

TOPICS OF THE DAY

DEMOCRACY: LABOUR: PROTECTION: "OPTIMISM": GERMANY
COMES BACK.

A RECENT review writer sets himself the thesis that "party is greater than leadership." His argument tends to an opposite conclusion. For example, he writes: "If we examine our views of democracy and our hopes for democratic government, we shall not pretend that we respect democracy merely as government by the majority. We shall confess that we hope from it the prevalence of the will of the majority through the leadership and the constant service of the few it trusts for the discharge of its executive functions." In other words, this is to confess that democracy is dependent for its success on its leaders. Its leaders are dependent for their success on obtaining a majority of supporters. As Mr. Dooley would say, "And there yez are."

The obvious truth is that democracy, as we know it, has to make the best selection of which it is capable among those who aspire to be leaders, or who thrust themselves or are thrust upon it as such. Leaders are all too often, if not usually, those who by hook or by crook can secure a following. Inasmuch as it is a well known fact that a very large percentage of the people, probably considerably more than three-fourths of them in any known democracy, are mentally incapable of forming rational opinions on any public question or as to the merits of any candidate for leadership among them, does it not follow that the unworthy aspirant to leadership has at least as good a chance of enticing a majority to his support as has the most worthy? Is it not a still more significant fact, which is becoming more and more evident, that the better and more capable elements of democracy are holding, or being held, aloof from public service?

All that appears to be saving democratic government from falling into contempt, where it has not already fallen, is the parliamentary system by means of which the undesirable elements directly thrown up by democracy are winnowed by more enlightened opinion, and the best among them are promoted to actual leadership. Even such parliamentary winnowing is not always successful. Leaders are not infrequently selected less for their moral or mental equipment than for their demagogic powers of appeal to the masses. It is fortunate, too, for democracy that the responsi-

bilities of supreme leadership often serve the purpose of sobering and greatly improving the one who is subjected to them. Men naturally tend to rise to the height of their positions.

The ultimate truth unmistakably is that not only is leadership in democracy infinitely greater than party, but that it is relatively all-important. A party is organized and exists in a democracy for the purpose of promoting a particular theory or set of views. It is really as anti-democratic as a dictatorship, unless democracy is to be regarded merely as the acceptance of the rule of a majority, no matter how secured. But that is far from the original idea or the true meaning of democracy, which signifies the rule of all the people by mutual agreement, and not the dominance of a majority of them ascertained by counting heads. With so large a percentage of people more or less unintelligent and incapable of forming or expressing enlightened opinions, what can there be of wisdom or impressiveness, much less of sacredness, in their electoral, so-called decisions? Generally speaking, one might as well drive a mingled thoroughbred and scrub herd of cattle down a common lane, with openings on either side towards its end, and accept as decisive the greater number which turns to one side or the other. The democratic system of enumerating "polls" is even worse than that, for experience has justified the maxim that majorities are usually wrong. They are wrong because of the successful appeal which demagoguery can make to ignorance and senseless prejudice.

These conclusions, while they do not directly suggest a remedy or a palatable alternative, do most convincingly point to the desirability of strict limitations of the jurisdiction of the form of "democracy" under which we suffer. It may be better or wiser to endure the political ills we have than to fly to others that we know not of, by radical changes such as several of the more restless nations of Europe have recently made—not without apparent temporary gain. But that does not preclude the stricter delimitation of the functions and powers of democracy. Democracy in its conception, and at its practical inception, was merely a taking over by or on behalf of the people of the monarchical or oligarchical rights previously established by immemorial usage. The rights of the monarch were taxation for purposes of defence and of government; the prescription of laws for the preservation of order or the punishment of crime; and personal adjudication in matters of justice. Subject to these fundamental principles of government, the people were free from all but occasional arbitrary interference. The juridical powers of the monarch were early delegated to appointed judges.

In taking over the powers and functions of monarchy, democracy should have been content with the exercise of those powers and functions, and should have restricted itself to them. Of course, new conditions would have necessitated certain innovations, but these should have been in strict conformity with the past. As a matter of history, democracy in its earlier stages did restrain itself within historic bounds. Until of recent years, the British democracy followed closely the well-tried paths of monarchical government. The Constitution of the United States was based largely on that of Britain. Of late years, "democracy" has been running wild, and it has at last become more despotic in its interference with individual and social freedom than autocracy, at its very worst, ever dared to be. The idea has been accepted, and almost deified, that the majority not only in the nation but in each little community has a divine right to impose its will on the minority, and to rule it with a rod of iron, if so disposed. Resistance of majority interference has come to be seriously regarded and denounced as lawlessness akin to crime.

