

REFLECTIONS

BY THE EDITOR

THE battle between the manufacturers and the farmers promises to be most interesting. When the C. M. A. were in the West, they invited the farmers of the prairie to come down East and see the industrial development which was creating a growing home market. The Grain Growers' Association retorts with an excursion of its own—five hundred farmers from all over Canada to invade Ottawa in early December. These men are to bring a club with them with which it is intended to deal a blow for a lower tariff. Mr. Rowley, President of the C. M. A., lives in Ottawa, but it is not at his house that the petition will be laid. The House on Parliament Hill, presided over by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, is to be the scene of this portion of the battle, which even now is in progress. Sir Wilfrid will receive them politely, of that we may be sure. He will tell them little, but he will send them away feeling that they have met a man who has the country's best interests ever before him. If Mr. Rowley meets them accidentally the occasion may not be so pleasant. Mr. Rowley has other methods. If Mr. R. L. Borden meets them, he may not recognise them, but if he does he will be quite as polite and quite as gracious as Sir Wilfrid. On the whole, it should be an interesting occasion.

ACCORDING to the census figures and such confirmatory evidence as is available, the manufacturers produce twice as much annually as the farmers. The manufacturers produce about 900 million dollars worth of goods annually and the farmers less than 450 million dollars worth. Figured on this basis, the manufacturer is entitled to more consideration than the farmer. It is so in the United States where the manufacturers produce 15 billion dollars worth of goods and the farmers nine. Perhaps the figures are unjust or inaccurate, but they are the best available.

From another point of view, the farmer has the advantage. The exports of farm produce are four times as large as the exports of manufacturers. In so far, therefore, as our export trade is valuable in enabling us to pay for our imports, the farmer is doing much better than the manufacturer. Inasmuch as he does this, he is entitled to consideration.

Reverse this proposition and another point of view is disclosed. The manufacturer sells twenty-nine thirtieths of his goods in Canada, and therefore the home market is of great importance to him. The farmer sells only two-thirds of his production at home and therefore the home market is not so important to him. In other words, the farmer could cope with free trade in agricultural produce more easily than the manufacturer with free trade in manufactured articles.

ADMITTING, for the sake of argument, that the manufacturer does not want free trade, nor reciprocity, nor even lower duties, can Sir Wilfrid Laurier offer the farmer anything which will satisfy him and leave the manufacturer adequately protected? Would it be sufficient if he got him cheaper rates on his produce to the markets of the world, provided him with more and cheaper farm labour, and greatly increased the scope and expenditures of the Dominion Department of Agriculture? This is a point which Sir Wilfrid might consider in advance and discuss with the agriculturists when they arrive in Ottawa. Surely there is a compromise somewhere which will satisfy both sides.

The manufacturer is helping to build up Canada; the farmer is helping to build up Canada; we are all trying to build up Canada. If one class demands the head of the other on a silver salver, murder will become necessary and murder is a gruesome and unprofitable business. The manufacturers should be able to live without injury to the farmers, and the farmers should be able to get along in spite of the prosperity of the manufacturers. Why cannot both sides get together and decide upon a national policy which will be satisfactory all round? If this is the object of Sir Wilfrid's promised tariff commission then it should be appointed immediately.

FOR six months the Conservatives of Toronto have been discussing the question of introducing party politics into municipal elections. At first the movement gathered great headway and threatened to march straight on to success. Gradually, however, the saner men of the party managed to stem the force of the new movement, and

now it is practically at a standstill. It is a safe prediction that it will eventually subside.

Toronto is overwhelmingly Conservative, but the people vote independently in municipal elections. There have been several Liberal mayors and occasionally a Liberal council and board of control. This jars on the sensibilities of the Conservative ward-worker who hates to see the Liberals sharing in municipal patronage.

