

will be to either nationalize the industries or support them by a system of subsidies.

All this, however, goes to show how large and complex the problem is and how wise it will be for all concerned, while recognizing the desirability generally of the ends sought by the Economic Conference, to reserve liberty of action as to the methods by which those ends are to be attained.

### Are Our Provinces Self-Governed?

IN Canada, no less than in the United States, we claim to have that system of self-government which our neighbors are fond of describing as "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." An incident that has just occurred gives the unfriendly critic of our institutions an opportunity to cast doubt upon our right to make such a claim.

The conditions under which our Lieutenant-Governors are appointed have, during all the years of Confederation, made possible some difficulties which, happily, have not hitherto arisen. In the old order of things the Lieutenant-Governor of every Province was an Imperial officer. In the new order of things, under the British North America Act, the Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces of Canada have been appointed by the Federal Government at Ottawa. In the formation of the Australian Commonwealth the Canadian example was not followed. There not only the Governor-General, but the Governor of every State is appointed from London.

That there was a possible danger in the appointment of Canadian Lieutenant-Governors was seen at an early stage in the history of the Dominion. A Lieutenant-Governor is presumed to be a non-partisan officer, holding the scales evenly between the rival political parties of the day, any one of which may at any time be called upon to assume the responsibilities of government. Could such a non-partisan official emerge from the field of party strife and become qualified to exercise his functions with absolute impartiality? Dominion and Provincial politics being usually closely interwoven, would it be right that a member of one of the contending parties should be chosen to a place at the head of a Cabinet composed of his political opponents?

There were men who had such grave doubt on this point that they felt it would be wise to retain the old method of Imperial appointment, as the Australians have since done. Others were able to contend, with some force, that to admit our inability to make such appointments from the ranks of our own people would be to admit our unfitness for self-government. As a compromise between these two views the suggestion was offered by a public writer, long ago, that the objections that might be raised to the appointment as Lieutenant-Governor of a man who had been engaged in the party strife of his Province could be met, in part, by a system of interchangeable Governorships, the appointee being named to rule, not over the Province in which he had resided, but over another Province.

Theoretically, at least, the dangers of the present system were clear enough. It must be admitted, however, that in practice little real difficulty has occurred. The Lieutenant-Governors chosen at Ottawa, with rare exceptions, have proved themselves moderate men, who recognized the responsibilities of their high positions and discharged their duties in a constitutional way. That the Lieutenant-Governor might be chosen from the political

party opposed to his ministers was one of the conditions that had to be faced—one of the risks that had to be taken. The danger that was anticipated in this respect has now been very sharply illustrated by the appointment of Sir James Aikins as Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. That Sir James is a Conservative while his Cabinet is Liberal creates no new condition. There have been many such cases, and, as we have said, rarely has that situation caused trouble. But Sir James is not only a Conservative; he is a Conservative who only a few weeks ago offered his services to the people of Manitoba in connection with the management of their Provincial affairs, and was over-whelmingly rejected by them. Sir James had been a member of the House of Commons. A Provincial election coming on, he retired from the Commons, was chosen leader of the Manitoba Conservatives and appealed to the people to defeat the recently formed Liberal Government, of which Mr. Norris was and still is Premier. Sir James himself thus became a chief issue in the contest. He was defeated in his own constituency by a large majority, and throughout the Province the people rejected his policy and his candidates. That is not a bit of ancient history. It is very recent history. It is very much in the mind of the public. Now we have the announcement that the man who was thus emphatically rejected by the people of Manitoba is by the act of the Government at Ottawa sent to rule over them!

Sir James Aikins is a gentleman of ability and of high personal character. We do not doubt that he will earnestly endeavor to discharge his duties in a constitutional manner. His appointment to an office of a different character might be beyond criticism. But his appointment to this particular office is, under the circumstances stated, not a wise one. It puts an unfair strain on the constitutional system. It creates a situation which cannot easily be explained to outsiders. It gives the Philistine over the border an opportunity to rejoice.

