

REFLECTIONS

By THE EDITOR

John Bull Should be Proud.

JOHN BULL ought to be proud. Every Canadian who is anybody is arguing about what we ought to do for him. Some say he needs the cash. The *Toronto Telegram* reeks with tears over the down-trodden British taxpayers who pay \$47,000,000 a year in food-taxes to keep up the British navy. It cries out in anguish because every British breakfast table is taxed to make up "Canada's just share in the burden now carried by the owners of these breakfast tables."

On the other hand, the *Toronto Globe*, *Toronto Star*, and other papers refuse to weep what they call "crocodile tears," pointing out that British trade is advancing by leaps and bounds, that Britain is the wealthiest country in the world, and that it has paid off nearly \$400,000,000 of the public debt in the last six years. Instead of money these papers would give men and ships—good, honest Canadian men and good, honest Canadian ships.

Others again would give both men and ships. They see Britannia cowering before the German Kaiser's mailed fist and momentarily expect the death-blow to be struck. Every morning that they wake up and find the Union Jack still floating over the British Isles, they are agreeably disappointed. All day they go about shaking their heads and saying, "It may happen to-morrow." Sir Hugh Graham and the *Montreal Star* lead in this dreary pantomime.

On the other hand, Mr. Cahan and Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monk and our own dear Captain Armand Lavergne refuse to believe that John Bull needs anything. Not a dollar, not a ship, not a man, would they send him until there is a referendum—by which they mean "never." But they covet a share in his councils. They want the right to sit in his Big Cabinet and direct the issues of war and peace.

So John Bull should be proud. We are all thinking about him and his affairs. Some of us are so engrossed in the work of wondering what we ought to do for him and what he might do for us that we have laid all other national topics and all other national problems aside. I sincerely hope the Old Man appreciates our concern on his behalf.

Terrible Times Out West.

MOST trying times in the West. The Liberals and Independents and grain-growers are talking about the election in Macdonald and crying "Stolen," "Robbed," "Plundered," and "Un-British." (It is to be noted that "Un-British," not "patriotism," is the last refuge of the politician.) Then there is that Police Magistrate McMicken, who let two Tories off with a fine, when he should have put them in jail. My, but the Liberals are angry. They demand the life-blood of Sir Rodmond Roblin. Nothing else will satisfy them, but his gory head on a political platter.

Then reverse the shield. The *Winnipeg Telegram*, with equal fair-mindedness, calmness, and gentlemanly bearing, retorts, "The Province of Saskatchewan was delivered soul and body into the hands of the most corrupt and unrepresentative government in Canada." . . . "A whole province was debauched and coerced." As if that were not enough, the *Telegram* editor adds: "The real meaning of the whole outcry about liberty is that a gang of political mercenaries and outlaws in the service of the Liberal party . . . have had final notice that their activities will no longer be permitted."

In short, the Liberals of the West are "corrupt," "mercenaries," and "outlaws"; the Conservatives are "robbers," "thieves" and "perverters of British justice." Even the *Ottawa Free Press* is led to say that Canada never before had "such a carnival of criminality."

What is Canada coming to, if one-half of these charges by both sides is true? Are we becoming so Americanized that we are ceasing to distinguish between right and wrong or even between fair and unfair, so far as elections are concerned? Isn't it pretty nearly time that decent citizens took this situation in hand and created a new atmosphere?

Non-Partisanship.

WHEN H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught summed up the impressions of his ten-thousand-mile trip, for the benefit of the Canadian Club, of Toronto, he saw fit to emphasize

two points: the value of the fullest education for the young and the benefit of considering public questions from a non-partisan viewpoint. With both of these hints, the best Canadians will agree most heartily.

If there ever was a time in the history of this country when the non-partisan element in the country needed to be thoughtful and alert, that time is the present. Each set of political leaders is inflamed with the most dangerous kind of jealousy. The sudden defeat of the Liberals last year seems to have made them ferocious; the unexpected victory of the Conservatives has made them almost impudent. Each party is in a mood where the ordinary barriers will not stop them. Neither will consider the other in the slightest, and neither is likely to give much consideration to the public when the party's interest seems to lie in another direction.

Our political leaders are too keen on party advantage. Nor is this confined to the leaders. The party journalists are in a very bitter mood. The

A Cash Contribution.

Shall Canada contribute \$30,000,000 cash to the British navy?

Such a gift would be inadequate and inappropriate. What is needed is fifty or a hundred million dollars' worth of ships, manned by Canadians as far as possible, carrying Canadian brawn and brains to help in the policing of the world.

Did Canada send money or men to Queen Victoria's Jubilee? Was it money or men which made up the Imperial Pageants of King Edward and King George?

Did Canada send money or men to go up the Nile with Wolseley?

Did Canada contribute money or men to South Africa?

Is Canada, in future struggles, to keep her soldiers and generals, her sailors and admirals, lolling on beds of ease while our borrowed gold is handed over stingily to purchase a few "hirelings"?

