

THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.
Vol. V. No. 16.

Toronto, Thursday, March 15th, 1888.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

The Week.

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, SOCIETY, AND LITERATURE.

TERMS.—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable in advance.
ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period.
Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage pre paid, on terms following:—One year, 12s. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. Remittances by P. O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.
All advertisements will be set up in such style as to insure THE WEEK'S tasteful typographical appearance, and enhance the value of the advertising in its columns. No advertisement charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Debate on the Quebec Resolutions	213
How can the Proposed Constitutional Amendments be Effectuated?	243
Manhood Suffrage in Ontario	243
The Protocols of the Fisheries Commission	243
Secretary Bayard's Change of Attitude	243
The Government's Dilemma	244
The Conference on the Manitoba Question	244
The Proposed Prohibition Party	244
Queen's University Endowment	244
The Crofters of Lewis	244
The Death of the Emperor of Germany	245
The Future of Germany	245
The Conviction of M. Wilson in France	245
TEACHING AND CRAMMING	245
MONTREAL LETTER..... Louis Lloyd.	246
PARIS LETTER..... Ives.	247
A TRIP TO ENGLAND.—II..... Goldwin Smith.	247
A THOUGHT (POEM)..... J. J. F.	249
DARWIN'S NEIGHBOURHOOD AND NEIGHBOURS..... D. Fowler.	249
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	249
MY HANDS FULL OF ROSES (POEM)..... William McLennan.	250
GIOVANNI DUPRE	250
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	251
LITERARY GOSSIP	252
CHESS	253

THE debate in the Ontario Legislature on the proposed constitutional amendments was sustained to the end with considerable vigour and ability on both sides. Perhaps the most effective speech was that of the Provincial Treasurer, Hon. A. M. Ross. He argued with much force that the great increase in the revenues of the Dominion since Confederation, an increase caused partly by heavier taxation, while the income of the Provinces had, necessarily, remained stationary, or nearly so, had so disturbed the ratio of distribution of income as to make a financial readjustment a matter of justice and necessity. It is to be regretted that the Government should have deemed it necessary to apply the cloture, so as to prevent the Opposition from putting on record their views in a series of amendments. It is difficult to see what valid objection there could be to this course, or what the Government had to gain by preventing it. Was it that they regarded the resolutions as of the nature of a treaty which must be accepted or rejected without alteration or modification? Even so they were sure of their majority. The course taken seemed hardly fair, certainly not generous, to the Opposition, and it is not to be wondered at that Mr. Meredith and others denounced it with a good deal of vigour.

THE Quebec Resolutions having been passed by the Government majority in the Ontario Legislature, what is to follow? They are, of course, to be sent to the Governor-General, to be transmitted by him to the home authorities. The other Provinces that were represented in the Conference, will, it may be assumed, pass and transmit the resolutions in like manner to England. What then? What view and action may be expected from the British Government? They will no doubt communicate in the constitutional manner with the Dominion Government, and the Dominion Government will as surely reply that the amendments are uncalled for and the innovations dangerous. What next? The question seems likely to emerge, whose prerogative is it to initiate constitutional amendments, that of the Central Parliament or of the Provincial Legislatures? The original constitution was framed and bestowed at the instance of the Provinces of course, for no Dominion existed. Should changes be inaugurated in the same way, or, the federation once formed, does the power to make such changes pass irrevocably into the hands of the central authority? The precedents seem to favour the latter view, as some slight changes have already been made at the instance of the Federal Govern-

ment and Parliament without reference to the Provinces. Still it would seem hard if the original contracting Provinces, in framing the federation, so completely effaced themselves that they must forever after be held by the bond, as interpreted and administered by the federal power. It cannot be believed they meant to do so. These are questions which are easily asked, but which the British Privy Council may, very possibly, be called upon to answer.

THE Manhood Suffrage Bill, introduced by Mr. Mowat in the Ontario Legislature, is a pretty thorough-going measure. If it passes, as no doubt it will, without material modification, it will confer upon every adult male resident, who is not criminal, imbecile, or lunatic, the right to use the franchise. There is no doubt, still room for debate as to the abstract wisdom of giving a vote to every man, irrespective of his interest or stake in the country, but there is scarcely room for debate as to the desirability, when the verge has been approached so nearly as in the existing law in Ontario, of taking the final step. The same remark may be made in reference to the Dominion. No good reason can be given for believing that the great majority of adult male citizens of Canada who are without the franchise under the present Dominion Act, are not quite as worthy of the trust in every respect as a large proportion of those already enfranchised. When to this consideration is added that of the vast expense that Act has entailed and will entail, and the large facilities it offers for fraud and litigation, it seems impossible that the Ottawa Government can long refrain from following Mr. Mowat's example. It seems a pity that it does not do so at once so as to put a stop to the great expense about to be incurred in the printing of a special Dominion Voters' List, which would surely be unnecessary in the case of manhood suffrage.

THE protocols of the Fisheries Commission, brief and unsatisfactory though they are, establish the fact that a distinct proposal was made by the British plenipotentiaries to have the matters in dispute settled on the basis of freer trade relations between Canada and the United States. Not only so, but, according to a statement said to have been made by one of the United States plenipotentiaries, and for the correctness of which Sir Charles Tupper, if the newspaper reports can be relied on, vouched in the House, a great deal of the time of the Commission was consumed in the determined efforts of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries to have the question of increased freedom in the commercial relations of the two countries considered. The latter statement, however, appears to be quite irreconcilable with the dates, as referred to in the protocols and explained by Sir Charles. As shewn by these dates, the formal proposal of the British plenipotentiaries was made on the 30th of November, at the second meeting of the Commission, and the formal reply of the United States plenipotentiaries, but three or four days later. Whatever the explanation of the discrepancy, the plenipotentiaries of the United States, on behalf of their Government, positively declined to deal with the question on a basis of reciprocity, on the ground that any such arrangement would involve a modification of the tariff of the United States, a matter with which Congress alone could deal. This reply is intelligible enough, and, as has been before pointed out, in no way indicates, on its face at least, whether the Government and people of the United States would be favourable or hostile to a measure of unrestricted reciprocity.

ANOTHER mystery presents itself for the speculation of the curious. There is certainly a strange incongruity, amounting very nearly to a contrast, between the position taken by the United States Commissioners in the reply above referred to, and the views expressed by Secretary Bayard in his personal and unofficial preliminary correspondence with Sir Charles Tupper. In a friendly communication dated May 31st, 1887. Mr. Bayard wrote thus to Sir Charles: "I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement, and there is but one way to procure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercially, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly or by an intendent however partial or oblique, the political relation of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country." In the brief discussion that ensued on the submission of the papers to the Commons Mr. Laurier pointed out that the protocols relating