

REFLECTIONS

By THE EDITOR

The Saskatchewan Sensation.

REGINA'S cyclone was easily eclipsed by the Saskatchewan election results. That the Scott Government would be given another term of power was inevitable, but that it should be so overwhelmingly endorsed was not anticipated by either Conservatives or Liberals. It was a great victory for the Scott-Calder Government and a severe blow to the Haultain-Rogers combination.

There are several interesting features of the case which are worth considering. In the first place, it is unusual to find both political parties with leaders of equal ability at the same period. When one party is strong in leadership, the other is usually weak. It is so in Saskatchewan. The local Conservative leaders are not to be compared in ability with the local Liberal leaders. Mr. Haultain is a good type of English-Canadian, but he is not energetic and has little political finesse. He is honest and straightforward, but lacks many qualities which make for political leadership. On the other hand, both Premier Scott and Mr. Calder are men who have given deep and exhaustive attention to political management. They are cool, calculating, and able. In addition, they had the prestige of being in office which is a tremendous help where the political record is fairly clean.

In the second place, there is a spirit of independence in the West which resents federal interference in provincial affairs. This is also true in Ontario, although I do not think it is equally true in the Maritime Provinces. For example, Mr. Roblin has long held Manitoba solid because of his hard fight with the Dominion Government for boundary extension and better terms. Now that he has got all he fought for, his power is likely to wane. So Sir James Whitney was helped in Ontario by the opposition, though extremely slight, of members of the Dominion Government under the Laurier regime. Hence the presence of the Hon. Robert Rogers in the West during the Saskatchewan elections was a detriment to Mr. Haultain rather than a help.

The Dominion Conservative party should avoid provincial entanglements. This is the lesson of three recent campaigns. I do not think that Premier Flemming was helped to victory in New Brunswick by federal sympathy. It is quite certain that Premier Gouin was not injured in Quebec, nor Premier Scott in Saskatchewan by federal opposition. If the Dominion Conservatives should make any further attempts to destroy provincial Liberal administrations they will be but digging their own grave. This is the chief lesson of the Saskatchewan sensation.

Canada, an Adjunct.

MR. BORDEN says Canada is not an "adjunct" of the British Empire. It was a "clever" remark. It might have been made by a phrase-maker on the *Toronto Evening Telegram* or certain "smark-aleck" weeklies in Winnipeg or Vancouver. It should never have been made by a man who is something of a diplomat and statesman.

Let me explain. Lord Salisbury, in 1897, denounced the Anglo-German treaty of commerce because Emperor William would not admit that Canada was part of the British Empire. Lord Salisbury's action forced the German Government, at a later date, to recognize that Canada is part of the British Empire and must be treated on the same basis as the United Kingdom. Does Mr. Borden want to go back to the old theory which Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Lord Salisbury fought so hard to kill? Does he desire to see international diplomacy revert to the idea that courtesies extended to Great Britain by the big nations of the world do not necessarily extend to Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa?

Again, just while Mr. Borden is claiming that Canada is not an "adjunct" of the Empire, the British Government is trying to prove to the United States Government that Canadian ships must have the same rights in the Panama Canal as British ships. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy's language when he read the report of Mr. Borden's speech may be more easily imagined than transcribed. I am quite certain that it would have melted any ordinary phonograph record-cylinder.

I hope Mr. Taft will not take any advantage of

the remark. It was made in a public speech when it is difficult for the most experienced speaker to have every phrase convey his exact meaning. Mr. Borden intended to state that Canada was an integral part of the British Empire, but such an important part that it would not submit to any treatment such as might be accorded to a mere crown-colony.

However, let Canadians get this clearly in their minds. If Canada ceases to be part of the British Empire, we lose more than the protection of the British fleet; we lose the advantages conferred upon us by many important British treaties. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty is the only document which safeguards the rights of Canadian shipping in the Panama Canal. If we were to lose those rights we should be in a much less advantageous commercial position for many years to come.

Mr. Borden, Otherwise.

ASIDE from this unfortunate remark, Mr. Borden's speech seems to have been masterly in tone and matter. It was in strong contrast to the noisy orations of the Hon. George E. Foster, and savoured of the grace, the finesse and the brilliancy of the former premier. It was just such a speech as the First Canadian should make.

Indeed, Mr. Borden has been well received in England, showing that he fully understands the importance of his mission. The press is quick to size a visitor in London, where regularly they have visitors from every nation and every tribe in the civilized and uncivilized world. The London press is always polite, but it draws fine shades of meaning. I cannot, by the most careful inspection, find an undertone of disappointment concerning Mr. Borden.

The British people have come to understand the independent and manly tone of the Dominions overseas. Sometimes the shout may be a little overdone and the tone slightly bombastic, but the spirit is clearly manifest. The Dominions want to keep in touch with the Empire, and are determined to do so so long as that Empire stands for all that is best and highest and noblest in modern civilization. At the same time, the autonomy and self-respect of the Dominions overseas must be maintained. This is the attitude of Mr. Borden and of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Either one could make the speeches of the other on this subject—because both represent the best Canadian thought.