Just how limited are and should be the proper functions of national or State government is strikingly indicated in the Ten Commandments—the national Constitution of the Israelites. Judaism was a theocracy—a priestly government carried out in the name of deity. A considerable part of its Constitution, therefore, had reference to religious duties. Apart from them, the civil laws prescribed for social regulation were only four in number. These were the forbidding of theft, of unlawful killing, of certain sexual relations, and of perjury. Within these bounds, individual and social Jewish liberty was left untouched, except in so far as it was affected by the patriarchal system of the time, as indicated in the Fifth Commandment concerning obedience to parents. No one would pretend that a Constitution suited to a pastoral people and age would serve modern society, otherwise than as a general reminder of the simple and natural fundamentals of social organization and requirements. But it must be generally conceded that departures from it, and consequent encroachments on private rights and liberties, should be regarded with profound distrust. The greatest menace to democracy itself, and from it to society, is the offhand acceptance of the idea that its powers are and should be unrestricted, that is, that a majority, no matter by what undemocratic or improper means got together, is entitled to impose its alleged will on a protesting and recalcitrant minority,—in other words, to crush individual freedom in the name of popular liberty. If democracy is to survive, the limits of its power to legislate must

be prescribed. To this end not only will leadership be found infinitely greater than party, but party will be recognized as the most potent and most dangerous enemy of democracy.

DENUNCIATION of the follies of one's own age is not usually considered a sign of wisdom. It has been a common practice throughout the ages and in every age, especially among the elderly, to whom change is likely to be unpleasant if not shocking. But there have unquestionably been times when wrong moral tendencies have manifested themselves; so why not in our time? Temporary changes in fashions there have been and will continue to be, for change is usually agreeable as a relief if not useful as an experiment. Radical changes in thought and consequent action are always to be suspected and usually feared, for "the wisdom of the ages" rests on very firm foundations. Disregard of it is always dangerous. With reference to our fellows, its basis is continuous experience. The thoughts of men are merely widened, not deepened, with the process of the suns. Hard practicality has been and must continue to be the governing principle in life. Conditions, subject as they are to evolutionary modification, not as we, or some of us, should like them to be, must be accepted and acted upon. A disregard of this is the besetting sin of the present day. Sentimentalism, for the time being, appears to have usurped the place of common sense among us.

Sentiment, that is, exalted thought and feeling, has its rightful purpose in life, as well as cold logic. But sentiment and sentimentalism are very different things. Love of one's neighbours is a highly commendable sentiment. An unreasoned and unreasoning desire to establish perfect equality and perfect contentment among all our neighbours is, if openly manifested, ridiculous sentimentality. Its usual and natural effect is to arouse more and worse discontent. Such will be and already is the consequence of the maudlin "sympathy with labour" now in vogue. From the day when the post-Eden edict, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread", was proclaimed, until now, it has not merely been verified in practice, but has proved to be the real *magna carta* of humanity. Before that, what was the worth of their luxurious and useless lives to our first parents? Work is the price not only of food and other necessaries to men, but of their progress, their approximate satisfaction and their contentment. Since Eden, there has never been a day without its vitalizing labour and accompanying pleasure to all physically and mentally equipped for its enjoyment. Inability

to work is the most serious misfortune that can befall anyone, with the single exception of an acquired aversion to work. It is to stimulate and spread this acquired aversion to work that our modern sentimentalists have set themselves. "Pity the poor labourer", they shout. He is "a wage-slave", they wail. By the first cry, they announce their distorted idea that work is an affliction; by the second, they proclaim the belief that wage-earning is a deprivation of freedom. How many of us are or ever have been other than wage-earners, in one way or another? How many of us with normal minds have ever regarded so being and doing as other than a privilege? It is the one who, for any good reason, is precluded from being a wage-earner that is to be pitied, not the one who is not merely willing but compelled to work for a living.

