

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. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. 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.

THE Oka Indian difficulty, which seems likely to fan the intense sectarian antipathies of the Dominion into the usual excited discussion, is primarily, it should be remembered, a question of property. The Seigniorship of the Lake of Two Mountains, the district in which the Indians claim proprietary rights, was granted in 1718 by the King of France to the gentlemen of the Seminary of St. Sulpice of Montreal. This title has been recognised by Act of Parliament as giving absolute ownership to the Seminary. The Act imposes certain limitations upon the Seminary in the amount of income derivable from the Seigniorship, and also in the auditing of its accounts by the Governor, but does not interfere in any way with the possessory right of the ecclesiastics in the district. Counter claims have been made by the Indians for the past hundred years, and opinion after opinion has been expressed adversely to them and communicated to their chiefs by the various authorities to whom they were addressed. These range from the decision of the Executive Council in the year 1788 to that of the Privy Council in 1878, and are unanimous.

CERTAIN privileges have always been granted to the Indians by the Seminary. They have been allowed to settle upon and cultivate all the land they have desired without let or hindrance. They were permitted to cut wood freely for their own use, but were forbidden to sell it. And the selling of land was expressly prohibited by the Seminary—a stipulation of the documents which give the Indians their sub-titles to their holdings. A lot of land has now been sold by an Indian, and the question is simply the validity of the sale. That it was sold to trustees for the erection of a Methodist Church is a secondary matter, and does not affect the real issue. The prior claim of the Seminary which makes the sale invalid once decided either way, it may be in order to discuss the motives that induced this body to exercise it, and the probable results of the permitted exercise of absolute power over whole districts by any ecclesiastical corporation. Until then such considerations only cloud the real issue.

WHILE in our opinion no word of appreciation should be withheld from the *Mail* for its courageous and constant propounding of the problem presented to English-Canada by French-Canada and her Church, we cannot agree with that journal when it discovers in Commercial Union a remedy for the almost mediæval relation of the *habitant* to his *curé* to-day. The *Mail* believes that "like the *émigré* who goes to work in New England, he would make the acquaintance of the spirit of the age," with the result that he would soon arise in his might and cast off the fetters of the Church whenever they interfered with his action outside what might appear to him to be her rightful scope. That, in the *Mail's* rosy dream, would be the first result. The second, and more important, would be that the unwarrantable and anomalous autocracy exercised by the Church in State affairs would be undermined, and finally, that these unrelated organisations would suffer their proper severance. It is not easy to see how the *Mail* justifies its comparison of the *habitant* who stays in Quebec with the *émigré* who goes to New England, unless upon the assumption that American influences would so surge into the French provinces, given Commercial Union, that he would feel them to the same extent as his brother who has gone forth to make his home in the United States. It may be supposed that the *Mail* does not intend us to take it for granted that liberalising American forces would at once dominate this stronghold of Roman Catholicism and Conservatism; but that a few years would necessarily elapse before our enterprising neighbour could revolutionise Quebec; and in the meantime that the *habitant's* educative chances would only approximate those of his unenthralled brother in New England. Even this more moderate expectation is nullified, however, by facts that we have always with us. It is well known that English enterprise in a French community is as seed sown in stony places. The stones are not the siliceous impediments that might be expected in the locality, but more serious obstructions industriously brought and heaped together by clergy and laity alike. English and Protestant manufacturers and merchants are not wanted there, and the fact is made so unprofitably patent to them that the field is in many towns almost entirely abandoned to the French. If this opposition is made to the operations of

English-Canadians, from whom the French have little or nothing to fear, what thorough, systematic, and obstinate measures might we not expect to oppose the introduction of the American element, threatening everything! American capital is not to be induced out of its own broad native field without special attractions; and we do not think that the special attraction presented by a powerful and hostile theocracy, and a slavishly obedient populace, is to be relied upon. It is most true that the French-Canadian clerical problem must be solved by the French-Canadian himself; and we cannot think that in view of the anti-clerical position and powerful influence of Old France, many years of our modern civilization will pass before it is solved. But we believe that the wary American will await its solution before risking his money in the province, rather than contribute toward it by losing all that he would undoubtedly lose in investments there under present conditions. The American capitalist is not, as a rule, disposed to assist personally in missionary enterprises.

In a recent *Mail* editorial, entitled "Reformers Opposing Reform," the "reformers" found guilty of this inconsistency were Mr. Mercier and Mr. Laurier, the "reform" being the abolition of the Legislative Council of Quebec and the Senate. The process by which the *Mail* decided that both these gentlemen have set their faces against all tampering with these citadels of Conservatism is a curious illustration of the fact that in politics few rules are expected to work both ways, whether it turns out that they do or not. The *Mail* remembers the declaration against the continued existence of the Legislative Council and in favour of Senate Reform, made by Mr. Mercier before he became Premier, and, in view of his present attitude, rather cynically observes: "Mr. Mercier has in many respects altered his platform since his accession to power; and, under Ultramontane guidance, he appears to have amended that portion of it relating to the Upper House." In other words, Mr. Mercier's policy has changed with his position. Mr. Laurier, however, the *Mail* expects to oppose Senate Reform, because, in the Session of 1886, he opposed the abolition of that ancient body. Now, if there is anything in the theory by which the *Mail* accounts for Mr. Mercier's change of base, it ought to lead us to expect a corresponding transformation in Mr. Laurier's opinions. Mr. Laurier is nominally, at least, at the head of a party with which the policy of Senate Reform has for some time been identified. It is quite reasonable to suppose that by the time it becomes necessary for him to use his influence for or against the proposed reform, Mr. Laurier will have been brought to see the inconsistency between his own opinion on this point and that of a leader of the Liberal party—the result being his adoption of the latter. It is, after all, the people who prevail, and when once Canadians have made up their minds that they want an elective Senate they will have it, Mr. Mercier or Mr. Laurier to the contrary notwithstanding. In the meantime it is not good logic to affirm the influence of the creators upon the creature in the one case and deny it in the other, in a statement which is purely inferential of both.

MR. JOSEPH PULITZER, that enterprising American who bought the New York *World* when it seemed to be a bad bargain, and made a fortune out of it that has few parallels in the financial records of newspapers, is said to be planning the venture of a similar journal in London, trusting to the appreciation of the large American element in England for the reward of his enterprise until such time as he may be able to educate British taste to a liking for American journalistic methods. As the press of any country is to a very great extent an outgrowth of national character, it is very improbable that the time will be short. Mr. Pulitzer will have to bring his educative processes successfully to bear upon those characteristics of Her Majesty's subjects that are at the bottom of their present appreciation of the leisurely and dignified newspaper methods in vogue in England before he can induce a profitable preference for a journal conducted by any other—a missionary prospect that is well fitted to discourage even a person of Mr. Pulitzer's sanguine temperament. The resident American population of Great Britain might be confidently counted upon to support such an enterprise, however—American news, with the exception of stock quotations and all that thereto adheres, being considered altogether at a discount as an attraction by the English newspapers. At present, for any complete knowledge of what is transpiring in his native land the exiled American must wait the arrival of the mails. This, in view of the space and money expended upon British news, political, social, literary, scientific and general, by the press of his own country, must be somewhat mortifying to his national *amour propre*, as well as disappointing. It is easily seen to be due, however, as Mr. Arnot Reid explains in his somewhat casual and superficial paper upon this subject in the current *Nineteenth Century*, to the undoubted fact that British people cannot be expected to take the same interest in American