(Jan. 29, 1914.)

The Taft Banquet.*

AT a special banquet in the King Edward Hotel, at which the guests of honor were ex-President William H Taft, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Sir John Willison, and Dr. James A. Macdonald, the President, Mr. John R. Bone, in his introductory speech, said:

Your Honor, Mr. Taft and Gentlemen: We are assembled here to-night to do honor to a man distinguished in politics and a man of great personal charm—(hear, hear)—who has enjoyed about all of honor and power that this world has to offer. When he comes to us in his private capacity, we welcome him not only for his individual merits but as the representative of a great nation—our neighbors. (Applause.) There have been many occasions when Canadian public men have appeared at functions of this character in United States, but the occasions when Canadians have had the opportunity of welcoming and entertaining distinguished American statesmen have been rare. We hope that to-day marks a new era in that respect. (Hear, hear.) Let us have, at least in social intercourse, shall I say, reciprocity. (Laughter.)

The reins of the office which our guest has recently laid down is probably the most remarkable office in the world. (Hear, hear.) As President of the United States he had no crown, he had no titles of nobility to distribute, he had no titles even for himself, he had no official dress, no insignia of office, no guards, no chamberlain, no gentlemen-in-waiting. His features do not even grace a coin or a postage stamp—

* The Hon. W. H. Taft, former President of United States, made his first visit to Toronto on this date. The Club tendered him a public banquet as a tribute to the distinguished place he occupied in the United States, to his standing as a jurist and to those remarkable personal characteristics which endeared him to all who heard him.

Sir John Willison is one of Canada's best known newspaper men. The high place he occupies in the profession he has followed all his life was recognized by His Majesty the King, who conferred Knighthood upon him two years ago.

Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is one of Canada's most distinguished Irish Canadians. After many years of service in the House of Commons, and as Minister of Justice in the Laurier administration he was appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, which position he now fills with honour and ability.

Dr. J. A. Macdonald is widely known as the editor of the Toronto "Globe," and has an international reputation as a speaker. He has been prominent in the Peace Movement both in the old and new world.

(applause)—and yet he enjoyed a greater authority than any European king. (Hear, hear.) He had vested in his person the central executive power of ninety millions of people. If unhappily his country had been at war, he would as Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy have become a virtual dictator. It is said that Lincoln exercised a more absolute authority than any Englishman from the days of Oliver Cromwell. And in these days the contrast is scarcely less striking. While it has become the undoubted duty of the English King to assent, as a matter of form, to every measure passed by the British parliament—Home Rule included—(laughter)—it is none the less the undoubted duty of the American President to exercise his independent judgment on every measure which comes before him; and it is recorded that one President exercised the veto power no less than three hundred and one separate occasions. It ought to be added, and our friend the American consul will pardon me for reminding him, that this President was a democrat. (Laughter.)

In the words of an authority competent to judge, the office of President is the greatest in the world if we except the Pope, to which a man can rise by his own merits. We are here to welcome a man who has held this glittering prize, and if he had a tinge of cynicism in his disposition he could tell us how great or how small is this greatest prize. I am sure we all welcome this opportunity, which is a unique opportunity, of emphasizing the cordial relations that exist between Canada and the United States—(hear, hear)—between the British Empire and the United States, the world's greatest Empire and the world's greatest republic, with Canada as the point of contact between the two. There may have been occasions when we have been disposed to be critical of our neighbors, when we were disposed to question their good judgment. Perhaps our guest can recall an occasion when he was even inclined to their good judgment. Perhaps we were in the wrong sometimes when they have objected. But in any case, as Sir Edward Grey recently so happily expressed it, when we disagree with Americans we disagree in the same language. (Applause.) We do not need to call on any foreign interpreter to tell us what we are trying to say to each other. There have been occasions when the relations between the two countries were disturbed by political propaganda. It took a few of our people a long time to learn that Providence intended us to be two nations on this North American continent, that Providence had a definite purpose in setting down these Great Lakes where they are—although I do not know that Providence had anything to do with the 49th parallel or the Maine

boundary. (Laughter.) But happily these times are long since past, and we can now give expression to sentiments of warmest friendship without the danger of being misunderstood.

There have been occasions when Canada felt that her interests did not receive proper consideration at Washington, occasions when she thought they did not receive proper consideration in England; and in this connection I would say, I would remind you, if I may do so without presumption, that nations, like individuals, are masters of their own destinies, and that Canada will have just that standing and that influence at Washington or London or elsewhere, her interests will receive just that consideration to which Canada is entitled by reason not only of her physical strength, but of those finer qualities of mind and heart and soul which are growing more and more worth while.

A great fellow-countryman of our guest has said: "There is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance, that imitation is suicide." I would apply the words of the philosopher of Concord to nations, and say that for every nation "envy is ignorance, imitation is suicide," and that the quicker a nation scorns imitation, smothers all baser feelings and develops a sane, confident self-reliance, meeting other nations with a level eye, neither boastful nor timorous, shirking no responsibilities, seeking no favors,—the quicker will that nation command the general respect which the possession of similar qualities commands for the individual.

One hundred years ago to-night there clustered not far from this spot where we are now gathered a little colony of log cabins nestling in the forest. They gave shelter and rude comforts of the frontier to about one thousand souls all told. That little centre of population was even then the capital of Upper Canada, but it was a capital of equivocal standing. Some of its public buildings lay in ashes. Its very existence was threatened. The country was in a state of war. It is our boast from that time until this peace has prevailed. But I do not know that it is anything we need boast about. If at any time there had been in that period anything else but peace, it would have been to the lasting disgrace of the parties responsible. Two neighbors are not worthy of particular praise because they are able to live side by side without flying at each others' throats every time they meet, without lying in wait every dark night to sandbag each other. Good-neighborliness requires some more positive manifestation than the mere abstention from these things. And the object lesson which

Canada and the United States can give and are giving to the world is not merely an object lesson in peace. It is an object lesson in friendship and amity, showing how two neighboring states may live side by side, each recognizing the other's individuality with whatever of quirks and crotchets it may contain, each recognizing the common interests that bind them together, the problems that are common to both, recognizing not merely their common heritage of laws and ideals and religion, not merely the community of interest they have in certain matters of high politics, but recognizing also and rejoicing in our community of interest in the transcendent problem of life, the problem of making this world a better place to live in, the problem of distributing a little more sunshine to the masses of mankind.

Now, gentlemen, I have been transgressing——

Sir John Willison: Go ahead.

Mr Bone: We are honored by having with us to-night in addition to Mr. Taft, three fellow-Canadians, each of whom representing a particular department of thought and activity, adds distinction and significance to this occasion. First, I have to announce that Hon. W. T. White, whose name appears on the program, has been detained at his home through illness. When he accepted our invitation he told us of the anticipated pleasure he had in expecting to be with us as an old friend of the Canadian Club of Toronto and as a representative of the Dominion Government, to assist us in welcoming our distinguished visitor from across the border. He assured us that no cares of office, no duties of the session, no tactics of an unscrupulous opposition—(hear, hear and laughter)—would prevent him from being with us. Unfortunately, we did not foresee the possibility of illness, but we can rejoice in reports from Ottawa that he is making progress towards recovery. I will not apologize for the gentleman who is going to take his place, although I might describe him as an added attraction. I have to introduce Sir John Willison.

