

(April 2nd, 1906.)

## The Imperial Crisis.

PROFESSOR STEPHEN LEACOCK OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I shall not preface my remarks with any apologetic explanation as to the brevity of half an hour in which to discuss so large a subject. We all recognize that thirty-five minutes is necessarily insufficient to properly deal with a subject such as I have selected to-day. Perhaps, too, an apology should be forthcoming had I needlessly startled you in my selection, "The Imperial Crisis." Yet I feel the wording is essentially appropriate at the present time. As we glance with retrospective eye over the past and seek to peer eagerly into the declouded future we must recognize that we stand on the brink of one of those epoches of national life, when the fortunes of peoples are made or marred.

The general political situation of the British Empire to-day is an anomaly. It is inconsistent with her future destiny. The present political and commercial relations among her component parts are no longer adequate, by reason of the growth and fast increasing wealth and importance of the greater colonies, Canada being the predominant partner in the Imperial system. We are doing wisely then, as Canadians, to take anxious thought for the future imperial policy, and the external and internal relations of the vast Empire of which we form an important part.

The great states of the world must more and more come to the front, stand foremost among the world's nations. Banish the term "little England" as belonging to a class that includes little Switzerland and little Belgium. The British Empire is the greatest of all the world's states. Its nearest rivals are Russia and Germany and the United States. But the British Empire is phenomenal—it is unique in human history. It embraces a territory much over 12,000,000 square miles—call it 13,000,000 square miles; it has a population of over 300,000,000 souls. Yet it confronts one difficulty, both vital and dangerous. It is not in the real and true sense a united Empire. It is different from Germany and the

United States in that it is not a single and consolidated territory. They are one commercially and politically, in policy and in power. The British Empire comprises a multiplicity of peoples; it is a great house divided against itself. It is commercially split into several tariff countries and in military and naval matters strategically divided, the burden of the whole falling upon the mother country. It cannot hope to be permanent, it cannot hope to stand divided commercially, and in military, naval and political structure. For the commercial aspect alone the tendency now is to commercial sunderance.

I am not going to talk on preferential trade. The brains of this Club must often, I know, have been saturated with this subject, and I am not going to surcharge your intelligence with further injections. We have heard much, too, of a revenue tariff. The British Empire comprises not only Britain, but Canada, Newfoundland, South Africa, the Barbadoes, the islands scattered the seas over. Each is moving, unconsciously perhaps towards a sunderance and severance of interest. In military and naval questions this is distinct. Yet the people of the British Empire are a maritime and naval people. The sea is alike the severance and union of the British Empire. The cornerstone of Imperial policy is to hold command of the sea, yet the whole burden of naval maintenance falls upon what is territorially the smallest part of the Empire. The burden falls on the mother country, increasing with every decade, increasing with every budget. Towards the Imperial navy Great Britain contributes \$184,000,000 each year; Canada contributes nothing, for I do not call the maintenance of a couple of dockyards a naval contribution. The people of England are taxed to, almost the last penny they are able to pay, because they aim to live up to the traditional record that the British navy must be equivalent to those of the best two militant nations of Europe—of the world, for Japan and the United States are formidable in their strength. The United States and Germany are great consolidated nations and united peoples and their naval estimates are now almost equal to those of Great Britain—and they will go on increasing.

The German Emperor William has declared that Germany must hold the "trident of the seas," and Roosevelt, while he vaunts nothing about the "trident," whatever that may be, grasps "the big stick" of a similar character. If Britain is to continue to hold "the trident" and fear nothing from "the big stick," there must be some change in our Imperial policy. Colonial contributions can alone save the situation.

Ah, but, the objecter claims, we don't share in the Empire's council. True, and there is a growing necessity for some such form of Imperial reconstruction. But the initiative must come from us. The mother country has learned the lesson of non-interference; she will not force new conditions upon us. If we cling to the present conditions

then it is our own fault—and ours alone. The mother country will meet us only if we take the first step.

Oh, but, the cynics and pessimists and doubting Thomases tell us, we are wiser if we remain in the path of quiet development. It is a natural evolution for which we must wait.

That word "evolution" is responsible for much intellectual blundering. I would sometimes-wish, if it were not for the sake of science, that Darwin and his fellows had never made or "evolved" their startling theory. Evolution indeed! It seems to be the chief and current explanation of anything and everything we cannot understand or otherwise explain. Ourselves, our faculties—nay, our very relationships—are now "evolved," and thus is set down as the solution of our past and the guide to our future.

