



### WHEN POLITICIANS SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT

FOR pyrotechnics, the Quebec Legislature has everything else "faded" this year. The arrival of Henri Bourassa and his faithful squire, Armand Lavergne, was sure to precipitate rare tiltings—not necessarily at "wind mills"—and to bring on brave battles with what it would be pointless to compare to Quixote's "wine sacks." To them joined himself another doughty knight in "P'tit Jean" Prevost, who was very bitter because his late colleagues in the Ministry had left him to his fate when attacked by the Opposition, though stoutly defending Mr. Turgeon. These three have made incessant war upon the Gouin Government, and have received payment in kind from the Premier—who is a hard hitter—and Messrs. Taschereau, Kelly, Devlin and Weir. The galleries have enjoyed the fray hugely; and it has made good reading in the papers. One fiery journalist, Mr. Asselin, took the wordy battle so seriously that he smote a Minister on the orifice whence the words issued, and he was promptly haled off to the deepest dungeon in the castle by the minions of the Government and kept there in mediaeval fashion until an Opposition lawyer managed to come at his rescue.

\* \* \*

SIR Lomer Gouin has certainly increased his prestige by his bearing during the melee. While less provocative than some of the others, he was singularly effective whenever he took seriously up the task of repelling an attack. It was hardly realised before that he was so good a debater. As a conservative statesman and leader of legislation in his own House, he has adways been a success; and this year he has exhibited both these capacities to a considerable extent. The finances of Quebec are—as I presume everyone knows—much better than they were. The addition to the Provincial subsidies nicely lifted the Province out of the rut in which it had been grinding along with such difficulty for years. There is more now to spend on good roads, on education, on sanitary legislation and the like; and the Gouin Government has been spending it with good judgment. Our Provinces generally seem to be well governed just now; and capable Provincial Governments are half the battle.

\* \* \*

THE prediction ventured in this department that Mr. Bourassa would make a mistake on leaving the Federal for the Provincial field, seems in way of fulfilment. No man could have fought harder than he has this last session; but the subjects which offer themselves for his absorbing industry and oratorical skill in the provincial field are hardly suited to his kind of Parliamentary ability. He is the champion of great national causes rather than the critic of petty scandals. His "metier" is to make set speeches on largely theatrical questions with an entire people in the audience, and not to sit down in a committee of business men and discuss the details of local administration. At Quebec he has appeared to be chiefly a disturbing element. He has badgered the Government and quite supplanted the Opposition; but he has not created a feeling in the Province that the tax-payers would like to see the present Ministers turned out and a Bourassa Cabinet installed in their places. He has made a good share of the fun; but he has not recommended himself as a maker of policies.

\* \* \*

PREMIER Whitney set his fellow statesmen in Canada a good example when he made a non-political speech on public questions to his constituents in Morrisburg. Whether we agree with what he said or not, does not matter. The point is that the Premier of a Province thought it worth while to forget for an evening that he is a party leader, and talked to his people as a public man. Our public men owe us something for their elevation to positions of prominence and influence. We put them where they have unequalled opportunities to study public questions at first hand, and we have a right to demand that they shall share with us the fruits of their

opportunities. This is a duty quite apart from their party labours. It is an educational task, and instruction should not be coloured by prejudice or warped by party passion.

\* \* \*

FOR instance, there is no reason why Mr. Aylesworth should should not lecture to the people occasionally on their relations to treaty-making and the treaty history of Canada. These are subjects in which we ought to be interested, if we are not; and Mr. Aylesworth is in a position to possess a lot of special knowledge regarding them. Most of us are at sea just now as to what we ought to do about the Waterways Treaty, the fisheries question, the admission of these American "training ships" to our inland waters. Mr. Aylesworth could help us very materially in coming to a conclusion if he would talk to us frankly, informally and without any secondary intention to make party capital. The lectures on historical subjects which we used to get from the late David Mills were of the utmost value. Then Sir Wilfrid Laurier could lecture on the political history of Canada for a generation and more; and we would be the better for his statements and deductions. Sir Richard Cartwright and Sir Charles Tupper could treat the same subject with unparalleled knowledge. You smile at the thought of the party wrangling which might come of it. But my point is that it should not. These men should forget—as Mr. Whitney did—to which party they belong. In some way we could solve the old problem—"How to make our politicians useful."

THE MONOCLE MAN.

Dr. Richard Arthur, president of the Emigration League of Australia, urges Britain to organise a system of emigration which would send Britain's overflow to the British colonies. The same idea was advocated several years ago by Mr. Beckles Willson in the *Canadian Magazine*. The chief reason for such a movement is "The Mother-country has landless men, the Colonies have manless lands."

FROM THE ROYAL ACADEMY EXHIBITION



"THE SHADOW."

A Striking Picture, by E. Blair Leighton, now on exhibition in London.