Sir John Willison said: *Your Honor, Mr. President, Mr. Taft and Gentlemen*: I have listened with interest to the Chairman's references to myself, and I have only this to say that if it be true, as I was taught in my youth, that we have to give account for every idle word we say, I am sorry for him. (Laughter.)

Now, a word in explanation is necessary at the outset. I appear tonight, as the Chairman has said, as an unworthy substitute for the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Bone: I did not say that.

Sir John Willison: Owing to a passing illness he could not come to Toronto to bear tribute to a man who has had almost every human experience that a man may have, and he has kept himself unspoiled, unembittered and untouched by the pomp and pride which surround those who occupy high places. (Applause.) Unfortunately it was not possible that the Prime Minister could assume the duty which the Minister of Finance was expected to discharge. Not only is he at the threshold of an arduous parliamentary session, but he is similarly afflicted as was Job, and as have been other good men whom the gods love. (Laughter.) But I have no doubt, judging from the record, they did not include the management of Congress or of an imaginative House of Commons and an intractable Senate. (Laughter.) And probably our guest will agree that there are greater worries in the world than any that Job experienced. It is all right to say in justice to myself that I have no responsibility for the temporary indisposition of Ministers. Although I have just returned from Ottawa, I did nothing to add to their trials and difficulties in order that I might have this very brief moment of glory and you this long moment of martyrdom. There was a vacant seat in the Senate, there was a High Commissionership unfilled, there was a prospective Lieutenant-Governorship, and who should be nearer the succession than I am at this moment? (Laughter.)

Mr. Bone: Carried.

Sir John Willison: I said nothing. (Laughter.) I sent out no runners. I dug no trenches. On the contrary, I actually beamed with goodwill in order that the Ministers might not fear approaching me. (Laughter.) While I thought I saw the trail of those who were seeking office, I could not discover any office that was seeking the man. Unfortunately, Sir, it was not even recognized that the man was there, so I came back to Toronto. (Laughter.)

Mr. President and Gentlemen, in fitting myself for this duty I had to do some hard labor. I found I had nothing available for this emergency. (Laughter.) Looking back for two or three years over the files of the irreproachable journal I am connected with, I found many references to our distinguished guest, but nothing that was absolutely suitable for this occasion. (Laughter.) I found an extraordinary amount of black type, and occasionally a line of brilliant red type across the page. I do not quite know why red type is so much more impetuous and aggressive than black type. I suppose it suggests the thin red line and raises the suspicion

that Colonel Sam. Hughes may be in the offing. But, as the poet has said, "We may rise on our 'red' selves to higher things." It didn't take me long to discover when I got into these files that this prodigal display of type indicated a general election, and it took me even less time to discover that I would never get the material for a speech for tonight in that atmosphere.

During the last Presidential election I crossed the United States from Detroit to San Francisco, and while I want to be cautious, it did seem to me that I occasionally read statements in the American press and utterances from the platform which suggested just a shade of feeling, having a suspicion of partisanship. But, Sir, in Canada, as we approach a general election our opponents sink to unexpected depths of depravity, and large type and a more exuberant rhetoric are required to save the common country. (Laughter.)

Perhaps our distinguished guest discovered long ago that we English-speaking Canadians were the Scotch of the New World, and for a long time we have invaded the United States as the Scots for centuries invaded England, sitting unobtrusively in the desirable places with emoluments, acquiring positions in a lowly spirit of Christian resignation and so combining thrift with foresight and so adjusting morality to truth (laughter and applause) as to regard alike the maxims of the moralists with the practices of the malefactors. I have no doubt that if the secret should be disclosed, the provision in the Constitution reserving the Presidency to native born Americans was adopted as a precaution against Canadians. Nothing perhaps so clearly reveals the prophetic insight of the authors of the American constitution, whose idea was not to mar the only safeguard against ultimate Canadian ascendancy, and the substitution of a monarchy. Which they feared most they are too wise and prudent to reveal.

Mr. President and gentlemen, the attitude of many Canadians towards the United States provides a curious study in human emotions. We are filled with veiled enjoyment when American policies excite the resentment of other nations. But if our great neighbor, and I am sure we are all conscious of the fact, if our great neighbor should ever be in real trouble, we would go with filled hearts and filled hands for any service that we could render. (Hear, hear, and applause.) We agree, Sir, that Old Glory often flies with just a little too much complacence over summer cottages in Canada, but we feel a thrill of common pride and common kinship when it is carried through our streets in these fraternal celebrations

which are becoming so common in both countries. In short we have all the foolishness and all the fondness which give interest and variety to family relationships. So should we ever reflect that in so far as there is misunderstanding between these two countries, the faults lie back in history, and there is nothing so fatuous and foolish as stirring the ashes of dead fires and cherishing the grievances of other centuries. (Hear, hear.) The truth of history is always slowly revealed. Almost always the judgments of the passing generations are obscured with prejudices, but if you will permit a prophecy, I venture to say this, that in the final judgment of history it will be established that there was nothing in the policy of Great Britain to justify the American revolution. (Laughter.) And I do not think faults of British policy lie behind the war of 1812. They were connected with the struggle of Great Britain to preserve the peace and to preserve the freedom of Europe, but for the estranging anger and bitterness which followed the civil war of the 60's, the great responsibility rests upon British journals and upon British statesmen. We all have something to forgive and something to forget, or better still to remember for discipline and for warning.

It is inevitable, Sir, that our attention should centre upon the faults rather than upon the virtues of free institutions. In that way we blaze the path of human progress. Knowledge comes and wisdom lingers. But wisdom is on the way. Is it not true that most of those who despair of democratic government have never set their hands to the task? They are content to sneer at those who sweat out their lives in the public service (hear, hear), but even they are the beneficiaries of the weaknesses and the rascalities which they deplore. But democratic government still has this: it is true that the great mass of the people desire the good of the state, and that the great majority of public men of one party or the other party, or of no party, are actuated by high motives, and apply their best knowledge and judgment to the problems they have to consider. I offer you as the best fruit of free government in North America the long roll of Presidents of the United States and Prime Ministers of Canada, and if it be true, as I believe, that no man of mean character can rise to either office, then it is the people who fix the standard and determine that only such men as these shall occupy these high places. (Applause.)

We have here tonight one who has exercised authority over nearly one hundred millions of people; who has held high judicial positions; who has administered a great de-

pendency, but who has kept his hands clean and his life sweet, (loud applause), and whose ultimate place in history will shame the minor judgments of his own time. (Applause.) I do not suggest, Sir, that he holds a poor place in the estimation of his contemporaries, for it becomes abundantly manifest, more manifest with every week and every month that passes, as his character becomes more clearly understood, his purposes become more clearly revealed, his wisdom is more signally demonstrated, that he holds and deserves a secure place in the affections and confidence of his fellow countrymen. I offer you as the product and triumph of free institutions our guest of tonight. We rejoice that he has come to Canada with a message of good will (applause), and because he has come among us there will be keener sympathies and warmer attachments between ourselves and our neighbors.

