

# REFLECTIONS

By THE EDITOR

## Chateauguay

HON. SYDNEY FISHER was defeated in Chateauguay by the Government candidate. This was to be expected. If the Government had not believed it could carry the constituency it would not have opened it first. The wise party managers have been justified of their political wisdom.

What is the significance of the loss of this Liberal seat? Probably as little significance as should have been attached to the Drummond-Arthabaska election in 1910, in which the Laurier candidate was beaten by the Bourassa candidate. That was a flash in the pan. This is little more because the Liberals were not in a position to meet the determined attack of their political opponents. There is no reason to believe that the decision reached by the constituency was based either upon the relative merits of the candidates or the relative merits of the party platforms. Rather it was a case of an opposition candidate being submerged by a government candidate because of superior force and method.

It may, however, have an indirect influence upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier and make him more willing to agree to a bi-partisan settlement of the naval question. It may help to prove to him that a joint settlement of this great national issue is the best he can hope for. If so, the sacrifice of so good a candidate as Hon. Sydney Fisher may be a blessing in disguise.

\*\*\*

## Congratulations

MOST people who are in a position to know agree that the *Montreal Gazette* is one of the best edited papers in Canada. It is also a splendid newspaper, even though it may be less popular than some of its more "frothy" contemporaries. Therefore, it is pleasant to be able to quote this leading political daily in favour of the attitude taken by the *CANADIAN COURIER* and other independent papers as to a bi-partisan settlement of the naval question. In the course of an article on the postponement of the proposed imperial conference, the *Gazette* says:

"It would be well if, all through the Empire, the question of naval and military defence could be removed from branch of politics wherein everything is used for the making of votes and the making of votes only."

With the *Winnipeg Free Press* leading Liberal opinion in this direction and the *Montreal Gazette* leading Conservative opinion, it begins to look as if our national reputation might yet be saved.

\*\*\*

## Civil Service Reform

WHEN Sir Joseph Cook, Premier of Australia, met the adjourned parliament the other day, he presented a memorandum setting forth the ministry's policy for the session. There were twenty points in the memo., of which No. 2 reads as follows:

"There is to be no preference or favouritism in the public service. Competency and merit are to be the sole basis of employment and preferment."

Premier Borden uttered a like sentiment before he came into office, but he seems to have forgotten all about it. Instead of the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission being extended to the outside service, the control of the inside service is slowly passing back into the hands of the Cabinet. There are scores of clerks at work in the Ottawa departments who are there in defiance of Dr. Shortt and his colleague, the two civil service commissioners. Mr. Borden may not have changed his mind, but certainly his colleagues are not practising the principles of their leader.

\*\*\*

## Mr. Churchill's Latest

RIGHT HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL was always changeable. He has even changed his party allegiance. But his changes in naval policy are simply wonderful. Just how far these changes are his and how far they are the Cabinet's, no one can tell. In the meantime, most of us believe that Master Winston is a reed shaken in the wind, a weather-cock turning quickly to every breeze that blows.

His newest policy is a Canadian-Australian-New

Zealand fleet operating in the Pacific and a British-Canadian fleet operating in the West Atlantic, with naval base in Bermuda. This is the best policy he has yet devised. It comes nearer to the ideas of the Dominion than either of his previous policies. Just where he got the idea no one knows, but a very similar scheme was outlined in the *CANADIAN COURIER* of April 12th by R. S. Neville, K.C., a prominent Conservative of Toronto. Other Canadian, Australian and New Zealand writers have urged that there should be a "Dominions Fleet" in the Pacific. The idea of a Dominions-British fleet at Bermuda is apparently a newer idea which may be original with Mr. Churchill or the experts of the navy department.

But what a spectacle Mr. Churchill presents. Last autumn he was all for a central fleet in the North Sea, to which all the Dominions shall contribute. He persuaded Mr. Borden that this is the only sensible method of Empire defence. A few months afterwards, he modified his views and proposed an Imperial Flying Squadron at Gibraltar, to which the Dominions should contribute Dreadnoughts. Two or three months later, he sends part

## HER HEART'S DESIRE



The Ambition of the Leading English Suffragettes Seems to Pertain Largely to the Results of Their Escapades. This Lady Has Achieved Fame, Being One of the Two Suffragette Leaders Arrested at Kingsway, London, a Few Days Ago. Each Reader May Draw His or Her Own Conclusion as to Whether the Lady is Enjoying the Situation.

of the North Sea Fleet to the Mediterranean and some ships to Bermuda. Now he is out with a fourth plan, as outlined in a despatch dated October 10th, and having as its new feature a Canadian-Australian-New Zealand fleet in the Pacific.