Never in the course of history has wage-earning been easier or less trying than at present. The wages of primitive men were food and such precarious security as they could obtain. Often their food was doubtful. Usually their security was more than doubtful. When they advanced to the pastoral stage, their toils for a living were not lessened. Their security was little more certain. The agricultural stage did not lessen their toils, but rather increased them, if it added to their personal safety. Only with the commercial or "capitalistic" age did wage-earning and a comparatively easy and secure living become possible for the great majority of men who until then had been "slaves" of Nature, the most exacting of all task-mistresses or masters. During long centuries men and women continued to perform their daily tasks in that contentment and satisfaction with something courageously accomplished which is so near of kin to happiness. No demand came from them for the pity of others, which always borders closely on contempt; no thought had they of pity for themselves, so long as they had honest work whereby they could earn a living. It was only when labour had been organized for political or quasi-political purposes, and capitalized as "Labour", that a discontent, far from divine, seized their leaders and gradually infected a minority of them—the least deserving of them, for worthy Labour is still as content as ever with its work, or would be if ignorant or selfishly interested agitators would leave it alone.

The press of any country, which is encouraging these agitators by repeating and emphasizing their pernicious cries and activities, is assuming gratuitously a responsibility that it will some day regret in vain. The repetition of Carlyle's strident and hysterical, not to say blatantly nonsensical shriek, apart from its context, that "Labour, wide as the earth, has its summit in heaven", makes

only for folly. What is now meant by "Labour", far from being as wide as the earth, is as narrow as the demagogic brains that control it, and no wider than their noisy mouths. Such Labour is so far from having its summit in heaven that its roots take hold on social hell. Labour is truly as wide as the earth, and always will be while human life on this planet lasts, but it will foretaste heaven only when it exchanges, whole-heartedly, honest and cheerful work for fair wages such as the industry in which it finds employment can afford to pay and still carry on at a reasonable profit, and with reasonable remuneration for the capital, skill and brains engaged in its establishment.

NOW that the uproar of the election has subsided, it should be possible to discuss Protection calmly and without offence, as an economic question instead of a political or partisan issue. Notwithstanding the degree of prominence given to it in the recent electoral contest, Protection has, in reality, long ceased to be a line of actual partisan cleavage in Canada. Both the old parties, and even the Progressives, are agreed that, situated as the Dominion is beside a great and growing industrial nation such as the United States, which steadfastly maintains tariff barriers against Canada, it would be mistaken policy on our part to grant her free admission to our markets. The reasons are perfectly obvious. The United States is committed, without the open dissent of either of her two political parties, to the principle of Protection for protection's sake; that is, her people are steadfastly opposed to permitting foreign competition with their industries, and committed to the maintenance of tariff duties high enough to prevent such competition. They are of the opinion that domestic competition in a market so extensive as that of the United States can be trusted to regulate domestic prices.

Whether their faith is justifiable or not, is not for our consideration. What does concern us is that if we do not impose a tariff sufficient for our own proper needs against our American neighbours, they will inevitably and in a very short time subdue us to their tariff system, with all the disadvantages of restricted foreign trade, and none of the advantages of extensive home competition which it confers on the people of the United States. In plain words, if we were to level our tariff walls, our neighbours would at once seize the opportunity to make the Dominion a slaughter market for their surplus products. For a time they would probably sell to us at prices below their domestic rates, and much below the

cost of production of similar goods in Canada. By this means they would ultimately smother and kill not a few of our local industries. As soon as that end was accomplished, up would go their prices to the high-protection, American limit; and Canada thereafter would, in effect, be subject to the United States tariff, with all its oppressions and none of its compensations. This situation is well known to and understood by our public men of all political parties. It is also well known to all that a tariff for revenue purposes, if for no other, is indispensable to the Dominion. Such a tariff can be made to afford the degree of protection necessary to prevent the destruction of our industries, and the consequent economic subjection of the Dominion to the United States tariff.

