

Home Rule as part of a general scheme of devolution to subordinate legislatures in England and Scotland."

Lord Hythe thinks Sir Edward Carson, who has fought so hard against Home Rule for Ireland, would support the wider scheme, and he counts on the powerful support of Mr. Balfour. "Let the Government," Lord Hythe says, "announce their purpose to set up a commission to draft a scheme for the establishment of local legislatures in England and Scotland (and possibly in Wales) as well as in Ireland."

Toronto's Misfortune

WHILE it is always a mistake to hold a community responsible for the folly of a few people, it is a fact that such folly often fastens itself as a reproach to the community and gives to the whole a reputation as undesirable as it is undesired. Toronto will undoubtedly suffer from the conduct of the comparatively few misguided people who systematically prevented Mr. Bryan from addressing a prohibition meeting on Thursday evening. Mr. Bryan is a pacifist, or perhaps it will be more correct to say he was a pacifist, for in recent months he has given a cordial support to the war programme of President Wilson. That many men should have viewed with disapproval Mr. Bryan's earlier attitude towards the war is natural and entirely reasonable. But surely that could not be a reason for denying him the right of free speech, even if his views had remained unchanged. No man should deem it necessary to apologize for desiring peace and for striving to maintain peace, even under circumstances in which most of those around him might deem war unavoidable. Of Mr. Bryan's sincerity, there could be no question. He proved his earnestness by resigning one of the greatest public offices in his country, rather than assent to a policy of which he did not approve. A man of such eminence and such sincerity, coming to Canada to take part in a demonstration for the promotion of a great social reform, should have received a cordial welcome and a respectful hearing. The organized effort to prevent his speaking indicates that while our armies are fighting in Europe for democracy and liberty there are people here who desire to create one of the worst conditions of autoeracy—the suppression of freedom of public discussion. The misfortune is that this menace to liberty comes from returned soldiers. It is just such things as this that bring many people to regard militarism as something hostile to freedom. The soldier who has fought for liberty in France and has come back to destroy liberty at home proves that, however meritorious has been his service abroad, he has yet to learn the first principles of Canadian citizenship.

The Military Hospitals

IF there is one question above others on which unity of thought and action is desirable it is that which concerns the reception and treatment of our soldiers who return from the battlefield broken in health. Every good citizen will desire that these men shall have the best possible treatment, with a view to their restoration to health and to their preparation for the work in life that is most suited to their condition. Unhappily in this matter, instead of unity and harmony, there has been for a long time a considerable degree of

friction. The Government many months ago created a Military Hospitals Commission, the membership of which was largely composed of gentlemen who gave their services voluntarily, and made the good work a labour of love. They soon found themselves in conflict with the authorities of the Militia Department, who claimed that they, and through them the doctors of the Army Medical Corps, should have control of the treatment of the invalided soldiers.

After many months of these embarrassing relations an effort has been made to secure greater harmony, with, it is hoped, consequent greater efficiency. The Militia Department is to take control of the returned soldier until he is discharged from military service, and then, during his period of further treatment and preparation for future work, he is to come under the direction of a new department of the Government created for the purpose, at the head of which is placed Senator Loughheed, who has been chairman of the Military Hospitals Commission. Under the new department the Commission remains, changing its name to the Invalided Soldiers' Commission, but evidently the scope of its authority is so very much reduced as to leave the members of the Commission in some doubt as to whether their usefulness is not gone. It is much to be hoped that on such a question there will be on all sides an earnest desire to co-operate, so that the returned invalids may receive the full benefit of the good treatment which the whole country desires them to have. Sir James Loughheed, who has in various capacities proved a very useful member of the Government, will doubtless do all that he can to retain the voluntary services of the men who have been working with him on the Hospitals Commission, and the Minister of Militia will be no less anxious to so co-operate with him as to prevent a repetition of the friction of the past.

Scraps of Paper

AN OFFICIAL statement issued at Ottawa a few days ago says:

"The Government has recently received information that an unfortunate impression has been created among naturalized British subjects in the Western Provinces who were born in countries with which we are unfortunately at war. It is said that many of these people believe that it is the intention of the Government to deprive them of their lands and to confiscate their property. For this reason they are in grave doubt as to whether or not it is worth while for them to engage in the work of production during the approaching season. It is also reported that they are apprehensive that the Government will impose discriminatory taxation upon them.

"In the early months of the war the Government issued a proclamation assuring all such persons of the enjoyment of their property and civil rights in this country so long as they obey the laws of the country of their adoption and refrain from any attempt to assist the enemy. That assurance stands good to-day. There is no intention on the part of the Government to deprive them of their land or to confiscate their property or otherwise to treat them unfairly or unjustly. Their fear that they will be subject to discriminatory taxation is also wholly unfounded, as it is not the intention of the Government to adopt or put into force any such policy."

It is much to be desired that the "naturalized

British subjects in the Western Provinces who were born in countries with which we are unfortunately at war" shall accept these assurances and proceed to put all their efforts into the good work of increasing production. But if they hesitate to do so, need anybody be surprised? Have they not good grounds for doubt? Whenever the German authorities offer to the world a promise to do something, intelligent men meet the assurance with the questions: How can we trust them? Did they not solemnly pledge themselves to respect the neutrality of Belgium? Did they not, the moment it suited them to do so, shamelessly violate that promise? Can any assurance they now offer be stronger than that which they gave to Belgium?

Canada unfortunately has been put in a position which justifies these British subjects of foreign birth in fearing that the pledge and guarantee of the Canadian Government are worth no more than Germany's guarantee to Belgium. These men of foreign birth came to Canada on the faith of representations made by agents of the Canadian Government that if they remained for a certain time, obeyed our laws, and took the oath of allegiance to His Majesty, they would become full citizens of the Canadian Dominion. The immigrants fulfilled their part of the contract. They lived out the specified term, took the oath of allegiance, and fulfilled all the duties of citizenship. Nevertheless, at the last session of the Canadian Parliament the Canadian Government repudiated the contract and violated the pledged faith of the country by depriving these citizens of the very essence of citizenship—the right to vote. How, in the face of that fact, can we expect these men of foreign birth to accept and rely on the assurances now offered to them?

M.P.'S and the Military Service Act

MR. T. A. HARTT, M.P. for Charlotte, N.B., is apparently of opinion that the question of selecting men for military duty under the Conscription Act should not be left to the tribunals appointed for the purpose, but that it is one of the matters in which the members of Parliament have a right to interfere. Mr. Hartt has been taking a trip through his constituency. "In the course of this trip, which included two visits to St. Stephen," says the St. Andrew's Beacon, "Mr. Hartt heard complaints of exemption from Military Service being refused in cases where it should have been allowed, and he gave everyone an assurance that if any case of injustice is brought to his notice he will interest himself in the matter and see that justice is done, and this without any question of the political affiliations of the person making complaint." Mr. Hartt's resolve that Tory and Grit—if there are such people any longer—shall be treated alike is, of course, most creditable to him. But there may be some curiosity, in which members of Parliament will share, as to the process by which Mr. Hartt proposes to over-ride the rulings of the established tribunals.

The Prohibitionists have had their own way lately to such an extent that the large counter demonstration which occurred at Toronto on Saturday comes as a surprise. In England the workingman's beer has been found to be a semi-sacred object. Toronto labor's demand for a stronger beer than is allowed may cause some trouble. "No beer, no boats," as a motto of the shipyard workers, is menacing.