

tion, the public returned the same men at the head of the poll. Such is the difference between direct legislation and indirect legislation.

Not many weeks ago Sir James Whitney, the Premier of the Province, prorogued the parliament. The Reform party, or the Liberal party as it is generally called, had laid as the basis of its platform the abolition of saloons, local option in taxation and woman suffrage. To all these Sir James and his shadows had declared their emphatic opposition. There was therefore a very clearly cut issue between the two parties.

The Tax Reformers in Toronto nominated Mr. Arthur B. Farmer, M. A., the secretary of the Tax Reform League, for one of the seats, and shortly afterwards he was endorsed by the Liberals. This seemed to give him something of a fighting chance, although he was opposed to the Hon. Mr. Crawford, who for some time had been Speaker of the House, and who had won the previous election by a vote of 5,469 to 1,519.

At once vigorous methods were adopted to appeal to the public. Two tents were secured and various speakers kept busy night after night. It was cause for great rejoicing at last to have the chance in an election to proclaim the grand truths that God made the land for the people, and that a race of land speculators have no more right to exist than a race of potato bugs. Besides the tent meetings, some of the boys invaded the street corners, where they took the same kind of a platform as the apostles of old, with the heavens for their canopy, and there they discoursed to the people on the essential difference between the value that comes with the growth of population, and the value due to the efforts of industry.

Last night the votes were counted, for Crawford 5,934, for Farmer 3,805. It is true that Mr. Crawford will sit in the next parliament, but not by a vote of three to one, as formerly.

The ridings are arranged in such a way that they give no possibility of any approach to fair representation. The constituencies were cut up purposely to deprive the Reformers of all representation. The total Tory vote in the whole city was less than 50,000, while the Reform vote was upwards of 26,000. With any kind of fair voting, therefore, out of the ten members the Reformers should have had three seats. As it is they have none.

In each constituency two men had to be elected, but not necessarily the two who had the highest number of votes. Mr. Farmer, whose platform was primarily for Tax Reform, was pitted against Mr. Crawford, and Mr. McTaggart, who fought principally for the closing of the bar, was pitted against Mr. McPherson. As Mr. Farmer had about 500 more votes than Mr. McTaggart, it seems to indicate that Tax Reform was more popular than Temperance Reform.

Our good friend and champion for Tax Reform, Arthur Roebuck, ran in another constituency and made a valiant fight, losing his election by only about 400 votes.

In the city of Ottawa, our good friends, the Southams, the owners of the Ottawa Citizen, an old Tory paper, came out in opposition to their own

party, with the result that the two members returned from that city stand for Tax Reform.

I cannot but feel that the Labor party has been humbled. Out of the whole Province they have won only one seat. Mr. Studholm of Hamilton, the lone representative in Parliament for some years, offered himself for re-election, and though the Tories had an overwhelming majority of members in the House they did not have the chivalry to let the labor men keep that seat without a contest. I am glad, however, that the public stood by him and returned him with a majority of about a thousand. For many years he has been a faithful friend to the Tax Reformers.

At the last municipal election in Toronto the Labor party put James Simpson at the head of the poll for the position of Controller. Today the Labor party has not a single representative to parliament in this city.

My impression is that we are on the eve of a commercial depression. That may lead the people to think. The Prodigal had to come down to the hog trough in order to "come to himself." Often the same thing is true of nations, as of men.

W. A. DOUGLASS.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of The Public for earlier information on the same subject.

---

Week ending Tuesday, July 7, 1914.

---

### The President's Independence Day Oration.

In a Fourth of July address at Philadelphia President Wilson advocated application of the principles of the Declaration of Independence to modern conditions. Among other things he said:

Liberty does not consist in mere general declarations as to the rights of man. It consists in the translation of those declarations into definite action. Therefore, standing here, where the declaration was adopted, reading its businesslike sentences, we ought to ask ourselves what is there in it for us. There is nothing in it for us unless we can translate it into terms of our own condition and of our own lives. We must reduce it to what the lawyers call a bill of particulars. It contains a bill of particulars—the bill of particulars of 1776—and if we are to revitalize it we are to fill it with a bill of particulars of 1914. . . . Patriotism consists of some practical things—practical in that they belong to every day life; in that they belong to no extraordinary distinction, but to those things which are associated with our every day, commonplace duty. . . . I have had some experiences in the last fourteen months which have not been refreshing. It was universally admitted that the banking system of this country needed reorganization. We set the best minds we could find to the task of discovering the best methods of reorganization. We met with hardly anything but criticism from the bankers of this country, or at least from the majority of

those who said anything. And yet, just as soon as that act was passed, on the next day, there was an universal chorus of applause from the bankers of the United States. Now, if it was wrong the day before it was passed, why was it right the day after it was passed? Where had been the candor of criticism by the concert of counsel which makes a great nation successful? It is not patriotic to concert measures against one another; it is patriotic to concert measures for one another.