It should be unnecessary to state that what applies, in this connection, to the American situation has no bearing on other countries, more especially Great Britain which, under its free trade system, offers no menace to our industries, and does offer us all the advantages of free and fair competition. We might, therefore, with great advantage to ourselves as well as to our fellow subjects in the Old Country, remove all tariff barriers between us and them, except such as are imperatively necessary for actual revenue purposes. On the foregoing points, all Canadians—with the exception of extreme and mostly interested converts to the United States doctrine of Protection for protection's sake—are now pretty nearly in agreement. True, there are still those who hold and assert that we should not discriminate between our fellow British subjects in the home land and our foreign rivals in the United States; who profess to believe that a Briton in Canada should be given an artificial advantage over his fellow in Great Britain, and that the interests of our Empire will thus be promoted; but their number is dwindling. Fewer Canadians every year are able to convince themselves or others that it is either patriotic or loyal to hamper or impede, say the centuries-old woollen industry of Great Britain, with its standardized products and world-wide reputation, by means of onerous taxes on Canadian consumers, in the futile attempt to establish a rival industry in Canada. Soon, it may be expected, there will be none either to see why they should consent or submit to tariff impositions which nearly double the price to them of British woollens manufactured in the Old Country, to the great disadvantage of Old Country producers, for the benefit of a few scattered Canadian producers of inferior woollen articles, mostly made from imported wool, for sheep-raising is rapidly dying out in the Dominion in spite of our "protective" tariff. It is only the few woollen manufacturers in Canada, not the many farmers, who

are beneficiaries of the high protective tariff on woollens. The farmers are probably being bled more freely than any other consumers by such duties.

Protection as a political catch-word has lost much of its seductiveness since it was first heard openly in Canada. When it was introduced by the late Sir John Macdonald, in 1878, the Dominion with less than half its present population was at its lowest economic ebb. The Northwest was still "the great lone land." The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 had recently been abrogated by the United States. Wooden ship-building was in its death throes, because of the rising competition of steel. The Blaine tariff had ended what remained of trade with the United States after the withdrawal of Reciprocity. Americans were mercilessly slaughtering their manufactures in Canada. The country was in a most dejected and despondent condition, ready to grasp at anything which promised relief, however vaguely. It was of this situation that Sir John took shrewd, partisan advantage. But Sir John was not a Protectionist. He was at great pains to declare and explain that he was not. He knew his Canada and her prospective needs too well to be a Protectionist. He declared explicitly, not for Protection as a principle, but for "a readjustment of the tariff, with incidental protection for *infant industries*." He stoutly maintained that tariff taxation was not to be increased, but merely to be made to bear more heavily on American imports. He promised definitely that the protection thus to be afforded to Canadian industry would be only temporary—while it was in its "infancy" and unable to defend itself. He left the distinct impression that Protection was not to be a permanency, but merely a temporary expedient.

Sir John's new policy—a leaf very properly taken, at the time, out of the Blaine tariff book—proved a political success, and, to some extent, an economic one also. But its effects were insignificant in comparison with the sudden expansion which the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the opening up of the Northwest to settlement and production induced. The good luck, combined with otherwise prudent statesmanship, which attended Sir John's venture in Protection gave that policy a fictitious credit with the public, which prolonged experience has served at last to exhaust.

All intelligent Canadians have now grasped the elementary truth that a tariff is merely a schedule of duties which the public must pay. "Duties" are "dues" or taxes imposed, under a tariff fixed by a government. In other words, a tariff is an open and avowed scale of taxation. The right of taxation is one of the prerogatives

of government. No fault is to be found with it, or protest against it to be entertained, so long as it is equitable and its proceeds are to be applied to legitimate public purposes. To fulfil these conditions, all collections under a tariff must go immediately into the public treasury, and no part of them into private or specially favoured pockets. With these facts and principles clearly in mind, it is not difficult to understand why thoughtful Canadians are no longer to be cajoled or misled into sanctioning Protection for protection's sake in this Dominion.

Protection for its own sake means just one thing—the imposition of duties or taxes high enough to prevent foreign competition; in other words, the domestic producer is enabled by it to enjoy a free hand in the setting of his prices in the local market, within the limits of the tariff. If the tariff is sufficiently high to prevent competing importation, the producer is in a position to add the whole of it to the price of his goods to domestic consumers, and thus to divert a tax imposed by the government nominally for public purposes entirely into his own hands, thus converting a public tax to his private use. This is so manifest a subversion of national interests to individual and selfish aggrandisement that it needs only to be stated that it may be condemned. Yet this is the obvious and unmistakable underlying principle of Protection for protection's sake—that is, of Protection which by means of tariff imposts or taxes prevents foreign competition with domestic producers. How many Canadians can now believe in the application of such a principle to their country's business affairs?

