

T378
B64
1923

THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

By

MARLOW BONNER

B 643

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

1923

23.00

The Government of Canada

The oversea possessions of the British Empire are grouped into crown colonies, protectorates, and dominions. Canada comes within the dominion group. In all of England's dominion possessions there are parliaments or legislatures elected on democratic franchises, and responsible governments.

The term "responsible government" is a comparatively new one in British colonial history. It means that in each dominion there is a parliament and an executive called the ministry, which is dependent for its tenure on the continuous support of a majority in the House of Commons.

The establishment of representative and responsible government in the dominion was a gradual process. It went on obviously from 1840, when the provinces of Quebec and Ontario were united, until 1893. Great Britain finally realized that as concessions towards autonomy were granted the links binding the dominion to her became stronger instead of weaker.

The study of popular government in Canada derives a peculiar interest from the fact that while the economic and social conditions of the country are generally similar to those of the United States, the political institutions have been framed upon English models, and the political usages have retained an English character. Thus it is that in Canada, the working of the English system can be judged in its application to the facts of a new and swiftly growing country.

The Dominion of Canada is a country more than three thousand miles long from east to west, with a region, which at the meridian of 114° W - is about seven hundred miles broad from north to south. North of Lakes Huron and Superior there is a barren and rocky tract of land, and therefore, almost uninhabited, which separates the fertile districts of Ontario from the Prairie Provinces, lying further west. This tract will remain thinly peopled, unless valuable minerals are discovered in parts of it. The natural resources of the Dominion, be-

230

sides its mineral wealth, consist in vast areas of rich soil, in large forests, and in the fisheries of the Maritime Provinces. There is coal in Nova Scotia and many parts of the west, with large deposits on the Pacific coasts also. The total quantity of coal is second only to that in the United States and Alaska. The climate on the Atlantic side is very severe in the winter but it is everywhere healthy.

Agriculture is now and may long continue to be the chief source of livelihood, and forestry may provide employment for centuries if fires are checked and replanting is carried out. Mining is now confined to comparatively few districts, but aided by the utilization of the enormous volume of water power, it cannot help but increase. At present the bulk of the population are tillers of the soil dwelling in rural areas or small towns; huge cities like those in the United States being comparatively few. The total population is about 8,000,000 and only two cities, Montreal and Toronto, have more than 300,000 inhabitants. There is plenty of good land to be had at a moderate price, and the agricultural class lives in comfort and prosperity. There is hardly any pauperism and need be none at all.

There is no opposition to immigration, so the population is likely to go on increasing for years to come, especially in the western half of the country. The land is almost entirely in the hands of small owners, which fact serves to attract immigrants. As great estates are unknown, great financial or commercial fortunes are few.

With the growth of commerce and the development of the country generally the opportunities for accumulating are now fast increasing, as they did in the United States about fifty years ago. There are not many great capitalists, or great incorporated companies, taking a hand in politics for their own interests. The element of working men congregated in large centers of industry and organized in labor unions, has not yet found leaders of conspicuous capacity, nor acquired a voting power which can tell upon the action of governments and party organizations.

The influence of Race and Religion is a very important factor in the administration of the Government of Canada. When Canada was ceded to England by France in 1763, the French speaking inhabitants numbered 60,000. They have now grown to nearly two and a half millions, or about one-third of the whole population. The great majority of these French speakers dwell in the Province of Quebec, but a large number are also found in Eastern and Northern Ontario, and in the Maritime Provinces. Few of the inhabitants of Quebec speak English. They constitute a community retaining French manners and ideas, quite distinct from those of the British districts. This separation is mainly due to religion, for they are all Roman Catholics, deeply attached to their faith. Nowhere in the world did the Roman priesthood during the last century exert so great a power in politics.

The Constitution of Canada presents no original feature. There is nothing in any of its provisions to attract attention by reason of its novelty; its chief interest lies rather in the way in which it is applied.

According to the British North America Act. 1867, Article 9, Canada is a Dominion of which the King of England is sovereign. As a matter of fact its constitution is that of almost all independent federal republics. The evolution of the Canadian Constitution may be divided up into four periods, each of which constitutes a distinct advance upon the one preceding.

During the ten years that followed the Treaty of Paris in 1763, the country was placed under the most arbitrary rule. French Catholics were kept systematically outside the government.

In 1774 the Quebec Act introduced some important improvements into this conquerors' rule. Henceforward, English and French were put on an equal footing and the use of our language was sanctioned in official documents.

As a result of the American Revolution and the great influx of royalists which ensued, the numbers of the English in Canada were greatly increased, and it became possible to give the colony a larger measure of self-government.

By the constitutional Act of 1791, Canada was divided into two provinces, upper and Lower Canada. Two chambers were created in both provinces, one to be chosen by the Government, the other to be elected. The weakness in the system was the fact that the Ministry was not responsible to the elective Assembly and that there was a rivalry between the elected Deputies and the Ministers. This resulted in an open revolt in 1837, under the leadership of the celebrated Papineau. The revolt was suppressed, and for two years the French province was placed again under despotic rule. Some drastic reform was necessary so Lord Dierham, as special envoy, advised the British Government to grant Canada complete autonomy.

The Union Act of 1840 united the two provinces and merged the two elective assemblies into one. It was under the Union of 1840 that the Canadian people served its apprenticeship to constitutional life.¹

In the years from 1861 to 1864 there was instability of political conditions in the United Provinces that was without precedent in the English speaking world. In October, 1864, all of the provinces sent representatives to Quebec. The Quebec Convention agreed on a federal instead of a legislative union. This was the first constitutional convention in the history of the British Empire. Seventy-four confederation resolutions were issued, which were embodied in the British North America Act passed by the Imperial parliament. The act received the royal assent on March 29, and the Dominion came into existence on July 1, 1867. There was no contention over the bill, either in the House of Lords or in the House of Commons. Some members of the House of Commons regretted that the act did not create a supreme court. Throughout Great Britain there was a popular attitude towards Confederation.

Confederation involved quite important changes in political organization for the provinces which came under the term of the British North America Act. These changes were necessary because each province had thenceforward to elect two groups of parliamentary representatives; one for the Dominion House of

1. Siegfried's Race Question in Canada, p. 135.

Commons, and the other for the Provincial Legislature. After Confederation the relations of the colonial office in London were only with the Government at Ottawa, and not with the five provincial capitals, as in the period before 1867. In 1873 an end was made in practice to the reservation of bills by the governor-general. The fulness of the concessions to the old British North American provinces has been made obvious by half a century's experience of the working of the British North American Act. Treaty making power, a very important concession, was fully conceded in 1907. Federal union has been costly and is still costly to Canada, in view of its enormous area and its comparatively small and scattered population. It has its inconveniences, arising from some of the direct methods of taxation, and the lack of uniformity as regards bankruptcy, usury, and other laws affecting commerce. No one will deny, however, that federal union has been, and is, worth all that it has cost.

The movement in the United Provinces for a union of all the British North American Provinces, was stimulated by the success of the United States under the federal system. The Fathers of Confederation noted some defects in the system used in the States, and realized that they must establish a federal union with a constitution that would reduce to a minimum the likelihood of friction between the central government and the various provincial governments. Macdonald said that the fatal error of the American constitution was in making each state a distinct sovereignty. He also said that the true principle of confederation lies in giving to the general government all the principles and powers of sovereignty. These principles laid down by Macdonald were adopted at Quebec. It was

2

agreed that in the division of powers between the Dominion and provincial governments the residuum should be in the Dominion government, and not reserved to the provinces, as in the constitution of the United States. At the same time there was retained for each province as ample measure of municipal liberty as could

2. Porritt's Evolution of Dominion of Canada, p. 224.

allow them to exercise those local powers which they exercise with advantage to the community. The enactment of criminal law was assigned to the central parliament.

The division of powers made by the British North America Act may be classified into four divisions. In the first division are those subjects which are assigned exclusively to the Dominion parliament. Twenty-nine subjects are enumerated, such as public debt and property and the regulation of trade and commerce. In the second division are those which are assigned exclusively to the provincial legislatures. In the third are the subjects of concurrent legislation, such as immigration and agriculture. The fourth division comprises the subject of education.

Before the Confederation there was a governor-general established at the capital of the United Provinces, and a governor in each of the other provinces. They were all appointed by the crown, on the advice of the colonial office in London, and were sent out from Great Britain.

By the British North American Act the office of governor-general was continued; and governors of the other provinces ceased to be appointed by the colonial office, but by the governor-general. The relation between the governor-general and the cabinet were not changed. There is no law of the imperial parliament which established the cabinet at Ottawa exactly, as it is constituted today. The cabinet system is simply based on usage.

The United Provinces had an unwritten as well as a written constitution. The power of the legislative council in respect to money bills was determined by the unwritten constitution. The constitution of the Dominion has important parts which are still unwritten. Among these is the restricted power of the Senate over money bills which will be explained later on.

The British North America Act imposed new duties and added responsibilities on the governor-in-council. The appointment of lieutenant-governor of the provinces is now vested in the governor-general-in-council; also the responsibility of disallowing acts passed by the provincial legislatures, and lastly the power of issuing orders-in-council. Orders in council are orders issued from the governor-

general-in-council which have the force of law. These new duties and responsibilities serve to add to the dignity and the nominal importance of the governor-general. The governor-general-in-council in reality is not much more than the title of the cabinet.

There is a high-backed, decorated chair in the chamber of the King's privy council at Ottawa. It is reserved for the King's representative but the occasions are very rare when the regal chair has been occupied by the governor-general during a session of the cabinet.