Gentlemen, for the privilege of speaking to you just for these moments I am grateful. I am grateful for your attention. I rejoice in the occasion which has brought us together, and I feel that the welfare, position and security of this continent to which we belong, and—whether upon one side of the boundary or the other—in which we have an immense and just pride, I feel that all good things and all good purposes will be advanced and strengthened by the visit of Mr. Taft. May he come to us often again, and many other representative American statesmen follow with him. (Loud applause.)

Right Hon. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, said: *Your Honor, Mr. Taft, Mr. President and Gentlemen,*—I wish to express my thanks to you all for the opportunity to be present at this reception to one of the foremost citizens of the United States, to a man who, having stood long in the fierce light that beats upon the Throne, commands the esteem, confidence and respect of those who have the privilege of his acquaintance or who are at all familiar with the history of his country in the making of which he has, in recent years, taken such a very large and important part.

There are many things one would like to say about your guest, if he were absent, which, for obvious reasons, I hesitate to repeat to his face. I do not know that he is a very ardent admirer of that policy which is usually associated with a free use of the big stick, but I have seen him swing a club on the golf links at Murray Bay and I know what happens to the ball when he does not by chance miss it. (Laughter.)

As a lawyer, a judge of the Circuit Court, a member of the Executive, a governor of the Philippines and as President of the United States, Mr. Taft's name must forever remain inseparably associated with some of the most important phases in the development of the national life of the Great Republic. Joseph De Maistre, the well known French writer, speaking many years ago of the United States and of the perils incident to a Republican form of Government, said: "Laissez grandir cet enfant encore au berceau." If the child has successfully traversed the early stages of its development, has emerged, so to speak, from the nursery and the school room, has successfully weathered the storm and stress of civil war, and now stands forth, in the full glory of its splendid manhood "four square to all the winds that blow," it is due in large measure to the patient toil, to the far-seeing statesmanship, to the self-sacrificing spirit of such men as Mr. Taft. I am well within the limits of historical truth when I add that not only the citizens of the United States, but the people of the world owe him a debt of gratitude deep and lasting, not only for his work of constructive statesmanship, but above all for the splendid example he has given us of fortitude in adverse circumstances and of the highest courage of which man is capable that of giving testimony even to his own undoing for the honest convictions of his soul.

Your guest, in conditions to which it would not now be proper to refer, came down from the highest position to which a citizen of any country may to-day aspire to take his place in the ranks of those who earn their daily bread in useful occupations, and this without an audible sigh, an uttered regret or a word of reproach to those from whom he was entitled to expect different treatment. His useful life is not, however, at an end; having laid down the sceptre, he has taken up the torch to light up to others the path of duty in which he has stood so long. (Hear, hear.)

Realizing all the truth of Webster's saying "that the greatest abiding interest of any nation is the law, the settled honest administration of the law," Mr. Taft has gone to one of America's great Law Schools where, by precept and example, he is giving himself up to the noblest of all occupations, that of teaching the youth of his country how to acquire knowledge and develop courage and above all, to practise it, to realize all the nobility of the beautiful sentiment expressed in Schiller's line "Life itself is not the highest good." Mr. Taft is no longer the Chief Executive of the United States, but he is President of the American Bar Association, and he

must find comfort and solace in the thought that those who know him best appreciate and love him most, as was recently said of another. The good opinion of those with whom we have worked and against whom we have contended from the first early struggles of youth on through the best years of life is an incomparably more precious possession than the estimate formed of us by the world outside—a world which knows our virtues and our faults only by repute and at second hand, and which judges men as a rule, not over the whole course of their conduct, but on some particular incident which, at a dramatic moment, has happened to come within the circle of the lime light.

Coming now to the topic which seems to be the subject of thought uppermost in the minds of all at such functions as this, viz., the relations of the British Empire and the American Republic, I fear that I must strike a somewhat discordant note. Although I concede to no man a greater desire to maintain the most harmonious relations between the two countries —many of my relations owe allegiance to the United States and some of my dearest friends are citizens of that country, —but I am not of those who believe "que tout est pour le mieux dans le meilleur des mondes." Our apparently friendly relations do not seem to stand the test of everyday experience. Occasionally, as in Manilla Bay, if a fight is on, a gun is trained or a British cheer is heard to make manifest the the good feeling for the United States that lies dormant in the breast of every Britisher "just as mechanism sleeps in silence till the touch comes that wakens it into sound." But in our daily intercourse, there seems to be something lacking. I am of opinion that much that is said about the presumed friendly relations which are alleged to exist between the people of the two countries is predicated upon false ideas. We talk about celebrating a century of peace between the two countries as if the millennium had arrived. "Let us not be blinded by visions of 'Golden Ages' or by delusions of the future and the past." To talk of peace, of universal peace, in the abstract, is to ignore the lessons of history. Please do not attribute this sentiment to that pugnacity which is presumed to be the characteristic of every Irishman. The cry for peace is an old world cry, but how often has it been heard, and when was there peace in the world? Think of the Temple of Janus at Rome. How often were its doors closed? De Maistre says: "Depuis le jour où Cain tua Abel, il y a toujours eu ca et là, sur la surface de la terre, des mares de sang que ne peuvent dessècher ni les vents avec leurs brûlantes haleines ni le soleil avec tous ses feux." It is a fact in nature: the life of man is a constant conflict, a continuous fight. From the cradle to the grave, man is engaged in a ceaseless, never ending struggle—against disease, for subsistence; against his passions, for virtue. Peace, perfect peace can only be had when conflict ends at the approach of death. The graveyard is the only place when one ceases from conflict and, therefore, enters into perfect peace.

The history of the individual is the history of the community and of the nation. I am not a militarist, although I believe with Tacitus "miseram pacem vel bello bene mutari" that a miserable peace may well be exchanged even for war, I never fired a shot in anger, the trappings of war do not appeal to me, the sight of human blood sends a shudder through my veins—but man with his passions, his avarice, his ambition, his lust, must be taken for what he is, and nations are men in the aggregate. I recall the impression made on me by the picture which I saw on the cover of a French magazine at the time the Palace of Peace was inaugurated at the Hague. On one side, was the Palace in all its barbaric splendor and on the other, the smoking ruins of an Albanian village during the recent Balkan war. The contrast was suggestive and instructive.

