

SOME ASPECTS OF HOME RULE.

FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL POWERS.

THE Federal power in Switzerland or in the United States is not an "Imperial" power towards the members of those confederations; the Legislatures of the States and Cantons are not mere "local" bodies; the powers which the States and Cantons hold are not "conceded" to them; in truth the "concession" is the other way; the federal authority has only such powers as the States have chosen to "concede" to it. But they "concede" without power of recall,* without power of secession; on the other hand, what they do not "concede" they hold, not as "concessions," but of inherent right. In a federal system, then, a written constitution is needed, and some such power as that vested in the Supreme Court of the United States ought to be vested somewhere, and it clearly cannot be vested in either of the bodies which are in fact parties to a bargain. But all this need not be where there is, as the writer in the *Times* supposes, an "Imperial" power "conceding" something to a "local" body. The amount of authority conceded to the local body needs to be defined in a charter or Act of Parliament; there is no need to define the authority of the Imperial power. That stays as it was before: if it was boundless before, it remains boundless. The Imperial power keeps the right of interpreting or even recalling its own Acts. When the greatest possible amount of local independence was "conceded" to Canada and Australia, there was no more need than before to define the power of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. For that Parliament stayed as it was; and, though the fact seems to be forgotten, it did not give up the power of legislating for Canada or Australia. It is true that the Imperial Parliament is not at all likely to legislate for Canada or Australia against their wills; but that is not to the purpose. The power of so doing has not been formally taken away.

ULSTER.

In the sense in which we say that Ireland is no part of the United Kingdom, Protestant Ulster is no part of Ireland. In race, in religion, in feelings, in wishes, it differs as much from the rest of Ireland as the rest of Ireland differs from Great Britain. It is a kind of Granada or Crim Tartary—the more modern form of "Crimea" suggests other thoughts—where the remnant of a conquering people has kept hold on a corner of a land of which the rest has been won back from them. To a native Irishman the recovery of Ulster might seem very much what the recovery of Granada seemed to the Spaniard or the recovery of Crim Tartary to the Russian. And one who loved not either Irishmen or Spaniards might hint that some of the effects of making Mussulman Granada Spanish might serve as a warning against making Protestant Ulster Irish. If it came to fighting, the Protestants of Ulster could most likely defend themselves more successfully than the Moors of Granada or the Tartars of Crim; but it is surely the duty of Great Britain not to allow any such fighting. It may be that the Ulster colony ought never to have been planted, as it may be true that the English ought never to have settled in Britain; but the one settlement can no more be undone now than the other. The Protestant corner has as good a right to Home Rule as the rest of the island, and what is Home Rule for the rest of the island will not be Home Rule for the Protestant corner.—EDWARD A. FREEMAN, in the *January Contemporary Review*.

THE IMPERIAL VETO INEFFECTUAL.

AN Irish Parliament, returned in the main by the very men who support the Home Rulers, would assuredly pass laws which every man in England, and many men throughout Ireland, would hold to be unjust, and which, whether in themselves unjust or not, would certainly set aside Imperial legislation, which England is bound by every consideration of honour and justice to uphold. There is no need to demonstrate here what has been demonstrated by one writer after another, and, indeed, hardly needs proof, that at the present day an Irish Parliament would certainly deprive Irish landlords, and possibly deprive Irish Protestants, of rights which the Imperial Parliament would never take away, and which the Imperial Government is absolutely bound to protect. If the English Government were to be base enough to acquiesce in legislation which the Imperial Parliament would never itself have countenanced, then England would be dishonoured; if Bill after Bill passed by the Irish Legislature were prevented from becoming law by veto after veto, then English honour might be saved, but the self-government of Ireland would be at an end, nor would England gain much in credit. The English Ministry can, as long as the connection with a colony endures, arrest colonial legislation. But the home Government cannot for any effective purpose interfere with the administrative action of a colonial Executive. Given courts, an army, and a police controlled by the leaders of the Land League, and it is easy to see how rents might be abolished and landlords driven into exile without the passing by the Irish Parliament of a single Act which a Colonial Secretary could reasonably veto, or which even an English court can hold void under the provisions of the Colonial Laws Act. It is indeed probable that wild legislation at Dublin might provoke armed resistance in Ulster. But a movement which, were Ireland an independent nation, might ensure just government for all classes of Irishmen would, if Ireland were a colony, only add a new element of confusion to an already intolerable state of affairs. Imagine for a moment what would have been the position of England if Englishmen had been convinced that Riel, though technically a

* That is, without power of recall by their own several acts. The relations between the Union and the States can be at any time modified in favour either of the Union or of the States. But they can be modified only by a change in the Federal Constitution, made according to a process laid down in the Federal Constitution.

rebel, was in reality a patriot, resisting the intolerable oppression of the Dominion Parliament, and you may form some slight idea of the feeling of shame and disgrace with which Englishmen would see British soldiers employed to suppress the revolt of Ulster against a Government which, without English aid, would find it difficult to resist or punish the insurgents. The most painful and least creditable feature in the history of the United States is the apathy with which for thirty years the Northern States tolerated Southern lawlessness and indirectly supported Southern oppression.—PROF. A. V. DICEY, in the *January Contemporary Review*.

