

But he did not.

14. He ought to have given effect to the Senate's declaration that

**"The shortage of farm labour must be met, and the method of meeting it must be prompt and decisive, if our present production of wheat and other cereals is to be maintained, let alone increased"** (a).

But he did not.

15. In framing his policy, he ought to have taken into most anxious consideration the nationally disrupting effect of the introduction of conscription. But he did not. In his speech of June 11 he denied that his bill would "induce disunion, discord and strife," or that its consequences should "be dreaded."

He sees more clearly now. Into his union government, he has not succeeded in inducing a single Quebec Liberal to enter; and Mr. Sevigny has told us that if he were to resign, his race would be unrepresented in the government(b). Neither Sir John A. Macdonald nor Sir Wilfrid Laurier would have reduced Canada to such disastrous cleavage.

#### **"HOW WOULD THE KAISER VOTE?"**

The question **"How would the Kaiser vote?"** is an impertinent one; but as it appears in huge letters on many billboards in Ottawa, it ought to be answered. My reply is that I am not in the Kaiser's confidence, and that he does so many curious things, that I am doubtful of his perfect sanity; but giving him credit for a modicum of sense, I am inclined to think the **THE KAISER WOULD VOTE FOR THE MAN WHO IS DISRUPTING CANADA**, even although in many other respects that man is most patiently and loyally doing very excellent work. The Kaiser has good reason to dislike us, and to wish to see us split into factions. He must enjoy seeing it done.

JOHN S. EWART.  
OTTAWA, ONT.

(a) *Ante*, p. 17.

(b) *Mr. Blondin is in France.*