

OUR HOME

VOL. V.

AUGUST, 1896.

No. 1.

POLICIES AND POLITICIANS.

The greatest defect in our system of government is that it does not distinguish between policies and politicians. A cert. in policy is represented by certain politicians. To overthrow these politicians is to overthrow the policy. The people may want the policy continued while they are disgusted with the politicians who administer it.

Where representative institutions prevail the government is supposed to represent the majority of the people, and it does in a certain sense. But it often happens that it only represents them on some one question which is considered of more importance than all the rest, and so the opinion of the people on many important questions is never known. It may even happen that a large government majority represents the will of the people in general on no question at all, for the votes of different sections at the same election may depend upon different questions, and adroit politicians will pay most attention, during a campaign, to the matter that most interests constituencies which they wish to represent. What the people of a small section want the people in general may be opposed to, and so the strength of a government may consist in the representation of sectional minorities on a large number of questions.

The people vote for the politicians? why should they not vote for the policies? If the constitution provided that a plebiscite on any public question should be taken on the petition of one half the voting population, the people could declare their policy, and then choose the men whom they wished to put it into effect. The policy of the people would be known; the men who were willing to carry it out could present themselves as candidates; and the people would choose their representatives on account of their honesty and administrative ability. It may be said that the men who believe in a policy

are the only ones who can properly administer it. This is true, and in the choice of representatives their views would have to be taken into account, but the people would not be so much at the mercy of any one party of politicians. They would have no reason to overlook any kind of wrong doing for the sake of maintaining a desirable policy, and candidates would have to stand on their own merits.

MOVING ON.

A great many people, in discussing the question of Canada's future, talk as if the country were always to stand still instead of moving on. It is very hard for some people to look at the future, but anyone can look at past. Well, look at the past. Does Canada stand now where it did twenty years ago? Compare the cities and towns of to-day with the cities and towns of that day. Note the changes in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa, Winnipeg, Hamilton, Halifax and St. John. Look at Vancouver and a host of other thriving towns that had no existence then. Make an estimate of the time it would take to travel over every mile of railway in Canada to-day; then ascertain how long it would have taken to have travelled over every mile of railway that Canada possessed twenty years ago. Visit the great annual exhibitions in all our larger cities and compare them with the little fairs of twenty years ago. Inspect our schools and colleges and churches. Look about you on every side and then answer the question, "Is Canada standing still or moving on?" The answer will certainly be "moving on." Yes, we are moving on, and the progress of the future will be greater than the progress of the past. We will move on by the lightning express instead of by the stage coach. The Dominion is fast becoming a network of railways, and railways induce immigration, bring distant towns into hand-shaking dis-