

speeches than with his portrait on the placards of a cigar manufacturer, he need not have apologized for taking his motto from a cigar sign. The quoted words were uttered by Henry George in his last speech, only a few hours before he died: Introduced to his audience as a friend of labor, George declared that his position was not that of a friend of the laboring class or of any other class. And then he added the quoted words: "I am for men."

The policy of the Anti-Imperialist League has come to be misunderstood recently in consequence of announcements of other American bodies organized to settle the Philippine question. It is no part of the policy of the League, to bind itself or to give any countenance to the policy of the Administration in the Philippine Islands, so long as the Administration contemplates and aims at securing an "indefinite retention of the Islands,"—according to the official programme given out by the Secretary of War. In this attitude the Anti-Imperialist League is differentiated from every organization which has in view the amelioration of existing conditions, while trustfully confiding in the "hope" expressed by President Roosevelt in his last message to Congress that the Philippine Islands may be in the future "in some such relation to the United States as Cuba now stands." As such organizations must thus become identified with, and apparent supporters of, the Administration's actual policy, which is calculated really to destroy the hope of any such relation, the Anti-Imperialist League still claims to preempt, as heretofore, the position which enables it to give voice to the growing sentiment in favor of Philippine independence.

A charitable young lady, visiting a sick woman, inquired, with a view to further relief, as to her family. She asked: "Is your husband kind to you?" "Oh, yes, miss," was the instant response. "he's kind—very kind. Indeed, you might say he's more like a friend than a husband."—Brooklyn Life.

**SUBTLE INFLUENCE OF OFFICE.**

A few years ago I met Mr. Urquhart, the present mayor of Toronto. It was just after he had first been elected to that office. We had a long talk and he expressed himself as a believer in direct legislation.

The Toronto papers had told of the activity of the Direct Legislation League there, in getting signatures from the candidates for Council and Mayor to pledges to abide by the will of the majority, and to submit all matters they could, which were properly petitioned for, even if the people could not enact but only advise. The Toronto papers had said that Mr. Urquhart had signed one of these pledges. My Toronto friends had told me of it and rejoiced in Mr. Urquhart's election. Many of them had worked ardently for it. He never denied making such a pledge and in our talk it was assumed. A Toronto gentleman says he has such a written pledge in his possession. The evidence as to the state of Mr. Urquhart's mind and as to his making such a pledge is, in my opinion, conclusive.

Mr. Urquhart has been in office for several years, and has made, I have every reason to believe, an honest and efficient mayor.

Recently a group of reformers secured the submission to the people of the question of the exemption from taxation of \$700 of all improvements on land. The Mayor opposed this, as he had a right to do in common with all other citizens of Toronto; but it was carried by a majority of more than two to one. Subsequently a group of gentlemen called on the Mayor and the following is the conversation as reported in the Toronto Globe of February 7, 1905:

Mr. W. A. Douglass—We have called upon you, Mr. Mayor, to enlist your services in the support of the \$700 exemption.

The Mayor—I may as well tell you at once I am utterly opposed to it, and will do all in my power to prevent it becoming law.

Mr. A. C. Thompson—Are you, the mayor of Toronto, going to carry out the wishes of the 16,000 voters who voted for this exemption?

The Mayor—When I took the oath of office I swore to guard the interests of the city, not to accept the views of majorities, however large. And I do not

believe this is in the best interests of the city.

Mr. Thompson—Are we to understand that you are using your position as mayor to oppose the will of the people as expressed by a larger vote than you yourself received, because Mr. Thomas Urquhart is personally opposed to it?

The Mayor—The people did not understand the question. I was opposed to the by-law before the election, and the people knew it, and I take it the vote for me is an indorsement of my views on the matter.

Mr. Farmer—Before the election you stated to me that if the matter went to the ratepayers and they carried it you would do what you could to have it sent to the legislature.

Mr. Thompson—Will you give the measure your support provided it shall not become law unless a majority of the ratepayers approve?

The Mayor—No. I will not support it in any form.

Mr. Thompson—Before your election as mayor you signed a pledge that upon the presentation to the Council of a petition of 3,000 voters you would submit any question to the people asked for by them. You also signed a pledge that if a majority of the people voted in favor of the measure you would use your best efforts to make it law. Are we to understand that the ante-election pledges of Mr. Thomas Urquhart are not considered by you binding on him after election day?

The Mayor—Have you the pledge here?

Mr. Farmer—No, but I have it at the office.

The Mayor—I never signed any such pledge; but if I did I would break it, as I would any pledge, if after further consideration I decided it was not in the best interests of the city.

The question here is not as to the merits or demerits of the \$700 exemption; it is as to the change of mind in Mayor Urquhart.

I have no doubt that Mayor Urquhart is as pleasant and courteous a gentleman to meet socially as ever, that personally he is as honest and incorruptible as ever, and that in municipal business he is more efficient than ever because of added experience. But he thinks he knows how to govern the people better than they know what is best for them, and he deliberately says he will break his written pledge and oppose the will of the majority of the voters of Toronto.

The question is not confused by dishonesty or inefficiency, because Mr. Urquhart is concededly both honest and efficient. But it is clear-cut and strongly made. Mr.