The error of the past, however, can do us little harm, but the future error is of grave danger. We are told to sit still and do nothing, to become pacific spectators of our own growth. Whatever is, is right, therefore we need make no effort for betterment or change.

Surely this is a serious mistake. We seek growth; we seek development; we seek progress. Then let us make it—not merely watch it. We are aware that many seemingly insurmountable difficulties beset any serious effort at Imperial reconstruction. Yet it seems to me that Imperial federation must be the ultimate goal. I would I could look forward to a new central Imperial parliament, alongside of which are ranged the colonial parliaments and the parliament for England—one supreme and law-making Imperial house and beneath it a series of local parliaments. This is the ideal as I view it. The difficulty arises in determining what it would involve to the English people themselves. Would they welcome a new parliament such as described with its subordinate houses? Would they consent to a delineation of its powers? Would they be prepared for the adoption of a written constitution and the banishment of all legal technicalities, precedent and tradition? What complications of ultra vires legislation and limited powers would arise?

The great disadvantage thus created would be the necessity of deliberate political construction or reconstruction. The British people have a horror of the radical change. They represent now the rescued wisdom of their forefathers.

If Canada were the only one to be consulted we might look forward to an earlier realization of our plan. We have fashioned our own Dominion and Provincial systems of government and we are proud of our handiwork. But in England they would view aghast the laying of unhalloved hands on the British constitution and having fun with it. They fear we might be like the small boy who thoroughly enjoyed the taking of his father's gold watch to pieces but met his difficulties when he sought to put it together again.

Yet surely we may fittingly ask for proper representation in the British parliament and voice our sentiments there. There are some 670 members there at the present. To these let 166 be added from the colonies. This would be in the proportion of four to one, the population of the colonies being some ten millions to forty-two millions in the United Kingdom. The mother country would not spurn our requests. The memory of the great American revolution still lives. Objectors will, of course, put forth the statement that the colonial few would become swamped and descend into little satellites in the British house. We cannot realize all we wish now, but we will develop with our growth.

Let us for a moment contrast the position of Canada in the Imperial system with that of Ireland. Canada has a population of 6,000,000 souls. This population is rapidly increasing—so much so that the 100,000,000 mark is within the possibilities of this century. Ireland has a population of 4,000,000, and for the past 50 years her population has been steadily declining. For the past 20 years—nay, almost 50 years—Ireland has been making trouble in the Imperial system; we have made none. Our future is in front of us; theirs—part of it, at least—is behind them. Yet for 20 years Ireland has made and unmade British ministries; for 20 years the Irish members in the House of Commons have been the arbiters of Imperial policy. Surely we have the vastly greater claim to make trouble or help things along in the British system.

There is a doctrine which some may look upon as long ago discredited, but there must be great advantage in securing an engine with power to control even the outlying points of the British Empire. Sir Frederick Pollock argued for an Imperial intelligence department as an indirect means of federating the Empire. We should have this outside of the delegation to the British parliament. The representation should not be merely advisory; it should have the power to tax and control. It should have a modified scheme of Imperial policy. Take such vexed questions as tariff relations and naval defence. If the parts of the Empire are co-operating all will go well. Then in the stern actualities of war we can count upon spontaneous parallel action.

The Imperial representatives should have the power to tax us. Some of you may think it is the ravings of a mad house to levy more taxes upon us. But in private life how much do we owe to the whip and spur of necessity? It is the things we can do or not do, as we see fit, what are left undone. How many of us would, left to ourselves, mail \$1.00 to the British Admiralty each year as a freewill contribution? Yet none of us would refuse it coming in the proper form and with Canadian representation.

The time has come for some form of Imperial reconstruction and consolidation. The greatest responsibility rests upon Canada as the premier colony. The mother country will never drive her colonies. The move must come from them, and it is fitting that it should initiate with

the greatest and major colony. We can no longer take refuge in passive inactivity. We must now take thought for the future—we must build before the storm; we must have the roof before the rain. When trouble comes the Empire must be ready to meet it.

We cannot longer maintain our colonial status. If we take no action along the course outlined we must drift in the other direction. There is no alternative.

