

be avoided. The country is unanimous on that issue. The Liberal leaders can scarcely take the position that a war election which in their opinion was bad a year ago, is all right now. But they can argue that the terms for an extension of the parliamentary term shall be fair. They can hardly be expected to agree to any one-sided terms, and they will not be justified in asking anything other than what is fair. We ought to expect from the leaders of the people on both sides of the House a mutually fair and equitable agreement, the main purpose of which is to avoid a war election, to enable the Government of the day to concentrate all its energies upon the most vigorous prosecution of the war, the mobilizing of all our resources of men, money and munitions, and the consideration of all the war problems which now and will confront the country, and which can best be solved by a coalition or national government representing and being composed of the best men of both parties.

The News contends that "there are other and very weighty reasons against any attempt to secure genuine co-operation between inharmonious and irreconcilable elements." It may be quite true that there are inharmonious elements, but it is assumption to say that they are irreconcilable. They may not be more irreconcilable than they were in Great Britain, where they were on the brink of civil war, and it is worth the effort to bring these at present inharmonious elements together. They must indeed be very weighty reasons which could be openly urged against an attempt to bring unity out of discord, and effectiveness in war measures out of the paralysis which now more or less exists.

The bringing about of coalition in Great Britain was a commendable stroke of statesmanship which gave the utmost satisfaction to all the loyal people of the British Isles and throughout the Empire, but probably dismay to the Kaiser, for it told him in unmistakable terms that Britain was in the war to a victorious finish. So would the coming together of the statesmen at Ottawa be hailed with delight from the Atlantic to the Pacific. And it may not be out of place to say that the people, not Cabinets nor caucuses, should rule.

May we be permitted to say also that Confederation was brought about by a coalition government, and that it would be quite fitting if the semi-centennial could be celebrated with a coalition government in power at Ottawa.

Let us be Canadians and patriots, rather than partisans, during the war at least.

---

## CANADA IS DRIFTING IN A DANGEROUS DIRECTION; THE TIME TO CHANGE THE CURRENT IS NOW.

(Monday, Nov. 13.)

The editorial in The Toronto News of Friday, on "Coalition and Patronage," and reprinted in The Standard on Saturday, was very brief, but it contained enough to make a suitable text for several articles.

Evidently The News looks with askance at the idea of a coalition in Canada—at Ottawa, and does not believe that any temporary incidental agreement between a few political leaders will have any great or permanent effect. Those who fear a coalition have only to look around to dis-