The governor-general's attitude on all political questions must be absolutely non-partisan. His attitude towards political parties must be the same as the attitude of the King towards political parties at Westminster. He must accept the services of the group of party leaders who can command a majority in the House of Commons. He must be ready at any time, however, to accept the services of the leaders of the opposition if the party in power falls. The position of the governor-general in Canada is similar to that of the King of England.

The political history of Canada from 1867 to 1917 is filled with corruption and scandals, which have developed out of methods used to raise money for election campaigns and similar things. The governor-general is aware of these facts, but his position is such as to make corrective action on his part impossible. However great the scandal, there can be no interference by him, so long as the political party in the majority supports the government in the House of Commons.

The Dominion of Canada is under responsible government in the fullest meaning of the term. In her internal affairs there can never be any uninvited interference from Great Britain. This is one of the fundamental principles of the relations between the two. The government of Canada can be made responsible in the widest sense of the term, only by the action of the men and women of Canada. It can be made actually responsible to all the people of the Dominion only by public opinion, expressed at the polls. Public opinion in Canada is slow in expressing

itself at the polls, against a government under which corruption has been manifested. Only once, in 1874, have the electors dethroned a government because it has proved corrupt. The party supporters of the government in the House of Commons vote with the government under all conditions. Nowhere in the English speaking world are party lines more rigidly adhered to than in Canada.

On the everyday political life of Canada, the governor-general has not as much influence as the editors of a newspaper that is not tied to any political party. He does not have even academic freedom. He must not venture even a hint of contemporary politics in public. One governor-general has declared however, that he could accomplish more as the executive in Canada without legal power than he could in some other colonies with it.

Some of the functions attached to this office are ceremonial, while others are only formal. The most important mission of the governor-general is to see that, no matter what may happen to contending political parties, the King's business in Canada goes on. The complete aloofness of his office from the fortunes of all political parties, and the fact that his term at Ottawa is fixed, gives value to his position. It is inconceivable that responsible government could continue without a governor-general sent out from England.

The British North America Act provided that there should be a Senate and a House of Commons, and that members of the Senate should be appointed by the crown, acting through the governor-general. The principle of an elected upper chamber was discarded. In practice the first statement meant that the senators were to be appointed by the cabinet at Ottawa.

The qualifications for senator are: that he shall be 30 years old; that he shall be a natural born or naturalized subject of the King; that he shall hold freehold property of the value of \$4000 above all incumbrances; that his personal property shall be worth \$4000 above all debts and liabilities; and, that he shall be resident in the province for which he is appointed.

Senators at Ottawa from Quebec represent senatorial divisions, while senators from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia represent their provinces at large. The concession of senatorial districts was held to be necessary to safeguard the sectional interest of the province. The true interest of upper Canada was that her very best men should be sent to the legislative council wherever they might happen to reside. Lower Canada felt that she had French-Canadian interest as well as British interest to be protected. Quebec, since 1867, has always had more peculiar interest to safeguard than any of the other provinces. For French-Canadians, religion and languages are the most important of these interests. The British population in Quebec is largely urban. It's special care is the industrial, commercial and maritime interests of Montreal, which are not the interests of the rural population. The claim that the Senate represents the provinces and safeguards their interest grows out of these peculiar interests of Quebec.

The subject of membership of the Senate will now be discussed. In 1867 there were seventy-two senators from the three geographical divisions of Canada. In 1916, at the plea of the Dominion Parliament the British North America Act was amended by the Parliament at Westminster; and the Senate has since consisted of ninety-six members. There are now four geographical divisions instead of three. These are Ontario, Quebec, the Maritime Provinces, and Canada beyond the Great Lakes.

If a deadlock occurs between the Senate and the House of Commons additional senators may be appointed. The number of these appointments is fixed at four or eight; and including seats for Senators from Newfoundland, the total number of Senators cannot exceed 110.

The Senators hold their office for life in order that the upper house may be a thoroughly independent body. A Senator can resign any time and his seat becomes vacant in any of the following cases: if he fails to attend

Parliament for two consecutive sessions; if he becomes a citizen of a foreign country; if he goes into bankruptcy; if he is convicted of a treason or any infamous crime; if he ceases to be qualified in respect to property and residence.

The payment of wages or salaries to senators in Canada is another constitutional fiction. As a matter of fact wages and traveling expenses have been paid to them from the first. The constitutional fiction is that these payments are not in return for services rendered, but to replenish members for loss they may sustain in attending to their parliamentary duties. Senators and members of the House of Commons have always received equal indemnities. They are paid \$2500 a session and may travel free. They have also the privilege of franking letters and parcels through the mails. Members of the House of Lords in England are paid no salaries.

The chamber of the Senate is colloquially known as the red chamber, from the color of the upholstery and hangings. It is modeled on the chamber of the House of Lords at Westminster and is the scene of state ceremonies. The Commons are summoned here when the King's speech at the opening or closing of the session is about to be read by the governor-general.

The chair of the Speaker of the Senate stands at the left of the throne. The place of black rod is at the bar, and it is at this bar that the commons stand when they have been summoned to the chamber. There are large galleries for visitors.

The senators sit in chairs, which is a departure from the custom of the House of Lords, where the members sit on benches. The chairs, two deep, face each other the length of the chamber. Senators who are supporters of the government sit, as in Westminster, to the right of the speaker. Members of the opposition sit to the left.

The ministry in England is divided (unevenly) between the House of Lords and the House of Commons. 'Every member of the cabinet at Ottawa must be either of the House of Commons, or of the Senate. There have been cabinets of

which no member was of the Senate. Thus it comes about that there is nothing in the Senate chamber which corresponds with the treasury bench in the House of Commons. In the United States no member of the cabinet may sit in Congress.

There is, however, always a leader for the government in the Senate. It is his duty to pilot government bills through the upper house. Questions in the Senate are addressed to the government leader. There is also a leader of the opposition in the Senate. The member to whom this position is assigned is elected in party caucus.

A new session of the Senate is opened with the speech from the throne - a speech which is prepared for the governor-general by the cabinet and in which the legislative work of the session is outlined. In England the speech from the throne is delivered by the King, after it has been prepared by the prime minister and cabinet.

Some bills originate in the Senate - private member bills and bills for divorce - rather than government bills. The Senate gives leave to introduce a bill and it is read the first time. At second reading the general principle of a bill is discussed; and after being read a second time it goes to committee. Causes and details are discussed in committee. It is reported both to the Senate, with or without amendment, and is then ready for the third reading. After a bill is read a third time it is carried to the House of Commons, and if amendments are made there it is returned to the Senate to adopt or reject. Discussion between the two houses over bills is by message. The rule for discussion in the United States is by conference and not by message. Great Britain discusses by message since 1851.

Finance bills cannot originate in the Senate. England has this same rule as to finance bills. By the Reform Bill of 1911, the House of Lords in England cannot hold up a money bill except for one month, and their power over other public bills can only hold them back for two years. This added a great deal to the power of the House of Commons in England and since that time the House of

Lords has been merely a cautious chamber of revision.

Unlike the Senate at Washington, the Canadian Senate has no part in originating or moulding tariff legislation.

In the initiation of bills, the activities of the Senate are much less than those of the House of Commons. This is also true in the case of the two houses at Westminster. The Senate is a revising chamber, just as the House of Lords in England. The Canadian Senate is not an impartial chamber of review. Its service as a revising body has been very spasmodic. It was vigilant only in the years that followed a change of government.

Before the Confederation the upper chamber in Canada had been continuously unsatisfactory. Confederation intended to create a Senate that would begin a new and better era in the history of the upper chamber. This expectation has not been even partially realized. The position of Senate is a highly privileged one. But privilege and freedom have been of no avail. Senators have never played a prominent part in Dominion politics. There have been only five even of national fame in the Senate since 1867. Senators are unknown to "the man of the street".

The people of Canada have been continuously indifferent to the Senate and its proceedings. Canadian newspaper ignore its debates. The reason for popular indifference is that the creation of the Senate in 1867 did not begin a better era in the history of upper chambers. It has even flouted public opinion. The Senate has never been an ambitious branch of the legislature and has always been free of office holders. The Senate admittedly has not exercised the influence in parliament that was expected by the Fathers of Confederation. The men who seek appointment to the Senate are not generally of the highest class. They are generally those who regard a senatorship and life salary as their due for services in Dominion politics to the party in power. The government has not made any serious effort to save the post of senator as a reward for any other kind of public service. From the early years of Confederation appointments to the Senate were always regard-

ed as the patronage of a political party. The principle that to the victors belong the spoils is nearly as old in Canada as it is in the United States.

In 1918, as a war measure, there was some reform in the distribution of patronage, but the principle was continuously applied to the speakership of the Senate and House of Commons. The Speaker of the Senate, who is paid a salary of \$4000 and given an apartment within the parliament building, is appointed by the government. In England, the Lord Chancellor presides over the House of Lords.

The spoils system was most rigidly adhered to in appointments to the Senate. The Canadian constitution places a vast patronage in governments. This same situation would exist in the United States if the president appointed every senator, every governor, and every federal and state judge. As it is, Senators in the United States, are elected by the people, two from each state. They hold office for six years, one third going out every two years.

