

Canadian Courier

THE NATIONAL WEEKLY

VOL. 7

Toronto, April 23rd, 1910

No. 21

WHEN a Canadian reads that a Labour Party has won in the Australian General Elections he may be inclined to do as the Pharisee did, raise his eyes to Heaven and thank

God that he is not like those rude Australians. Certainly, if the Labour Party of Australia be like unto the Labour Party in the British House of Commons, then is Australia deserving of some sympathy. The truth, so far as it may be discovered at this distance, is that the Labour Party of Australia would be more properly termed a Radical Party. In a country where the urban population is so large and the agricultural population so small, compared with Canada, a labour party is not so unnatural as might appear at first sight.

Besides, a labour party well led should be as efficient and as effective as any other party. Hon. Andrew Fisher, the new premier, is a man with considerable parliamentary experience. He served in the Queensland parliament before confederation. In 1904, he was minister of trades and customs, and premier in 1908 and 1909. He is a protectionist, his protection policy differing only from Canada's protection policy in that he would protect only those industries which pay union rates of wages. This difference is not very deep, since every Canadian government, federal or provincial, has adopted the principle of union wages on all government work.

There is one striking difference between our labour party and the Australian. Canada's trades-unionists are inclined to ignore the military and naval forces of the country as being the engines of capitalism while the Australian trades-unionists recognise that national safety can only be assured by a proper development of both these forces. Australia is surrounded by brown and yellow neighbours, and if Australia is to remain a white man's country, the military and naval forces must be capable of repelling an armed force. Therefore Australian labour is in favour of compulsory military service which Canadian labour professes to believe to be detrimental to the best interests of civilisation.

ON one point, the Australian and Canadian labour men are similarly constituted; they both object to the immigration of labour unionists from Great Britain. Both countries are looking for new population, but both have been forced by labour influences to discourage the importation of skilled mechanics. Both desire that the flow of new citizens shall consist entirely of domestic servants and farmers. There is much of selfishness in this attitude, but selfishness is so general a trait of human character even in these advanced times that the labour unions cannot be greatly blamed. The standard of living is rising in Great Britain and when it reaches the standard already raised in Canada and Australia, the colonial mechanic will not be pressing his objections so strongly.

SIR LOMER GOUIN has shown a great deal of courage and a high grade of statesmanship in his renewed announcement that in future the export of pulp-wood cut on crown lands will be prohibited. This has been the policy of Ontario for a number of years and it has worked well in that province. As only about twenty per cent. of Quebec's export of pulp logs is from leased crown domain, the immediate effect will not be great. However, as the years pass and the privately owned spruce forests cease to provide much timber, the new policy will have increasing effect. In the course of ten or fifteen years, Quebec will cease to export pulp logs and become a great exporter of wood pulp and of paper. In other words, instead of exporting the raw material, Quebec will export the manufactured product. A cord of pulp logs worth \$5 will produce, roughly speaking, a ton of wood pulp worth \$15; or when manufactured further, a ton of paper worth \$50. Why should Quebec, or any other province, export pulp logs at \$5, when they may be manufactured into paper and exported at a value of \$50?

Of course the United States paper-makers will object. They

REFLECTIONS

BY THE EDITOR

want the logs to keep their mills going, as the United States supply of logs is not sufficient to meet the demand. Nevertheless, the question is a purely domestic one and Ontario and Quebec

are pursuing a policy which would find equal favour with the United States if the positions were reversed. When the United States objects to our conserving our national resources in this way, the flimsiness of the objection is so apparent that it may be passed unnoticed.

New Brunswick and Nova Scotia will no doubt adopt similar regulations at an early date. It is to be hoped that they will not delay their action until their spruce supply is nearly exhausted. Nova Scotia is in an especially bad way in regard to its crown lands. No scientific surveys have ever been made and thousands of miles of Nova Scotian crown lands have slipped into private hands without any benefit to the provincial treasury. It is claimed by those who know something of the facts, that Nova Scotia has the most unsatisfactory crown land administration of all the provinces. This is due to carelessness and incompetence extending over half a century.

HOW valuable the timber lands of Canada are becoming is well illustrated by the recent action of the Minister of Lands and Mines for Ontario. By a simple flourish of his pen, Hon. Frank Cochrane has added \$350,000 a year to the income from timber limits. To accomplish this, he has increased the dues on pine sawlogs from one dollar to one dollar and a half per thousand feet, the dues on square timber from \$20 to \$50 per thousand feet and ground rents from \$3 to \$5 per mile. Further, the lumbermen must pay the entire cost of fire-ranging instead of one-half as formerly.

Previous to 1887, the dues on pine sawlogs, which is the main item in this bill of charges, was 75 cents. It was then increased to one dollar. Now there is a further increase of fifty per cent. About half a billion feet per year is the total output.

Of course the lumbermen are objecting. Some of them say the government has taken them by the throat. In the end, the people will probably be forced to pay, especially if general trade conditions continue as favourable this year as they were last year. However, the government have fully investigated the subject before taking this action and have decided that it is in the public interest. It is another phase of the agitation for the conservation of our national resources.

CONTRARY to expectations, the House of Commons has passed a compromise anti-racing bill. It is along the lines suggested in this column last week—legalising betting on race-tracks and absolutely prohibiting the hand-book maker, the pool room, the tipster and all the other objectionable followers of horse-racing. While betting during race-meets is legalised, the length of the meets is restricted to a reasonable period, namely, seven days per meet and two meets a year on each track.

Mr. Miller is to be congratulated on his acceptance of the compromise. On the evening of the famous defeat of his Bill in the House, Mr. Miller took a rather rigid attitude. He declared that he would rather have the old law than the compromise. Since then he has changed his mind—and in our opinion has shown both common-sense and wisdom in so doing. The old law was so indefinite as to be merely an aggravation both to the racing associations and to the anti-racing influences. The new law legalises what it cannot prevent and prohibits what it cannot tolerate. It makes no false pretensions. It eliminates hypocrisy.

HORSE-RACING is a fine old sport which it would be a shame to abolish. However, when Vancouver and Victoria held racing meets which had a duration of 40 to 60 days, this historic sport of kings was degraded. The Fort Erie and Windsor tracks, maintained for the amusement of the sports of Buffalo and Detroit respectively,