

timent—one that demands the utmost respect, it is true, but hardly one that should govern in such a matter. One of the chief speakers against the motion paid much attention to the ease with which divorce is obtained in some of the American States, an interesting phase of the subject, but hardly an important one, since nobody is proposing to adopt the American divorce laws in Canada. Much more appropriate and forcible was the reference by the supporters of the motion to the experience of the Maritime Provinces and British Columbia, where divorce is dealt with in a judicial way, and where the procedure forms a pleasing contrast to the wretched system of divorce by Act of Parliament. One prominent speaker against the motion said he had never heard of a Roman Catholic from Quebec asking Parliament for a divorce. No doubt that is true. It would still be true if divorce courts were established. The Roman Catholic Church sets its face sternly against divorce. The reasons upon which it founds its objections are such as are entitled to and receive universal respect. It is that profound respect that leads many members of the House who do not hold the same view of the question to refrain from giving effect by their votes to their own opinions, and indeed to refrain from discussing the question at all. But no reasonable Roman Catholic citizen will object to a frank discussion of the subject—a discussion in which the sincerity of his own convictions is recognized and respected. It does not seem that a refusal to establish divorce courts is the logical outcome of the conscientious views held by Roman Catholics, and held also by many Anglicans.

Since, whether there be divorce courts or divorce bills, the Roman Catholic will not seek divorce, he is not in a practical way concerned in the question. Should he not, then, having given expression to his conscientious convictions and thus guarded against any misunderstanding of his attitude, stand aside and leave the matter in the hands of those who just as sincerely hold a different view? If refusal to establish divorce courts were accompanied by a prohibition of divorce, the position would be quite intelligible. But Parliament does not take that position. What it in effect says, is this: "We do not claim that divorce, for certain causes, is either morally or legally wrong. We admit that there are cases in which divorce should be granted. But we mean to take the most unreasonable and most expensive and most unjust way of dealing with the question. We will have a system in which the records of Parliament will be smirched with the often filthy details of such cases. We will try the cases before committees of the two Houses, many of the members of which are entirely lacking in the qualities required to judge such matters, and so lacking in appreciation of their responsibility that they are easily open to any amount of wire-pulling, lobbying and solicitation that the interested parties may be willing to resort to. Last, but not least, we will make the trial so expensive that only people of means can get relief, and those not so well off must be content to suffer injustice. In fact, we will proclaim to the world that in the greater part of Canada, in a matter of the highest importance to the social and moral condition of the people, justice is not for the poor, but for the rich only."

This is precisely the position taken to-day by the House of Commons, though it has not been put exactly in these words. It is not a proclamation that should make a Canadian proud. But it is not one the truth of which admits of no denial.

Lord Northcliffe

EXTRAORDINARY things happen in war time, and it is not wise to set down anything that is proposed as impossible of realization. Not very long ago anybody predicting that Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. F. E. Smith would be colleagues at the same Cabinet table would have been counted as little less than a lunatic. Probably the rumor of to-day least likely to prove correct is that which says Lord Northcliffe will become a Minister in the Coalition Government. Lord Northcliffe no doubt is ambitious, and he might like the recognition that such an appointment would give him. The Ministers might think that putting upon him the responsibilities of office would be an effective way of checking his attacks. On the other hand, Lord Northcliffe, in his wide journalistic connections, loves the role of critic, and fault-finder, perhaps we might justly add, of mischief maker. In his present work he obtains some notoriety, which probably is agreeable to him. His acceptance of office would oblige the newspapers which he controls to desist from their attacks on the Government, and without these attacks they would be much less in the limelight than they are now. Take it all in all, we are inclined to think that Lord Northcliffe will find the position of a journalistic free lance a more agreeable one than that which would arise from his acceptance of office. It is quite unlikely that he would be offered a Cabinet place, and quite as unlikely that he would seriously desire it.