The attitude of political parties toward the senate will not be explained. About 1900, when the Liberal government was confronted with a hostile majority in the Senate, the Senate rejected four or five government bills. In 1916 when a conservative government was faced with a liberal majority, the Senate rejected six or seven bills or so amended them as to make them unacceptable to the government. When the majorities in the Senate and House of Commons are harmonious, government bills are never rejected, or even amended in any way that will make them unacceptable to the government. At these times the Senate at Ottawa is as docile as any upper chamber in the world. At these times its sittings for public business are not continuous from day to day like the sittings of the House of Commons. The sittings seldom extend beyond the dinner hour. The sole business of the Senate as regards government bills generally is to say ditto to the House of Commons. Only a new government, which is temporarily without a majority in the Senate, need fear the power that the Senate can exercise as a Chamber of revision.

Senators never resign except when they are appointed lieutenant-governor of provinces. Most of them are quite elderly. Death or failure to attend for two consecutive parliamentary sessions creates on an average five or six vacancies a year. There is always a long waiting list for appointment to the Senate. On the list are names of men in the House of Commons who are tired of close attendance on the house, with the physical and nervous strain it entails. Men are also on the list who have held cabinet office in provincial administrations, and who are out of a job. Others are owners or editors of newspapers who conceive that a seat in the Senate would be some return for the services they have rendered to their political party. As vacancies in the Senate occur, the agitation for Senate reform completely dies away. One Canadian Chronicler wrote this: "Nature may be fairly depended upon to wipe out the surplus senators before next session"⁴. Both conservatives and Liberals agree to reform the Senate but before they become the majority party, but then they do not give it another thought.

The Senate of Canada has rendered a few public services such as improving details of bills sent to it from the House of Commons and serving as a divorce court for five provinces. It has also rendered two distinctly party services. Twice its existence has made it possible for a political party, defeated at general election, to bother and thwart a new government. Its existence has added quite largely to the patronage of governments, and this enabled them to keep in line a larger number of office-seeking partisans.

The Canadian Senate has a peculiar interest in students of parliamentary institutions. This is due to its failure to realize the expectations of the Fathers of Confederation, to its failure to make a beneficent impression on politics in Canada, and to its failure to convince the people of Canada, during its fifty years' existence, that it has been of any possible public usefulness. These facts make it the most interesting upper chamber in the world. It is especially interesting when we remember the fact that it represents the fourth attempt since 1791 to establish a second or upper chamber, modeled after the House of Lords.

⁴. Porritt's - Evolution of the Dominion of Canada, p. 303.

The House of Commons is the real center of political power in Canada. The representation of the provinces was redistributed in 1914 so now the number of members stands at 234. The province of Quebec, by the British North America Act is entitled to a fixed number of 65, and the other provinces are represented in proportion of their population. Parliament is not free in enacting redistribution bills; it is simply the instrument of the law. Quebec is the only province which can look on without concern when a redistribution bill comes up; thus Quebec is the pivotal province.

The provincial legislatures determine the franchises on which members of the House of Commons shall be elected. This is in accordance with the Federal principle. The provincial legislatures also have the right to divide the provinces into congressional districts. Canada has not followed the example of the United States in the redistribution of population. It has never permitted the provincial legislatures to map out the electoral constituencies from which representatives of the province are elected to the House of Commons. Redistribution is regarded as a privilege of the party in power. Equal electoral divisions have never been attempted by either Liberal or Conservative governments. Favorable treatment has always been given to the rural divisions. Both political parties accept the principle of a larger unit for urban than for rural constituencies. The reason for this is that if the same unit of population were given to cities and counties, in rural constituencies you would have such a large area of territory as to be almost impossible to cover, as there is a very large territory with a sparse population in Canada.

With only a few exceptions, all the 234 electoral divisions are single-member constituencies. Divisions of counties are known as "ridings". The term "division" in Canada is applied only in cities which return three or more members. Electoral divisions are not numbered, as in the United States, but are named. A member of the House of Commons is never mentioned in debate by name, but is referred to as the "Honorable member" for whatever constituency he represents.

In England, the members of the House of Commons are elected by single districts, as are our Congressmen, with the exception that a few districts elect two members each.⁵ The population of the districts varies greatly, the average being about 60,000. The districts or constituencies are of three kinds: boroughs, counties, and universities. The reason for county, borough, and university constituencies is that thus each of these differing interests is assured a fair representation. The English voters enjoy the privilege of double or plural voting, but no one may cast over two votes. The franchise in England is granted to all men over 21, all women over 30, and to those who were actively engaged in the war at 19.

By section 41 of the British North America Act, it was provided that the electoral laws of the provinces should apply to the election of members to the House of Commons. In 1885 a uniform franchise was established in all the provinces. There were eight qualifications for voters. These were (1) owners and occupiers of real estate of the value of \$300 in a city, and \$200 in a town; (2) persons in receipt of incomes of at least \$300; (3) life annuities of \$100 a year; (4) farmers sons, living at home; (5) sons of owners of real property; (6) tenants of property paying more than \$2 a month rental; (7) fishermen owning fishing gear to the value of \$150; (8) Indians in possession of district tracts of land in an Indian reserve, with improvements valued at \$150. The franchise was thus based on property in accordance with the principles of the Conservative party. The Act of 1885 provided that there should be a revision of the electoral rolls each year. This act was condemned in all the provinces as a departure from the federal principle. The Liberals opposed it as it made property the basis of voting instead of manhood suffrage.

In 1898 there was a reversion of provincial franchises, and since then members of the House of Commons have again, as from 1867 to 1885, been elected on the same franchises as members of the provincial legislatures.

5. Porritt's - Evolution of Dominion of Canada, p. 317.

The general requisites for voting at Dominion elections are: that a man shall be a nature-born Canadian or a subject of the King by naturalization; that he shall be 21 years old; and not disqualified by reason of insanity or by conviction of crime. In 1917 a war-time election act was passed. It enfranchised wives, widows, mothers and sisters of Canadian soldiers and sailors who had gone overseas to fight with England. After the war this bill ceased to affect the Dominion elections act; the general law became the same as it was before the war.

Manhood suffrage has long been established in all the provinces except Nova Scotia and Quebec. In Nova Scotia the vote is based on real or personal property. The franchise in Quebec is based on property, or on income, except for teachers in schools under the management of trustees.

Canada's electoral system was modeled after that of England. Most of these old world laws and usages have passed. The plural vote has survived longer than any of the other importations, but it survives now only in Nova Scotia.

The British Parliament determines the qualification of a member of the House of Commons. Any British subject may be a candidate for a seat. No qualification in real estate is required of any candidate. There is no residential qualification and a Canadian is eligible as a parliamentary candidate at any election in England, Scotland, or Ireland, as soon as he arrives in the country. As in England, it is not necessary that a member reside in the constituency that he represents. These easy conditions make a parliamentary career possible for a man of ability who has an instinct for politics. He can regard it as opening to him a career in Dominion politics. Canada and England would never have reached their present high state of development and efficiency if they had not had non-residential qualification for members of the House of Commons.

Those who are disqualified for parliamentary candidates are government contractors, members of provincial legislatures, men who have been convicted of corrupt practices at elections, public officers, and civil servants⁶. In England, royal officials are not allowed to sit in the House of Commons. This law was en-
6. Wallace's Government of England, p. 38.

acted years ago to check the influence of the King. No peer may be elected to the Commons.

General elections in Canada do not come at fixed and regular periods. The election of a new House of Commons begins a new parliament. The term can last for five years but it is possible for the governor-general to dissolve parliament at any time, in one of two cases. He must grant a dissolution if his ministers ask for it; and he can order a dissolution at a crisis, which in his, (the governor-general's) opinion renders it necessary that there should be a general appeal to the constituencies. With only a few exceptions, parliaments have run nearly their full course of five years⁷. The English House of Commons are elected for a term of five years, but are never allowed to serve out the full term. The Cabinet of course, desire that the election shall come at a time when the people are favorably impressed with their party, so they frequently appeal to the people just after the passage of some popular law. The House of Commons may show their approval or disapproval of the Ministry by passing a vote of lack of confidence; by passing a hostile measure; by refusing to pass a government measure; and by filling vacancies with members of the opposition party.

The last session of a Canadian Parliament before dissolution ends in exactly the same way as any other session. There is the usual speech from the throne in the Senate Chamber and a royal proclamation dissolving parliament. It is announced in the proclamation that an order has been given to the crown clerk to issue the necessary writs for the new Parliament. The writs go out in the name of the King and there is a separate writ for each electoral division. The sheriff is commanded to cause election to be made in every district and also to cause the nomination of candidates at the election. The election is held seven days after the nomination.

Before the writs have been received by the retiring officers party conventions have been held in each constituency at which candidates have been

7. Wallace's Government of Canada, p. 50.

chosen. The premier of the government which was in existence has issued his manifesto to all the electors of the Dominion, and the leader of the opposition has issued a similar manifesto. Each candidate has made his address to the constituency he desires to represent.

The returning officer knows nothing of political parties. It does not come within his duty to make inquiries as to the party affiliations of the electors. He is legally required to see (1) that the person named in each nominating paper has consented to the nomination; and (2) that along with each nominating paper there is a deposit of \$200. British parliamentary candidates pay official expenses of elections; the candidate must make a deposit large enough to cover his quota of the official expenses. The Dominion treasury pays official expenses at elections in Canada. There is an undemocratic feature in the election code of 1882. Each candidate must deposit \$200 with the returning officer before his nomination is accepted. If he is successful, the deposit is returned. It is not returned to the unsuccessful candidate if he fails to obtain a number of votes at least equal to one half the number polled by the candidate elected. The object of this law is to prevent irresponsible men from thrusting themselves into an election, and it is obviously an aid in maintaining party discipline. Labor has always put up a strong opposition to the election deposit.