Of course there is this difference. Sir Wilfrid thought Canada should, for a time at least, avoid mixing in the making of peace or war. Mr. Borden is anxious to plunge into this responsibility. But after all this is a matter of detail—although an important detail.

A Canadian Navy.

WILL Mr. Borden be advised to create a Canadian navy? I hope so. On his own principle of bearing a due share of responsibility, he will have to build a squadron of battleships, a squadron of cruisers and a flotilla of small boats. If Canada demands one-sixth the control, she must supply one-sixth the fleet. This means, if it means anything, that the Borden navy will be five times the size of the Laurier navy; that instead of having two training ships we shall have four or five; instead of one naval college, we shall need two or three; and instead of one naval shipyard, we shall have three or four. This would mean a strong Canadian navy, forming an integral part of an Empire navy, in which all the Dominions overseas would be represented.

If he decides not to have a Canadian navy he will probably adopt the Montreal-Star-Norton-Griffith policy, as outlined in the *Star* of June 7th. This declares for "one British navy under one Admiralty Board." In other words there should be no Empire navy; only a British navy. This is quite the opposite of the policy adopted by the last Imperial Council and since loyally supported by the CANADIAN COURIER.

The *Star* goes on to say that "the day when it was thought possible that the Colonies might better slowly create navies of their own, seems pretty well to have vanished." Also, "The late Canadian Government tried to establish a separatist navy which would be controlled from Ottawa. That

policy was fatally mistaken." It seems hardly credible that a sane newspaper would take such an attitude, but such is the case. It also seems incredible that Mr. Borden should accept such poor advice, but he may.

Agricultural Education.

THE Conservation Commission recognizes that the farmer of Canada cannot be educated through huge experimental farms, such as those at Ottawa, at St. Anne de Bellevue and at Guelph. The farmer will not go there for instruction. Consequently the Commission is establishing small experimental farms in the counties or districts. For example, thirty-five are to be created throughout Canada this year, of which nine will be in Ontario.

I have long been advocating such decentralization in experimental farms and agricultural college education. If the farmer is to be educated, it can be done only by putting the education where he can reach out and get it. One big agricultural college in a province is a mistake. It serves a purpose, but it doesn't reach all the farmers. It reaches only a few, and it makes specialists of those few.

What the farmer wants is general education, and he can get this only through the agricultural public school and the local experimental farm. Ontario recognized this when it established agricultural experts in county towns to give advice and assistance concerning local problems.

We have now established the principle of county instructors, and county experimental farms. All that remains is to establish the principle that a rural school should be an agricultural school, with a curriculum and text-books separate from those used in city public schools. Then we shall be on the high road to agricultural efficiency, progressiveness and success.

Self-Interest vs. the Party.

RECENT election results in Canada indicate that the Canadian is voting less and less according to the dictates of partisanship and more and more from his ideas of self-interest. The day when voters could be driven to the polls to do the bidding of the party leaders is passing away. Independence is growing. The Conservative may vote Liberal to-morrow, or the Liberal may vote Conservative. Canadians are more inclined to vote for men and measures than ever before.

Analyzing the reasons for this growing independence, one finds much of self-interest in it. Each section of Canada finds that it has interests of its own and it is inclined to vote that way. Even the party newspapers recognize that and hedge accordingly. For example, the *Winnipeg Telegram* is much less a protectionist paper than the *Toronto Mail and Empire* or the *Montreal Gazette*. The political leaders recognize the same set of circumstances and the Liberals in Nova Scotia advocate a policy which often materially differs from the policy advocated by the Liberals of British Columbia. Sectional self-interest is getting very strong in Canada, and the wise politician studies it closely.

Then there is personal self-interest. The manufacturer and all who are intimately related to him in business, including most of his employees, are thinking more of their business than of the fortunes of their party. They will vote with the party if it does not interfere with their commercial interests—otherwise they will bolt without hesitation. Even the farmer is beginning to show signs of intelligence, and to think more of the "agricultural interests" than the fate of politicians. Also the "foreign" voter figures out as best he can which party is likely to do the most for him, before he decides which way he will vote.

All this growth of independence is sure to have an effect upon our politics. The successful politician realizes that he must be popular with the people and that ability to buy them drinks and cigars or to call them by name does not necessarily mean popularity. He must find out what self-interest there is in certain provinces, districts or classes, and cater to it.

It is also likely to make the people less chary of discarding one government and accepting another. Heretofore in Canada, because of the intense partisanship of the voters, a government has been able to stay in power for several successive terms. Now the people are beginning to recognize that all governments look alike and that one has as many virtues and as many vices as another. The theory that it is unwise to change from one set of rulers to another is almost exploded, and the benefits of short terms of power are being more fully recognized.