Every advocate of a Canadian fleet will welcome Mr. Churchill's latest plan as a return to sanity. Canada wants its own ships, and so do Australia and New Zealand. Each may satisfy its ambition and yet create a great fleet in the Pacific which will perform a distinct service to the Empire as well as to each of three Dominions having Pacific interests.

\*\*\*

## What This Means to Canada

MR. CHURCHILL'S new plan offers Mr. Borden a permanent naval policy which will satisfy the advocates of a Canadian navy in his own party and the advocates of a Canadian navy in the Liberal party. It would give Canada a naval service of her own, a naval unit of her own, operating in the Pacific in harmony with Australia and New Zealand. It would mean a national settlement of this vexed question to which all parties in Canada could agree. It should satisfy the ultra-imperialists and the ultra-Canadians. It should

stop all the senseless bickering as to who is loyal and who is disloyal. The charge that Canadians cannot establish a naval service equal to that of Australia and New Zealand will be answered once and forever.

Just what part Premier Borden has had in working out this new plan is not clear. The despatch indicates that he was not wholly pleased with the "Gibraltar Flying Squadron" idea, and has agreed to the newer plan of a Canadian-Australian-New Zealand fleet operating in the Pacific and having its base every other year at Vancouver and Sydney. If all this is true, then Mr. Borden is likely to come out of this long discussion with more honour and glory than some of us had anticipated.

So far as the *CANADIAN COURIER* is concerned, any scheme which will eliminate the idea of permanent money contribution and which will create a naval service which will appeal to Canada's pride and self-respect, will be welcomed. The details are unimportant so long as the main principles are vindicated. If Mr. Churchill and Mr. Borden have worked out such a scheme, they will receive their due meed of praise from all those who put country before party. All classes of Canadians are clamouring for a settlement which will enable Canada to keep faith with Australia and with the Home authorities.

\*\*\*

## Sir John Thompson, Nationalist

LAST week, we quoted from a speech by Sir John Macdonald, in 1865, in which he clearly spoke of Canada as a nation, in alliance with the United Kingdom and the other self-governing colonies—or "dominions," as they are termed to-day. As the founder of the Conservative party, his attitude should be of some importance to the Conservative party of to-day.

There is one other outstanding figure whose opinion is entitled to equal respect with that of Sir John Macdonald. That figure is Sir John Thompson. Speaking in Toronto on January 6th, 1893, the successor of Sir John A. in the leadership of the Conservatives expressed these statements:

"Every man who is a Canadian at heart feels that this country ought to be a nation, will be a nation; and, please God, we shall help to make it a nation. But, sir, we do not desire that it shall be a separate nation, but that it will be a nation in itself, forming a bulwark to the British Empire, whose traditions we admire, whose protection we enjoy, and who has given to this country in the fullest degree the right and power of self-government, and agreed to extend to the people of this country every facility which a self-governed and independent people could desire to have."

Thus the opinions of the two Sir Johns were the same—they believed in Canadian nationality combined with British connection. They were neither of them centralists. They both believed that Downing Street rule had gone never to return. They believed in "the development of Canada as a self-governing nation within the Empire."

\*\*\*

## The Panama Canal

CONGRATULATIONS from all the world are pouring in on the United States for their enterprise and skill in having completed the Panama Canal. If no untoward accident takes place, light-draft ships will be passing freely across the new canal in 1914 and all sorts of vessels in 1915. To-day, the two oceans are practically united.

To reduce steamship journeys from Atlantic ports to Australia or to Hong Kong by 5,000 to 8,000 miles is a tremendous economy in transportation. To the United States, it opens a new transcontinental passageway for its fleet. Henceforth the defence of the Pacific Coast will be one problem with that of the defence of the Atlantic Coast. Soldiers might be shipped across the United States by train, but the battleships had to go around Cape Horn. Now the journey will be short and easy.

While the Panama Canal was a military necessity to the United States, it is, like the Suez Canal, a work for the general good of the world. The products of the East will pass to Europe more cheaply and more easily, and Europe will send more return cargoes with equal facility. While the United States will benefit most of all by this expenditure of \$400,000,000 and nine years of engineering effort, there will be a corresponding benefit to all other countries. No nation lives to itself alone, and all such national undertakings have beneficial results in which the other nations share. As the world grows smaller commercially, the world grows bigger ethically. Universal peace will come from international knowledge, which is a product of railways, canals, steamships, telegraphs, cables and airships.