Elections to the House of Commons at Ottawa are very simple. There are three or four constituencies in which electors vote for the candidates. In the other 220 electoral divisions the electors vote for one or other of two candidates. At Dominion elections only members of the House of Commons are chosen. There are no party emblems on the ballots to indicate with which political party the candidate is affiliated.

The term "Liberal" or "Conservative" has never been embodied in a Canadian act of parliament, altho these parties have existed since 1792. All political parties in Canada are without statutory recognition.

The names of candidates are printed on the ballot papers in alpha-

betical order. The electoral code of the Dominion determines the size and every detail of the ballot paper. The hours of polling are from nine to five o'clock. Ballots are counted at the polling station by the deputy returning officer. Each writ is promptly returned to the clerk of the crown at Ottawa.

Each candidate is required by law to appoint an election agent. At elections in England the maximum sum that can be expended by a candidate is fixed by law. The sum is determined by the number of electors, and by the general character of the constituency. In Canada there is no such restriction on election expenses. They are within the control of the candidate.

Petitions arising out of elections are tried before two judges of the superior court of the province in which the election in dispute was held.

A member of the House of Commons may resign at any time by a formal notification to the speaker. A member of the English House of Commons can free himself from service only by being appointed to the stewardship of Chiltern Hundreds. This office is called a sinecure as it has no duties attached. Occasionally a member of the Canadian House of Commons accepts an appointment to a country postmastership that happens to be vacant. He holds the office for a day or two then hands his resignation to the postmaster-general.

There is no fixed time for the assembling of the Canadian parliament, but it must meet at least once each year. The financial year of the Dominion ends on March 31, and a new parliament practically begins at this time. Parliament is convened by a proclamation, issued by the governor-general. The date of its assembly is determined by the cabinet. The sessions usually extend from November until April or May. Parliament at Westminster is usually in session from February until August.

When a new parliament assembles the House of Commons is without a speaker, and the clerk presides until he is elected. The speaker is the chairman of the Commons for the purpose of maintaining order and interpreting the rules of the House. At Ottawa the position of the speaker towards political parties is

midway between the position of the speaker at Washington and that of the speaker at Westminster. The speaker at Westminster is non-partisan and is usually reelected no matter what party comes into power. The speaker at Washington is the leader of the majority party in the House of Representatives, and after his election remains a party man. The choice of the speaker at Ottawa lies with the cabinet, as at Westminster. The nomination is moved by the premier who is usually of the Commons and leader for the government in the House. A second candidate is rarely nominated and a division is seldom taken on the motion for the election of speaker. The speaker at Ottawa is seldom of the leaders of his political party. He must be non-partisan and does not attend party causes. He does not completely sever himself from his party, as does the speaker at Westminster, but may make political addresses in his constituency and elsewhere.

The speaker at Ottawa serves only during the lifetime of one parliament. It has long been a custom that when one political party continues in power for two or three parliaments, if the speaker in one is of British origin the next one shall be a French-Canadian. It is a rule also that the offices of speaker and duty-speaker can at no time be held by men of the same race. The offices of clerks and serjeant-at-arms are also divided between the two races. The origin of division of offices dates back to the early years of the United Provinces, when Quebec and Ontario elected exactly the same number of members to the legislature. Quebec today elects only 65 of the 234 members of the House of Commons and its population is not one-fourth of the population of the Dominion. But an equal division of the offices of the House of Commons is regarded by Quebec as necessary to the preservation of its rights and privileges.

After the speaker has pledged himself to maintain the rights of the Commons, the Commons are summoned by blackrod to the bar of the Senate. The speaker announces his election to the governor-general and submits himself for the approbation of the crown. Approval and confirmation are announced from the throne. These are granted, and the speaker and his retinue return to the House

of Commons.

The House next asserts its independence of the crown. A dummy bill, known as "Bill No. 1" is handed by a clerk to a member on the Treasury Benches, who introduces it to the House, and moves that it be read a first time. No further progress is ever attempted with Bill No. 1. It isn't heard of again until the opening of the next session of parliament.

The organization of the House is not complete until the leader of the opposition has been elected. A feature in which Canada stands almost alone is the recognition of the leadership of the opposition as a sort of public office.⁸ A salary of \$7000 is paid to the leader of the opposition, while the speaker of the House receives \$4000. The speaker at Westminster receives £5000. The leader of the opposition is elected at a caucus which is attended only by the members of the opposition in the House. No Senators attend the caucus. The caucus method is an importation from the United States and not England. Both the party supporting the government and the party in opposition maintain the caucus system. Caucus at Ottawa is held behind closed doors, which fact is a stage behind the caucus at Washington. There is no independent report of its proceedings.

The Chamber of the Commons and also that of the Senate were destroyed by fire in 1916, but a new parliament house was rebuilt at once. The Commons hold their sittings in an oblong chamber. It is divided by an aisle extending from the main entrance to the speaker's chair. Members sit in rows on each side of the aisle. The members of the cabinet sit in the front row. The most commanding place is assigned to the premier, who is the leader of the House. The desks of the front row are always occupied by ministers, as active members of the privy council. The desks in the front row to the speaker's left are occupied by the leaders of the opposition. The rest of the opposition occupy the rows of desks behind those assigned to their leaders. The table at Ottawa is reserved for the clerk and his assistant and as the place of the mace while the house is in session

8. Bryce's Modern Democracies, p. 429.

and the speaker is in the chair. The table has a larger use at Westminster due to the difference in seating of the two chambers.

The privilege of the floor of the House of Commons is much more restricted than that of the House of Representatives at Washington. It is nearly as closely restricted as at Westminster, where a stranger is never permitted beyond the bar.

The King must never be present at a sitting of the House at Westminster just as the governor-general must never be present in the House at Ottawa.

At Westminster, the speaker's chair is stationed at one end of a small hall in which the house meets. The supporters of the Ministry occupy the side of the Hall to the speaker's right; those of the opposition, the side on the left. The front bench on the speaker's right is called the Treasury Bench and is occupied by the Cabinet. The one opposite is called the Opposition Bench and is occupied by the late Ministry of the defeated party. A member who does not count himself a follower of either party sits "below the gangway". The members all sit on benches, while at Ottawa they are provided with chairs and desks.

Returning to the chamber at Ottawa, there are galleries on all four sides of the chamber, all freely open to visitors. The speaker, however, may order strangers to withdraw. The press gallery is immediately above the speaker's chair. The reporters sit on the same side as the party which they are supporting. This is a peculiar feature among press galleries.

Canada is a country of many newspaper organs and few independent journals. Conservative newspapers, during a tenure of power by the Conservative party, are rewarded by the bestowal of cabinet office or senatorships on the controlling owners. The press gallery at Ottawa is a stepping-stone to a career in Dominion politics, or in the civil service. Canadian newspapers do not report debates as fully as the newspapers in England, as there is a wider range of public interest other than political ones in Canada. Dominion politics are much more discussed in the house, on the street, and on trains and street cars in Canada

than federal politics are so discussed in the United States.

In some aspects of industrial and social life, Canadians are more akin to their American neighbors than to the people of England. But Canadian political life is much more akin to political life in England than to political life in the United States. Especially is this true in regard to popular interest in the proceedings of Parliament, as that any day a political crisis may develop that may involve the fate of the Government.

Procedure of the House of Commons is determined by rules which are part of what may be described as the law of Parliament. In the first session of the Dominion Parliament the rules of the House were closely modeled on the rules of the House of Commons at Westminster. A general rule - Rule No. 1. - was then adopted which declares that in all cases not provided for in the rules, "the rules, usages, and forms of proceedings of the House of Commons of England shall be followed".⁹

All of the rules and usages at Westminster are not practicable at Ottawa. In Canada there is no national church, as there is in England, so there is no Chaplain in the Canadian House of Commons. Prayers are read by the speaker. Forty members of the House at Westminster constitute a quorum while at Ottawa where the number of members is less than one third of those at Westminster, twenty members constitute a quorum.

Every member is required to attend session, unless he has secured leave of absence. There is no roll call and no reading of the journals as there is in Washington. Each political party has its whips, whose duty it is to keep members in attendance and to know their whereabouts. The whips arrange pairs for division and the government whips have the responsibility of keeping a quorum.

Procedure in regard to the speech from the throne at Ottawa is the same as that at Westminster. The opening paragraph outlines the legislation that

9. Porritt's Evolution of Canada, p. 401.

is to be introduced during the session and the paragraphs indicating that the government will need votes of money is addressed to the House alone. The speech is then read again before the House and the members debate on the address in reply to the speech. To two of the younger members of promise, is assigned the duty of proposing and seconding the motion for the address of thanks. The leaders of the opposition attack the speech and the Ministers of course defend it. If the motion to thank King is carried, the Ministry win; if it is not, parliament must be dissolved and an appeal made to the people.

There is no time limit for speeches. It was 1913 before the House had any rule under which a debate or any subject could be clotured and this rule has never been applied in the debate on the address. The cloture rule in the English House of Commons is rather strict, as it is also in American House of Representatives. In the latter House there are rules prescribing that the time occupied by any member in discussing a legislative problem shall not exceed one hour.

The debate on the address has much more than a formal or ceremonial value. It can be a debate on the state of the Dominion, or an opportunity of calling the attention of the government to unfavorable conditions in the body politic. It also affords an opportunity to the opposition to challenge the policy of the government, and of testing the feeling of the House.

A special committee prepares lists of members to compose the select standing committees of the House - committees which continue only during the session in which they are appointed. There are eleven of these committees, in addition to a committee that has charge of the official reports of the debates, and a committee that has charge of the library of parliament. The acceptance of the report of the special committee is moved by the leader of the House.