PROHIBITION AND ATHEISM.

IN a recently published sermon on "The First Miracle of Christ and Prohibition," preached on Sunday, January 17, by the Rev. Geo. J. Low, Rector of St. Peter's, Brockville, the author, in considering what escape can be found from the dilemma that "not only our Lord Jesus Christ, but the whole Word of God, from beginning to end, countenances and makes provision for the drinking of intoxicating liquor: therefore, either the consumption of such liquor is lawful and right, or the Word of God is wrong," says, after dealing with the effort to prove there are two kinds of "wine" and "strong drink" mentioned in the Bible, and the effort to show that Jesus Christ—the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever—"though He used and countenanced the use of alcoholic drinks when He was on earth, would, if He had lived now, have been wiser and better,"—after disposing of these ignorant or blasphemous arguments, the author says:

The third answer to this dilemma is that of the Infidel Prohibitionists; and their reply is: "It is true that the Bible allows the use of intoxicants; and so much the worse for the Bible." Well, this answer has the merit, at all events, of being straightforward and logical. But you see to what it leads. Perhaps you may be surprised to hear of Infidel Prohibitionists; yet there are very many of them in the United States. They have a very extensive literature of their own—newspapers, novels, etc.—all inculcating total abstinence and atheism. The late D. M. Bennett, in his lifetime the editor of an agnostic paper called the *Truth Seeker*, founded a town in the State of Missouri, called Liberal, on a prohibitionist and atheistic basis. And this town of Liberal was advertised in the various freethinking papers (such as *Man*, *This World*, etc.) in terms to this effect: that in the said town there were "no churches, no saloons, no preachers, no spirit-sellers, no alcohol, no devil, no Christ, no God!" What think you of that for Prohibition?

MUSIC.

TORONTO MONDAY POPULAR CONCERTS.

THE ninth Monday Popular Concert, on Monday evening last, was chiefly remarkable for the appearance of Miss Juliette Corden, a young and promising soprano, of New York City, who has been engaged by Col. Mapleson for his autumn season of opera in London. The daily press truly describe her voice as of a lovely quality. The purity and veracity of her tones give greater carrying power to her voice than would be noticed by the careless listener. Miss Corden was heard at her best in English ballads, her style having scarcely matured enough to do full justice to the well-known *cavatina* from "Ernani," which she essayed during the evening. Miss Corden created genuine enthusiasm, and was encored three times. The Quartette Club played their selections most artistically, and Mr. Jacobsen gave Rode's "Air in G" in his most felicitous style, and would have been encored had he cared to respond to the invitation enthusiastically held out to him.

At the next concert, March 18, Miss Kitty Berger, solo zither player to the Queen, will appear. The greatest musical event of the year will be on the 29th of March—the eleventh concert—when Lilli Lehmann, the world-renowned *prima donna*, M. Ovide Musin, solo violinist, and Herr Franz Rummel, solo pianist, will be the attractions.—*Clef*.

PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY'S CONCERT.

PROBABLY the most ambitious effort made by the Toronto Philharmonic Society was their performance of A. C. Mackenzie's sacred drama, "The Rose of Sharon," in the Pavilion Music Hall, on the 16th instant. This is one of the most important and scholarly works which have been produced by contemporary British musicians, and in point of interest is considered superior to the opera, "Columbia," by the same composer. Mr. Mackenzie is a believer in the creed of the advanced or Wagnerian school of music, and the "Rose of Sharon" is distinguished by most of the peculiarities which characterize the productions of that school. The absence of well-defined *aria*, the complexity of the instrumental parts, the extended use of the *leit-motif*, and the complete subordination of the solo vocal parts to the unity of the work all point to the adoption of the theories advanced by Wagner in his critical writings and exemplified in his compositions. The difficulties of the work are very great, and the fact that the oratorio received so excellent an interpretation speaks well for the *esprit de corps* and the musical enthusiasm which must have animated the members of the chorus to enable them to sustain the months of dry drudgery necessary before a public performance could be attempted. The audience was much larger than is usual at the Philharmonic Concerts, and