### Mr Bourassa's Reply

WE published Capt. Talbot Papineau's letter to his cousin, Mr. Henri Bourassa, and in our last issue we gave Mr. Bourassa's reply. Apart from the gratuitous insolence to Mr. A. R. McMaster, Papineau's law partner, which mars the paper, Mr. Bourassa's letter is well written and puts the best possible face on his attitude. The trouble is that Mr. Bourassa seems unable to understand the simple fact that Canada is a part of the British Empire and therefore must expect to share in the burdens which naturally arise from that connection. If it be said that Canada has no representation in the Imperial Government or Parliament, and consequently no voice in the making of war or peace, that fact may be at once admitted, but it does not carry with it any reason why Canada should not, like other parts of the Empire, do her part. Canada has had no grievance on that score and has done now. The circumstances under which the Empire has grown up have made it necessary, hitherto, that the control of Imperial affairs should lie in the Mother Country. Canada has cheerfully recognized this fact. She has never sought to have a direct voice in Imperial affairs. She has shared in the benefits of the Empire, and never was there a time when more consideration was shown for her views by the Imperial authorities than in recent years. Therefore, notwithstanding the absence of a direct voice

—a point that is magnified by some people who do not really understand Canadian public opinion—Canada holds a position in the Empire which carries with it responsibilities that cannot be evaded. Under her constitutional status she could only voluntarily participate in the war. There is no power in the world, while the British North America Act remains unrepealed, that could compel Canada to take any part in the conflict. Of her own free will she has decided to make the war her own, just as the other self-governing Dominions have done. There can be no doubt that the adoption of this policy by the two great political parties in the Federal Parliament has the approval of the vast majority of the people of Canada, and of every Province of Canada. A Government which in a crisis like this failed to pledge Canada to do her bit would have been swept away by an indignant people.

It suits Mr. Bourassa, in his writings, to treat Canada as a separate country, having neither interest in nor duty to the Empire at large. In that entirely mistaken view we believe he has but few followers. If he represented the views of French Canadians generally the situation might well cause anxiety concerning the future relations between the various sections of the Dominion. Fortunately for Canada and for the Empire, the French Canadians turn for leadership to other men who have a finer conception of the privileges and responsibilities of British citizenship.

### Lord Lansdowne

RUMOR is again busy with Lord Lansdowne's name. The latest report is that he will resign on account of ill-health, and that his resignation will have no political significance. Lord Lansdowne is no longer young. He might well desire to be relieved from the responsibility that he bears as a member of the Cabinet without portfolio. If his age and ill-health are really reasons for his retirement the cabled statement that his resignation would have no political significance may be borne out. But if Lord Lansdowne should retire because of difference with his colleagues on the public questions of the time, his resignation might have a very important bearing on the political situation. His influence in the Unionist party is very great. His retirement because of a difference on a question of policy would almost certainly be followed by the resignation of others and might easily mean the break-up of the Coalition.

### Save For The Loan

MR. McKENNA, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a review of the successful manner in which the tremendous cost of the war has been financed by the Imperial Government, bears testimony to the considerable part that has been played by the contributions of the working classes. The British workman has not usually been remarkable for thrift. Many thought that an attempt to teach him to be thrifty for the purpose of lending his savings to the nation would fail. But it did not fail. The small savings of the working classes proved a material help to the Treasury, and the contributing of them gave the workmen a new interest in the war. So it will be, we believe, in the case of the new Canadian loan soon to be floated, if facilities are afforded for the co-operation of the men and women of small means.

The United States satisfaction their foreign ports for the \$4,345,000,000 plus exports and 1915 the 1916 represents Canadian figures and they consider to wake up neighborly. The return month by month by the admission of Canada's foreign trade, excluding shipped through \$1,385,000,000 preceding year increase over the year and enterprise year ending double the regular end year ending double the years. The ratio of the two export surplus presents our case was \$256,000,000.

For many largely in the ed relatively ours in the not been lo the war. Th it at 100,000 Canada's po times as m little less th ting it in an per capita in capita trade this connect tively large be the resul of the Unite population, country, abs annual prod year's yield United State per head. O resented an head of pop ing for dom in Canada's the total yel The same co ber and in by us.

However, ment of our war munition not operate than that of scarcity of la race. Never is eminently manufactures