Supporters of the government are in a majority on each committee. Membership varies from 25 to 119 and the importance of a committee is indicated by the number of its members. 286.16

In the English House of Commons there are four standing committees which are minatures of the House. Most of the committees are appointed by the committee of Selection, consisting of eleven members. England also has Select Committees to report upon some special subject or bill.

Returning to Canada, the procedure in the House on bills is almost identical with that in the Senate. There are some bills, however, which cannot originate elsewhere than in the House. The Senate has no Committee of Ways and Means nor any Committee of Supply, for bills imposing charges upon the people must originate in the House.

All money bills must be based on resolutions of the Commons; and private members cannot introduce bills of this description. No bill relating to trade can be introduced until it has been considered in a committee of the whole house, and agreed to by the House. Two days notice must be given of a motion for leave to introduce a bill for the appointment of any committee. On the day designated the bill is introduced and read a first time. At second reading the case for the bill is fully presented, and the House decides for or against the principle of the bill. If there is opposition, it can be moved that the bill be given "six months' hoist", or "read a second time this day six months". If the motion is carried it means that the bill has practically been rejected. If the House accepts the principle of the bill at second reading, it goes either to one of the standing committees or is considered by the committee of the whole. The purpose of sending it to a standing committee is to perfect its details and thereby lessening the work on the bill by the committee of the whole house. At second reading stage, a member can speak only once. In the committee of the whole there is no restriction on the number of times a member may speak. After the third reading, the bill goes to the Senate. The royal assent must be given before the bill becomes law. Since 1878 the power of the government to veto or reserve a bill is dormant. It has so long been out of use as to be almost forgotten in Canada; and parliament at Ottawa passes bills with little or no apprehension of

veto by the crown. According to Wallace, laws in Canada are subject to two vetoes; that of the governor-general and that of the British government. He admits that the governor-general has practically no choice but to sign measures concerning Canadian affairs alone; and he exercises less and less power of vetoing even laws that affect the mother-country.

There are three classes of bills introduced in the House of Commons: Government bills, private members' bills, and private bill legislation.

Government bills are all bills for which the government is responsible. The two most important government bills are (1) the budget, and (2) the bill voting supplies for all the services of the Dominion. The budget is framed by the minister of finance and introduced by him in the House. Two and sometimes three hours are occupied in its submission to the House. The budget covers the receipts and expenditures of the government for the fiscal year. Inland revenue duties go into effect at once after announcement by the minister of finance. All the revenue is derived from (1) customs duties on imports; (2) inland revenue duties on wines, beer, tobacco and patent medicines; and (3) mining royalties, payments for leases of land and water privileges. The budget has become less interesting after the Liberals became protectionists, for there was no longer any opposition to a high protective tariff, as the Conservatives were all protectionists. From the House, the budget goes to the Senate. The Senate can reject it only at the cost of bringing the various governmental services of the Dominion to a standstill, and is denied all power of amendment.

In the Committee of Supply the estimates are taken department by department. Each minister is in charge of the estimates for his department. It is quite a long process to carry the estimates thru committee and involves much close work on the floor of the House for ministers. A large part of the session is occupied by these votes of money but some of the most effective work of the House is done at the numerous sittings in committee. No matter how large a majority a government may have, the fact that there will be detailed discussion by the opposition of the estimates is, in itself, a check on slipshod methods.

The House is not continuously in Committee of Supply. The vote for one department is carried, then some other business is taken up, and when this is finished the House again goes into committee. The appropriation bill is returned to the Commons after it has been passed by the Senate. The Commons are then summoned to the Senate Chamber and the bill is carried by the speaker to the bar of the Senate to receive the royal assent. The final stage of the appropriation bill is in an ordinary session the only occasion on which the speaker is the representative of the House in the communications with governor-general.

To review a little government bills are those which come.

At Westminster the House discusses the details of money bills in committee of the Whole.¹⁰ When dealing thus with the appropriation bills, it is called the committee of the Whole on Supply, and when dealing with the tax bill, the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means. The Commons have an inflexible rule that they will make no appropriation of money not requested by the Ministers so logrolling is almost impossible.

To review a little, government bills are those which come to the house from the Cabinet. All these bills originate in one or other of the state departments. Members on the government side know beforehand the chief principles of the government bill. They learn these in caucus in the early days of the session, so the caucus serves as a link between the government forces in the House and Cabinet. A government suffers a loss of prestige in parliament if it is compelled by division within its ranks to abandon a government bill.

A government in each regular session must carry through parliament the budget and the appropriation bill as this is essential to its success.

A private member of the House of Commons has at least four opportunities of exercising his parliamentary abilities. He may address questions to ministers. In putting a question no argument or opinion can be offered; and
10. Wallace's Government of England, p. 64.

the minister in replying to a question must not argue or put forward any opinion. The answers may be either oral or written, and in either case are embodied in the official report of the debate.

A member may at any sitting initiate a discussion on a definite matter of urgent public importance, provided twenty members support his motion for leave to move the adjournment of the house. A statement for the government follows a motion on an urgent matter of public importance, and in times of stress such statements have a quieting influence.

A third opportunity afforded to private members is that of submitting motions to the house in favor of reforms or amendments of the law. Much effective propaganda work for amendment is impressed on the government, and by discussion of these motions, newspaper and other popular support is secured. It sometimes happens that as an outcome of these discussions the government undertakes to introduce a bill for the reform suggested by the private member. There is no chance for a private member's bill if the government is hostile to it.

A fourth opportunity is that of submitting bills to the house.

The Cabinet.

There is no change in the premiership if the result at a general election returns to the House of Commons a majority pledged to the support of the administration already in power. If the opposition party has secured a majority the premier tenders his resignation to the governor-general. The governor-general makes the appointment to all cabinet offices on the recommendation of the premier. Every member of the cabinet knows that when the premier falls from power, he must at once resign.

A new cabinet is formed by the governor-general sending for the leader of the opposition who is ordered to form the new cabinet. There are twenty-three ministerial offices in Canada at present. The new cabinet of A. Bonar Law in England consists of only sixteen members.

The first minister and secretary of state for external affairs

receive a salary of \$12,000. These two offices are usually held by the same man. The two parliamentary secretaries receive \$5000, and the other ministers receive \$7000. These salaries are in addition to the parliamentary indemnity of \$2500.

The number of ministerial offices at present is twenty-three.

These are:

1. First Minister.
2. Secretary of State for external affairs.
3. President of the King's privy council for Canada.
4. Minister of Finance.
5. Minister of Trade and Commerce.
6. Minister of Public Works.
7. Minister of Railway and Canals.
8. Minister of Marine and fisheries and of Naval Defense.
9. Minister of the Interior.
10. Minister of Immigration and Colonization.
11. Minister of Militia and Defense.
12. Minister of Agriculture.
13. Minister of Customs.
14. Minister of Inland Revenues.
15. Minister of Justice.
16. Postmaster-general.
17. Minister of Labor.
18. Secretary of State.
19. Minister of Mines.
20. Attorney-general. (This office is usually held in conjunction with that of Minister of Justice).
21. Solicitor-General.
22. Parliament Secretary of the department of external affairs.

23. Parliamentary Secretary of Militia and defense.

Parliamentary secretaries, like the solicitor-general, are of the ministry, but not of the Cabinet.

The Canadian premier has much less freedom of choice in framing a new cabinet than the prime minister of England. The premier of England must consider the claims to office of the men who are associated with him in the leadership of the party. These men are both of the Lords and Commons so there must be a division of cabinet and ministerial offices among them. In Canada the Senate is not a factor in the organization of the Cabinet as all claims of a politician are settled by his appointment to the Senate. At Westminster a premier must consider the claims of men only who are already in parliament, while at Ottawa he has to also consider the claims of men in the provincial legislatures. It is usual for the Canadian premier to summon to his cabinet men who are either premiers of provincial governments or leaders of the opposition. These men must resign their seats in the provincial legislatures and seats in the House of Commons must be secured for them, for only members of parliament can hold cabinet offices. There are always members of the Commons who are willing to resign their seats on the promise of a nomination to the Senate.

The new premier must also consider geographical, racial, and religious conditions before he forms a new cabinet. Three cabinet or ministerial offices are usually assigned to both Quebec and Ontario. There is a custom to assign certain cabinet offices to particular provinces. The department of the interior, for example, previous to 1917, was usually assigned to a member from the Prairie Provinces. This was due to the fact that the purpose of the immigration propaganda, under the supervision of the department of the interior, was to attract immigration into the provinces. The freedom of choice of a premier is also restricted by the claims of the financial interests of Montreal and Toronto, that they have a voice in the selection of the minister of finance. The distribution of cabinet offices on the preceding bases is an innovation on the usages and

traditions of cabinets in England.

Another innovation is the presence in the cabinet at Ottawa of ministers without portfolios. These ministers attend cabinet meetings and share in the collective responsibility of the cabinet. They draw no salaries so their actions are difficult to criticize. Ministers without portfolios have often added a great deal to the debating strength of the cabinet in parliament. The reason for these ministers are (1) to secure for the cabinet the aid, counsel and influence of strong men, who are not free to devote themselves entirely to politics; (2) to satisfy the claims of a province which otherwise might not be represented in the cabinet; (3) to honor a man who had claims on the party in power. This dignity is not unlike the honor of a summons to the privy council in England.

More than one half of the members of the ministry at Westminster are not of the cabinet, while at Ottawa, the solicitor-general and the parliamentary secretaries of state are the only ministers who are not in the cabinet.

