

undone to prevent the possibility of such poisoning of the wells of public information.

Newspapers are too important agencies of influencing public opinion to be allowed, with safety to democracy, to operate with their ownership and control camouflaged from public view. The ownership and control of every newspaper should be in full view, in the open daylight of publicity. Every newspaper should be compelled by law to publish a declaration of all the essential facts in regard to its ownership and control; and the suppression of any one of such essential facts in such declaration, or any false statement in it, should be made a criminal offence, to be punished with a severe penalty. Should not the Union government regard it as a duty to frame such a law for parliament to place upon the statute book of Canada?

### The Casualties Lists

Many homes in England may be rendered desolate when the next mail shall arrive. The angel of Death has been abroad throughout the land; you may almost hear the beating of his wings. There is no one, as when the firstborn were slain of old, to sprinkle with blood the lintels and the two sideposts of our doors, that he may spare and pass on; he takes his victims from the castle of the noble, the mansion of the wealthy, and the cottage of the poor and the lowly.

These words—the most famous passage, perhaps, that ever came from the lips of an English orator—were spoken by John Bright in his great speech in the House of Commons, on February 22, 1855, during the Crimean War. The Canadians who have gone to the front in this war outnumber greatly the total number of troops who went from Great Britain to the Crimea; and the totals of casualties in this war have assumed proportions that could hardly have been conceived of at the time of the Crimean war as ever being possible in any war.

Again and again, since three years ago last spring, have the black shadows of war fallen on Canadian homes; again and again has the angel of Death been abroad throughout our land, even as of old, when the Israelite sprinkled the lintels and the two sideposts of the doors of their houses with blood. And now once more the casualties' lists are of saddening length and are bringing grief to many homes in Canada. What words, however weighted with sincere emotion, can give expression to the sorrow of bereavement, or the sympathy which every feeling heart holds for the bereaved! It is for us Canadians at home, for whom and for our country's future, the patriot sons of Canada now sleeping in Flanders' fields have died, to do our utmost that conditions in Canada in the years to come shall not be such as to make their deaths a sacrifice not fruitful in the fullest measure. It is for us to do our immediate duty of backing up the men at the front, resolute that all the suffering and sacrifice in this world-struggle for freedom and the future shall not be made a failure and a mockery by an abortive peace.

### The Imperial War Council

A statement of interest and importance has been made by Hon. N. W. Rowell, president of the Privy Council at Ottawa, in regard to that new development, the Imperial War Cabinet, in whose deliberations Premier Borden took part, as a member, while he was in England during the past three months.

When the war began, Canada had complete control over Canadian affairs, of course; but in questions of foreign policy, in the supreme issues of peace and war, Canada had no voice, in the existing system of dealing with such affairs. These matters were in the hands of the government

of Great Britain, as trustee for the whole Empire. That state of things, a survival from an epoch which had been outgrown, plainly could not continue. To quote from Mr. Rowell's statement:

Canada's position and her part in this war entitled her to a voice in determining the issues of peace and war and in settling her own destiny. The difficult problem which faced the statesmen of the Empire was how to reconcile autonomy with unity. This problem has been solved, for the present at least, by the institution of the Imperial War Cabinet, and Canada now has a voice in determining the issues of peace and war, not as a favor, but as a right. Never has the flexibility and adaptability of the British constitution been more strikingly illustrated than in this momentous development. Cabinet Government itself was a development of the British constitution, and, as we all know was not authorized or created by any statute or Parliamentary enactment. The Imperial War Cabinet is a new development, to meet the needs of our British Commonwealth. It is unlike any other Cabinet which has ever existed, and our ideas and theories as applied to other Cabinets do not and cannot apply to this.

Premier Borden has well put it, the Imperial War Council is a cabinet of governments, and its decisions can be implemented only by the independent, voluntary action of the governments of the self-governing nations within the Empire. The premiers of the overseas Dominions, it is to be noted, took part, as members of the Imperial War Council, in the deliberations of the Supreme War Council of the Allies, held in Paris in July last.

The outstanding fact is, of course, that the British Empire is no longer a great European power with world-wide colonial possessions, or even a central power with a system of self-governing Dominions ranged around it. It is something vastly greater than either of these things. It is a coalition of free, self-governing nations, all of equal status.

