



was threatened, there was no general desire for reciprocal trade with Canada. The *raison d'être* of his present attitude, Mr. Hill frankly explains:

"In ten or fifteen years, according to present indications, the United States will need every bushel of its wheat product at home. Would it then be disadvantageous for us to share in the products of the fields of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan?"

In other words, the complement essential to United States prosperity is being broken. While the factories of the East were capable of almost infinite expansion, the farms of the West were strictly limited by the quantity of arable land available. To this, add the fact that Western farmers have been notoriously prodigal of the fertility of their soil and the cause of Mr. Hill's anxious interest in "the fields of Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan" becomes apparent.

If Mr. Hill's Canadian railway policy and Canadian tariff policy are to succeed, the exchange of commerce between Eastern and Western Canada will practically cease to exist and certainly not increase to the hoped for vast dimensions. The grain of the Canadian West will be carried in increasing quantities to Minneapolis and there, will be ground into flour for exportation. The goods requirements of the farmers of the Canadian West will be supplied from Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, instead of from Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, and the cities of Eastern Canada. If interchange of commerce within the Dominion is essential to the growth of a strong self-supporting nation, then Canadians must be watchful of Mr. Hill, his railways, and his tariff policy.

Where Canada Stands

THERE is a lesson to be learned from the controversy over Professor Wrong's letter to the London "Spectator," in which it was stated that Canadians regard British policy towards this country with distrust and often anger. The lesson should be learned by Mr. Strachey, the editor of the "Spectator," and the other editors in England.

Professor Wrong's remarks were evoked by one of those imitating patronizing articles concerning Canada which English editors are only too prone to print. Not one Canadian in a hundred reads them, but many Canadians hear of them, and resent them.

The truth seems to be that Englishmen in the mass seem to be unable to get the "Colonial" idea out of their heads. Canada and Trinidad, Australia and Jamaica—all are "Colonies," and the dwellers in or the visitors from them are all "Colonials." Canadians, in the word of a Cabinet Minister at Ottawa, "doesn't like being bunched in with a lot of lazy officials and niggers." Condescension of the cordial variety is handed out to "Colonials" in large instalments. The American literary man who, sixty years ago, wrote concerning "A Certain Condescension in Foreigners," could have written a correspondingly acute treatise on the quality of condescensions which Canadians receive. They should not become irritated, but they do.

Professor Wrong told a lot of truth. The articulate classes who have thought deeply on the lamentable history of British dealing with Canadian interests are far from being unanimously glad and proud to occupy a position of tutelage, but it was a surprise to many to hear Professor Wrong boldly voice what they believe to be the truth; not that the Professor is any faintheart, but because it has not been considered discreet as yet to announce such views. If the truth were known, in many cases business reasons have prevented.

Another great source of trouble is the letters which some few enthusiasts send to English newspapers. The "Spectator" itself published one of them the other day in which the writer—who signed himself "Colonial"—announced that Canadians are wildly enthusiastic Britishers. He remarked in Kipling's verse:

"We were taught by our English mothers
To call Old England 'Home.'"

Of Canada that is simply not the truth. Eighty-seven per cent. of the people living in Canada were born in this country. Not five per cent. of that number ever crossed the ocean or have any prospect of ever crossing it. Canada is their home and their country. Has anybody ever heard a native-born Canadian call any country but Canada "home"? One country is enough

for them. They have a respect for Great Britain. Does the feeling go any further? Yes. Some of them, no matter what Canada's status might be, would fight in England's aid, but that does not check their national aspirations.

Traveller after traveller comes and goes back to England having learned nothing of the real attitude of the Canadian people. The few "All Red" enthusiasts frequently "fill them up." There is little real hostility to England but there is really great indifference. The visitors are slow to grasp the Canadian's attitude, which is that of one absorbed in his own business and not wishing to be disturbed. As for Mr. Strachey and his kind, there are a dozen reasons why they should know nothing of Canadian sentiment.

Mr. Hyman's Resignation.

THE Hon. Charles Hyman is an exception to the rule that Canadian cabinet ministers go South for coolness when the North gets too hot to hold them. Mr. Hyman's ill health is not merely an excuse; it is a fact. His constitution, strong as it is, has been undermined by his faithfulness to duty. Mr. Hyman took his office seriously. In the language of the street, he was a horse to work. He used to put two eight hour days into every one.

Before he went away he resigned his portfolio. Was he right in doing so? Seeing that politics is a game, was this just the best way the game could be played? Does a man throw his cards on the table before the hand is fought out? Some of Mr. Hyman's best friends think he would have done better to sit tight until the other fellows got tired of bluffing.

If every Conservative paper in Canada demanded it of Mr. Hyman, that would be no reason for him to resign, because the Conservative newspapers are the natural enemies of those at present in power at Ottawa. Their anger and their surprise at the wickedness of their political opponents is taken by the worldly wise with a grain of salt. If the weak sisters of the Liberal Press joined in the clamour, that would still be no particular reason why Mr. Hyman should yield points to the other side. Mr. Hyman's critics have no monopoly of virtue. If his accusers could wait a year to warm over their rotten herring, Mr. Hyman could fairly claim a similar period of time in which to think his resignation over. While it was very noble to give up the Department of Public Works at this stage, it would have been more discreet to have kept it until the election trial was over and he knew how the cards would stack for a new deal.

Mr. Hyman was the victim of a system of elections which has grown up in Canada whereby the statesman's right hand does not know what his left hand is doing. Which is to say, the rough chores of politics have fallen into hands not too nice. Very often the public man is up in the clouds where he cannot keep an eye on the unbridled enthusiasms which exist lower down. Whence come bribing, switching, ballot-stuffing and what is generally known as "fighting the devil with fire." For many years before Mr. Hyman impinged on politics, London was a place in which both sides used the recognized means of combating the Evil One with his own weapons. Mr. Hyman is the martyr of a bad practice, and the pity of it all is that the devil in this particular instance had no need of being fought that way. Although a great deal was said about the Autonomy Bill in that campaign, the Autonomy Bill was not the issue. Charlie Hyman was the issue. And the question was, would London turn him down for William Grey just when Sir Wilfrid Laurier had made a cabinet minister of him? Would London nip the career of a tried and favourite son just when it had burst into flower? London said no. And London was mighty proud of the man-to-man way in which the cabinet minister got out and made his canvass. Charlie Hyman would have won on his merits if there hadn't been a single dark lantern agent or one dollar of sly money in the constituency.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Hyman will find in the South not only health but courage. He can carry London again. His friends believe in him and would like to see him back in the Department of Public Works, of which he has been an able and efficient minister. He has done nothing in office to reflect on Sir Wilfrid Laurier's good judgment in choosing him as a business man to run a business department in a business way. The remuneration of a cabinet minister is not an object to a man like Mr. Hyman, but the honour is a great deal. He has given Canada his best service and Canada is under obligation to give him fair play.