If you can stand a further shock, there is another myth to which perhaps you will pardon a brief reference. I constantly hear that a war between the two countries is unthinkable, because it would be fratricidal, for it is said, the United States and our Empire are two Anglo-Saxon countries, bound together by ties of blood, language, literature, traditions. Was there ever a greater fallacy? Of the 90 or 100 millions of people in the United States how many are of Anglo-Saxon ancestry? Am I well within the limits when I answer: only a relatively small percentage. It is quite true that, for the moment, English is the dominant language in both countries and, to a large extent, we have a common literature, but the traditions and historical background of the United States vary with different communities. To the great majority, traditions go back to the Revolutionary period with its legacy of ill-feeling and misunderstanding. The Declaration of Independence was inspired, to a larger extent, by the "Rights of Man" and the "Contrat Social" than by Magna Charta and the monarchical principle of the English Constitution. I have no doubt that many of you are shocked by this plain speaking, but did time permit, I could make good all that I have said and deliberately said. I do not use this language be-

cause I have anything in common with the Jingoes, Heaven forbid!—but because I honestly love my country as I sincerely respect the United States, and I know how important it is, not only from the narrow standpoint of the selfish interest of those two nations, but from the broader point of view of the interest of mankind, that there should be peace between them. But no good or great object was ever attained by loose and inaccurate thinking and speaking. We have much in common, in addition to language and literature. We have the bond of the English Common Law based, as it is, upon the sound foundation of Divine Justice applied to the affairs of men with a leven of the logical system inherited from old France. We have many mutual interests and ties of kindred, but there is only one enduring foundation upon which Peace can rest, and that is the foundation of mutual respect and confidence. We must respect our neighbor's vineyard and be tolerant even of his prejudices. We must guarantee equal rights to unequal possessions, equal justice to the strong and the weak. (Hear, hear.) The old Roman maxim "Audi alteram partem" coupled with the rule "to stop, look and listen" applicable in railway crossing cases has a special place in international relations. I discovered this on two occasions: first at the Hague, when I sat as a member of the Tribunal which heard the Newfoundland Fisheries Reference. After listening to Sir Robert Finlay, I thought there was only one side to the question, but when Mr. Root sat down, I fully realized how men may differ in the construction of our international treaties. Recently I had another experience which drove the same truth forcibly home: I was present at the Canadian Club, Ottawa, when a distinguished member of the American Bar was the speaker. He chose for his subject the Panama Canal Tolls, and let me assure you that when he finished his calm logical exposition of that question from the United States side, there was not a man present who did not feel satisfied that there were two sides to it.

No one has done more to promote the cause of International Arbitration than your honored guest, and no man can do more to promote and foster a feeling of mutual respect and forbearance between our two countries. You, on your side, Gentlemen of the Canadian Club, have a duty to perform. Two nations with 3,000 miles of frontier and inland oceans and rivers held practically in common, must necessarily rub elbows at many points: under such conditions, friction is inevitable, controversies must arise, and when they do, remember the maxims "Hear the other side," "stop, look and listen," before indulging in harsh language or unfair criticism. Teach our people that, as there are two sides to every controversy, we cannot expect both parties to look at the question in dispute from the same angle. This holds good, let me say, not only in international, but also in interprovincial relations. No one element in this country and no one country among the nations of the earth has a monopoly of intelligence, learning, patriotism and honesty. Let us always remember that if wisdom and justice in policy are a stronger security than weight of armament, the language of passion, the language of sarcasm, the language of satire serves merely to arouse mischievous passions—holding in mind, however, that armaments are a necessary evil. (Applause.)

Reverting again to our relations with the United States, let me say this final word: our proximity may have its disadvantages, but there are compensations. Living within the shadow of a country with a population of 90 or 100 millions, we must not be surprised if occasionally the rays of the sun which shines for all are shut out from us. We have this compensating advantage that there is no place in the world in which more is attempted to better the political, social and industrial conditions under which men, women and children live, and these conditions are so much alike in the two countries that we must largely benefit by their success and their failures. Gentlemen, all is not profligacy and corruption in the political, municipal and social life of the United States any more than with ourselves. Those of us who go to New York, for instance, may see the seamy side of things crudely exposed—perhaps we find what we are looking for—on the other hand, there are the hospitals, the schools, the improved tenement houses, the libraries, the museums, the picture galleries, all making for the uplifting of man and his physical and moral improvement.

I recall some years ago when in Italy I visited the aquarium at Naples and in conversation with another tourist asked if there was anywhere a finer collection of specimens from the deep.

"There is only one better," I was told.

"In New York there is an aquarium which is second to none in the world." And yet how little do we know of what is being actually accomplished almost in our midst.

As making also for better and closer relation between our two countries, we have the ceaseless ebb and flow of population south and north—north and south—thousands each year bring the new land memories of their old home and friends.

Let me conclude with this quotation from Russell's speech on International Law at Saratoga:

"Mr. President, I began by speaking of the two great divisions—American and British—of that English speaking world which you and I represent to-day, and with one more reference to them I end."

"Who can doubt the influence they possess for ensuring the healthy progress and the peace of mankind? But if this influence is to be fully felt, they must work together in cordial friendship, each people in its own sphere of action. If they have great power, they have also great responsibility. No cause they espouse can fail; no cause they oppose can triumph. The future is, in large part, theirs. They have the making of history in the times that are to come. The greatest calamity that could befall would be strife which should divide them.

"Let us pray that this shall never be. Let us pray that they, always self-respecting, each in honour upholding its own flag, safeguarding its own heritage of right and respecting the rights of others, each in its own way fulfilling its high national destiny, shall yet work in harmony for the progress and the peace of the world." (Loud applause.)

Dr. J. A. Macdonald said: *Mr. President, Your Honor, Mr. Taft and Gentlemen,*—The time allotted to me I would gladly surrender to our guest of the evening. But I recall that ever since two o'clock this afternoon Mr. Taft has been on his feet almost continuously making speeches. A chance at "tired nature's sweet restorer" would no doubt be grateful to him. As it is not my intention to express any personal opinions about him, good, bad or indifferent, the next twenty minutes would be for him a perfectly safe opportunity for "balmy sleep." I feel under no obligation, such as pressed upon Sir Cha[illegible] Fitzpatrick and Sir John Willison, either to defend Mr[illegible] record or to justify my own. No recorded words of [illegible]e would be out of tune with the genial courtesies of this occasion. I turn, rather, to the duty assigned to me as a member of this Canadian Club: the duty of speaking some words in the presence of our distinguished guest on the Significance of Canada's Imperial Relations.

We may not all agree as to Canada's Imperial relations, or as to their significance. Were Imperial relations mechanical and artificial, and were Canada a dead thing without will or power, a mere pawn on the board, there would be no room for difference of opinion. But in a situation of life and growth and constant change, and dealing with matters and movements that have absolutely no precedent or example in

all history, it is inevitable that differences should arise, alike as to the relative importance of facts and as to their real significance. There are, however, some few things which seem to be pertinent and which one may venture to express on this occasion.

1. Canada's Imperial relations have been and still are of Canada's own choosing. I have sometimes been asked by Americans if Canatda is not ready to join the United States in one great continental republic. Not long ago the question was put in all seriousness in this form: How long before Canadians will demand their freedom?

People who so think do not know that the world has moved since the Declaration of American Independence. They do not understand what changes the past century wrought—changes in Britain, changes in America, changes in the world, changes in the whole conception of national freedom and in the ideals of national life. They have not measured the real significance, the world significance, of the movement that led to the independence of the American Colonies in the 18th century. Least of all do they appreciate the thing done by Canada, the unique thing, the original thing, the world-changing thing done by Canada in the 19th century.

We are sometimes told that Canada has nothing to her credit in the political history of the world: that everything Canadian is due to Britain: that this Dominion has been a non-productive beneficiary of Imperial advantages. My answer to all that humiliating talk is this: were it not for what was done by a former generation of Canadians, Canada might not to-day be a part of the Empire. And this must be added: Had Canada made the other choice, the British Empire as the world to-day knows it could not have been.