Official Clothes

AT the opening of the Legislature of Nova Scotia a few days ago the recently-appointed Lieutenant-Governor, Hon. David McKee, wore the gold-laced uniform in which the Provincial Governors are usually garbed on official occasions. The Speaker of the Assembly, Dr. Ellis, wore the uniform of his rank in the military service in which he is now engaged. The democratic Halifax Chronicle has objected to the uniforms in both cases. It would have the Lieutenant-Governor, a civil officer, appear in the ordinary garb of a private citizen. As for the Speaker, the Halifax writer hopes he will not continue to wear a uniform which may "seem to submit the civil power to the militarism which humanity is fighting against to-day," and that he will hereafter appear "clothed in the time-honored gown which custom ordains shall be worn by the Speaker." There may have been times when the appearance of a man in military uniform while discharging the functions of civil life would have given reasonable ground for criticism. Just now, however, the military side of affairs is more than usually important, and the man in khaki is regarded with much approval, even when he is found preaching the gospel of peace and goodwill from the pulpit. A curious phase of our Halifax contemporary's criticism is that it is willing to accord to the Speaker a privilege of conforming to custom which is not to be allowed to the Lieutenant-Governor. The Speaker is advised to return to the customary gown. But the gown is not the ordinary garb of the citizen. If, while walking in the street the Speaker were to wear it—especially if accompanied by the big wig which he wears at the opening and closing of the Legislature—he would cause a small sensation. One has difficulty in understanding why, when the Speaker is to be allowed to wear the customary official gown, the Governor should not be allowed to wear the customary official uniform.

Pomp and ceremony, fuss and feathers, may easily be indulged in to a degree that is both laughable and inconsistent with the spirit of a democratic age. But it is just as easy to go to the other extreme and disregard customs that lend dignity and character to public occasions. The late Keir Hardie, in his first days in the House of Commons, wore a common cloth cap which made him the subject of ridicule, but later he yielded to the proprieties so far as to appear in a respectable felt hat. There is a pretty London story about the late King Edward that is worth telling. A very democratic member, who had been advanced to Cabinet rank, was reported to have objected to the wearing of official uniform. He was sent for by the King, who in the kindest manner gave him some useful advice. "If you wish to be comfortable in your new position," said the King, "take my advice and conform to its rules and customs. If you wear the uniform your action may be the subject of comment among your friends for a day, and then nothing more will be heard of it. If you don't wear the uniform your failure to do so will be the subject of comment and embarrassment every day of your official life." The new Minister had the good sense to take the King's wise advice and was able to hold his own on public occasions alongside the grandest of those whom he met: That the Speaker of a legislative body shall wear the "time honored gown" is right enough. Equally right is it that others holding high office shall on public occasions wear the costume which the rule or custom of the time calls for. If a Lieutenant Governor in any Province, on public occasions, may not wear the uniform prescribed for such officials in Canada, and worn by the Governors of other Provinces, why should a Speaker wear a gown?—why should the Judges do so in our courts? There can be no harm and there may be much good in every station of public life wearing the garb which custom has regarded as a proper indication of their rank or authority.

An Amalgamation--"The Journal" and "The Miller"

WITH this issue the consolidation of the Canadian Miller and Cerealist with the Journal of Commerce has been accomplished. This action has been undertaken in the interests of the readers of both journals, it being felt that the widening of the scope of the Journal of Commerce to include and thoroughly cover the grain and milling trades of the Dominion would render a valuable service in dealing specifically with one of Canada's greatest natural industries. The principal features of the monthly magazine, Canadian Miller and Cerealist, will be included in a regular monthly section of this journal, while at the same time, a special weekly department will be devoted particularly to the grain and milling trades in the shape of a reliable statistical review of the domestic and world's movement of grain, reports of the grain and milling markets from the principal domestic and world centres, and general news features of the industry. The monthly section will be devoted chiefly to technical and practical discussion of milling topics, including the articles of leading Canadian and world authorities on these subjects, and the other regular features of the strictly technical magazine. These features, in addition to the regular well-known features of the journal, will constitute a magazine of marked usefulness.