There have been three attempts to create a titled aristocracy in Canada. Titles there have never been in esteem except among candidates for these honors. In 1918 the union government submitted an act to abolish titles to the colonial government, so there are now no hereditary titles in Canada. The bestowal of knighthood was not ended by this action of the government, but the bestowal of baronetcies and peerages on Canadians resident in the Dominion.

Every member of the cabinet, who is of the House of Commons, in accepting an office to which a salary is attached, must seek reelection. He must accept office openly and must give his constituency an opportunity of passing judgment on his acceptance. The origin of the law governing acceptance of office dates back to 1705 in England. There are few reelections of cabinet ministers contested. Members who have accepted office at the formation of a new cabinet are seldom put to the trouble and expense of a contested election. The cabinet can always "open" a safe constituency. It can always induce one of

its supporters in the House of Commons to relinquish their seat in exchange for life membership in the Senate; and the defeated cabinet minister is at once reinstated in the House of Commons. The law making reelection a condition of office is continuously in force.

The Cabinet is the executive of the Commons. It is the medium of all communications with the governor-general who in turn is the medium of all communications with the Secretary of State for the colonies. Communications from the Cabinet are in the form of minutes of council. Appointments and contracts are also made by minutes of council.

Responsibility for all bills for raising revenue lies with the cabinet. The finance bill, or the "budget" is prepared by the minister of finance. Each minister prepares the estimates of the department over which he presides. Before the budget can be submitted to the House of Commons, it must receive the approval of the cabinet. ¹¹ The budget of England is prepared by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, after he has received the estimates from the various departments. Government bills other than financial bills are also framed by the cabinet. In England government bills are of two kinds, financial and non-financial and this is also true in Canada.

It is the constitutional privilege of a minister who resigns from the cabinet to make a statement from his seat in parliament for the reason of his disagreement with his colleagues, and of the grounds on which he resigned. Only in parliament can ^{the} ~~be~~ ex-cabinet minister make his first statement of the reasons for his resignation. Resignations of ministers on questions of policy are infrequent. A minister who persists in his opposition to a bill at cabinet stage sometimes loses more than his office. He may break with his party; find himself unwelcome at caucus; and jeopardize his seat in the House of Commons at the general election. A government measure may involve the fate of the government so every member of the cabinet must, therefore, support it by voice or vote.

Wallace's Government of England, p. 142.

Political questions under discussion, concerning which the cabinet as a whole, can come to no agreement, are known as "open questions". The enfranchisement of women is a typical example of an open question.

The duties of a cabinet minister are (1) to assist in council, and to share in the collective responsibility of the cabinet for the acts, measures and policies of the government; (2) to frame the policies of his department; (3) to receive deputations on all matters connected with his department; (4) to pilot through the House of Commons bills that originate in his department; (5) to carry the estimate of his department through committee of supply; (6) to answer all questions concerning the policies and activities of his department; (7) to support the policies and measures of the administration in parliament.

In Canada, as in England, political life is practically a parliamentary career which culminates in the cabinet. In every Canadian Cabinet there are two or three men equal to the average of a cabinet in London or Washington, although the range of choice is naturally smaller in a smaller population. There is little distinction or influence to be won in any other political field.

Provincial Legislatures.

The powers, duties, and functions assigned by the British North America Act to the provinces are so clearly defined that there can never be much conflict or friction between the Ottawa government and the governments at the provincial capitals.

An account has been given of the methods of appointing lieutenant-governors, and of the franchises on which the provincial legislatures are elected. It has also been told how it comes about that today only two of the nine provincial legislatures - Quebec and Nova Scotia - are bicameral. In 1905, when parliament created the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, the single-chamber plan was so well established, that it was enacted in the

organic law that the legislatures should have only one chamber, to be known as the legislative assembly. No claim is ever made that the legislatures of Quebec and Nova Scotia are at all superior to the legislatures of the provinces in which there are only legislative assemblies. Legislative councils, in the provinces in which they still survive, have even fewer friends in the press and constituencies than the Senate at Ottawa. The legislative councils are of some slight value to the political party in power and they add a little to the patronage of the premiers.

A legislative councilor holds office as long as he has the strength to carry himself to the legislative chambers. In Quebec his salary is \$1500, and at Halifax the salary is \$700. These salaries have come to be regarded as pensions.

Membership of the legislatures in the seven unicameral provinces varies from 36 in Prince Edward Island to 106 in Ontario. There are 81 members of the legislative assembly of Quebec. Salaries of members of the legislatures range from \$200 to \$1500 with a salary of \$400 for the speaker in Quebec. The term of a legislature is not definitely fixed, but it may not extend beyond four years.

The government at a provincial capital is organized as nearly as possible like the government at Ottawa. The lieutenant-governor takes the place of the governor-general; and there is a secretary of state through whom communication is maintained with the central government. Provincial governments communicate through the department of state and the government at Ottawa with the colonial office in London.

Responsible government has been established at all the provincial capitals since 1870. Party lines are in the provincial legislatures the same as in Dominion politics, Liberal and Conservative, with a few Labor or Socialist members. The relations between the provincial legislature and ministry are the same as at Ottawa; and the procedure of the cabinet is the

same.

A provincial ministry remains in power only as long as it can command a majority in the legislative assembly. If defeated on a vote in the assembly, it must either ask the lieutenant-governor to dissolve the legislature; or the premier must tender his resignation to the lieutenant-governor. If the premier resigns without asking for a dissolution of the legislature, the procedure of the lieutenant-governor is similar to that of the governor-general under similar circumstances.

The ministry of Ontario is not exactly of provincial ministries as the political civilization of Ontario is more advanced and comprehensive. There is a larger population, and more cities, than in any of the other provinces.¹² Ontario stands towards the other provinces in the same relation as Massachusetts stands towards the other states of New England.

A typical provincial ministry has the following offices:

1. Prime Minister and)
2. President of the Council) Usually held by the same man.
3. Attorney-General.
4. Provincial Secretary.
5. Provincial Treasurer.
6. Minister of Agriculture.
7. Minister of Education.
8. Minister of Public Works.
9. Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines.

The provinces have established the usage of appointing men to the cabinet without portfolios.

Every member of a provincial cabinet, with or without portfolios, must be a member of the legislature.

Salaries of provincial premiers range from \$2200 to \$9000. Salaries
12. Porrot's Evolution of Dominion of Canada, p. 489.

of other ministers range from \$1500 to \$6000. These salaries are in addition to indemnities received as members of the legislature. Members of legislatures, unlike members of parliament, do not have the privilege of franking letters, but there is a basket into which they throw letters, and these letters are stamped at the expense of the Province.

The lieutenant-governor has no fixed term but holds office "during pleasure"; however, he cannot be removed within five years of his appointment. Salaries of lieutenant-governor, paid by the dominion government, range from \$2000 in Prince Edward Island, to \$10,000 in Quebec. A lieutenant-governor like the governor-general at Ottawa, must ride an even keel in politics. The office is rarely held by a man who has been in the front rank in parliamentary life, but is usually bestowed on a man of the "old party war horse" variety of politician. The lieutenant-governor is the most apparent link connecting a province with the Dominion. In all ceremonies of state he takes the same part as the governor-general at Ottawa.

A provincial legislature is organized for business in exactly the same way as parliament. At the opening of a new session, there is a debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Committees are organized as at Ottawa. The procedure on the reading of bills is also the same. Legislative measures are classified as (1) government bills, (2) private members' bills, and (3) private bill legislation. Members have the same opportunities as in the Dominion parliament of introducing bills and motions.

Procedure on the budget and on the estimates is similar. The budget system is as well established at the provincial capitals as at Ottawa. The exposition of the budget by the provincial treasurer is the event of a legislative session. In the provinces which possess crown lands, the treasury is replenished from three sources. These are (1) two annual subventions; (2) direct taxation; (3) money accruing from the sale or renting of crown lands, and from royalties on coal and other minerals. All the legislatures have

power to levy direct taxation, and until 1915 the only direct taxation in Canada was that collected under provincial enactments. Legislatures have power to pledge the credit of a province to raise loans. They have power also to grant subsidies to railway companies.

There are three checks on the legislatures under the organic law of the Dominion. The lieutenant-governor can withhold the royal assent to a bill. He can reserve a bill for the governor-general-in-council at Ottawa; and even after a bill has received the royal assent, the governor-general-in-council can disallow it. Disallowance must be proclaimed within one year after enactment. The two checks that the lieutenant-governor can exercise are practically obsolete, and the real check is the power of disallowance at Ottawa.

In the early days of Confederation the Dominion government held the idea that the relation between the Dominion and the provinces was analogous to that between parent and child; and it acted accordingly. Disallowance was frequent. Cases were carried to the Privy Council at London and this court overthrew the early conception of Ottawa as to the status of the provinces and now it is only very infrequently that acts of the provincial legislatures are disallowed. The exercise of disallowance is antagonistic to the principle of home rule on which the government of the Dominion itself is based. It is only through this power of disallowance that the imperial government can check legislation by a province that may impair an imperial interest outside the Dominion. The imperial government has power to disallow an act of the Dominion parliament, but can only indirectly bring about the disallowance of an act of a provincial legislature.

A further restriction on the provincial legislatures is that they may not legislate against the privilege of denominational schools which either Catholics or Protestants had by law at the time of union in 1867. The rights of minorities in respect to parish schools are strictly safeguarded by the

British North America Act.

There is a Canadian court to hear appeals from the provincial courts. Appeal lies in the last resort from this to the judicial committee of the Privy Council in England. The Canadian Supreme Court is not created by the Constitution and is not considered coordinate with the legislature.

Both the Dominion judges and provincial judges are appointed by the Dominion executive during good behavior. There is no separate system of provincial and Dominion courts as the State and federal courts in the United States.