To a tariff for revenue such an objection does not lie. It is adjusted with a direct view to competing importation and to a consequent revenue-collection. It gives the domestic producer the advantage over his foreign competitor that his usefulness to the country deserves, while not permitting him to impose on his fellow citizens by taking advantage of its provisions to compel them to pay for his exclusive benefit, or in greater part, a tax nominally imposed for the good of the country at large. Whenever a tariff excludes importations, as it must always do when imposed for protection's sake, it is utterly unjustifiable. So long as its primary aim is revenue, the protection which it incidentally must and will afford is commendable, always provided that it does not operate to the disadvantage or injury of our fair-dealing fellow subjects in other parts of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

The conclusions of right thinking and adequate information with regard to Protection are that, at best, it is an expedient to be adopted only for the safe-guarding of our industries against

foreigners who are bent on unfairly injuring them. At worst, it is domestic robbery and, in effect, foreign economic warfare injurious to both parties concerned. It is never endurable when it is pushed to an extent which robs the State to enrich the individual. It is always wrong when it forbids importation and prevents reasonable competition. It is justifiable only when the taxes which it imposes are made available for the needs of the national treasury.

This is not a proper subject for partisan debate and division. The applicability of Protection in any country is, or should be, for impartial expert enquiry and decision. The sooner it is eliminated entirely from "politics" in Canada, the better will it be for the Dominion, among whose various constituent provinces there are such wide and glaring differences of interests in the matter.

A PROMINENT American social reformer is reported to be "highly optimistic" with regard to prohibition. A "social reformer", in these days, it is needless to remark, is one whose faith is not primarily in God or Revelation, but in legislation as a means of social "uplift." Analogously, he would doubtless have recourse to his own boot-straps if he were desirous of elevating himself physically. This particular "social reformer" appears to base his "optimism" on the future conquest of the world for "laws". He says, "Next to the preaching of the gospel, the people should be taught respect for laws." Inasmuch as in the "neighbouring republic" the people not only make the laws themselves, but provide for their own instruction, this is the exact parallel of remarking that the people who educate themselves to make the laws which they do make should further educate themselves to "respect" the laws which they have made, after making them. It is a somewhat complicated proposition, but distinctly "on all fours" with the boot-strap one.

This gentleman is reported as having gone on to observe that "the sale of liquor would practically come to an end *if* young and old would refuse to purchase liquor sold in violation of the law by bootleggers, dive-keepers and others who have contempt for the laws on the statutes." He added, "Self-respecting citizens cannot, in any way, countenance lawlessness. With education on the part of churches and temperance organizations, and proper enforcement of the law, the liquor traffic will, *in time*, be abolished."

If this is not enlightened and impressive "optimism", what is it? All that is demanded for its realization is the disappearance of a desire, and, in consequence, of an "effective demand" for

things prohibited by people who have no inclination to use them! When those who have no desire—a comparatively small remnant—can persuade those who have both a desire and a strong disposition to gratify it to forego that desire and that disposition, prohibition will triumph gloriously. The only fly in the prohibitionist ointment on that glad day will be that there will be no need for prohibition. And when there is no need for prohibition is the only prospective time when it gives any promise of ever being effective. This may be a sad thought for prohibitionists, but their own “optimist” faces it cheerfully. He is mistaken, however, in asserting that “self-respecting citizens” cannot “countenance” the breaking of prohibition laws. They not only *can*, but they *do*, with a willingness which, of course, does them infinite discredit, considering that the law is, constitutionally, of their own making. He is also rather unduly sanguine in asserting that “the Churches” favour prohibition. By far the largest, most experienced and most influential Church in the United States or in Canada does not favour prohibition, and is not afraid to state the reasons for its disfavour. Only certain ministers of certain “Churches” favour prohibition. What “the Churches” all favour is *temperance*. If they were more enlightened, as they probably soon will be after observing prohibition on display a little longer, they would denounce it unanimously as the worst enemy of temperance they have ever known.

The “optimism” of this “social reformer” most to be admired—in the original sense of the word—is evinced by his confident declaration that “with proper enforcement of the law, the liquor traffic will, *in time*, be abolished.” His enthusiasm as to the future unfortunately blinds him to the fact that “the traffic” has already been abolished, root and branch, by prohibition, and the world thus saved for the prohibitionists. There isn’t any “traffic” any more. What looks so like it, in its worst form, is merely an anti-prohibition chimera. It is nothing but an unlawful swapping of cash for “hooch”, contrary to the statute in such case made and provided—not against the buyer, but the seller of the “hooch”! All that has to be done, now, is to await the conversion by the prohibitionists of all the buyers in order to be quit for ever of the sellers, and so, of even the shadow of a prohibition shade.