Looked back upon fom our vantage point of clearer vision those were crisis-days when the struggle for self-government was on in Canada. That struggle had to come to these Provinces as it came to the American Colonias a century earlier. Men of the British breed gathered into communities overseas in which they made their homes could not but feel the throb of the Anglo-Saxon impulse. With all due respect to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, and with respect, too, for the grateful fact that in my own blood, as in his, there is no Sassenach strain, I use deliberately the words "Anglo-Saxon." Sir Charles warned us that "a relatively small percentage of the people of the United States are of Anglo-Saxon ancestry." What matter? That percentage in numbers may be small, and in other respects its influence

may be insignificant, but my observation, in all parts of the American Republic, is that the United States to this day, even as Canada, is directed and dominated, in all controlling ideals and movements of government, by that subtle something which through the centuries has stirred in the Anglo-Saxon blood, and which I venture to call the Anglo-Saxon impulse. (Hear, hear.)

That impulse everywhere and forever makes for personal liberty and for the community rights of self-government. For the American Colonies, liberty and the rights of self-government meant separation from the Mother Country and the loss of that national background running back through a thousand years. There was no other way known to history. Never in all history did any colony of any empire come to national self-government except by cutting the painter and striking for independence. Washington, Franklin and the rest took the only way at that time known to statesmen.

Then in the 19th century came Canada's day of decision. It was a long and stormy day. No man saw clearly. There was no blazed trail. No people had ever gone from colonial subjection to national self-government except by one road—the road of separation. There were those in Canada who believed that self-government must take that one road of separation, and they fought against it. These were those who even at that cost were ready to take it. In Britain statesmen, in both parties, thought the separation of Canada inevitable. They were prepared to grant, not Confederation, but Independence. Beaconsfield and Gladstone both thought what was called confederation and autonomy would lead straight to the independence of Canada.

But in Britain and especially in Canada were statesmen of the farther vi[illegible]. They saw, dimly, fitfully saw, the rise of a new Canad[illegible] Canada leading the way for a new Empire. Lyon M[illegible]zie and Louis Papineau, Baldwin and Lafontaine, George Brown and John A. Macdonald; men of vision, men of courage, men of faith: they went out not knowing whither they went; and by the trails they blazed the people of Canada have come to their own, to their rights of free citizenship, to their responsibilities of national self-government, to their obligations and dignities in Canada's Imperial relations. (Applause.)

And so it has come about that, not by constraint, not by compulsion, but by the free and deliberate choice of Canadians themselves, Canada's Imperial relations are what they are, and in the great days to come shall be what Canadians choose to make them. (Hear, hear.) Not in tariff and trade merely, not in immigration and citizenship merely, not in defence merely, but in all the great choices of Canadian nationhood the law of the nation stands:

> "The gates are mine to open
> And the gates are mine to close."

2. Upon that first point this second follows: Canada's achievement in Imperial relations made for the transformation of Britain's Imperial idea, and for the prestige and the Permanence of the British Empire. On the old lines the Empire could not endure. The old idea of "imperium," with its centralized sovereignty and its subject states, had no future for sons of the British blood. Its day was done. Unless there came a new idea disintegration was inevitable. The coming of Canada brought that new idea—the idea of national feedom and national autonomy not without but within the Imperial circle. Canada achieved it. After Canada came Australia, then New Zealand, then, only yesterday, South Africa. The four overseas dominions, with self-governing Newfoundland, constitute, with the Mother Country, the great strong right hand of the world-empire of Britain. Those five fingers are bound to that great palm, not by bandages of dependence, not by bonds of compulsion, but by the vital ties of a common blood, a common purpose and a common Imperial will; and, not in the mailed fist of threatening or oppression, but in the handclasp of world friendship, those five fingers all close toward the palm.

3. Canada's Imperial relations give special significance to Canada's American position. On this continent and in relation to the power of English-speaking civilization in North America, Canada stands for more than Canada alone. This Dominion has indeed a part of its own to play, a part which can be played only by Canadian citizens. That part is important to the American Republic and to North American life. But as an integral and constituent factor in the life and power of the British Empire Canada plays a part in America unmatched by any other nation.

As an expression of what I mean, and as an adequate statement of the significance of international relations in North America, I venture to quote in the presence of our guest a statement made to me in the White House at Washington by the Hon. P. C. Knox, when he was Secretary of State in Mr. Taft's Government. Mr. Taft may remember

the occasion, and perhaps also the words. It was at a time when opinions were being expressed as to the political effect of trade relations between Canada and the United States. Mr. Knox's words were these:

> "Instead of us desiring the political union of these two countries it is to our advantage that Canada remain out of the Republic and remain in the Empire. If there were no Canada it would be in the interest of the United States that one should be created and should be made a self-governing nation in the British Empire."

I asked him why? and this was his answer:

> "The power of North America to-day is the power of the United States, and the power of Canada, plus the power of Britain. If Canada were separated from the Mother Country, and made either a distinct and independent sovereignty or States in this Republic, there would then be for North America no 'Plus the power of Britain.'"

Sir, for myself as a Canadian I accept that philosophy. I accept that doctrine of American internationalism. And Mr. Taft himself, as I recall his words, made this pertinent comment:

> "The situation on the Pacific, which is the large concern of both countries, is a much simpler and much safer proposition for this whole continent because two flags, representing English-speaking civilization, ideals and power are afloat on the Pacific from the Mexican boundary to the North Pole."

It is indeed the Pacific, not the Atlantic, that gives this English-speaking fraternity of North America their chief concern. And to the United States as well as to Canada it is of prime importance that far across the Southern Pacific the Commonwealth of Australia and the Dominion of New Zealand rise up, [illegible] freedom of their young national life, flying aloft the Union Jack of Britain. The Atlantic for us has no secrets, no surprises, but who can tell what mysteries lie hid in the darkness of the Pacific. For this reason, in the days now emerging, the four English-speaking nations fronting on the Pacific, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, under their flags of the Red, White and Blue, must accept their full share of responsibility for preserving the interest of English-speaking citizenship on the Pacific, as through the long centuries Britain has preserved it over the Seven Seas. (Loud applause.)

4. The international relations between Canada and the United States and our common boundary line, unbarbarized by forts or battleships or guns, are of significance, not for these nations alone, but for all the world. That unprecedented and unparalleled fact of 4,000 miles of civilized internationalism is a message to all continents, the supreme message of North America to all the world. What has been done by these proud and ambitious Anglo-Saxon peoples ought not to be impossible in Europe or elsewhere in the civilized world. What does this thing mean? It means this: In this new civilization national rights are respected and national aspirations are given free course. To illustrate and to justify that new doctrine Canada stands up in North America with less than 8,000,000 of people over against the United States with nearly 100,000,000, and for a hundred years has been free and unmolested; and to-day, without a standing army or a "visible" navy, Canada is more secure from war and from war scares than any war nation of Europe. And why? For this reason: the United States and Canada have both learned the meaning of that saying of Canning when he conceived the Monroe doctrine—"every nation for itself and God for us all."