A mere cash contribution would be a "bluff," utterly unworthy of a great people. It would be a subterfuge which would destroy our self-respect and make us the laughing stock of the Britannic world. Better far that we should admit that we are selfish, that there are no "men of fighting blood" left in the country, and that we prefer to take our chances by letting the other people of the world settle its destinies.

Perhaps also it would be advisable to abandon the name "Canada" and adopt "Carthage."

whole atmosphere is charged with party hatred.

One part of the country has little superiority over another in this respect. Neither political party may throw stones at the other. Even the "third" parties, the Grain Growers and the Nationalists, are adopting tactics which smell of hatred and intolerance. Party government we must have, but we should always be able to treat our opponents with courtesy and generosity. This is what we are in danger of forgetting.

"JAM" Aikins on the Navy.

MR. J. A. M. AIKINS, M.P., has been discussing the naval question before the Brandon Canadian Club, and discussing it intelligently if not conclusively. He says that there are two ways in which Canada can aid the British Isles. We can build battleships immediately and attach them to the North Sea Fleet to protect the Empire's heart. Or we can let England shield itself from the direct blow and form a cruiser fleet to protect the trade routes and relieve the British Isles from that necessary duty. Apparently Mr. Aikins favours the latter half of the alternative. He points out that if the food supplies or raw material is cut off the British workshops and British workers cannot live. A destruction of Britain's merchant ships would produce a panic and the government would be obliged to sue for peace. Whatever is done Mr. Aikins would have it done quickly so that the world would know that the

British Empire is one and indivisible.

Apparently if Mr. Aikins were not a member of the Conservative party in the House of Commons and were free to express his own opinion he would be in favour of a Canadian navy. He is probably typical of many Conservative members of Parliament. Just what effect these private opinions will have upon the public policy of the Conservative party is not yet apparent. The question of political tactics and political strategy is playing an important part in the naval discussion. Those who are in favour of a Canadian navy and a non-partisan settlement of the question can only hope for the best and trust that the leaders on both sides will eventually recognize that the interests of the Dominion and of the Empire are of much greater importance than the political future of any party or any set of politicians.

Will Roosevelt Win?

A FRIEND of mine, whose judgment I respect, writes me from New York: "I think Teddy will not win." He goes on to explain and one paragraph is most illuminating. It runs thus:

"Wilson apparently has not made any mistakes in his campaign. Bryan usually started off big right after the nomination, but steadily lost strength up to election day. Wilson, apparently, instead of losing is gaining right along. Of course, I may be wrong in my prediction, but while a number of people believe Teddy has a chance, no one wants to bet on him."

The shooting incident has made some votes for Roosevelt. His courage was impressive. But this is the Democratic party's one great chance. With two Republicans in the field, and with a good candidate of its own, the Democratic party must win or admit that it is a negligible part of the country's political machinery. Moreover, it must not only elect Wilson, but it must gain enough states to ensure a Democratic Senate. The House is Democratic now. To make Wilson's regime satisfactory, the Republican majority in the Senate must be wiped out. Therefore, it would seem that this ought to be a big Democratic year.

The Conviction of Becker.

LIEUTENANT BECKER, of the New York police, has been found guilty of instigating the murder of Rosenthal, a gambling-house keeper who grew tired of paying money for police protection. Most people will be sorry for Becker, but pleased that such looseness in a police "system" has been severely checked. If such a "system" could succeed indefinitely in New York, it would sooner or later be imitated in the larger cities of the continent and hence become a national and perhaps an international evil.

Canada is vitally interested in the progress of American democracy. We are considerably and continuously affected by the social and administrative developments of the United States. We suffer by the evils which arise there and benefit by the reforms which succeed.

No nation, in these days of swift trains and swifter telegraphs and telephones, lives unto itself. There is an inter-relation of vice and virtue, reaction and progress, which affects all nations. Therefore, we rejoice, with the people of the United States, that one more serpent has been scotched.

Our Logical Minds.

WHEN a shot is fired at an European monarch, we describe it as a blow for freedom. When a shot pierces the breast of Theodore Roosevelt, an advocate of the people, it is a blow against freedom. Wonderful logic, isn't it?

I am sorry for Colonel Roosevelt, and I think the man who fired the shot came near to committing one of the crimes of the century. But I do not think there is so much difference between a shot fired at a prominent person in Europe and one fired at a prominent person in America. Only a fool or a lunatic would believe that killing a monarch, a statesman or a popular leader is a method of reform. Therefore, let us be logical. There are fools and extremists in every country and America is no more free of them than is Europe. Let us not boast idly, nor draw false conclusions to the detriment of the aristocrats and monarchs of Europe in order to tender ourselves some idle flattery.

The great struggle in all countries is to get one man to respect the rights of the other. Every country has witnessed the gradual growth of this principle. Sometimes there is a recession, but on the whole the progress is constant. Nevertheless, the world has not yet reached the point where jealousy and hatred, in relation to citizenship, may be said to be eliminated.