

REFLECTIONS

By THE EDITOR

Being Misunderstood.

SOME of our friends say that we are opposed to Mr. Borden's navy policy, while some say we are in favour of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy. THE CANADIAN COURIER has a policy of its own. It is in favour of a Canadian navy, first, last and always. When we adopted that policy, both Mr. Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier were in favour of it. THE CANADIAN COURIER will continue to support that policy, no matter what swerving may be done by either political leader.

If Mr. Borden is not in favour of a Canadian navy, then he is opposed to us. We are not doing any opposing. We stand for a well-defined policy which we have advocated for years. If Mr. Borden or Sir Wilfrid Laurier chooses to oppose that policy then they are opposing us and all others who favour a Canadian navy.

We do not expect all the readers of THE CANADIAN COURIER to agree with us, although we shall do our best to convince them that they should do so. However, if any of them sympathize with Mr. Borden, that is their privilege. If any of them sympathize with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that is their privilege. Our task is to advocate as best we can the policy which we think is wisest for Canada as an important unit in the family of British nations.

Where Both Might Have Shone.

PERSONALLY, the writer believes that both Mr. Borden and Sir Wilfrid Laurier had a splendid opportunity to act in the best interests of the Empire in connection with this navy question. The policy of Canada should have been settled on a non-partisan basis, and neither leader has made any great effort to do this.

Last November, a memorial, signed by nearly three hundred prominent citizens of Edmonton, Saskatoon, Regina, Winnipeg, Toronto and Hamilton, was presented to both these statesmen asking for a non-partisan settlement of the navy question. Both have chosen to ignore that request. Even the Montreal *Star* advised Mr. Borden to take the Liberal leaders and leading journalists into his confidence and explain the reasons for his policy. Mr. Borden refused or neglected to do so. What Sir Wilfrid would have done if Mr. Borden had taken the *Star's* advice, I cannot say. If he had refused to act in a broad spirit, then the blame would have rested upon him. As Mr. Borden refused to consult him, then Mr. Borden is entitled to all the blame, if any, which attaches to the course which he chose to pursue. In so far as Sir Wilfrid Laurier neglected to encourage Mr. Borden to consult him, he too must take his share of the blame, if any.

Again speaking personally, I believe that both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition would have stood higher in the estimation of the independent people of the country, had they made some sort of effort to reach a non-partisan settlement of this important national and imperial question.

More Than a Canadian Question.

THIS is more than a national question. It is an imperial policy which we are called upon to aid in deciding. Our decision on the navy question must be duplicated by the people of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. That famous non-partisan resolution of March, 1909, passed by the Canadian House of Commons, was duplicated in the same month of the same year in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. That resolution did not originate in Canada; it came from London. Its authors intended it to show to the world that the overseas Dominions were behind the United Kingdom in the defence of the Empire and in the maintenance of the world's peace.

To-day, as in March, 1909, Canada must do what Australia and New Zealand are willing to do. The three countries must act in concert or the effect will be spoiled. If Mr. Borden decides to ignore the wishes of Australia and New Zealand, then he is striking a deadly blow at the Empire which he professes to admire.

Canada has no right to act alone or in opposition to the other Dominions. All the colonial and imperial conferences of the past have had but one object—to unify the internal and external policies of the different parts of the Empire. If Canada

to-day decides to ignore Australian and New Zealand ideas in the matter of separate fleets, then he is upsetting the good work of the past twenty-five years in behalf of Imperial unity and Britannic co-operation.

The Union Jack.

A READER in Montreal, who has not the courage to sign his name, writes to tell me that the Union Jack is the flag of the British Empire, and that Canada, Australia and New Zealand have no other flag. He claims that Canada's "Red Ensign" is not her flag, it is simply a bit of bunting designed to be used on board vessels registered in the Dominion.

Legally, I believe this timid gentleman is partly right. Practically, he is quite wrong. The Union Jack is not Canada's flag. It is the flag of the United Kingdom. It combines the cross of England, the cross of Scotland, and the cross of Ireland. It bears nothing to represent any one of the Dominions. How, therefore, can it be their flag?

Besides, Canada has made the Red Ensign her flag by custom and use. Australia has a similar flag and so has New Zealand. There may be no real authority for their use, but there are a lot of customs and constitutional conventions in full force in this country which have no more "legal" sanction than our use of the Red Ensign or Australia's use of the "Southern Cross" in the field of her ensign.

Will my unknown friend tell me where I am wrong in these statements?

Canadian Automobiles.

EXPERTS in automobile statistics tell us that of the 50,000 motor cars in use in Canada 40,000 have been imported from the United States. For these, Canada has paid the manufacturers of that country eighty millions of dollars, besides twenty millions in duty.

These figures, if accurate, indicate a great future for the Canadian automobile industry if the manufacturer is alive to his opportunities. A number of United States manufacturers have seen this future development and have established branch factories at Walkerville, St. Catharines, Hamilton, and elsewhere. There are three large Canadian factories at West Toronto, Orillia and Oshawa, besides several smaller factories. All these have been growing steadily and the output for 1913 will be larger than ever before.

