

years. Too much time and energy is given over to futile debate, party strife and even personal contention and not enough to really constructive statesmanship.

**5. Representative Functions.** The House of Commons is also a representative body. It is a great mistake, however to suppose that it is altogether or even mainly a house of representatives. There is a vast difference between the House of Commons in Great Britain or Canada and the House of Representatives in the United States. In the United States nearly all questions of Policy and statecraft of great national significance are finally decided by the President and the Senate. The House of Representatives is mainly a house of delegates sent to Congress to guard the special interests of their electoral districts, a great panel of committee-men from which some sixty different committees are doled off to secret committee rooms for the purpose of adjusting as best they can, the conflicting claims of all the different states on matters affecting the equitable incidence of taxation and the appropriation of public money for public purposes. In other words the duties of the House of Representatives are largely administrative. It is only in its prerogative control over the treasury that it is really derived from the House of Commons in Great Britain. In Canada, however, the situation is entirely different. With us the Governor-General is a mere figure-head and the Senate, like the House of Lords in Great Britain, has largely fallen into desuetude. The whole burden of statecraft, therefore, falls upon the House of Commons, and its one great standing Committee, the Cabinet. If we are to have statesmen at all, therefore, it is in the House of Commons alone that we may hope to find them. A member of the House of Commons must, no doubt, guard the interests of his electoral district, but that is only an incident. He is really elected because he is the one man intimately known to his electors who is most likely to make a real contribution to the work of a Parliament charged with all the heavy responsibilities of directing the destinies of a great nation. The only reason why there are electoral districts at all is the human, geographical reason that it would be impossible for all the electors to elect a whole House of Commons on a single ballot paper. The fact, however, remains, at least in theory, that a member of the Commons once elected is elected primarily to represent the whole people and not the interests of the electors residing within the limits of his particular geographical district. If he must be guided by the opinions of his electors, so must they be guided by his. If they are to advise him, so must he advise them. If he must follow them, so must they be prepared to follow him. Upon occasion, he must even be prepared to oppose his own electors and take his chances of persuading them that they are wrong and he is right. No man who has not that amount of conviction and courage has any right to sit in a British House of Commons. The practice adopted by the late revered John Morley of making at least one comprehensive dispassionate address to his electors each year on state affairs cannot be too highly commended. Would that we had more men of the scholarship and conviction of Morley at present. The practice of consigning the discussion of affairs of state to the petty tactics of

parliamentary party procedure on the one hand, and to the heat and passion of general election campaigns on the other, has become both futile and dangerous.

**6. Educational Functions.** The House of Commons is also an educational institution. Indeed, strange as it may seem at first, this is really its most important function. The education of the people is, after all, the only positive function of government. The functions of defence are obviously purely negative and precautionary. The administration of justice is really purely defensive. Justice gives to each man his due and then leaves him precisely where it found him. Such questions as capital and labour, free trade and protection, and private and public ownership, really turn upon questions of class justice and not upon questions of positive efficiency and progress. If we would have an illustration of the proposition I have just ventured, that education is really the only positive quantity in the making of a nation, we need only turn again to the commonwealth of the United States. Will any one imagine, then, what the hundred millions of people in the United States would really be like and what their civilization would be like, were it not for their great public school system and the generous, almost prodigal, endowment of their numerous colleges and universities, both from public and private sources? The secret of the success of the United States is not to be found in the constitution, nor in Congress, but in the schools.

The House of Commons, then, being our greatest national institution, has important educational functions to fulfil. The debates in the House of Commons, the comments upon these debates in the public press and on the public platform, and the lively discussion of all pressing public questions at the grand assizes of each succeeding general election are really the only effective means our people have of gaining what little knowledge they have of the fundamentals of our system of government, its framework and its ornament, its successes and its failures. Unfortunately, however, as I have perhaps too often said already, the House of Commons has become distinctly too partisan and personal of late. It is at this point therefore, that public service clubs like the Kiwanis, Rotary and Canadian Clubs have a great work to do at present. I believe personally, indeed, if personal opinion on the point be of any value, that these clubs are destined to become a recognized abiding part in the framework of any national constitution designed to interpret the sane, sound, dispassionate mind and will of the people to the House of Commons as the House of Commons is designed at present to interpret the mind and will of the people to the Cabinet and the Crown. If so, we may easily hope for even a greater House of Commons in the future than in the past. May I also suggest that nothing could be more desirable than that these clubs should keep in closest possible touch with our schools, colleges and universities, so that the influence of sound scholarship and learning, especially in matters of state, may be fully recognized for what it is worth in the work of government. Hence citizenship week.

Having finished a laborious analysis of the functions of the House of Commons, may we venture, finally, at great risk to offer a corresponding analysis of the type of statesman needed to fulfill these func-

tions in the best way. If so, his chief attributes would probably be the following:—

1. **Personality**, that is, the total engaging effect of the man upon his fellow-men in sentiment, thought, action, speech and manners.

2. **Leadership**, that is, foresight to plan for the future and courage to carry on.

3. **Education**, firstly at least enough liberal education to enable him to sympathize with and appreciate all legitimate human interests in the community, and secondly, enough special education, especially in history and government, to make him a careful, critical, constructive student of the history and institutions of his own country.

4. **Utterance**, effective, convincing, compelling, lucid utterance by speech, pen and personal example.

5. The capacity to give and receive wise counsel from his associates and colleagues and even from large assemblies and masses of men.

6. The capacity to appoint and place competent trained, trustworthy lieutenants and subordinates, and to trust, direct and encourage them when they are appointed.

7. A wholehearted, unselfish devotion to the public service and a fixed, improveable determination to prefer always the public to private interests.

It would be interesting to examine and to measure the life and work of some great statesman by these criteria. The late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was outstanding at least in the first, second and fourth. The late Woodrow Wilson was equally outstanding in the third and fourth. He is said, however, by some to have been weak in the sixth and perhaps in the fifth. Possibly Mr. Gladstone would score a higher aggregate of marks on all seven points than any statesman of his time. We refrain from taking any examples from living statesmen.

#### IV

#### CANADA AND THE PROVINCES

The internal constitution of Canada is built upon the federal plan. This federal plan was admittedly taken from the constitution of the United States. There are, therefore, two parliaments everywhere in Canada, the Federal Parliament and the Provincial legislatures of the different constituent provinces. The powers of the Federal Parliament, twenty-nine in number, are laid out in section numbered ninety-one, and the powers of the provincial legislatures in section numbered ninety-two of the N. B. A. Act. All unenumerated powers are allotted to the Federal Parliament, but two of the powers named in section ninety-two and, therefore, allotted to the provincial legislatures, viz.: "Property and Civil Rights" and "Matters of a Local and Private Nature" are so comprehensive in their terms that most of the unenumerated powers have hitherto been given to the provincial legislatures by decisions of the Courts, notably by decisions of the Judicial Committee. These two groups of powers are entirely exclusive. The Parliament of Canada cannot trespass on the game preserves of the provincial legislatures nor the provincial legislatures upon those of the Parliament of Canada. Should any trespass occur, the case is carried to the Courts. Education is sacred to the provinces and is, therefore, in order to make its provincial character doubly clear, dealt with in a separate section numbered ninety-