Great Britain and the United States have both illustrated in history, as Mr. Taft so splendidly declared to the Empire Club to-day, that any people that desires to be free and is fit to be free must be given freedom's unfettered chance. That principle is the guiding star of Britain in her dependencies. It guides the United States in relation to the Philippines, to Cuba and to Mexico. Canada stands up to prove it true for all the world. (Applause.)

5. One thing more and I have done. Canada and the United States, facing their responsibility for the development and the defence of English-speaking civilization in North America have need of something more than great armies on shore and huge navies on sea. The supreme question is not: Shall the Oriental nations open their doors to our trade, to our civilization and to our Christian missionaries? Those doors are open now—wide open. Within ten years an absolutely new world situation has been created. In that new situation this is for us the serious question: In the impact of North American life on the nations beyond the Pacific shall our civilization stand? The Armageddon of the Pacific will not be in the clash of brute force but in the clash of vital ideas. The last arbitrament is not the sword of war but the life of the nation. It is ideas against ideas, character against char-

acter, life against life. In that conflict the United States and Canada shall stand or shall fall together. It is our supreme and sacred obligation, men of Canada, men of the United States, Americans all, so to live and so to lead that in the inevitable testing of our nations the ideals of our North American civilization shall stand. (Hear, hear.)

Sir, it is because Mr. Taft believes in the supremacy, not of brute force but of ideas, because he is concerned supremely for the supreme things in our civilization, and because he has done a man's full share in making the civilization of the United States and of Canada a civilized unit, vital, virile, Christian, as North America faces the older civilizations of the world, that you and I and all true Canadians would join in doing him honor to-night. (Cheers and loud applause.)

Mr. Bone: *Your Honor and Gentlemen,*—It is now my pleasure to propose the second and the last toast to-night. I am sure no words of mine can add to the heartiness with which you will respond. It is a toast to a man whose name, even if his career were ended, which it is not—(hear, hear)—because I am sure there are still fresh honors in store for him, is assured of a high place in the pages of history when the smoke of party conflict has passed away. History is generally fair, and history will record that the twenty-seventh President of the United States was a man of rare attainments, who as lawyer, judge, diplomat, governor and President served his country well—(hear, hear)—who left behind him a record of distinct achievement, who very materially increased the prestige of the United States in his relations with foreign countries, Canada included. He was actuated by a desire not only to serve his own people, but by sentiments of friendship and good will to all to improve her connection with other powers. He is a man of likeable personality, filled with human sympathy, a sincere gentleman, and in asking you to drink his health I beg to assure him that we do it, not as absolute strangers, but as friends.

Hon. William Howard Taft: *Mr. Chairman, Your Honor and Gentlemen of the Canadian Club of Toronto,*—I feel as though what I were about to say was anti-climax from the great speeches which we have heard. I feel as though you were entitled to a personal explanation—(laughter)—as though I ought to offer some excuse for the very strenuous life that my presence in your midst has brought to some very worthy men.

I begin with that delightful gentleman, that fine lawyer, that father and that host, who has made my stay in Toronto

full of the utmost pleasure, His Honor Sir John Gibson, Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. (Applause.) They have taken me into Government House, and if all Government Houses and all families in Government Houses are as this one, I intend to solicit invitations to all Government Houses. (Laughter.)

I do not know how I have got into this. My recollection is that it was the President of Toronto University who took the first step. He seemed to think that he had a society on his hands. I do not know whether it was altogether a wise step of inviting somebody from beyond the border to talk to the boys and girls. But after that came the Empire Club, and after that the Canadian Club, and then the Women's Canadian Club, and I do not know how many other clubs I would have had the opportunity of speaking to if there had been forty-eight hours rather than twenty-four. (Laughter.) But I have enjoyed every minute of it, and the only thing that had detracted from that pleasure is the consciousness that my being here has interfered with the proper administration of the Provincial Government and that proper attention on the part of the University officials to the duties they ought to discharge, and in addition to have the pleasure of these various Ministers of the Government who have honored me by their presence at some of the numerous entertainments where I have had to inflict a few observations on the victims that were gathered before me.

Now there are a great many things that I will contemplate in this visit. One of them is brought up by the kindly remarks of Sir John Willison. In the first place, Sir John pictured himself in the capital of the Dominion with a number of vacant offices there seeking the men. He reminded me of a story that I heard in Kentucky when I was in the respectable business of being a judge. (Laughter.) They once elected a Republican governor in Kentucky. There is part of Kentucky that has always been Republican, the mountain part, and where they have been voting for Republican candidates for years and years and years, and finally Providence intervened and gave them a Republican governor. Then there started down from the mountains an old man called Zeke Carter, who had been a thorough Republican and had voted and voted and voted but all to no purpose, and finally the kingdom had come. He mounted his old mare and drove down to Franklin, and intimated to the authorities that having been a supporter of the Republican party they ought to recognize that with an office. He put up at the Capital Hotel

for about ten days. Then looking at his vanishing bank roll he moved to a boarding house. He spent some ten days there, and then he took to sleeping where he could, and pursuing what we call in our country—I do not believe you have it in yours—the free lunch route. But finally, after he had had a number of conferences with a great many leading Republicans, he heard from them that they did not propose to maintain the spoils policy of the Democratic party. They were introducing a reform in which the office was seeking the man. Well, his free lunch route gave out and he had to give up. He mounted his old mare, and as he went through the town he passed before the Capital Hotel, where he saw seated a good many people with whom he had made acquaintance during his stay, and they called out to him, asking where he was going. He said, "I am going home. My money has run out and I cannot stay. I have heard a good deal of talk about the office seeking the man here, but I have not seen any office seeking the man. If any of you fellows see any office seeking the man I wish you would tell it that you just saw old Zeke Carter on the Versailles Turnpike mounted on his old mare, and he is going damn slow." (Laughter.) Some of us who have been in political life know how Zeke felt.

I had occasion to make a few remarks in Montreal at the meeting of the American Bar Association, and perhaps I can repeat a sentiment that I there expressed. You never get quite close to a man as a friend until you have had a row with him. Until he calls you names and until you call him names, and you get filled with that frank expression in a controversy that develops heat, and after that you can come to the most pleasant and loving terms. I got so used in my own country to that sort of friendship (laughter) that when I encountered the same kindly treatment in Canada I was at home.

The Chairman's very pleasantly and ably conceived speech in the opening to-night referred to the Presidency and the power of that office. That is what met me everywhere I went in the United States. I was told it was the most powerful office in the world, and I suppose it is. But when you hold it you do not realize it. (Laughter.) You are always thinking about its limitations and not about its powers. It is an office that I would not advise any man to hold unless his epidermis is fairly thick. It is an office that makes you consider at some length the truthfulness of the public press (laughter) and I may add, its accuracy. (Laughter.) But

one of the things you learn is that most of the things that seem hard, most of the things that you think you will never forget are not worth in any degree the worry you give them. (Hear, hear.) The lessons—and there are many lessons—that those of us who have gotten along even as far as I have gone would like to introduce in the heads and into the consciences of every man so that they might learn the truth in the pursuit of happiness and contentment in life. But they have got to have their lessons just as you have and you cannot ever make them conscious of the fact respecting many truths that time spent in thinking how you are going to get even with some man who has done something that you think is worthy of very severe treatment by you is time wasted. (Applause.) Life has so many pleasures, and there is so little time to enjoy them, that there is no use depriving ourselves of comfort and contentment by worrying ourselves over an opportunity to get even with somebody, because you always find, if you are a man that has ever made response to real manly sentiments, that when the opportunity comes to get even you are too much of a man to take advantage of it. And therefore I look back upon my Presidency now, full as it was of worries with the utmost gratitude for the opportunity it gave me and without the slightest feeling toward anybody that had anything to do with making it a trial. (Bravo.)