Courthouses are built and maintained at the expense of the provinces. The government at Ottawa appoints the judges. A judge may retire on pension after he has become seventy years old. The judges must be appointed from the provinces at whose bar they will serve.

There is a supreme court or court of appeal in each province. Cases may be carried from this court to the Supreme Court at Ottawa. In certain cases appeals can be carried to the judicial committee of the privy council at London.¹⁴ Mr. Riddell of the Supreme Court at Ottawa says "In the United States, the courts are supreme; in Canada, the people- thru their representatives. Half a dozen men in the States can paralyze the activity of a Senate and a House and the people are helpless. That is called democratic government. In Canada, if the court fails to apprehend the real intention of an enactment, any government which can command the support of the people can at once correct the error."

In Canada, there is less of politics and political maneuvers, in connection with the courts than in any other department of state service in the Dominion. The judiciary stands high in public estimation and is permeated with the spirit that actuates the people of England in the working of their political institutions.

14. Porritt's Evolution of Dominion of Canada, p. 499.

Every province has its own municipal code for the organization and administration of municipal affairs in counties, villages, towns, and cities. The provinces have not closely followed British precedents in municipal organization and economy. More of the municipal officers in Canada are directly elected than in Great Britain. There is also some divergence from the British system in the organization of municipal councils. In England, there are two general divisions of local government, city and county. There are three classes of boroughs in England. They are governed by a council, consisting of councilmen and aldermen, the aldermen serving as a sort of permanent care which gives continuity to the management of public business. Besides boroughs, there are counties, urban districts, rural districts, parishes, and poor law unions to carry out local government. The government of a county consists of an elected county council, also composed of councilmen and aldermen.

Returning to Canada, the municipal standards of Ontario, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island for a generation before the war stood high.

Their government before the war was stable, and little affected by the ups and downs of parties in Dominion politics. Their legislatures, and provincial officers enjoyed popular confidence and esteem.

Similar statements could not be made of the other provinces. Their governments were not always pointed to with pride. Exposures of corruption in connection with contracts, railway subsidies, grants of public land, or scandals in the legislatures, in the twenty years before the war, were common to all of them. Peculiarly gross scandals were revealed in Manitoba and in British Columbia.

The Canadian provinces do not enjoy such an extensive or secure body of powers that the central government must respect, as does an American State. Their taxing power is so far restricted that they receive large gifts annually from the Dominion government, and they occupy in every way a place much inferior in independence to that of a member of our federal union. In the United

States, certain enumerated powers are granted to the central government and all others are reserved to the States, while in Canada the powers which the provinces are intended to exercise are named and all others are reserved to the Dominion government.

This scheme of government seems at first less democratic than that of the United States, because the direct action of the people is not so frequently invoked, their people's share in the government being limited to the election of representatives to the Federal and Provincial legislatures. But the power of the people in this one function is so complete that nothing more is wanted. In choosing and instructing their representatives the people have all the means they need for giving effect to their will, for the representatives choose the Executive, and if the Executive and the Legislature differ, their differences can be settled in appealing to the people by a dissolution of Parliament. The Canadian Frame of Government is accordingly highly democratic. It fixes responsibility upon representatives each of whom can be called to account by his constituents, and upon a small number of administrators each of whom can be watched, questioned, and censured.

In a country inhabited by two races of a different language and religion, it might be expected that these differences would form the basis of political parties. This might have happened in Canada, but for two causes. One is the Federal system of government and the other may be found in the party system itself. On many questions which have nothing to do with race or religion English speakers are in agreement with French speakers, Protestants in agreement with Catholics, so that each political party is composed of both elements. Public opinion desires to maintain a political connection beneficial to both elements, altho the French population is less ready to bear its share in responsibilities to the British dominion as a whole, which fact was shown by their opposition to the general levy of men to serve in

the war.

Since 1807, the questions which have had the most constant interest for the bulk of the people are those which belong to the sphere of commercial and industrial progress, and the development of the material resources of the country-matters scarcely falling within the lines by which party opinion is divided. So when party conflicts arise over these matters, it is not the principle that is contested, but the plan advocated by the Government or the Opposition. The task of each party is to persuade the people that in this instance its plan promises quicker and larger results. Thus it happens that general political principles count for little in politics, though ancient habit requires them to be invoked. Each party tries to adapt itself from time to time to whatever issue may arise. The tendency to an adaptive flexibility is increased by the duty of tactfully handling the racial and religious feelings of the voters. Thus politics is apt to become a series of compromises. The rich and the poor have been found in both parties, and in tolerably equal proportions. No labor party had arisen before the war except among the industrial workers of Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver. In Canada the motive of personal advantage, which stimulates the activity of many party workers in the United States is hardly felt, for the places to be won are too few.

Parties in Canada seem to exist for their own sake. Ideas are not needed to make parties, for these can live by heredity and memories of past combats. The fighting spirit of the people is kept alive by the two unending sets of battles which are kept going, one in the House of Commons at Ottawa, the other in the Provincial Legislature. Men grow up from boyhood identifying themselves with their party and regarding its fortunes as their own. Party feeling seldom introduces bitterness into social life and this mitigates party strife. The fact that there has been personal good feeling between the opposing parties has helped to produce the ex-

cellent institution of the Canadian Clubs.

In 1900 a club was founded at Hamilton, Ontario, intended to foster both Dominion patriotism and local patriotism, by bringing together men of both parties to listen to addresses on all sorts of non-partisan topics at dinner. The idea found favor, and within a few years similar clubs had sprung up in nearly all the cities of the Dominion. They have been of service in accustoming men of opposite parties to know one another personally and work together for common civic and national aims. These clubs bring to eminent visitors from Europe and the United States opportunities of bringing their views and counsels before Canadians of all classes.

Part of what has been said concerning parties applies rather to the recent past than to the present, for the years since 1914 have seen many changes. The first of these was a schism in the Liberal party arising over the question of compulsory war service, which led to a coalition of a section of that party with the Conservatives then in power. Very recently there has emerged a small Labor party in some industrial areas such as Montreal, Toronto, and British Columbia. After a recent election in Ontario, the Labor party was found to be the largest of the various groups in the Provincial Legislature, and it formed a Ministry there. The example of the independent action which the landowning farmers had been taking in the North-Western States of America, did something to rouse Canadian farmers to a like assertion of their own special interests.

Party organization is looser than in the United States and not so tight as it has grown to be in England: nor is the nomination of candidates that supremely important matter which it long ago became in the United States. A man gets accepted as a candidate either because he is of some local note, or is recommended by persons of influence in the party. A party victory does not carry with it a distribution of "good things" among the
 Bryce's Modern Democracies p 475

15

minor politicians. To men an election is of course a gain to the leading politicians on the look out for office, but these places are few compared to those that have to be fought for in the United States. In Canada, therefore, little is heard of Rings, and the Boss, though he exists both in and out of the legislatures.

The motive of the Canadian citizen's vote is determined by his ecclesiastical sympathies; in Quebec, by the influence of the priesthood; and by his own material interests. The last motive has often been strong enough to override not only religious but even party loyalty.

Three parties have developed in Canada since the world war. These are the Liberals, Progressives, and Conservaties. The Liberals are in control of the Government, and Mackenzie ^{KING} as premier, is their leader. The Progressive party is composed of laborers and farmers. The Progressives are stronger than the Conservaties, but at present the Conservaties are on the opposition bench as Crean, the Progressive leader, refused to lead the opposition as he is receiving a larger salary at the head of a trade organization. Meighan is the present leader of the Opposition Party.

It is one of the most interesting features of the political system of Canada that ~~the~~ its institutions, thoroughly English, have been placed in a physical and economic environment altogether unlike that of England and almost identical with that of the Northern United States. It is remarkable how the political phenomena of Canada and those of the United States illustrate one another in so many points. Viewed as a whole, the Government of Canada, although nominally monarchical, is rather more democratic than that of the United States. No single man enjoys so much power as the President during his four years, for the Prime Minister of Canada is only the head of the Cabinet and cannot afford to break with it, while both he and they are liable to be dismissed at any moment by Parliament. The voters are in the United States more frequently summoned to act, but in Canada their power is legally boundless, for their representatives are subject to no such

restrictions as American Constitutions repose.

In the United States from early days there has been an almost superstitious devotion to the idea of popular sovereignty, and at times enthusiasm for it has risen so high as to make every plan which invokes the direct action of the people act like a spell. In Canada the actual power of the people is just as effective, but neither the idea in theory nor in application in the exercise of voting power has possessed any special fascination. The Canadians have never fallen under the influence of this or any other abstract idea. They are content to be free and equal without talking about Liberty and Equality. They are content with having complete control of their administrations through their legislatures. Popular sovereignty here is not a self-assertive and obtrusive part of the national consciousness.

Democracy in Canada, in spite of these criticisms, has attained certain main ends and purposes.

Law and order are fully secured everywhere, even in the wildest parts of the West. There is no lynching and hardly any unlawful action in labour troubles, and administration goes on smoothly in all the Provinces.

The Canadian Government is democratic through and through, but it is not free from defects. These defects may be attributed to the newness of the country, to the forces of the institutions, or to those faults in their working which spring from the permanent weakness of human nature.

Taken as a whole, the institutions are well constructed as they are modeled after those which long experience has approved in England. Canada has made the first attempt to apply the Parliamentary system to a Federation. The experiment has been successful, for the machinery has worked smoothly. Some say that the Provincial Governments try to encroach on the Dominion sphere, while others complain that the Legislatures and Cabinets are too many for a small population, yet it must be

remembered how difficult it would be to govern from any single centre regions so far apart and so physically dissimilar.

