

defences is, for these nations, a fool's paradise, then the best things in life are a lie.

Another echo of militarism comes from Chicago where Mr. Roosevelt was presented to a nominating convention as a man of granite and iron in a speech which was an eulogium of war. At the St. Louis convention Mr. Bryan declared that this "is a declaration that the time hoped for, prayed for, of perpetual peace will never come, thus eulogizing the doctrine of brute force and giving denial to the hopes of the race. And this President, a candidate for re-election, is presented as the embodiment of that ideal, the granite and iron to repre-

sent the new idea of militarism. Do you say you want to defeat the military idea? Friends of the south, are you trying to defeat the military idea. Let me tell you that not one of you, north, east or south, more fears the triumph of that idea than I do. If this is the doctrine that our nation is to stand for it is retrogression, not progression, it is the lowering of the ideals of the nation, it is the turning backward to the age of force. More than that, it is a challenge to the Christian civilization of the world and nothing less."

Here are two great forces in conflict. It is for each man to determine which side he will countenance.

Everyone should read Sir William Muck's notable contribution to this subject uttered at the Fielding banquet July 11.

The Liberties of Parliament.

IN its issue of Monday, May 31, the Montreal Star asks:—

Can anyone imagine the Mother of Parliaments permitting documents of great public importance being withheld from it by the Government except for grave reasons of public interest.

The insinuation here is that the Dominion government is acting on a contrary rule, which is a thing not supported by the evidence. But we particularly desire to point out that the British parliament is no longer a model to copy. Aside from the fact that the prime minister and leader of the House of Commons was howled down the other night, there is the following description of the "mother of parliaments" in the columns of the London Speaker:—

Mr. Balfour's government has stolen one after another of the liberties of the House of Commons, but even in the House itself it is only a small minority of members that cares very zealously for its rights. When a motion for the guillotine comes on people in the country think it is six of one and half-a-dozen of the other, and that discussion is all recrimination. But Mr. Balfour's latest proposal is so ex-

treme as to exasperate even the most patient and casual observers. The Licensing Bill has been discussed for thirty-four hours. Mr. Balfour now proposes to give four more days to the Committee stage, two days for report, and one for third reading. The Westminster Gazette calculates that the whole time the discussion is to occupy in committee will be fifty-eight hours. Now, the Crimes Act, as the Daily Chronicle points out, had been in Committee fifteen days, the Home Rule Bill twenty-eight days, the Education Bill thirty-eight days before the closure was applied. The government papers justify this violent proposal by pleading the obstruction of the Opposition, but Mr. Ellis shows in the Times that of five amendments discussed Wednesday two came from the Government side of the House. It is not the fault of the Opposition that the session began too late, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer cannot go on with his Budget, that Mr. Arnold-Foster is not allowed to reform the Army, and that Mr. Balfour pays no attention to the business of the House. If the Government choose to spend the dregs of an ignoble existence in forcing this bill through Parliament without discussion, it must not expect to find its legislation treated with any respect at all by the next government.

T
the M
It h
the la

a bo
five f
in the