I do not claim any credit for that. I only claim that it is a discovery that helps to make life in the future a great deal pleasanter, and I hope to make life more useful not only to myself but to other people with whom Providence enables me to live, and in the same degree to contribute to their happiness. (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir John Willison said something about democratic government. I agree with him. What kind of government should we live under if it was not democratic government. How would we feel under a government that we did not have some voice in. I have been told that I did not believe in democratic government, that I am really not in favor of popular government. While time was that I would get excited about that charge, when I would say that a man who said so was a liar, now I would smile and say he was not correct in his statement. I have got along far enough now to be able to say just what I think about popular government and to introduce some slight qualifications with reference to its usefulness, and the necessity of placing restraint upon the majority instead of the minority. That I have said and am going to say right along, no matter whether they think I am reac-

tionary or a man that does not believe in popular government or not, because I know differently. I think and believe that those of us who understand popular government and know what will work out for the permanent good of humanity and insist upon having these elements in it are the real friends of popular government and are those who are anxious to make it beneficial to the human race.

Now, at the Empire Club I talked about the Empire. Tonight I would talk about democratic government. Canada and the United States have much in common in that regard. We in making government more responsible for the happiness of the people are going to make government more democratic and are introducing two elements that make success more difficult.

We have dropped the laissez faire idea that the only good government is that which governs the least, and we have come to think that there is much that a government can do, and ought to do to help along all the people and thereby to make life lighter and easier for those who are unfortunate in the race—an object we must have if we are going to make progress in the human race; and therefore we are imposing on government a greater and greater burden. It is more expensive and it requires greater and greater ability to administer a government on that plan successfully. It requires efficiency, and it requires experience. You do not employ a lawyer to build a bridge; you do not employ a doctor to construct a railway. You employ in your private business the men who are trained by their experience to do the things you wish done. We cannot get on in government unless we proceed in the same way with reference to those tasks that require expert knowledge.

Now, on the other hand, the democratic spirit at first seems to veer in the di[illegible] of assuming that everybody in the community is able t[illegible]erything, and do it just as well as everybody else, and p[illegible]haps a little better, and we have to curb these two tendencies and bring them together, and it is no easy thing to do, gentlemen.

Encountering now those strong tendencies it seems to me that the cure for those difficulties pressing on democracy is a spirit that tends towards not only equality of opportunity, not only equality of right before the law, but equality of experience, equality of character, and even equality of common sense. (Hear, hear.)

Now, we have been struggling in the United States to introduce a merit system into the civil service. We have got-

ten along fairly well in the Federal government. Of course after one party has been in office fifteen years, the civil service, while theoretically it seems a wonderful thing to speak of, but practically it brings a tremendous strain, and patriots who have been out and fought for fifteen years think a civil service rule is all right, if you will only just give them six months in which to make the necessary changes. I am not complaining of that, Sir. There is something very trying when a party comes into power, finding all the offices filled. But I am hoping that if the good Lord shall arrange it that the Republican party should come back in four years it would not have the same temptation to strain the civil service law as a party that has been out for fifteen years. So that after a while by action and reaction we will get a system such as they have in England, and such as I hope you have here. (Laughter.) Well, I did not mean to trespass on any local prejudice. But in England I think they have it in perfect form. They have permanent Under-Secretaries and from that clear down to the tide waiter everything is governed by merit. (Hear, hear.) There is a solid body of civil servants who go on every day discharging their duties. They are experts in the work they have to do, and the only changes are in the political Under Secretaries and Secretaries, and they, of course, ought to change when the party goes out in order that the policy of the Government may agree with the verdict of the electors.

Now, that is essential not only in the national government, but it is even more essential in municipal government. One thing that has tried our faith in popular government is the failure that we have made in the United States in our municipal government. But I am glad to say there is a new spirit there now, and those who advocate the merit system in local matters are now given a very much better hearing than they were. Now, then in municipal government you need experts quite as much, and indeed a little more than you do in national government. It is the municipal government that looks after our health; it is the municipal government that gives us our transportation; it is the municipal government that gives us our water, our light and everything that goes into the comfort of life. Therefore we should have experts in the government to make it what it ought to be, because every day we are putting greater and greater burdens on that government, and the only way we can do it is by retaining a body of civil servants in the employ of that government who will learn by experience how to discharge their duty. But the positions

must be permanent, and you must pay good salaries, because if you create such positions they will attract the best men in the community towards them. How can you expect to get good officers if you only give them a year, or two years or three years, and then a change takes place and they go out. Of course you are not going to get the best men under such a system. It is a wonder that we ever get good men at all. But the capacity of the Anglo-Saxon for government is such that we have been able to adapt ourselves to some very poor machinery.

There are other problems, too, in a different direction. We can go too far in this matter of adding to the functions of government. The government can do a good deal, but it cannot do everything, and one of the things we have to learn is that legislation cannot make a man over. They are going ahead to do a great many things to-day that they are going to regret they ever attempted to do. They are going into a wave of municipal ownership and operation. I do not object to municipal ownership, but I think municipal operation is a very dangerous experiment. I think we shall find it to be so. We have so many interests, and so many municipalities we can try them on some and then the wiser people can wait and see how it works out, but those who rush ahead can pay the bill. Men can get on the hustings and get into office by offering all sorts of improvements, that the government is going to run everything, and everybody is going to enjoy the millennium of comfort, and they will project some plan to borrow on the bonds of the municipality, but they will find that the interest charged on that wicked Wall Street or elsewhere becomes so high that it increases the taxes, and they learn that high taxes are not just the best platform to go to the people on. (Laughter.) The change that is coming about is an economic change that the government cannot go into [illegible]essive use of public funds and public credit for a lot of [illegible] that men would like to do because the government is not fit to carry on a great many enterprises profitably, and the government is not going to be able to convince many people that it can.

It has been a great pleasure for me to hear Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, even if he did cast aspersions at my golf. (Laughter.) That is one of the easiest things to do. Golf is a game that everybody can enjoy, no matter how much of a novice he is, therefore a jest at a man's game is nothing to the purpose because it does not drive him from the game. "Hope springs eternal in the human breast." (Laughter.)

