

appeal to the Government, and the further right, if that appeal is persistently ignored, to appeal for independent initiative on the part of individual members of the Government, but one also of whether individual members of the Government can assume any initiative themselves.

We have known that parliamentary procedure requires that a Government measure must be voted for by Government members in spite of personal conviction as to what is best for Canada; and that a measure the Government has not proposed must not be voted for by Government members however valuable its adoption may be for the people.

We now realize, as we may not have realized in the past, that a member of the Government is also in a position of some difficulty during the interval between sessions. He is then faced by a curtailment of his initiative that is even more serious, both for the country and for himself, than the parliamentary one because Council is not accessible to the press, as is Parliament, and there is not machinery available for recording the position of the different ministers in Orders-in-Council that may be proposed or passed. Each must rely upon his own record as a man for the estimate of the people as to his probable suggestions and vote in Council.

Civil servants were fortunate in being able to select a man of Mr. Crerar's standing, and we believe that his action has focussed attention upon a few fundamental changes that should be made in our Governmental economy. We recommend them to progressive thinkers:

These are: (1) democracy involves the right of appeal for all, and if Government will not allow an appeal from it to an impartial tribunal, small in numbers, it can not refuse an appeal to the electorate; (2) democracy in Government does not involve secrecy in the proceedings of Council or the vote of members in Council; (3) justice and honesty does not include the principle that any vote on any issue should be decided for any reason other than a sincere conviction or belief that the vote so cast is in the best interests of the entire people; and (4) which is a natural consequence of 3, dignity in Government does not include any but the gravest applications of the principle that an adverse vote to a "Government measure" shall be taken as a vote of "want of confidence."

If Mr. Crerar's inability to reply favourably to a serious endeavour to reach a satisfactory solution of the present Civil Service problem (it long ago passed the bounds of the simple matter of the bonus) does nothing further than to

make more certain the adoption in the near future of the principles we have enumerated, the exchange of letters has been worth while.

LABOUR AND THE FEDERATION.

The Civil Service Federation of Canada has definitely associated itself with the Labour movement in Canada in accepting into membership the Mechanical staff of the Printing Bureau and the Federated Association of Letter Carriers; both of these bodies being affiliated with the Labour Congress. The Federation is to be congratulated upon this movement; the only regret being that the event has been so long deferred. The case of the salaried man or the wage-earner, whether remuneration is gained by labour of the hand in physical pursuits or by the brain in office duties, is one and the same. The problem involves a square deal to those who have to appeal to Capital for the means of earning a living. Quite a percentage of the wage-earners in our cities is living below the poverty line and it is the duty of all wage-earners to combine in order to demand a decent living for those of its numbers who may be in distress or suffering from industrial, commercial or Governmental injustice.

Has this atrocious war left in the ranks of the Civil Service any who may demur at the idea of the policy adopted by the Federation? To any such we say the labour movement is ever broadening its boundaries until now in Great Britain it includes teachers, authors, lawyers, doctors and engineers. It even includes the capitalist so long as he is a producer and human. This is admitted to be the greatest social reform movement ever attempted, much less achieved, in any country. As proof of the universality of the movement we would refer our readers to an article in *The Public* of August, last, written by a clergyman who in eloquent terms deplores and contests the fact that "religion is excluded from these programmes of social reform." And he asks "why are ministers of religion excluded from membership in the new 'hand and brain' decision." The British Labour Party is opposed to the admission of the clergy to their ranks on the ground that the church is not democratically controlled, that it stands socially aloof from the working people, and that it lacks the punch when the blow for freedom and justice is expected of it. We have no intention of arguing the merits of this case and merely cite the controversy as indicating the earnest anxiety of the clergy to take a part in what is bound in the future to