave notice in the House of Commons recently regarding the navy, is as follows:—

Resolved—That it is expedient (in connection with the bill now before this House intitled "An Act to authorize measures for increasing the effective naval force of the Empire") to provide,

(a) That from and out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada there may be paid and applied a sum not exceeding thirty-five million dollars for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval force of the Empire;

(b) That the said sum shall be used and applied under the direction of the Governor-in-Council in the construction and equipment of battleships or armoured cruisers of the most modern and powerful type;

(c) That the said ships when constructed and equipped shall be placed by the Governor-in-Council at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire; and

(d) That the said sum shall be paid, used and applied and the said ships shall be constructed and placed at the disposal of His Majesty subject to such terms, conditions and arrangements as may be agreed upon between the Governor-in-Council and His Majesty's government.