

him. Mr. Hanna will hear from the Government. If further action be necessary Parliament will hear the member. He will find a score of fellow members who have similar grievances and who will sympathize with his complaint. In the end, probably, the train will be restored.

To secure greater speed for a train between two important cities a number of stops on the way will be cancelled. That will suit the alleged millionnaires of the big cities. They will appreciate the fast train. But the people at the smaller stations, who for many years have had the privilege of travelling on that train, will not view the matter in the same light. They will want to know why their time honored privilege is to be cut off to suit the opulent residents of the city. Their member will want to know too. The Government and Parliament will hear from him. Mr. Hanna will hear from the Government and Parliament. He will be made to understand that if he wants a fast train between the two cities, he will have to make it a new train and not cut out any privilege hitherto enjoyed by the residents of the wayside villages.

The engine drivers on a division of the railway think they should have better terms—less work and more pay. The Brotherhood agree with them and take their case to the foot of Mr. Hanna's throne. Mr. Hanna regrets that he is unable to grant the request. He thinks the men are not overworked and that they are getting fair wages. Besides, there are economic reasons which he must consider. The costs of operation have increased faster than the revenues. The business cannot afford to allow the increased wages to the men. Mr. Hanna is sorry, but, etc. etc. Does anybody suppose that this ends the affair? The Brotherhood brush Mr. Hanna aside and appeal to Ottawa. Their delegation is received by the Premier and the Minister of Railways. The Premier, after listening attentively to the delegates, blandly informs them that they have brought their grievances to the wrong place. "You must see, gentlemen", he says, "that we have nothing to do with this business. We are members of the Government and members of Parliament, and you must understand that neither of these classes are permitted to have any voice in the management of the railways. It is Mr. Hanna you must deal with." Only once does the Premier make a speech of that kind to a delegation of the railways workers. "What is that you are saying, Mr. Premier?" remarks the leader of the delegation. "Do you mean to tell us that Mr. Hanna and his irresponsible Board of Directors are to govern this country? Who is he that he should be allowed to exercise this power? Is he the Government? Did we elect him for that purpose? Did we not elect our member of Parliament to co-operate with you in the work of governing the country? Is Responsible Government abolished? Do you think we are going to let you and your supporters hide behind

Mr. Hanna? We are not going to the bother of further talk with Mr. Hanna. We must have a settlement of this matter by you and your Parliamentary supporters. And if you and they do not do as we want them to do we will—" "Please do not say more," pleads the Premier. I see now how matters stand. We will take Mr. Hanna in hand and you will get what you ask."

The widow O'Leary's cow has been killed on the track. She is quite sure that the railway people are responsible and makes her claim accordingly. The autocratic Hanna says she should have attended to her gate and kept her cow away from the track. Does anybody imagine that such an answer settles the question? Not by a long chalk. The widow appeals to the member of Parliament for the district. If there is any hesitation on his part she calls on the nearest clergyman, who by good luck may be a bishop. Why should not the widow be paid for that cow? The member and the bishop and the neighbors will feel that, whether the widow's gate was open or closed, the Government's money box should not be closed in such a case. It is related of the late Peter Mitchell that he once held up the estimates of the Railway Department for a couple of days until he obtained from Premier MacKenzie an assurance that the cow claim of a widow in New Brunswick would be paid. Does Mr. Hanna imagine that members of Parliament in the future will be less pertinacious than Peter Mitchell?

The Treaty Will Be Ratified

NOTWITHSTANDING the hostility to the German Peace Treaty manifested at the recent special session of the United States Congress, we believe the treaty will yet be ratified by the Senate. While among the most partisan opponents of President Wilson there is much joy over the Senate's adverse action, there is a widespread desire, even among moderate Republicans, that some ground may be found for a compromise which will ensure acceptance of the treaty, rather than that the world's affairs should be embarrassed by a flat rejection.

At the recent session both parties thought they were strong enough to win. The President and his friends thought the argument for the treaty was so strong that their opponents would in the end yield. The Republicans thought Mr. Wilson was so anxious for the approval of the treaty that, rather than risk its rejection, he would accept their reservations. Both sides thus assumed a stiff attitude. Both are better informed now. The Republicans see that unless they are to take upon themselves, in the coming election; the responsibility of rejecting a treaty which most of the civilized world supports, they must be willing to modify their demands respecting amendments or reservations. President Wilson sees that

if the work of himself and his associates at Paris is not to be wrecked he must bend a little to the storm that has arisen. Both sides will desire, in the new session of Congress that is opening immediately, to find a ground of compromise and when there is evidence of such a mutual desire, failure need not be feared. On both sides there will be an effort to "save their face." Reservations will be found which the Republicans will hail as important, and which Mr. Wilson will accept because he will say they do not materially affect the treaty. And with such reservations the treaty will be ratified.

Proportional Representation

PROPORTIONAL representation has long been advocated by many thoughtful students of the science of government, but hitherto has not taken any substantial shape in Canada. The principle is one of those which have been put forth by the United Farmers of Ontario and now that that section of the community has come into power in the Provincial affairs of Ontario we may expect some definite scheme to be propounded at the first session of the new Legislature. It so happens that the very existence of the new Government affords one of the strongest reasons for some change in the system of representation. It appears that while the Conservative Government of Sir William Hearst has been defeated and obliged to resign, the returns of the election show that the Conservative candidates received nearly three thousand more votes than the candidates of the United Farmers and the Labor party, from whom the new Cabinet has been formed. In this case it is quite clear that under the present system a minority of the voters have obtained power. An application of the system of proportional representation should correct a situation of this kind. The efforts to apply the new system have met with opposition in some unexpected quarters. In the case of the last franchise legislation in Great Britain the House of Lords, a body usually regarded as very conservative, introduced amendments providing for the application of the system of proportional representation to several groups of constituencies, and the House of Commons, usually the more democratic body, refused to agree to the amendments. It will be interesting to see how far the system can be applied in Ontario. If it prove useful there no doubt it will be tried out in Dominion affairs also.

In a contest that seems to have been a renewal of the strike issue of a few months ago, Mayor Gray, of Winnipeg, has been handsomely re-elected—a triumph for law and order. He received 15,630 votes against 12,514 for his opponent. But is there not cause for disquiet in the fact that a candidate who did not stand for law and order received so many votes?