

ticularly open to censure when used in the midst of a great war, when the energies of British statesmen are properly employed in the great work of saving the Empire, rather than in fanciful schemes for reorganizing it.

One is not surprised to learn from the cabled report that, following Sir Richard McBride, Sir Charles Lucas expressed regret at the remarks of the British Columbian Agent. Sir Charles Lucas is an old Colonial Office man, now retired, of great ability and wide experience. Probably no man in England is better able to understand the Imperial problems. In terms very polite and complimentary to Canada, describing this country as the "Princess Royal" of the Dominions, he intimated that if Canada desired any constitutional change she should give a lead, should make overtures. Sir Charles, an accomplished author and experienced man of affairs, knew well how to make his point quietly and smoothly. Translated into blunter English, his speech meant that if Canada desired constitutional changes so much that she must ask for them in this time of crisis, the least that Englishmen should expect was that Canada should find out what she wanted and put her desire into some definite, intelligible and official form. When Canada has done this and her requests have been refused by the Government and people of the United Kingdom, it will be time enough for her agents to go into the London clubs to threaten the Imperial authorities concerning what may happen "if the Overseas Dominions were not treated as they had a right to expect at the hands of the Mother Country."

If discontent with the present Imperial relations existed in Canada beyond the chairs of a few writers aiming at sensationalism, it would surely find expression in the only body fully entitled to speak for the Canadian people—the Parliament of Canada; and if there were any scheme of closer union understood by the Canadian people and desired by them, unquestionably the Canadian Government and Parliament would have formulated their requests for the proposed constitutional change. No such action has been taken by our Parliament, or proposed by the Government, for the simple reason that, apart from a few faddists, nobody in Canada is troubling himself at this time over such questions.

The U.S. Presidency

THE political situation in the United States grows more interesting as the convention days of the two great parties approach. Unless conditions arise in which a "dark horse," but little heard of now, will be brought to the front, the Republican race will be between ex-Senator Elihu Root, ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, and Justice Hughes, of the United States Supreme Court. Mr. Root, although a man of the highest ability and fitness for the office, does not develop increased strength. Mr. Roosevelt, on the other hand, seems to be growing in popularity. The Progressives who followed him in his bolt of 1912 are still largely with him, and many of the old guard of Republicans, even though they feel that he is responsible for the wrecking of the party at that time, are now disposed to accept him as the only candidate who can bring a Republican victory. Justice Hughes occupies the interesting position of a man who has persistently refused to authorize the use of his name as a candidate, yet is regarded as one, and one who daily grows in strength. He maintains absolute silence on all the issues of the day; he

says not a word concerning the coming election except to forbid the use of his name. It appears to be taken for granted, however, that if events so shape themselves as to produce a pretty general demand for him at the Republican convention, he will not refuse a nomination. There will undoubtedly be a great Hughes party in the convention. There will in all probability come a moment when all other names will be dropped—except that of Col. Roosevelt. It is barely possible that, in view of this Hughes strength, Roosevelt will bow to the popular will and declare his readiness to support Hughes. Such a development would secure the nomination for Justice Hughes under conditions that would give him tremendous strength, and make his election in November highly probable. It must not be forgotten that, while the Democrats won at the last election, Mr. Wilson represented only a minority of the voters. It was the division of his opponents into two parties that gave him the victory. Let these two divisions be heartily re-united and the fight between their chosen candidate and Mr. Wilson will be a very keen one, with prospects rather favorable to a Republican victory. But can they be so re-united? Col. Roosevelt, more than ever, is the important factor in the situation. There is a growing feeling that there is only one candidate whose nomination will be acceptable to him, and that one Roosevelt himself. If the Hughes movement becomes so strong as to promise control of the convention, the chances are that Roosevelt will find some reason for again withholding his support from the Republican ticket, and will again manifest his intention to take the field as a third candidate. A prospect like this would have much to do with the decision of Justice Hughes. While he might be induced to give up his judgeship and accept the nomination of a united party, he would certainly refuse a nomination from a section of the party, which would have small chance of success at the polls. If Roosevelt manifests a disposition to insist on running, Hughes' name will have to be dropped. Then, as between Roosevelt and any other possible candidate, the Republican managers may come to the conclusion that their only hope lies in accepting Roosevelt and any other possible candidate, the stances might receive the nominal approval of the party generally, but there would be an under-current of indifference, if not of hostility, that would cost him many Republican votes in November.

On the Democratic side there are neither complications nor doubts concerning the candidate. The only name that will be seriously placed before the convention is that of President Wilson. He will be unanimously and heartily nominated, for, while parts of his policy have met with some Democratic hostility, it is not likely to be carried to the point of desiring to defeat him. He is the only Democrat who has a chance to win, and his chance will not be too good if he has to meet the candidate of a really united Republican party.

National Unity

IN the French Chamber of Deputies the Premier, M. Briand, recently delivered a patriotic address in which he appealed for national unity in the prosecution of the war. His address is thus summarized by the Toronto News:

"The French Prime Minister told his critics that in such a momentous crisis as this, confidence between the Government and Parliament should be real and fraternal. It was unthinkable that Ministers responsible for the conduct of the war

should be continually interrupted in their work. Such a condition was unworthy of the people's representatives. He warned the trouble-makers against hampering a Government which was doing its best in war-time, and against thus committing a heinous crime against their country. To the credit of the French Opposition, the criticisms subsided and the Government was thus given a free hand to proceed with the war."

The Toronto News thinks this address of the French Premier "might well have been directed by way of rebuke to the Opposition at Ottawa." Perhaps there is some ground for this comment. Speakers, under conditions which usually mark the party system, are not always careful to temper their criticisms. But the News has strangely overlooked a most important fact. Might not the state of affairs in France be more correctly deemed a "rebuke" to the Canadian Government for their manner of carrying on the war? In France when the war came the old Government retired and a War Ministry was formed, embracing, as far as possible, representatives of all sections of the French Chambers. In England from the beginning of the war the British Government invited the confidence and co-operation of their leading opponents, who frankly made public acknowledgment of this effort to promote national unity. A little later this unity was further advanced by a re-organization of the Government, which became and now is a coalition of all parties.

It was not so in Canada. When the war came the systems of party government and party patronage were in full operation. The Canadian Premier and his colleagues did not follow the French and English plans of securing national unity. They adhered to the party system and they are adhering to it to-day. Perhaps this was all right. There may be many to think so. But the situation in Canada has been so entirely different from that of England and France that it would not be reasonable to expect in Ottawa the same kind of national unity as is found in London and Paris.

A strange story has been widely published, without contradiction, to the effect that the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia refused to approve of a Prohibition measure proposed by his Ministers unless they would include in it provision for compensation to those at present engaged in the liquor traffic. The question of compensation is an interesting one on which there is room for difference of opinion, but it is not one on which a Lieutenant-Governor can properly, in a public way, challenge the conclusions of his Ministers. The Prohibition bill is not to provide for compensation, so the Governor's view does not prevail. But the announcement that such a difference existed indicates that there is need of some instruction at Victoria on the constitutional relations between a Lieutenant-Governor and his advisers.

Notwithstanding the earlier reports, in which there was much information of British losses, and little of the enemy losses, the later official news assures us that, while the naval battle off the Danish coast last week was marked by the death of several thousand brave British sailors and the loss of a number of British ships, there was no such victory for the enemy as has been claimed in Berlin. The enemy losses, it is now believed, were even heavier than ours. The outstanding fact seems to be that the Germans, after some hours of severe fighting, fled back to their ports, leaving the British fleet still the mistress of the seas. ▽