The average ward-worker in any city is not a broad-minded individual, and he is not yet acquainted with the demeritary principles of civil service reform. He is usually honest, but he is intensely partisan and is kept so by scheming members of parliament and semi-professional politicians who manipulate the ward-workers for their private advantage. Your leading citizen, with an automobile and a five-thousand-a-year income is never a ward-worker. He sits at home on his spare evenings and laments in a most high-minded way over the follies of the ward-worker and the politician. He does nothing to improve matters, and refuses to exchange his lounging robe for an evening with "the boys" who study voters' lists and keep the constituencies in political working order. What Canada needs is a revival of interest in political smallwares by the men who have education and knowledge. The common people are anxious to do right, but they cannot succeed when they are lead only by men whose aim it is to prevent their doing right. If the men who spend so much of their time raising money for hospitals, Y.M.C.A.'s, and foreign missions were to give a small fraction of their time to ward politics, our public and municipal life would be purer and more progressive. The small place-hunter would be eliminated.

NON-CHURCHGOERS

The Editor of the British Weekly in a recent issue has a very severe criticism to make regarding the carelessness of ministers, and it is possible that his remarks apply to Protestant ministers of Canada as well as to those of Great Britain. He says "the losses in our membership are due mainly to leakage," especially by removal from one district to another. If the pastor whose care they are leaving does not notify the pastor to whom they are going, the church may lose them. He speaks of the "incredible and shall we say criminal apathy of ministers" in this regard.

Is there such a leakage in the Protestant churches in Canada? If so, who is to blame? These are questions on which the Canadian Courier desires to have the opinion of its readers. Will you write us a letter about it?

THE "Mail and Empire" argues that our cruisers on the Atlantic and Pacific are too small to be any defence. Let us admit that and see where the admission carries us. A big battleship of the Japanese navy may come along and bang the Rainbow to pieces. That is the picture as it now is. Supposing instead of the Rainbow, we had bought a Dreadnought, the best that Great Britain could produce, and had stationed her at Esquimaut. Not having any cruisers or torpedo destroyers to scout for her or to defend her from sudden attacks, she would be helpless. Japan could send three or four small boats after her and some dark night they could torpedo her before her officers had time to think. Therefore one Dreadnought would be useless. Two Dreadnoughts would be equally useless and so would five. The only sure defence would be a fully equipped fleet—and that we cannot have just yet.

The Rainbow is a training vessel—the basis of a fleet that is to be. She is the insignia of Canadian sovereignty on the Pacific. Perhaps she is little good as a fighting force. The man who defends her on that score is as big a fool as the man who attacks her because she cannot repel a full division of the Japanese fleet.

Sir Charles Beresford is in favour of having colonial fleets for patrol work and for training purposes. These fleets will do work which the smaller British warships now do on all the oceans of the world. In this sense they will be of assistance to the Empire. The "Mail and Empire" is simply talking arrant nonsense when it maintains otherwise. Not that the cash contributions which it advocates are bad, but rather that the arguments it advances in favour of them are childish and anaemic.

WINNIPEG'S Navy League has passed a very fair resolution. It endorses the present policy of the government as being the "best permanent policy," but also urges a contribution of Dreadnoughts or cash. One can understand sensible men taking this view. It is the proper view, if there is really any immediate danger of an attack by Germany. Those who favour a Canadian fleet only, do so because they believe that there is no immediate danger of a conflict with Germany. However, a difference of opinion on this point is quite within the bounds of reason.

Compare this reasonable attitude with that of Messrs. Bourassa and Monk in Quebec. These gentlemen say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is preparing the way for compulsory military and naval service under the British crown. They condemn the Canadian navy, and threaten revolution if any one should propose a direct cash contribution.

Again, it is equally interesting to note the attitude of the more partisan Conservative papers in the English-speaking provinces. They are down on the Canadian navy as not being the best permanent contribution. They go to the other extreme.

It is unlikely that Parliament will make any change in its policy, either to please the anti-militarists of Quebec, or the pro-imperialists element in the Conservative party. What has been done may not be the wisest course, but it was the only possible one under the circumstances of the case.