So many criticisms have been made upon the working of the institutions that some of them need to be enumerated.

There has been bribery at elections and a recourse to election funds. Few elections would stand if either party pressed the law against its opponents. Large sums are spent in contests, illegally as well as legally. Liquor flowed freely at the expense of candidates until the days of Prohibition.

There is a great deal of corruption among legislators but it is hard to discover and prove. Members rarely sell their votes, though many of them may be influenced by the prospect of some advantage to themselves if they support a certain Bill. Charges have been brought of the abuse of personal gain, which have served to discredit the persons accused and weaken the administrations of which they were members. Calumny has never assailed any Prime Minister. There is plenty of that form of jobbery in the Dominion Parliament which consists in allotting grants of public money to localities with a view of winning political support for the party. The intrusion of National party issues into Provincial Legislatures has resulted in lowering the quality of those bodies. There is, as in all democratic countries, lavish expenditure and waste. Economy has unceasing foes in the form of insistence of members who want something for their friends, and in the multiplication of offices in order to confer favours. The prosperity of the country tends to make the people heedless.

The permanent Civil Service has not risen to the level of modern requirements, because too little care was taken to secure high competence and favour prevailed where special capacity was needed. There has not yet

been time to test the working of the recently erected Civil Service Commission.

The career of politics does not draw to itself enough of the best talent of the nation. In Canada the attractive opportunities opened to ambition by other careers partly account for this fact. This decline in the quality of members has created a certain want of dignity in the public life. The imputations cast upon men of spotless character have lowered the tone of politics, and affected the respect of the citizens for the men who direct the affairs of State.

Democracy in Canada, in spite of these criticisms, has attained certain main ends and purposes.

Law and order are fully secured everywhere, even in the wildest parts of the West. There is no lynching and hardly any unlawful action in labour troubles. Civil administration goes on smoothly in all the Provinces.

The secondary schools and the elementary schools in the towns are excellent, and particular care has been bestowed on the provision for scientific instruction in agriculture.

Legislation of a public nature is as a rule well considered and well drafted. The finances of the Dominion, apart from those grants to localities already referred to, have been managed with ability though not with economy. National credit stands high, and taxation is not oppressive, having regard to the capacity of the people to bear it.

There are those who regard the prohibition of the sale of intoxicants as an inroad upon individual liberty, however great the benefit to the community. With this exception, the citizen is nowhere better guaranteed in the enjoyment of his private civil rights. The Executive and public opinion interfere as little as possible with him.

A government deserves to be credited with the positive successes it has achieved, and it should also be credited with the negative success of

having escaped evils that have troubled other nations living under similar conditions. A few of these negative successes may be mentioned.

All Democracies are thought to be burdened with the malady of Demagogism. Canada has suffered from it less than any other modern free country except Switzerland. Some of her statesmen have not been over-scrupulous, but few have played down to the people by lavish promises. Party spirit has been very strong, but party organization has not grown to be, as in the United States, a secret power bringing the legal government into subjection for its selfish purposes. Municipal administration has been in most cities tolerably honest and efficient; purer than in the cities of the United States, but not as pure as in English cities.

The spirit of License, a contempt for authority, a negligence in enforcing the laws, have been so often dwelt upon as characteristic of democracies that their absence from Canada is a thing of which she may well be proud. We should ascribe the strength of the Executive, the efficiency of the police, the strict application of criminal justice, and the habit of obedience to the law, partly to the quality of the population, but largely to British traditions. It has often been said that the law is strongest where the people feel it to be of their own making, but there is another aspect of the matter. The sentiment of obedience to legal authority, planted deep in days when that authority was regarded as having an almost sacred sanction, has lived on into a time when the awe and sacredness have departed, and rooted itself in the British self-governing Dominions. It was never a slavish sentiment in England, for the citizen looked to and valued the law as granting protection as well as demanding obedience.

The student of Canadian affairs who compares what Canadians have accomplished in developing the material resources of their magnificent country, feels some disappointment when he surveys the field of politics. Struck by

the advantages which popular government enjoys in a country whose people are industrious, intelligent and educated, he expects to find democratic government free from the evils that have impeded its path in the Old World. Here, where there are no memories of past wrongs, no dangers to be feared from foreign enemies, no lack of employment, there should be honest and efficient administration, general confidence in the government and contentment with the course which public policy has followed. These things, however, he does not find. He does indeed find much to admire, yet the people are dissatisfied with their legislatures and their ministries. There is an unmistakable feeling that something is wrong, even among those who are not prepared to say where the cause lies. The integrity of people are apt to expect public as well as private virtue wherever the conditions of life are simple. The difficulties due to the differences of race and religion in the population do not explain this discontent of the people for those differences have not corresponded with party division and have not prevented the growth of an ardent national patriotism in both races. Whatever political difficulties may arise in the Dominion Government from the necessity of keeping the two racial and religious elements in good humor do not arise in Provinces where one or other element is entirely preponderant. Administrative errors and financial waste cannot be thus accounted for; and they are the same defects that are complained of in Dominion Government.

The charge most frequently brought against Canadian Statesmen is that of Opportunism. It is a word which may be used to describe the action of a statesman who finds himself obliged to postpone measures which he thinks important to others which he thinks less important, because he can carry the latter and cannot carry the former. The term is frequently meant to impute to a politician the absence of convictions or any fixed policy based upon principles. The latter kind of Opportunism has been frequent in Canada for the reason that since 1867 the larger issues of policy have been comparatively

few, and the smaller issues by which votes are captured have entered the field. Such were questions relating to public works, including that of transportation facilities. Canada has such vast spaces that canals and such facilities are of supreme importance, but they are treated as questions not so much of principle as of practical needs, as the country grew, demands for assistance from public funds went on growing, and those who planned enterprises for their own gain had occasion for securing benevolent help on the part of the government. Administrations placed in the middle of this struggle for favours demanded by the representatives of the districts affected, used their opportunities to strengthen themselves in the country and make sure of seats that had been doubtful. Now and then individual members were not above turning to personal account the influence they possessed. In every country a game played over material interests between ministers and constituencies is not only demoralizing to all concerned but interferes with the consideration of the great issues of policy. Questions such as fiscal and labour questions need wide vision and a firmness that will resist political pressure. These qualities have been wanting, and the people have begun to perceive the want. Educated opinion in Canada is dispersed over an enormous country in cities far from the Federal Capitol and far also from one another. That opinion has not been strong enough nor concentrated enough to keep legislators up to the mark in efficiency or in a sense of public duty.

In every country where a rapid exploitation of natural resources drags legislators to an abnormal extent into the sphere of business, opportunities cannot but arise for bringing exceptional temptations to bear on those who have favours to dispense, and the surrounding atmosphere grows unhealthy. This has happened from time to time in England and the United States. Their experience warrants the hope that when normal conditions return, and the air has cleared, the temptations will be reduced and the larger issues of policy again become the chief occupations of legislatures. As the enlightened class grows

large enough to make national opinion a more vigilantly effective force, the tone of public life may rise, There are already signs of a keener sensitiveness and a stronger reforming purpose in the general body of the citizens. The political faults visible in new countries may be disappointing, but they are more curable than those of old countries. A young country like Canada must be expected to have some of the weaknesses of adolescence as well as the splendid hopefulness and energy which make the strength of youth. The great thing after all by which popular government stands or falls must be the right-mindedness and intelligence of the people and these Canada has.

Striking the balance between what democracy has done for her and what it has failed to do, it must not be forgotten that the coexistence of two races different in religion as well as in languages, contained the menace of what might become a real danger. Canada has so far avoided the trouble Ireland has had by the elastic nature of her institutions and the patriotic prudence of her statesmen. This is no small achievement and is a proof of the customs of the Canadian people and the spirit of mutual good feeling which the practice of free self government can form. One of the general lessons which may be drawn from the history of democracy in Canada is drawn from a comparison of the experience of the United States. The Canadian Constitution was an adaptation of the British Constitution to the circumstances of a new country in which a Federal and not a unitary government was needed. It reproduced certain features of the United States Federal system which experience had proved, and sought to avoid the defects that experience had disclosed. It followed in other points the parliamentary and Cabinet system of England, and it carried over into Canada the habits and traditions by which that parliamentary system had thriven. Hardly anything in it is traceable to any abstract theory. The Federal Constitution of Canada was affected a great deal by the dogmas of Popular Sovereignty and of the so-called "Separation of Powers". Experience has shown that those constitutional provisions in which

the influence of these doctrines went furthest are those whose working has proved least satisfactory. We see from this that history teaches us that it is safer to build on the foundations of experience and tradition than upon abstract principles, because it is seldom possible to predict what results the latter will give when applied under new conditions. Political philosophy is itself drawn from the observation of actual phenomena, and if its precepts are to succeed in practice they must be adjusted to the facts of each particular case.

The experience of Canada has been short. Only half a century has passed since the Federal system of the Dominion was set to work. Since then the country has been steadily developing and the population has been rapidly increasing. Immigration is increasing every year but it is not likely to change the beliefs and tendencies of the inhabitants. There is no prospect at present that institutions which have gained the general approval of the people will be fundamentally changed. As economic problems arise, however, and as intellectual movements are propagated from one nation to another, new ideas inspire new political aspirations and find their expression in politics. Canada is well prepared by the character of the people, by their intelligence and law-abiding habits, to face whatever problems the future may bring. She is capable of finding ways to remedy any defects she may find in her government, and of making her prosperity the basis of an enlightened civilization.