### Heartburnings in High Places

It grieves us deeply to see in recent London journals evidence that there is anxiety among the old nobility over the creation of new titles. The Lords of long lineage like not these new-made peers. And at the same time there is in evidence more than ever in Great Britain the sentiment against titles, as being alien to the spirit of democracy.

As one English writer puts it:

It is not the fact that inferior people get titles that should give us concern. It is not that they get them so often by secret gifts, by impudent touting, by base service.

But it is the corrupting effect of titles on the national currency that is their real offence. They falsify our ideals. They set up shams in place of realities. They turn our minds from the gold to the guinea stamp and make us worship the false idols of social ambition. Our thinking as a people cannot be right when our symbols are wrong. We can't have the root of democracy in our souls if the tree flowers into coronets and gew-gaws. Do not think this is only a small matter touching the surface of our national character. It is a poison in the blood which infects us with the deadly sins of servility and snobbery.

But let us turn back a moment to the blue-blooded Lords of ancient lineage, who are indignant that their order should be invaded by upstarts. In 1841 a young scion of nobility, Lord John Manners (heir to the Dukedom of Rutland, who succeeded duly to that title, and after being in several governments, died in Belvoir Castle as recently as August 4, 1906), wrote a poem which became celebrated on account of these lines in it:

No! By the names inscribed in History's page,  
Names that are England's noblest heritage,  
Names that shall live for yet unnumbered  
years,  
Shrined in our hearts with Cressy and  
Poitiers,  
Let wealth and commerce, laws and learning,  
die—  
But leave us still our old nobility!  
If the noble author of those lines were

alive today, no doubt he would add to them lines to this effect:

Alas, it moves me unto bitter tears  
To see intruding in the House of Peers  
Men not of noble blood and long descent,  
Like him whose title should be Lord Cement,  
And not (as in the Heralds' gilded book)  
It stands, past changing: Baron Beaver-  
brook.

Such things oft make me wipe my weeping  
eye.

Alas, alas, our old nobility!

Is it not sad to think that the hero of High Finance, who cleaned up some \$13,000,000 by the cement merger in this country, and then went over to England and became a Lord, has to put up with not only the disapproval of democrats both in Canada and in England, but also the displeasure of nobles of ancient lineage?

### Great Britain's Outlay

In his recent explanation in the House of Commons on a vote of £700,000,000 for war purposes, Bonar Law, Chancellor of the Exchequer, made for the first time a distinction between the ordinary and what he termed the "recoverable" war outlay of Great Britain. In the latter class he put the amounts advanced to Allied governments, as follows: Russia, £568,000,000; France, £402,000,000; Italy, £313,000,000; Belgium, Serbia, Greece and Roumania, £119,000,000. A total of £1,402,000,000; to which may be added £208,500,000, advanced to overseas governments within the Empire, making the immense aggregate of £1,610,500,000.

As in the Napoleonic wars, Great Britain has borne the lion's share of the burden both of the fighting and of the cost; in saying this there is no disparagement of the superb, unconquerable spirit of which France has given proof, or of the valor and the sacrifices of the others of the Allied nations in the cause of freedom. It was Great Britain's financial strength which enabled some of them to stay in the struggle until the United States came in, when part of the financial burden was shifted to this side of the Atlantic.

As for recovering all the advances made, the present chaotic welter in Russia does not look very promising in regard to the repayment in any very near future of that £568,000,000. Russia, after the war, will have to be reconstituted; it is a country of 180,000,000 people, and has great natural resources. As for ravaged Belgium and Serbia, what vast sums will they not need for restoration, before they can begin to think of paying their debts? The indemnities due by Germany for the destruction wrought outside Germany in the attempt to secure world-domination by German might, if calculated justly to the last item, would make a mountainous sum.

W. F. Nickle, M.P., is circularizing the county councillors asking their endorsement of his protest against the conferring of hereditary titles on Canadians.—Kingston Whig.

It is satisfactory to note that Mr. Nickle, who has given such proof that he is a sterling democrat by his vigorous offensive in parliament against the planting of hereditary titles in this democracy, is still on the job. Such noxious growths, produced by crossing snobbishness with high finance, have no rightful place in Canada.

Sellers in the United States of Liberty bonds, which have gone above par, have discovered that the profit they have made thereby is subject to the federal income tax. Which is an application of a principle of direct taxation as manifestly just and sound as the principle also established in the United States, as in Great Britain, that the income derived from war bonds should in the form of interest likewise be subject to taxation.