



IT is amazing to me that friends of British connection as well as British statesmen "at home" should desire to keep up our present relation in this country to treaty-making with our next-door neighbour. What under the sun have they to gain by it? Of what advantage is it to the British Government to lock up a treaty, just agreed upon between the British Ambassador and the American Secretary of State, until certain formalities have been gone through with—to surround it with official secrecy, as it were, while all the while the provisions of the treaty are public property in the United States, are discussed not only in the American Senate but in the American press, and are even cabled to the London *Times* from "our own correspondent" in New York or Washington? If there be any gain from secrecy, it is not obtained; for secrecy is not observed. The American Senate is not bound to regard any treaty as private, though it has been its custom to debate them with closed doors. But the doors must usually be a-jar; for the gist of their discussions invariably leaks out and is published freely in the newspapers.

YET the whole situation is intensely exasperating to the Canadian citizen. A treaty is being made at Washington practically between his country and the United States. The chief negotiator for Canada is the British Ambassador. With this, we have not the slightest fault to find, especially when a Canadian expert is called in to advise the British representative. We are conscious that the backing of British prestige is a great benefit; and are ready to believe that the Americans would not give us a very patient hearing if we were to appear in the conference room alone. We are not very deeply impressed, however, by the assurance that we gain greatly by the diplomatic experience of the British Ambassadors—even when they have diplomatic experience, which the present excellent Ambassador has not—for we are conceited enough to imagine that we are "better bargainers" in accordance with the American method than are our European trained brothers, and that if we were given the British prestige without the intervention of the usual British Ambassador, we would get the more satisfactory bargain out of our capital neighbour and "brother chip."

BUT we do not dream of asking that. We realise perfectly that so long as Britain supplies the force, she must have full control of all British negotiations in which it plays even a silent part. Not that there is the slightest risk of war with the United States. It is merely a line fence and "fishing hole" agreement which is to be

struck. Thus we are entirely content until the bargain is reached. But then we feel that we are needlessly humiliated. The text of the bargain is reduced to two copies. One is handed to the American Government which promptly sends it on to a branch of the American Federal Legislature, where it is discussed by political representatives of the sections of the country most interested. Doubtless citizens concerned are invited to Washington to instruct their Senators; and every American interest touched is immediately informed and given an opportunity to make its wants known and its influence felt. The other copy is sealed up and sent—not to Ottawa—but to London; and there it will not be made public until the American Senate has agreed to the original text.

CANADIANS concerned may get such information as they can from what is published in the American press. They cannot go to Ottawa to instruct their political representatives; for Parliament knows nothing about it. It is true that the Imperial Parliament is similarly in the dark; but in what way does that improve our position? We lack even the safeguard which might be afforded by such members of the Imperial Parliament as would take an interest in the Canadian case. We are now told that we may never know officially what was in the Waterways Treaty if the American Senate refuses to ratify it. Yet what harm would have been done if a third copy of that treaty had been sent to Sir Wilfrid Laurier with permission to lay it before Parliament, or—if the farce of secrecy was to be kept up—before a small committee of Parliament with power to discuss it quite in the American Senatorial fashion? It would not have become any more public than it is to-day; but Canadian interests would have been put on a level with American interests and Canadian self-respect would not have been wounded. If the British Government preferred to still observe Old World methods in dealing with "business-is-business" Americans, the British people could at least have had the satisfaction of getting their information from their Canadian rather than their American "own correspondents."

IT is to be feared that the British statesman does not always realise the political wisdom of making it as difficult as possible for critics to say to Canadians that they bear burdens or suffer disabilities because of British connection. The British statesman comes in contact only with the imitation-English and intelligent few. He does not know "the cross roads philosopher" or the corner grocery statesman. He is unaware of the fact that Americans have a habit of jibing Canadians for being "subjects" to a "monarchy" and lacking the glorious freedom of citizens of a republic. He should consult some of the German immigrants who will not stay in Canada because it is "under a monarchy" but seek the "liberty" of the free Republic to the south. Now this possibly unenlightened controversy is greatly affected by such incidents as that supplied by these treaties. As Sam Hunter put it so vigorously in the *World*, here is "Jack Canuck" refused a look at his own treaty, while our Uncle Samuel is quietly reading it through in the background. That sort of thing does not serve to keep our people contented and to make sure the basis of permanent British connection. Surely it would be prudent to trim off a little bit of European red tape to make us feel better at a time when circumstances are about to demand of us real sacrifices for Imperial defence. These real sacrifices we will bear readily enough. It is the useless tying of our hands while Uncle Sam grins at us that bites to the bone.

N'IMPORTE



Delegates attending the Annual Convention of the Canadian Forestry Association, which was opened by Lord Grey at Convocation Hall, Toronto, on February 11th. Among those in the group are President W. B. Snowball, Hon. Frank Cochrane, Hon. W. C. Grimmer, Mr. M. J. Macoun, Professor Fernow, Mr. E. Stewart, Mr. Archille Bergevin, Mr. Thomas Southworth, Mr. A. T. Drummond and other prominent workers on behalf of Forest Preservation.