



#### PROVINCIALISM DYING

**M**R. HENRI BOURASSA'S address at the banquet of the Commercial Travellers in Montreal was well conceived and happily delivered. Perhaps his most important statement was that "the old narrow provincialism is dying fast," which is a reverse way of saying that nationalism is growing. He claimed that local attachments and interest in local problems should not blind people to the necessity of considering national and imperial problems in the broadest possible spirit. "I say in the name of the French-Canadians that we are proud to face every problem brought before the people of this country in a broad spirit, prepared to meet the views of our English fellow-citizens," asking only for frank and brotherly discussion.

While taking this broad, statesmanlike attitude, Mr. Bourassa expressed the hope that citizens would not forget that the Dominion is based upon a federation scheme, just as the Empire is based on self-government, and that the greatness of each province meant the greatness of the Dominion. It is a just and opportune appeal. Those who are working hard on provincial problems should not be considered unnational or anti-national. Too often people ascribe high praise to workers on Dominion problems and forget or overlook those who are doing equal service in provincial spheres.

Mr. Bourassa has done good service in pointing clearly to the danger on both sides—first of being too provincial and second of being too national. Each Canadian citizen has a double role to play, a double duty to perform. He must regard his local affairs with a keen and judicial mind and must also remember that his province is one of the nine which go to make up the great Dominion. The Dominion is the provinces, and the provinces are the Dominion. Our patriotism must be broad enough to include both.

#### THE ENGLISH IMMIGRANT

**I**N common with many other Canadian publications, "The Courier" has received protests against its attitude towards the new English settlers. Protests are always welcomed by an editorial staff, as they form the basis for consultation and argument. Nevertheless there does not seem to be any great reason why the attitude of Canadian journalists and the Canadian public should be revised. There are good Englishmen and poor Englishmen, just as there are good Canadians and poor Canadians. The *Times* correspondent who points out that it is the impecunious and shiftless Londoner who causes the most trouble has "hit the nail on the head." He points out that "the Englishman who succeeds is hardly ever a Londoner." Undoubtedly the "cockney" is the bone of contention, Canada maintaining that she does not want him and the cockney himself maintaining that he has a right to an opportunity. It is a rather difficult situation. Canada wants more immigrants, but she wants rural citizens rather than urban dwellers. When the latter class press in upon us, we are compelled more or less reluctantly to explain that they are unwelcome. This leaves us open to the charge that we boycott all Englishmen, which is quite untrue. Our only recourse is to keep on explaining and explaining, until the people of the motherland get our point of view. We hold no grudge against those who have misunderstood. If a hundred more explanatory articles are required they will be forthcoming. The British business man, the British mechanic of a high grade, the British domestic and above all the British farmer will find here a warm welcome. The cockney will continue to receive the cold shoulder.

#### IMPERIAL CONTACT

**S**IR CHARLES FITZPATRICK did the Over-Seas Dominions a service when he said that these districts are not suffering from any plethora of visits from British public men. The editor of *The*

*Englishman* says that the chief reason for the neglect is that the British people overseas have no vote for the British House of Commons and the politicians cannot waste time on us. The explanation seems inadequate. So far as Canada is concerned, we do not desire the visits of politicians so much as we desire those of statesmen, publicists, financiers and business men. We would like to have the active interest of those who are not busily engaged in working out the purely domestic political problems of Great Britain.

The Select Committee of Peers, appointed to consider the question of a new constitution for the House of Lords, has recommended that official representatives of the Over-Seas Dominions might safely be admitted to that body. The editor of *Canada* suggests that 37 of the 40 life peerages which it is proposed to create should be allotted as follows: Canada 17, Australia 12, South Africa 5, New Zealand 3. These "Barons of the Empire" would, he thinks, be a strong link in the bond of Empire. These peerages are to be granted, the suggestion continues, to the High Commissioners and retired political representatives and prominent figures in commercial and financial life. The suggestion is worth considering, although it would seem difficult to find men who are willing to accept such honours with all the obligations involved.

There is no doubt a feeling in Great Britain and in the self-governing colonies that if the Empire is to develop its cohesive powers, there must be some kind of intimate contact between the centre and the outer circle. An Imperial Council, consisting of a certain number of British representatives and an equal number of Over-Seas representatives meeting once a year when the colonial legislative bodies are not in session would seem more feasible. It would not involve a change of residence, nor would it require the assumption of titles which might be inconvenient and burdensome. Representation in the House of Lords is hardly democratic enough for the colonies. These two advantages of an Imperial Council over representation in the Lords would seem to be almost overwhelming with such light as we have at present.

#### FOREIGN SHIPS AND COASTING TRADE

**M**ARITIME public opinion has received another check from the Dominion Government. Last spring an Order-in-Council was passed, to come into force on January 1st, 1909, providing that foreign ships should not be allowed to engage in the coasting trade between Canadian ports on the Atlantic. Many Norwegian ships were engaged in carrying coal and steel from Nova Scotia ports to St. Lawrence ports, and the Canadian ship-owners wanted protection. Those who sell supplies to the ships backed up the demand. The Government promised to make 1908 the last for this kind of competition, but like some other pre-election promises it has gone by the board. The foreign ships have been given three years freedom. In 1912, the question is to be again discussed.

Of course, the coal and steel companies are jubilant. They believe in this foreign competition. Mr. Wanklyn, vice-president of the Dominion Coal Company, says: "You may mention that the Government is acting for the best interests of the country." It will be noted that Mr. Wanklyn does not say that if the Canadian vessels gave equally low freight rates, they would get the preference. Like a few others of our prominent financiers, he is so busily engaged in earning dividends for his stockholders that he finds no time to discover what is the best interests of Canadian and British shipping as a whole. Apparently he and those who like him are financially interested in low freight rates have no disposition to consider the national effect of this foreign competition.

The ship-builders of Canada, the ship-owners, and the merchants who sell supplies have a real grievance here. Shipping-men are as much entitled to protection as any other class of the community.