One of the most serious questions for sober-minded men to address themselves to in these United States is what are we going to do with the influence and power of this great nation? Are we going to play the old role of using that power for our own aggrandizement and material benefit? You know what that means. That means we shall use it to make the people of other nations suffer in the way in which we said it was intolerable to suffer when we uttered the Declaration of Independence.

The department of state of the United States is constantly called upon to back up commercial enterprises and the industrial enterprises of the United States in foreign countries; and it at one time went so far in that direction that all its diplomacy was designated as "dollar diplomacy." It was for supporting every man who wanted to earn anything anywhere if he was an American.

But there is a limit to that which has been laid upon us more than any other nation in the world. We set up this nation and we propose to set it up on the rights of man. We did not name any differences between one race and another; we did not set up any barriers against any particular race or people, but opened our gates to the world and said all men who wish to be free come to us and they will be welcome.

We said this independence is not merely for us—a selfish thing for our own private use—but for everybody to whom we can find the means of extending it.

Now, we cannot, with that oath taken in our youth; we cannot, with that great idea set before us when we were a young people, and practically only a scant 3,000,000 people, take upon ourselves, now that we are 100,000,000, any other conception of duty than what we entertained at that time. So if American enterprise in foreign countries, particularly in those foreign countries which are not strong enough to resist us, takes the shape of imposing upon and exploiting the mass of the people in that country, it ought to be put to a stop, not encouraged.

I am willing to get anything for an American that money can buy, except the rights of other men. I will not help any man buy a power he should not exercise over his fellow being. . . . You hear a great deal stated about the property loss in Mexico and I deplore it with all my heart. Upon the conclusion of the present disturbed condition in Mexico, undoubtedly those who have lost properties ought to be compensated. Man's individual rights have met with many deplorable circumstances, but back of it all is the struggle of the people, and while we think of the one in the foreground, let us not forget the other in the background.

Every patriotic American is a man who is not

niggardly and selfish in the things he needs that make for human liberty and the rights of man, but wants to share it with the whole world. And he is never so proud of the great flag as when it means for other people as well as for himself the symbol of liberty and freedom.

I would be ashamed of this flag if it ever did anything outside of America that we would not permit it to do inside of America. We stand for the mass of the men, women, and children who make up the vitality of every nation. . . .

It is patriotic sometimes to regard the honor of this country in preference to its material interests. Would you rather be despised by all nations of the world as incapable of keeping your treaty obligations, or would you rather have free tolls for American ships? The treaty may have been a mistake, but its meaning was unmistakable.

When I have made a promise to a man I try to keep it. The most honorable and distinguished nation in the world is the nation that can keep its promises to its own hurt. I want to say, parenthetically, that I don't think anybody was hurt. I am not enthusiastic for subsidies to a monopoly and nobody can get me enthusiastic on that subject. But assuming that was a matter of enthusiasm, I am much more enthusiastic for keeping the integrity of the United States absolutely unquestioned and unswayed.

Popularity is not always successful patriotism. The most patriotic man is sometimes the man who goes in the direction in which he thinks he is right, whether or not he thinks anybody agrees with him, because it is patriotic to sacrifice yourself if you think you are right. Do not blame anybody else if they do not agree with you. That is not the point. Do not die with bitterness in your heart because you do not convince anybody. But die happy because you believe you tried to serve your country without selling your soul. . . . And my dream is this, that, as the years go on and the world knows more and more of America it will turn to America for those moral inspirations that lie at the base of human freedom, that it will never fear America unless it finds itself engaged in some enterprise inconsistent with the rights of humanity; that America will come to that day when all shall know she puts human rights above all other rights and that her flag is the flag not only of America but the flag of humanity.



#### President Wilson and Woman Suffrage.

A delegation of 446 women called on President Wilson on June 30 to present the resolutions favoring woman suffrage adopted by the Federation of Women's Clubs, and to urge his support of the pending Bristow-Mondell woman suffrage amendment. In reply the President again referred to the failure of the Baltimore convention to embody endorsement of suffrage in the platform. His personal opinion, he said, is that it is a matter that belongs to the states for settlement, not the nation. Mrs. Rheta Childe Dorr then asked, "Is it not a fact that we have very good precedents for altering the electorate by the Con-