

# Public Opinion

Professor Kylie's Reply.

Editor, CANADIAN COURIER:

Sir:—I should hesitate to reply to Mr. Charleson's article, "A Phase of Centralism," were it not that in the editor's opinion a friendly exchange of views may throw some light on this difficult subject.

The British Empire must be taken as it is. It has nothing to do with the Persian, Roman, Napoleonic or other brands of Empire. Taken as it is, it includes a central government which has charge of foreign affairs and of the dependencies, and exercises a veto upon colonial legislation. Within the last few months Sir Edward Grey has been deciding whether or not Canada should be at war. Mr. Charleson thinks that the veto power is dead. He will find that the Imperial Government recently vetoed New Zealand legislation on the ground that it threatened Imperial interests. Under this central government the colonies, or Dominions, have obtained and do exercise large powers of self-government.

The question for Canadians is, Shall this central government be maintained? Shall we enter into and preserve it, or shall we develop our autonomy until Canada becomes an independent state? Are we, for example, to have a Canadian ambassador at Paris, or to be represented there by an Imperial ambassador? Are we to vote at the Hague as a separate unit, or as part of the Empire? Some people, whom Mr. Charleson calls centralists, think that some measure of central government must be maintained if the Empire is to be a state at all. They see no other way of governing the dependencies, or of controlling the islands, coaling stations and harbours which encircle the world. They have no desire to diminish the present autonomy of the Dominions, indeed they are quite ready to increase it to any point which will not mean the destruction of all central authority. As against them Mr. Charleson urges that the Empire is to be "an ideal federation of nations," and expresses his belief in "the ideal of a Canadian autonomy."

These are attractive phrases, but unfortunately very hard to understand. If they do not allow for any form of central government, they must mean that the Dominions are to become independent states, which may form a league of alliance and may retain a common king. That such an arrangement would not work, cannot, of course, be demonstrated since it has not yet been tried. We can point out, however, that it does not provide for existing Imperial possessions, and that it substitutes several states for one state; and we can fairly use history to the extent of noticing that similar arrangements have not been successful in the past. England and Scotland, England and Holland, were united under one crown, but their relations were by no means happy. Mr. Charleson says that these illustrations are not apt, but he gives no reason for his statement. In fact, Scotland seemed ready to choose a different king from the one recognized in England, and the possibility of this did much to bring about the union.

As to leagues or confederations of free states, history is discouraging. The American States were driven into union by the failure of their loose alliance. That does not mean that if the British Dominions enter into some form of federation, each Dominion will have the powers which belong to Massachusetts in the American Union. Federations differ one from another according as the powers are apportioned between the central government and the states. Inside the British Empire the Dominions will have larger authority than have the provinces within other federations. Such matters, for example, as trade, will fall naturally to the Dominions. The influence of geography and of local feeling cannot be ignored. Still geography is not our master, and should not be allowed to break up the British Empire any more than it has been allowed to prevent the union of the United States, Canada, South Africa, or the maintenance of the Empire itself until this time. Neither are we slaves of our history, or at least of one part of it. The development of Canadian autonomy has been uninterrupted, but it does not follow that the development is to go on of its own weight until Canada becomes an independent state. History has also preserved a common government for the Empire, and we are free at any moment to say, "We have all the local control needed, we must now enter into and preserve the common government." We are our own masters. We make history, just as we override, for any number of purposes, the so-called limitations of geography.

We need not, therefore, give too much thought to the argument that when Canada demanded pieces of self-government she was not happy till she got them. Nothing else could be expected. Canadians were not represented in the central government. Indeed, this fact alone explains some of the demands for Canadian autonomy which in the circumstances were just and natural. There is a chance that the American colonies would not have revolted if they had been given a place in the administration of the Empire. At least Chatham and Franklin, who both took hold of the problem at this end were nearer a solution than anyone else. Canadians are not represented now. Any day we may demand control of our own foreign affairs, and refuse to be happy till we get it. The real question remains, should we be wise to make any such demand, should we prefer to maintain a common government for this or for any other purpose. This is the only

question involved in the whole controversy, and Canadian autonomy consists in the fact that we can answer it freely.

EDWARD KYLIE.

Colleges and Farm Progress.

O. A. College, Guelph, Feb. 6, 1913.

Editor, CANADIAN COURIER:

Sir:—In response to your inquiry regarding the productivity of farm crops in Ontario, I have looked up the Provincial statistics for the past thirty years and I have taken into consideration the four most and extensively grown crops in Ontario, other than hay and pasture, which are, oats, barley, fall wheat and corn. If we compare the average yield per acre of these crops for the past fifteen years with that for the fifteen years previous we find that there is an increase in every case, the increases being as follows:

Oats	10.2%
Barley	20.1%
Fall Wheat	11.1%
Corn	6.8%

I consider this a wonderful showing when we consider that the tendency in a country like this is to receive diminishing rather than increasing yields of grain per acre, as there is possibly not one farmer in a hundred in Ontario who supplies as much fertilizing material to the soil in the form of manure and fertilizer as he removes from the land in the form of crops. We certainly have very great evidence in tracing a large proportion of this increase in yield per acre to the direct work of the College in the introduction of better varieties, and in the educational work, which has brought about better methods of farming.

Many of the most extensively grown farm crops in Ontario are the direct result of the work of the College, such as the Mandscheuri Barley, the O. A. C. No. 21 Barley, the Siberian Oats, etc., and others which have been increased indirectly by the College, such as the Banner Oats, the Empire State Potatoes, the Dawson's Golden Chaff Winter Wheat, the White Cap Yellow Dent Corn, the Canadian Beauty Peas, the Silver Hull Buckwheat, etc.

The averages in increase in yield per acre as applied to the average value of the crops of Ontario for the past five years would mean an annual increase in dollars for the Province as follows:

Oats	\$3,846,505.27
Barley	2,251,657.07
Fall Wheat	1,733,548.49
Corn	603,307.56

Total .....\$8,435,018.39

These figures represent simply the annual market values of the increases of the four principal grain crops per acre when we compare the last fifteen years with fifteen years previous. This amount would be sufficient to pay the entire expenses of running about forty agricultural colleges similar to the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph. This amount is about ten times as great as the federal grant for agriculture, which is to be distributed to all the Provinces of Canada in 1913, or about forty times as great as that portion of the federal grant which Ontario is to receive in the coming year.

Yours very truly,

C. A. ZAVITZ,

Professor of Farm Husbandry.

## Everybody's Overdoin' It



"In 1913 there is a good chance of the sea being filled up with warships."—Philip Baynes, in Bystander.