There are two requisites for success in the Canadian automobile field. First, the Canadian manufacturer must not try to take full advantage of the tariff, but must sell his car at a price which approximates to the price of a similar car on the other side. So far as I can discover, the Tudhope people in Orillia have come nearest to this ideal. But all must do it, if the industry is to make the progress it should make. Secondly, the Canadian companies must have sufficient capital to establish supply depots in all the larger Canadian cities. If the owner of a Canadian car in British Columbia or Nova Scotia wants a new part, he must be able to get it quickly. This is essential.

It is to be hoped that the Canadian manufacturer will show himself equal to the occasion and put this industry on the best possible basis. Business courage and foresight must be exercised in an extraordinary degree, otherwise the importations will continue in large proportions.

A Wonderful Bulletin.

EVERY financier and manufacturer should carefully study "Bulletin I" of the census department showing the progress of Canadian manufacturing during 1901-1911. The returns for the whole of Canada show an increase in the yearly product amounting to nearly seven hundred million dollars. The increase in each class of manufacturing, the increase in each province, and the increase in each city are well worth serious study. He is a wise man who knows what industry will show the greatest increase in the next ten years, which province is likely to afford the best field for effort in any particular industry, and what city is likely to make the greatest manufacturing progress. A study of this bulletin will enable the

careful man to make a reasonable estimate on all these points.

In order to stimulate a study of these points THE CANADIAN COURIER is offering prizes for the best essays on two subjects: "Canada's Most Profitable Manufacturing Industry," and "Canada's Greatest Manufacturing City." Fuller particulars will be found on another page. It is hoped that the younger men in manufacturing establishments and the university students in political science will enter this competition.

Hydro-Electric Figures.

HON. ADAM BECK is pleased. A dozen more municipalities have passed the necessary by-laws which make them members of the Ontario Hydro-Electric commission's family. Also, the figures for 1912 show a surplus of receipts over expenditures. Power purchased at Niagara cost \$456,635 and power sold to municipalities netted \$511,801. This leaves a surplus of \$55,000. Of course the interest on the four millions invested is not considered, nor the necessary sinking fund, nor the cost of maintenance and administration. Figuring each of these items at five per cent., the commission would need a surplus of \$600,000. Then there are a few other little items, such as losses in previous years, accrued interest and so on. However, the outlook is for larger surpluses, and the prices of electric light and power are satisfactory to those who use them.

Ontario Going Dry.

MUNICIPALITIES in Ontario held their annual elections recently and many of them voted in favour of local option. Over half of the municipalities are now in the dry column, although more than half the population is in the "wet" districts. Only one municipality, Acton, secured the necessary three-fifths vote for a repeal.

The peculiar feature of the situation is that while temperance sentiment is growing and the number of licenses is being steadily reduced, the consumption of liquor shows no decrease. The municipalities that have adopted local option are mainly those in which liquor drinking at the bar had become unfashionable. Where licensees sold bad liquor and failed to observe the laws of the province and the sentiment of their neighbours, the licenses have been extinguished. This is as it should be. The present movement, as far as it has gone, does not deprive all men of good liquor, but it does deprive many foolish men of injurious liquor. Which is a step in the right direction.

Hypocrisy and Betting.

AN American writer points out how close we come to hypocrisy in dealing with race-horse betting. He says there was more money bet on the presidential election of 1912 than in any one year on all the race-tracks in America. The newspapers quoted the odds in every city day by day. No one seemed to think it immoral. Nor does this writer believe it was immoral, laying down the general principle that wagers are "law-declared immorality."

There is something in this criticism. Here in Canada we have much the same form of hypocrisy—or lack of clear thinking on the betting question. We do not raise a cry against betting on elections, on hockey matches, football matches or any other national amusement, but we have made all sorts of laws to limit race-track betting. Our conduct does not seem wholly consistent. Prize-fighting and "glove" contests are surely more immoral in their tendencies than horse-racing, yet betting on them puts no man under a social or legal ban.

Not that I am in favour of race-track betting as a whole. Under certain conditions I think it might be left to the individual taste and conscience. Of course, the hand-book man is a menace, because he is a professional defrauder or the agent for an organized gang who have a well-defined scheme for taking the public's money. I think the state should control the betting and the liquor traffic. I would legalize and regulate both forms of amusement or indulgence. Not many people will agree with me, perhaps, but I think that on the whole this would be the best method of eliminating the undesirable feature of these two "ancient and honourable" customs.

But above all, let us avoid hypocrisy in regard to betting. There are features of gambling which must be suppressed for the safety of the weaker and more ignorant brother. At the same time, don't class a man as immoral who bets in a gentlemanly way at a race-track, unless you are willing to declare that betting on an election or a football match is also immoral.