The forces of sectionalism with their narrow outlook threaten our future. Let us have done with the cry of Canada first. In that puny gospel lie all the seeds of future disruption and ruin. We cannot be an independent country. We must become the citizens of a wider country and the children of a greater fatherhood. Separated, our far-flung Confederation would snap under its own weight. We know that underneath the surface of the political life of our country there smoulder the fires of racial and religious antagonism. Our connection with the British Empire is the real tie that binds us together. And let it be the consecrated aim of every patriot to develop us into one single, united Canadian people.

of effort, lets down the moral tone and saps the virility of the recipient. This applies not only to the working of the charitable institutions, but to other work, as well. It is, indeed, a principle of too general application. We look at colonization roads, and it applies there. There are districts now rich enough to at least help to build their own roads, in which a suggestion to that effect would receive scant encouragement. We look at some branches connected with the agricultural department, and it applies there. But I propose to touch the question to-day only as it is applicable to the care of the mentally afflicted class.

We have in the institutions for the insane in this Province 6,000 people. These are maintained at an annual cost of quite \$1,000,000, if we allow anything at all for capital account. For the maintenance of but 1,200 of these (or about 20 per cent.) is anything contributed by the patients themselves or by those legally or morally responsible for their care and comfort, and for these 1,200 the total amount collected for the year ending September 30 last, was less than \$115,000; which is the highest point yet reached, and much of this was contributed by the working classes, who are, as a class, the least disposed to avoid payment. This means that 88 per cent. of the cost of maintenance is defrayed by the Province.

#### INSANITY A DISEASE.

It has been said that governments owe it to themselves as a measure of self-protection to take care of this class. While acknowledging the duty I would place it on far higher grounds. As a measure of humanity and practical Christianity, I would say we owe the afflicted the best and tenderest care we can give them, and if it comes to choosing between the best system and one less efficient to this class, I would unhesitatingly advocate the most efficient system, regardless of expense, and if the province were polled on the question I am satisfied this would be the almost-universal verdict. For people are realizing to-day, as they never did before, that insanity is not an offence; it is an affliction. That it is not a disgrace; it is a disease.

There are those who claim that much has been saved to our citizens by the mere fact that we started in the business of caring for this class on a centralized plan, and that central control of these institutions, as distinguished from local or municipal control, whether by cities or counties or groups of counties, has proved itself better in many ways. The central plan should result in the decreased cost of maintenance per head, it affords room for more modern methods and for healthy rivalry between institutions, it admits of better service and better food, clothing and care, it admits of better accounting and auditing, better discipline amongst employes, more chances for promotion, more opportunity furnished for comparison and mutual improvement. The central

plan is superior to the localized one at many points, but it is greatly behind it in one, and that a most important one, and it is this: That the central system destroys that careful oversight of each individual case which is the distinctive feature of local interest and control. It is because of this inherent defect of the central control that we have this anomaly; our system, which is the best and cheapest per head, is the one that produces the greatest number of heads.

While efficient central control may be the better for the sufferers, and may be the more economical when the expense is calculated at per head, yet without local supervision to prevent abuses, it acts as a perfect drag-net with the meshes all too small. It draws in all the cases that should come in, together with very many cases which should not. On the other hand, a municipally managed institution might be administered in too parsimonious a spirit. In such institutions efficiency and small cost might be mistakenly regarded as synonymous terms. Admission would be made too difficult and curable cases might be neglected until they became incurable, and persons who ought to be under seclusion would go on propagating their kind, and, generally, immurement in one of these places would come to be looked upon as a greater calamity than going to prison.

The superiority of the localized system consists in the fact that the municipal officers have personal knowledge of every case, and of the ability of the relatives to pay, and whether they should be made to pay. In this respect the Ontario system is deplorably defective, and could not be made effective except at the cost of maintaining a horde of local officials, practically inquisitors, who would necessarily have to get the most of their information from municipal officials and others, whose sympathies would naturally lie in the direction of protecting those responsible.

