

than to pick out military anniversaries for flag distinction. The Board took him at his word and the flag will fly every day. Trustee Simpson may think he won an advantage but it looks as if he had made a tactical error and lost where he had hoped to gain.

Flying flags on school-houses every day is an idea which we have borrowed from the United States where flag-flying is a disease. Its extension to Canada is not to be commended. Loyalty to the flag is not proven by excessive display; parading one's virtues is usually taken as evidence that one holds them lightly. Flying ten thousand flags a day will not add to Canada's reputation for either patriotism or loyalty.



WINNIPEG'S municipal elections are over and, in the eyes of the rest of the country, Winnipeg is not so progressive a city as it was thought to be. The by-laws to provide for public baths and underground conduits were carried, but the by-law to provide \$50,000 for a public art gallery was defeated. The property owners of Winnipeg have proved that they are no better than the property owners of other cities in the Dominion and have refused to recognise the value of a civic art gallery. They will vote money for any commercial purpose which can be devised, but they have not a cent for culture.

Canada is woefully lacking in an appreciation for the higher and better things of life. We are still in the primary stages of development. We are still barbarians to a large degree. The dollar mark is the only one we fully appreciate. We even reduce education to a commercial basis and refuse to countenance that which is purely for the purpose of distinguishing gentlemen from men. Not a single city in Canada has an art gallery, though every city of any importance in Europe recognises its culture value. Even in the United States and Australia, the larger cities have galleries where the poorest citizen may see something which will enable him to feel that adding machines and cash registers are not the greatest products of man's genius.



HON. R. P. ROBLIN, speaking as a private citizen before the Conservative Association of Winnipeg, on Thursday evening of last week, again spoke most disparagingly of our proposed "tin-pot" navy. Just when the gentleman, who in public life is known as the Premier of Manitoba, became such an ardent imperialist history does not record. Some say that it was when Lord Milner visited Winnipeg; some put it down to the influence of a visit from Sir James White; others think the conversion took place when Earl Grey honoured the domicile of Hon. Robert Rogers a few months ago. Whenever the conversion took place it was certainly complete. As an imperialist, the Hon. Mr. Roblin quite outshines Colonel Denison, Mr. Castell Hopkins, Mr. Alexander McNeil and Col. Sam Hughes.

He maintains that a Canadian navy will be both a menace to Canada and to Great Britain. It will be a menace to Canada, since it may possibly embroil us with the United States. One of our Admirals may get "chesty" and insult Uncle Sam. It is a menace to Great Britain, because when we get into trouble, the British fleet will find it necessary to come over and get us out of it. There is the first Argument. Mr. Roblin does not say the militia is a menace to Canada and to Great Britain, though he might reasonably use the same line of argument concerning it. Apparently our militia officers are to be trusted—which is a compliment for General Otter and Sir Percy Lake.

The second Argument is that Chauncey M. Depew says that war between Great Britain and Germany must come within two years. How flattered our old friend Chauncey will be to be quoted by Mr. Roblin on such an important subject! Where Ex-Senator Depew is best known, he is considered to be an authority only on after-dinner jokes. Perhaps this is really one of Mr. Depew's jokes which Mr. Roblin has mistaken for a serious statement.

The third Argument is that a Canadian navy is the beginning of Canadian independence. This was followed by a burst of eloquence in which he said: "It is our duty to stand together and resent this attempt to wreck the bonds that tie us to the mother land." Whether the audience wept or not, the despatches do not tell us and the writer was unavoidably absent.



WHILE Mr. Roblin, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and Mr. Hazen are declaring for a direct money contribution to the British navy, instead of a Canadian-built and Canadian-controlled unit of that navy, the members of Parliament who represent rural constituencies are telling us that eighty per cent. of their constituents are

opposed both to a Canadian navy and a direct contribution. The people of the towns and cities are quite willing to do something, the less the better; the people of the country districts are not anxious to do anything. If Sir Wilfrid Laurier carries the Canadian Navy bill through the House in January he will have done so in the face of much opposition from those who represent rural ridings. Almost every farmers' organisation in Ontario which has expressed an opinion on the subject is opposed to all kinds of naval expenditure. Perhaps this is due to the fact that they have not yet heard from Hon. Chauncey M. Depew, friend to Hon. R. P. Roblin.



MR. FIELDING has made another budget speech and this time a most cheerful one. The palmy days of 1907 have been duplicated in 1909 and the rivers of coin are again flowing Ottawaward. Mr. Fielding says that the revenue is sure to be ninety-six million this year, perhaps a hundred million. The surplus over current expenditure will be something like sixteen million.

After all, this is a small matter. The earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be about the same, and the surplus will be much larger. The larger surplus is due to the fact that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and his board of directors spend very little of their income on furbelows. The meetings of the C. P. R. directors are not very numerous and they occupy very little time. They have no Hansard and because their speeches are not reported they do not make them. If Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding could get the House of Commons to take a leaf out of the book of the C. P. R. directors and despatch the business of the country in a businesslike manner, the surplus would be larger. It is only when two institutions with equal revenues, the one public and the other private, are compared that we are able to get some idea of how awkward an institution is a People's Parliament.

Mr. Fielding announced one reform which is worthy of special mention. Certain military expenditures, hitherto chargeable to capital account, are to be charged to current expenses. Good. Further, all naval expenditures are to be charged to current expenditure. This is excellent. For half a century, finance ministers have been pursuing a system of bookkeeping in Canada which is not supported by the practice in other well-governed countries. Just why a rifle, which is worn out in six years, should be charged to capital expenditure, is difficult of explanation. Indeed all military expenditure should properly be charged to current expense account. Railway bonuses and steel bounties should also be charged to current account, though Mr. Fielding tried to show reasons for not doing so.



WE confess to considerable sympathy with the Dukes. The House of Lords must be reformed, of course, but the process is rather trying. For example, a speaker declared that the Duke of Portland's ancestor had filched 60,000 acres of public land when he was Ranger of Sherwood Forest. It was subsequently shown that the only land ever acquired in Sherwood Forest by a Duke of Portland amounted to 939 acres, for which he paid \$140,000. All sorts of cock-and-bull stories are being trumped up against them, and they are kept busy proving that they and their ancestors were not really criminals.

Again, we feel sympathy for them in their objections to paying higher taxes and a share of their "increment." The present system has lasted so long that they thought it would last forever, and made their investments accordingly. Whether the Liberals win in the forthcoming election or not, the House of Lords must be reformed and there must be a better distribution of taxation. It is inevitable, but the outlook is not pleasing to the present holders of large estates. They have much the same feelings as the hand-loom workers had when the steam-driven spinning and weaving machines were introduced or as the type-setters had when machines for setting type were first introduced.



THE real trouble in Great Britain is unemployment and decreasing population. Between 1896 and 1902, there was an emigration of 400,000 people; in the next six years it amounted to 934,000. Between 1896 and 1902, public savings banks deposits rose by \$200,000,000; in the next six years they rose only \$75,000,000. Between 1896 and 1902, the average unemployed was 30 in the thousand; in the next six years it was 51 in the thousand. Any country with such an industrial record and an increasing tax-bill is sure to have heart-searchings of an extraordinary kind. We can but hope that they will find the correct road out of their difficulties.