GERMANY has been admitted to full standing in the League of Nations, as a permanent member of the Council. If this does not mark the beginning of the end of the League, the teachings of history, and especially German history, are about to be falsified.

The League, conceived by the late Mr. Woodrow Wilson, fathered by the politically-departed Mr. Lloyd George, and assisted at birth by M. Clémenceau of France, with a sardonic grin on his face, has never during its seven years of life shown impressive signs of healthy or promising existence. By means of "a few kind words", from time to time, it has been able to persuade some of the smaller and weaker States of Europe to accede to its wishes. Wherever and whenever it has faced considerable national strength, it has failed ignominiously. Witness Poland and Italy.

The League *idea* may have been admirable. Its birth was untimely. Such an idea is not to be successfully presented and imposed on the vanquished at the close of a world-disturbing war. It is to be matured in calmness and presented for acceptance in profound peace. As it was introduced, it interfered seriously with the prompt and proper settlement of the war. Its terms served only to exasperate the feelings of the defeated nations. Germany was excluded from it. The United States scornfully refused to enter. Only the three great conquering Powers of Europe constituted its actual strength, with such support as could be hoped and expected from a miscellaneous collection of more or less unimportant or nondescript States scattered all over the civilized and semi-civilized world. The United States, Germany, Russia, the three by far the most populous countries of the western world, stood or were held aloof. What was to be looked for from such conditions?

For some inscrutable reason, Great Britain, after exhausting if not ruining herself to defeat German aspirations to world dominance, had no sooner achieved her immediate purpose than she was induced to exert her remaining strength to the utmost to rehabilitate and re-establish her late enemy and perpetual national rival. The persistent effort of British statesmanship after the war was to restore Germany both politically and economically. The success of that policy is now practically complete. Germany is relatively stronger to-day, and a greater prospective menace to world peace, than she was before the war. Every one of her late opponents is burdened with debt and taxation which will make renewed military exertion almost impossible for at least sixty years, or two generations of men. Germany, with a huge debt before the war, and notwithstanding her enormous outlay during the war, is at present virtually free from debt. Her currency has been stabilized. She is far better equipped for economic production than ever before. She is in a position to repudiate her reparations obligations under the Dawes scheme whenever she sees fit. She has already intimated

her intention to do so. The last soldier of occupation of her territory will have to be withdrawn as soon after her admission to the League as she sees fit to make the demand. Her disarmament agreements will become "scraps of paper" at the same time. She has a special private treaty with Russia, the terms of which are kept secret. Austria is ready and more than willing to be annexed by her. What's Locarno to her or she to Locarno, that she should forego her age-old ambitions? The florid eloquence in which French and German representatives at Geneva indulged, when Germany's entry into the League was announced, had only the value of all kindred oratory on similar occasions.

Within the League, her position of "complete equality" will speedily become one of supreme domination, or she will wreck it and cast it to the winds from whose whirlwinds it was evolved by impractically sentimental or would-be cunning minds. Nothing could have been better conceived to serve Germany's ultimate ends than the League of Nations, and she will use it until she is quite ready to cast it contemptuously aside and disclose herself in her old "shining armour." All the indications are that, well within the life of the present generation, Germany will be a far greater menace to the peace and freedom of the world than she has ever been in the past. And the League of Nations will not have been the least important factor in her "come back." British diplomacy since the war will rank as the most effective primary cause. It is true that one should not strike or kick a fallen antagonist, but one is hardly required by humanity or wisdom to set him on his feet again, nurse him back to strength and pay for his subsequent training that he may enter the ring in better form at a later date.

W. E. M.

FROM THE EDITOR'S CORRESPONDENCE

The Court House,
CALGARY,
12th Aug., 1926

The Editor,
THE DALHOUSIE REVIEW,
Halifax, N. S.

Dear Sir:

In the July number of the Review, under *Topics of the Day*, "W. E. M." administers a deserved rebuke to one of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Alberta. In fairness to the other members of the Court, I think I should be named, as I am the guilty Judge.

The circumstances of the occasion afford the reason for my error, but, of course, do not excuse it. When moved by righteous indignation, a Judge had best be silent.

Yours truly,

W. C. IVES.

Please publish in next number.

W. C. I.