

no influence upon its status at the conference.

"2—In the selection of its delegation each nation may avail itself of the panel system. This will enable each state at discretion to entrust its interests to such persons as it may designate."

"The adoption of the panel system will in particular enable the British Empire to admit among its five delegates representatives of the Dominions, including Newfoundland, which has no separate representation, and of India."

The last paragraph, apparently, is the correspondent's comment.

This report would seem to indicate that the British Empire is to have fourteen delegates—five from the United Kingdom, two each from Canada, Australia, South Africa and India, and one from New Zealand—while each of the other Allied nations is to have only five. It would be difficult to make out a case for such preponderance to Britain, and one may well doubt if the other powers have consented to such an arrangement without some qualification. What that qualification is may perhaps be judged from another Canadian Press report of the same date which, after stating that Mr. Lloyd George supported the Dominions' claims and President Wilson opposed it, adds:

"Although it is true that representatives of small nations, which include the British Dominions, will only be called in when directly affected by the question under discussion, in actual practice they will attend the great majority of the sittings. Indeed, it is difficult to see what question does not affect them."

Here, probably, is the explanation. The British Empire is not to have the disproportionate representation that the first report indicates. In reality, the Empire, like the other powers, will have only five delegates having a right to seats at the Conference table. The Dominions' representatives are not to have that right. They are to be "called in" occasionally. "The small nations, which include the British Dominions, will only be called in when affected by the question under discussion." Thus it appears that Canada's representatives are not to have full membership in the Conference, but are to be allowed to sit in the ante-room and be "called in" when it suits the Conference to allow them that privilege!

If this is a correct statement of what has been agreed to, the situation is not one that should afford satisfaction to anybody in Canada. To be represented by Lloyd George, Bonar Law and Arthur Balfour, all having full membership in the Conference, would be a far more dignified position for Canada than to have our Premier and his colleagues told on one day that they may enter the Conference chamber, and on the next day that they are to be shut out. The attempt to give some recognition to the Dominions seems to have resulted in an arrangement entirely lacking in dignity and in usefulness.

The inspired report tells us that Mr. Lloyd George "brilliantly fought for the direct representation of the Dominions, India and the Native States." Doubtless this is true.

Among all parties in England there is a most generous recognition of the important part the Dominions and India have had in the war, and a universal desire that their service shall receive marks of appreciation. If the Dominions' representatives pressed their claim for direct representation, Mr. Lloyd George and his colleagues of the Imperial Government felt in honor bound to support it, even though they saw, as they must have seen, the embarrassments arising from it. If the Dominions, under the in-and-out plan described, occupy a position verging on the ridiculous, the fault is not on the British Government. It is on those who have unreasonably pressed for a representation which is really not necessary.

There are occasions when Canada has special interests of her own requiring consideration, and then there is no difficulty in obtaining adequate representation. The Peace Conference does not seem to be such an occasion.

Continental Prohibition

IN nothing has there been more rapid and remarkable progress in recent years than in the movement for the prohibition of the liquor traffic. In both Canada and the United States there has long been a strong movement in that direction. Prohibition of a local character—applying to a city, a county, a Province or a State—has been successfully established. But until recently there was in almost all quarters a considerable body of people who opposed the movement—sometimes with organized effort. The conditions of war time brought a marked change in this respect. A great many people who had not been advocates of prohibition became such for war-time at least. Where prohibition was established, its results in most cases were so satisfactory that, apart from classes directly affected, there has not been much disposition to return to the old freedom. In the United States the movement has become even stronger than in Canada. Under a war-time measure there will be nation-wide prohibition of a temporary character in the United States from July 1, 1919. Meanwhile the advocates of prohibition have prosecuted a vigorous campaign aiming at nation-wide and permanent prohibition, through the agency of an amendment to the constitution of the United States. Such an amendment, having been passed by the two Houses of Congress, requires the assent of two-thirds of the States, thirty-six out of the forty-eight. The Congressional action was taken some months ago, and the various State Legislatures have since been the scenes of keen debates on the subject. Last week several additional States endorsed the prohibition amendment. The necessary thirty-six States have now approved the prohibition amendment, which provides that it shall become effective one year after the date of its confirmation by the States. Thus, under the war measure prohibition will become the law of the United States on the first of July next, and in January, 1920, the war-time law will be superseded by the constitutional amendment making prohibition a part of the permanent law of the nation. As Prohibition is established to-day in the greater part of Can-

ada, and the Province of Quebec will become "dry" on the first of May next, the day is close at hand when the prohibition flag will wave over all North America.

Halifax and St. John

IN several cases the returning soldiers have complained of their treatment on board the transports engaged by the Government to bring the men back. Investigation of these complaints is in progress, and we may safely expect that whatever faults there have been in the transport arrangements will be exposed and corrected, so that in future the soldiers and their dependents may receive all the comfort that is reasonably possible on their homeward journey. There should at all events be no such overcrowding of the ships as has been alleged, with some foundation. A winter voyage across the Atlantic is hard enough for the seasoned Canadian, and harder still for the wives and children, who, in many cases, are coming to Canada for the first time. There is, however, one feature of the reports from the soldiers which rises above all the complaints, and is a source of much satisfaction. Whatever be the experience of the travellers on shipboard, they unite in bearing testimony to the warmth of the welcome they receive when they land at either Halifax or St. John. In both of those hospitable cities well organized committees of men and women have given the soldiers, their wives and children a welcome that has made them forget, for the moment, the hardships of the Atlantic voyage. Food in abundance, necessaries, comforts and luxuries, clothing where needed, everything that would serve to assist the travellers, were at their disposal, and all accompanied by the gentle and sympathetic ministrations of the ladies of the two cities. When the St. Lawrence navigation reopens Montreal and Quebec may be relied on to do likewise. While the returning soldiers are welcomed with cordiality everywhere in Canada, they are likely to remember with particular pleasure the reception accorded to them when the stormy ocean voyage ends and they set foot on Canadian soil.

Bank Amalgamation

THE amalgamation of Canadian banks is not always viewed with pleasure by the public. In cases where the process of union is likely to destroy competition it may be a danger. On the other hand, in the keen contest for world-business that is coming, strong financial institutions are necessary if Canada is to play a satisfactory part. In the union of the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Bank of Ottawa two of our strongest banks come together. It is worthy of note that, with about 300 branches of the two banks, there are only eleven points where they are competitors, and these points are at large centres where there are ample banking facilities. The union, therefore, is likely to operate to the advantage of both, with hardly any disturbance of the staff of either. The Bank of Nova Scotia is an old institution which has long occupied one of the foremost positions in Canadian banking. In its enlarged field of operations it should maintain and strengthen that high position.