

REFLECTIONS

By THE EDITOR

Imperial Citizenship

BECAUSE one is a Canadian citizen is no sure reason for being a British subject. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, Hon. Mr. Perley and others are not British subjects. They have the same status in Great Britain as the Hindoos have in Canada.

This is not fair, of course, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and Hon. Mr. Perley should be recognized in England as British subjects, and the Hindoos should be recognized in Australia and Canada as British subjects. If there is to be a British Empire, there should be Imperial citizenship. No Empire can be founded on inequality among equals. The man who refuses to recognize the Hindoo as a brother citizen is no imperialist.

This subject was introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the last Imperial Conference, and a somewhat extended discussion followed, neither the Canadian nor South African nor Australasian delegates were willing to accept the black and yellow citizens of the Empire as citizens in Canada or South Africa or Australia or New Zealand. The matter was eventually left in the hands of Hon. Mr. Harcourt for investigation and action.

Mr. Harcourt has since been negotiating with the various self-governing Dominions to know what they would do. Apparently they have arranged a partial settlement. Any man who has lived four years in the Empire and one year in the United Kingdom is to be a British citizen. So the despatch runs. Thus Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and Hon. Mr. Perley will be compelled to live a year in "Lunnun" to become naturalized citizens of the "Hempire." Any Hindoo who lives a year in England will also become a citizen of the Empire and entitled to live in Canada or Australia. Perhaps!

The difficulties in the way of imperial citizenship are but an indication of the difficulties which beset those who would tie up the Dominions and colonies into one bundle of faggots. The centralism for which the Duke of Westminster, Lord Northcliffe and other seekers after Royal favour are pouring out millions to support the Round Tables, Over-seas Clubs, Imperial Daughters, and so on, will be a long time coming. Indeed, the millennium will probably win the race.

When the full text of this proposed "citizenship" bill is available, more will be heard of the subject.

Twentieth Peace Congress

COULD anything be more edifying than the urbanity and sweet reasonableness of the men who are attending the twentieth Universal Peace Congress at The Hague? Isn't it pleasant to know that there are men who are so certain that the war-like policies of monarchs and imperialists and blatant republicans will some day mark with universal disapproval? Indeed, these gentlemen are so sanguine of the future that five hundred of the delegates went joyfully and uncynically to view the Palace of Peace erected by that grand old robber-patriot, Andrew Carnegie, late of the United States.

The chief topic at the Congress is the question of an international police force. What the world wants is a strong referee. The game of the nations must be regulated as lacrosse and baseball are. Indeed, the lacrosse game in Canada might be used as an illustration of the international game of war and politics. While professional baseball, with its professional referees, is making steady progress, professional lacrosse, without professional referees, is going equally steadily down hill. If the Peace Congress could create a police force of armies and navies which would be recognized by all nations and which would be strong enough to coerce a recalcitrant nation, the world would certainly be benefitted. But that is yet a dream.

Curiously enough, Great Britain is blocking the way by refusing to agree that trading ships shall be free from capture in time of war. Germany would stop building so many war vessels if Great Britain would recognize this international doctrine, and then the way to be an international police force would be somewhat clearer. Lord Salisbury said "No!" and no British Premier since has had the courage to alter the decision. When David Lloyd George is premier, he may do so—provided Winston Churchill is not a member of his cabinet, and pro-

vided, also, that Lord Roberts and Lord Charles Beresford have been sepulchred in Westminster Abbey.

Who Pays the Discount?

WHEN a private corporation sells five million dollars' worth of bonds for four million dollars, it at once adds five million to its liabilities. Its ledgers and published accounts show that this is done. In short, the million dollar discount on its bonds must be met out of profits.

Applying this principle to the sale of bonds by the Toronto Hydro-Electric and other municipal companies, it would look as if some of these had wiped out their profits for years to come. The Toronto H. E. sold four million dollars' worth of bonds at 83. The discount would be \$17 in every \$100, or \$680,000. Supposing that the Tor. H. E. made \$100,000 a year for seven years it would just make up the discount it lost on its sale of bonds.

Such occurrences as these will help to teach the people that the financing of private corporations is not so easy or so simple as the average man thinks. A manufacturing company, a street railway company, or any other private undertaking would hesitate about selling bonds at 83, and would probably take many sidesteps before consenting to such a sacrifice. On the other hand, public corporations are not in a position to sidestep, even if their managers had the ability to understand the tremendous advantage of selling bonds only when the bond market will take them advantageously.

Iron and Steel Bounties

THERE is no doubt that the iron and steel men supported the Conservatives in 1911 because they felt that with a "protectionist" government in power, there might be a prolongation of the bounties on iron and steel. They have been sadly disappointed. The Borden Government has followed the policy of the Laurier Government and provided for the extinction of these favours. Neither have they changed the duties so as to make up for the loss of bounties.