Now, we are getting along very well as between the United States and Canada, and as between the United States and England. It is true that the relations between these two countries and our own country are different from other international relations in this that it is true that the suggestion of war brings a feeling of revulsion in both countries. (Applause.) Of course we have our differences. While we went ahead we were not looking around to see what everybody else was doing. We expanded, and our heads were swelled. Well, we have come to a halt in our expansion, and many of our people are now thinking that money is not everything, and expansion is not everything. There are a good many other things to attend to, and we have got to have a halt to look around and help those who are not so successful in the race, and that feeling has come over the entire country. It is not going to stop us in business, but I am quite sure it has affected the attitude of society towards material growth and material expansion. That there are other things higher and better to look after that ought to command the attention of the people, and the people are going to do it.

Now, on your side it is but natural that as you are in your era of expansion and growth that you should look at us askance, and that you should reason sometimes that we are not paying as much attention to you as you are entitled to—and very often we do not. There is no doubt about that. You have inherited from your Anglo-Saxon ancestors as we did that certain sense of national self-consciousness that might be improved upon. (Laughter.)

I went to the Philippines and came in touch with the Spanish civilization there. There are some difficulties about that civilization which we all recognize and which we are only too willing to point out, and then there are some very striking truths in their system of philosophy. They believe that contentment and happiness is largely made up of small things in life, largely made up by the lubrication of society in manner, and in bearing and in courtesy.

Now, as between the United States and Canada, we have had in times past a good many strains. I am not going back with Sir John Willison to argue over the righteousness of the American Revolution. I am a little bit afraid to do that, because this afternoon when I submitted a few observations of admiration for the British Empire I was told that if I had been living at the time of the revolution, I would have been a United Empire Loyalist. Then I expressed the opinion that I had rather overdone it in what I said about the British Em-

pire. (Laughter.) I am entirely willing to let that revolution stand just where it is. (Laughter.) I am not going back either to discuss the righteousness of the War of 1812 which was conducted for the purpose of freedom of all the world. And my friend Macdonald is wrong about Canning. If he is to bring Canning back he should not do it at the time of the War of 1812. His day did not come until 1820. (Laughter and applause.) I am not going to enter into that discussion either. I am entirely willing to admit that Canning was the first to suggest the principle of the Monroe doctrine, and I beg you to remember, gentlemen, that it came from England, and you can make it mean anything. But we have had a good many strains during that one hundred years of peace. There is the Oregon and Maine boundary business, that was settled by two great statesmen—Daniel Webster and Lord Ashburton. There were a lot of people in the United States who said "fifty-four forty" or fight. Well, they did not fight, and it was not "fifty-four forty" either. Then we come to the Civil War, and that was a great strain, and never as long as I am able to express my view shall I fail to express the gratitude, the deep gratitude that as an American I feel to Her Majesty Queen Victoria for her personal interposition to save the breach between England and the United States in the dark days of the Civil War. (Applause.) Then we had the French ready with their troublous times, and then we had Venezuela, and there we heard some views as to what the Monroe doctrine meant, that we were virtually the sovereign power of this hemisphere, and that our fiat was law. While we do not believe that now (laughter) it was not so then. It was an unfortunate expression. The Monroe doctrine is a very useful doctrine. There are those in the United States who call it an obsolete Shibboleth, and think it ought to be done away with. Well, it has kept our troubles in this hemisphere to ourselves, and it has become a permanent, accepted doctrine not as part of International law, but as something that European powers respect. It is better that we should settle in this country, if we can, our own difficulties. I know some of them seem to be insoluble. I could mention one now. I do not believe you know. You do not always appreciate the benefits that the United States gives Canada. You do not seem to appreciate the great advantage that we offer you in being the buffer between you and some other country. (Laughter.)

Now it takes a lot of different people to make up a nation and a populace. And you cannot make the whole people responsible for the heat of extreme declarations of a part of

the populace. I do not know of any people that does not have a large foreign assortment of—I do not like to call them by an invidious description—but I must say a large and varied assortment of asses, who say a great many things, that, if they were called upon to say if they really meant it would take the hint lest others in the intoxication of the moment might feel it necessary to give prominence to an undoubted use of superlatives, and we are not going to get into a breach on account of these people. (Hear, hear.)

I really believe that there is not any reason, not only that there is no good reason (of course there is no good reason) for any trouble between us or any breach between us. We have settled a great many differences by arbitration, and we are going to settle a lot more. About arbitration, there are some gentlemen in our country that have this view of arbitration. They are strongly in favor of arbitration when they are certain that the arbitration is going to result in their favor. That is not arbitration at all. If you play the game you have to be willing to lose (hear, hear), and there is no use talking of making an agreement to submit an issue to a tribunal if you are not going to take your medicine when you get it, and that is what we are coming to.

Now, there is the question of the Panama tolls. We do not agree among ourselves. Mr. Root and Mr. Choate don't think we have the right, and Mr. Knox and I think we have the right. Now, all I object to is this: I do not mind you saying you have the right; what I object to is that you should say because you have the right you should not be willing to have the issue decided. Now, we do not want to argue what the treaty means. If the treaty means what you think it means, and the issue ever comes (I do not know what the present administration is going to do) but if the issue ever arises, of course it will go to arbitration, and the place I would be glad to leave it, as Sir Charles said to-night, I would be glad to leave it to a tribunal consisting of three Supreme Court Judges of the United States and three members of your Privy Council, and have the lawyers sit as judges. There are those who would fear that a tribunal of this character would be hampered by allegiance to one's country. But I believe the administration of justice should be higher than allegiance to any country. I believe that the judges under our system have a higher appreciation, and come nearer to the highest ideal than that in any other judicial system that I know of. I won't say anything about those who are talking of our building the canal and

managing it, and therefore won't arbitrate anything about it. They are talking through their hats. It is quite true if the issue comes we are going to arbitrate it, and we are going to arbitrate it because we made a treaty in which you are entitled to certain rights in the management of the canal, and whether you are entitled to these rights is not to be determined by whether we built the canal, but because the treaty binds us, and if it does, we are going to live up to it, that is all. But do not be too confident about the treaty. There used to be a lawyer with us who had a great reputation for jury trials, and he said he never was certain of but one case in his life, and that one he lost. (Laughter.)

But I am glad to be here with you, and with the Club. I am glad to meet my friends here. Brother Macdonald and I went down in "one red burial," and I am not going to revive that struggle here. I am not here for that purpose. I do not want to bring back those things into this atmosphere. That is past history. It is one of the things that men who examine details later on will wonder over, that is all. It is a delight to me to be able to come here and greet you gentlemen who in the partisan controversy, if I may call it such, thought it necessary to paint certain pictures that were I won't say, incorrect, but were a little shaded. But now we have forgotten all that, and later on will come again—probably in other controversies. These are the things that are practically, I presume, a federal controversy. Those happy days we all have, and after awhile the common sense of the people prevails when they learn the facts.

That is how my friend Willison and my friend Macdonald do, and those of us who are filling offices have to stand it. But it is not a very bad thing after all.

I am grateful to you all in Toronto for the very cordial reception that you have given me. I have one word more to say, and I am done. I do not represent anybody. That is one great pleasure I have in coming here. I have no responsibility. Perhaps you have discovered that, but I do bring you what I know to exist, the good will of my fellow countrymen, their respect and their hope, and anticipation that this century of peace that we have enjoyed will continue forever. I thank you. (Cheers and applause.)