#### INSANITY INCREASING.

Our system makes it easy to magnify the mental condition of the individual cases and to establish the inability of the relatives to do anything in support of the sufferers, it may be justly described as the finest on earth to produce a constant and increasing supply of patients. It is not merely patriotic pride to describe our population as among the soundest and healthiest on earth. Yet the number of mentally afflicted in our institutions is increasing at the rate which would be alarming indeed if an explanation of the increase were not forthcoming. In the service given in our institutions and the inherent unsoundness of our method of admitting patients and of collecting maintenance is to be found the partial explanation. What are the figures? Notwithstanding that we are among the sanest of peoples, and that there is little admixture of race among us—said by alienists to be a fruitful source of insan-

ity—we find that while we had but one insane person in each 1,188 of population in 1871, and in each 707 in 1881, and in each 613 in 1893 and in each 474 in 1901, we have one in each 340 in 1905; while in Quebec there is to-day only one in each 450; in New Brunswick one in each 460; in Nova Scotia one in each 850.

#### THE SITUATION STATED.

That is to say, according to the above figures insanity is three times what it was in 1871 and over twice what it was in 1881, and is rapidly increasing; and there is to-day nearly one-third more lunacy in Ontario than in Quebec and New Brunswick and two and a quarter times as much in Ontario as in Nova Scotia. It is useless to blame emigration and immigration for this state of affairs. The four Provinces suffer and benefit equally from those causes, and as to the plea that immigrants furnish more than their share of the insane, this is only very slightly the case, the fact being that the native born constitute 87 per cent. of the whole population and 80 per cent. of the patients; and this difference is partially accounted for by the fact that the immigrant population of our institutions is entirely made up of the friendless of a class which, if native-born, would have friends to take care of them. While capable of partial explanation, these figures raise at once the question: To what extent is the policy on which our expenditure is based responsible, and what is the remedy? The trouble with all Government help is that the help is so pleasant to take that it is apt to create an appetite for more. After one experience of Government help, people come to rely upon it instead of upon their own exertions. If we had not begun by aiding railways so liberally, without a doubt another method of financing the building of railways would have been evolved here, as it was in American States, not a whit richer or more enterprising than we. Is Government aid to-day given in such a way as to kill individual effort, and can it be given in such a way as to stimulate it? Had the plan originally adopted, or since pursued, retained in some way the assistance of the municipality in determining who are properly admissible and who should pay, and to what extent it would have enlisted the help of thousands of persons having intimate knowledge of the cases, who would all have been interested in some degree in seeing that the system was not abused. One of the most conspicuous consequences of the plan adopted is that it has developed a system which, however humane and efficient it may be, has a pauperizing tendency. It deprives the communities and individuals of all the incentives to the exercise of that oversight which only they can give, and supplies them with potent, and in some cases irresistible, inducements to charge upon the Province the care of the senile, the destitute and the weak, who, by any stretch of imagination can be held to be defective in intellect. No such complaint exists in the

cases of Houses of Refuge and of non-pay hospital patients. Does the local knowledge and interest in these cases furnish the explanation?

I have given you the situation that presents. I have stated the problem. I ask the Canadian Club to solve it. I impose but one condition, and that is—that your solution shall not result in increased burdens on the municipalities.

(April 9th, 1906.)

## The Relation of Physical Training to Modern Civilization.

DR. GEORGE J. FISHER, SECRETARY OF THE ATHLETIC LEAGUE OF  
Y.M.C.A.'S OF NORTH AMERICA, NEW YORK.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Canadian Club,—I assure you that I appreciate it both as an honor and a privilege to have the opportunity of addressing your club. I have heard of you and your splendid success and the esprit de corps which characterizes your organization, and your rival clubs at Ottawa and Montreal spoke most highly of the members of this organization.

As your chairman has said the subject of my address does seem a somewhat complicated topic. I think you are fortunate in the arrangement of your programmes to prescribe a thirty minute limit. It was a cautious thing to do, for I may perhaps hope that you can survive that time no matter how dry the talk may be. I am reminded of the man in somewhat similar circumstances who was about to be introduced. The chairman leaned over towards him and asked quietly, "shall we allow the members to enjoy themselves a little longer, or shall I introduce you now."

Ambassador Choate used to distinguish between the respective ends of a barber and a sculptor by declaring that the barber curls up and dyes and the sculptor makes faces and busts. Either end would I imagine be preferable to being talked to death. It is told of Admiral Côté that he went to pay a sympathetic call at the bereaved home of a recently deceased friend. He was anxious to say some good things of the man, but didn't know exactly what to say or where to begin. Finally he called the young hopeful to his knee. "Bobby," he asked, "what were the last words of your beloved father?" Bobby was puzzled for a moment and then he looked up and replied, "Please, he did not have any last words. Mother was with him to the end." So I fear today I will have the last word.