For this reason the Drummond's big business, known as the Canada Iron Corporation, is in financial trouble. The Drummonds worked hard for the Conservative party and gave freely of their wealth in the campaign of 1911. They deserved more consideration than they have received. But this was ever true of those who hang on Princes' favours.

That the Drummonds will pull through without serious loss every one will hope. They are grand citizens, who have done much to develop iron-mining in New Brunswick and iron-smelting in Quebec and Ontario. Their corporation may be highly capitalized, but not nearly as over-capitalized as some other favoured industries. Fortunately for them and the public, their common stock was never listed and is practically all held by the "insiders."

The incident will but serve to prove that Canada's iron and steel industry is not yet in a position to bear competition from the older countries.

Non-Partisanship in Congress

WHEN Senator Penrose introduced his resolution in Congress last week to appropriate twenty-five million dollars for American troops to patrol Northern Mexico, there was a non-partisan debate in support of the President. Both Republicans and Democrats laid aside their party politics and discussed the Mexican trouble on a purely national basis.

This example should not be lost by the Canadian Parliament. It should indicate to Liberal and Conservative members that the next naval debate in the House of Commons should be on a non-partisan basis. Surely the Canadian members are not less patriotic than the much-condemned United States senators?

Foster Is Back

HON. GEORGE E. FOSTER is back. He has reached Vancouver after a prolonged trip through Australia, China and Japan. The author of the non-partisan naval resolution of 1909 has no further excuse for absenting himself from

the field of action. He must now sit in cabinet council and tell his fellow-ministers that he is in favour of—

- (1) An "Emergency" action of an imperial nature.
- (2) A Canadian fleet.
- (3) A non-partisan settlement of the whole naval question.

These are the principles he has stood for in the past and which Canada expects him to fight for again. If he does so, the three hundred signators of the "non-partisan memorial" must support him, and their support will be worth a great deal. Indeed, the Canadian League may also be induced to proclaim him as a hero.

Mr. Foster knows what Australia thinks, knows how determined that country is to have an Australian navy, manned by Australians and built as far as possible in Australia, that he is in a position to read the riot act to some of less well-informed colleagues. The great question is, "Will he do it?"

The Imperial Movement

PROFESSOR STEPHEN LEACOCK, in an article in the *National Review*, the leading Conservative monthly in England, uses phrases which require explanation. Speaking of the defeat of the Naval Bill, he says: "It appears, quite wrongly, as if the advance of Imperial unity had received a serious check." Again, he says: "If we look below it [the surface] we shall see that the broad current of the Imperial movement is not arrested in its flow." Once more he says that the motto of the Conservatives was "Be Imperial."

If these phrases, and others which might be quoted, were used by a Tory stump-speaker seeking to make votes among the ignorant populace, they might be excused. But when they are used by a college graduate, who is also a college professor, they must be taken more seriously. There are some people who think Professor Leacock is a mere joke, but we do not agree with them. He is a power for good or evil.

What, then, is this "Imperial movement" of which Professor Leacock writes? Is it an attempt to introduce the old days of Downing Street rule, which cut the United States off from the Empire and which would have cut the North American provinces off also had it not been for Lord Durham's wisdom? Is this what "Imperial Unity" means? If not, Mr. Leacock should explain.

For one hundred years Canada has been fighting for freedom within the Empire, and she has won every battle. Canada to-day is the greatest self-governing unit within that Empire. The relations are better than they ever were. Then why this "Imperial movement"? Were Lord Durham, Lord Elgin, Sir John Macdonald and Hon. Edward Blake wrong in fighting for that freedom as a self-governing unit within the Empire? Was Australia wrong when it demanded the same or even greater autonomy than Canada possesses? Was New Zealand wrong? Was South Africa wrong? If not, why this movement for "Imperial Unity"?

Will Professor Leacock, or some apologist for him, please explain?

Militia Expenditure

MANY people are wondering how many millions will defray the cost of General Ian Hamilton's meteoric trip through Canada. When Sir John French made his report, some years ago, the military expenditure under Sir Frederick Borden jumped up more than a million a year. It is safe to say that Sir John French cost Canada at least five, and perhaps ten, million dollars. General Hamilton's report is even more sweeping, and it would seem to presage an even larger bill of costs.

While favouring a steady development of the militia, and especially the inexpensive but effective cadet system, there are those who are beginning to wonder if our military expenditure is not growing too rapidly. The expense of the permanent corps and the headquarters staff is generally thought to be out of proportion to its usefulness or its necessity. If the permanent corps was displaced by a series of travelling drill-sergeants, as in Switzerland, much would be saved. Garrisons and military schools are tremendously expensive. Moreover, it is a question whether military uniforms are necessary for citizen soldiery. They are very nice when you desire to do honour to a visiting prince or king, but the Boers did not need them and the Swiss use them little. A soldier will learn more about a rifle when he is in his old clothes than he will when he is in "full dress."