

Garneau, George Stewart, Jr., J. M. Lemoine, or G. Mercer Adam? What Canadian has not read with a feeling of national pride the beautiful poetry of John Reade, or Charles G. D. Roberts, the well known writings of our French-Canadian poet-laureate L. H. Frechette, or the soul-stirring patriotic lines of Charles Mair? What country such as Canada can point to greater names than those of Sir Wm. Dawson, Robert Bell, or Sandford Fleming in science and literature, or to brighter and more eloquent writers than are Principal Grant, of Queen's University; Martin J. Griffin, of Ottawa; or Nicholas Flood Davin, of Regina? A greater part of the writings of Sir Daniel Wilson and Prof. Goldwin Smith form a powerful and lasting portion of our Canadian literature.

Looking therefore at the spread of education throughout the length and breadth of our Dominion, at the newspaper in every city and hamlet of the country, at the marked superiority of our journalistic work to that exhibited over the line, and to the great number of distinguished writers who have sprung up of late years in all the varied branches of thought and knowledge, it must, I think, be conceded, that the intellectual development of our young but progressive nation has kept pace most nobly with the material welfare of the people.

I may now be permitted to sum up, as briefly as possible the progress this country has made during the last twenty years. In 1868 we formed a fringe of scattered settlements and disorganised colonies along the American border, where we now see a united and determined people. Then we had 2,500 miles of railway, now we possess 11,600 miles; then we had deposited in Chartered and Savings Banks \$37,000,000, now, the amount foots up to \$148,000,000; where we then had life insurance in force amounting to \$35,000,000 we now have \$171,000,000. And thus it is in everything that can be enumerated as forming a part of national wealth or power.

Our Canal system has kept pace with our Railways; the registered tonnage of our ships is now 1,130,000 tons, placing us fourth amongst the nations of the world, and ahead of even the great Republic to the south of us. While our political institutions following the laws of British development have evolved from the colonial chaos of fifty years ago, and the general confusion of twenty years since, to a system of government which I believe to be unequalled in the annals of the world for its just distribution of responsibility and power, between the governed and the governing classes.

The best description, couched in the most eloquent and expressive language that I have ever seen of our present form of government, is that given by Principal Grant in his most interesting work, *Ocean to Ocean*, as follows: "We have a fixed centre of authority and government, a fountain of honour above us that we all reverence, from which a thousand gracious influences come down to every rank; and along with that immovable centre, representative institutions, so elastic that they respond within their own sphere to every breath of popular sentiment. In harmony with this central part of our constitution, we have an independent judiciary instead of elective judges—too often the creatures of wealthy adventurers, or the echoes of fleeting popular sentiment. More valuable than the direct advantages are the subtle indirect influences that flow from our unbroken connection with the old land, those living and life-giving forces that determine the tone and mould the character of a people. Ours are the old history, the graves of forefathers, the flag they died for, the names to which a thousand memories call, the Queen whose virtues transmute the principle of loyalty into a personal affection.

In conclusion, let us glance at two pictures, one expressing the hopes of an ardent patriotic Irish-Canadian as to the future of this country; the other a description by our most eloquent and popular Governor-General of what he himself saw a quarter of a century afterwards.

Thos. Darcy McGee, during the progress of the Confederation Debates of 1865 made a remarkable and eloquent speech, and in the course of his remarks spoke as follows, the danger referred to being that of war with the United States, then anticipated: "Over our homes a cloud hangs dark and heavy. We do not know when it will burst; with our own strength we are not able to combat against the storm. What we can do we will do cheerfully and loyally. But we want time to grow; we want more people to fill our country; more industrious men to develop our resources. We want to increase our prosperity; we want more extended trade and commerce; we want more land tilled and more men established through our wastes and wildernesses; we of the British North American Provinces want to be joined together, that if danger comes we can support each other in the day of trial."

How well this was done in the hour of trouble need not now be dwelt upon, when during the late rebellion volunteers sprung to arms and hurried to the seat of trouble animated with the same national patriotism whether they hailed from the Maritime Provinces, from Quebec or from Ontario. What, then, is the verdict of history? What was the language used by Lord Dufferin twenty-four years after that speech of Darcy McGee's, when he visited Winnipeg, the straggling Fort Garry of a decade before? He also was referring incidentally to our relations with the United States. The following magnificent words are well worthy of our closest attention:

"But of no closer connection (to United States) does she dream. In a world apart, secluded from all extraneous influences, nestling at the feet of her majestic mother, Canada dreams her dream and forbodes her

destiny—a dream of ever-broadening harvests, multiplying towns and villages and expanding pastures, of constitutional self-government and a confederate empire, of page after page of honourable history added as her contribution to the annals of the Mother Country and to the glories of the British race, of a perpetuation for all time upon this Continent of that temperate and well-balanced system of government which combines in one mighty whole, as the eternal possession of all Englishmen, the brilliant history and traditions of the past with the freest and most untrammelled liberty of action in the future."

These are noble words and noble thoughts, fitted indeed to guide all future generations of Canadians in the true path of constitutional development.

We hold, as a people, a curious position and one from which we have largely profited. On one side of us we have the natural life of America, youthful, tumultuous and energetic—burning with hope and purpose—on the other we have the natural life of Britain, mighty in heroic tradition and strengthened by the wisdom of ages. In material progress we have adopted much of the hopeful and vigorous action of the American, but in political development we very properly prefer the nobler and more stately British polity and principles.

Let our prosperous and progressive Dominion continue in the path it has been pursuing until it reaches that altitude of national prosperity which will enable it to enter into a partnership of power and peace with the motherland of nations and her great allied dependencies, and may it ever be with Canada in these brilliant words of poetic patriotism:

Fair land of peace, oh, mayst thou be
Ever, as now, the land of liberty,
Treading serenely thy bright upward road,
Honoured of nations and approved of God,
On thy fair front emblazoned clear and bright
Freedom, fraternity, and equal right.

Toronto.

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

THE CANADIAN AND THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION.

NEVER has the question of Canada's future been more freely and fully discussed than during the past year. On all sides prophecies and forebodings are uttered; some pointing towards Independence; some towards Imperial Federation, and none (we may say) towards Annexation, for if anything can be inferred from all that has been said upon the subject, it is this, that Canadians at any rate will "hold their own," and that of annexation they will have none.

When less was known of the American system of Government than at present this resolution was somewhat sentimental in its character. Now, however, the principles of the American Constitution are fairly well understood by Canadians, sufficiently so at any rate to enable them to discuss with intelligence the comparative merits of their own system with that of the Republic. The conclusions following such discussions must be gratifying to patriotic Canadians, for the general verdict is that Canadians emphatically have a better form of government than that enjoyed by the United States, and although there are some few who at all times, seasons and places, even in the House of Commons itself, point Canadians to Washington as the centre of freedom and good government, the voice of the people is not with them, nor have they succeeded to any extent in making proselytes.

To examine all the differences that exist between the American and the Canadian Constitution would require volumes. The main differences may be stated very briefly. First, of course, is one which springs from the very fact of our colonial status. The United States have in themselves the supreme power, whereas Canada (in theory at least) looks to England for her supreme power. In other words, Dominion laws are subject to veto by Imperial authority, while American bills may be vetoed by the President or pronounced unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, but these are two powers existing in the State itself.

One very striking difference between the two systems of government is that which arises in regard to the powers of the States of the Union and the Provinces of the Dominion. The State is with Americans the unit; not so in Canada with the Provinces. Federal influence has but little to do with the individual State; Dominion authorities have much to say and do in connection with Provincial affairs. The very fact that all judges are appointed by the Dominion Government shows how far the Federal power extends. The only positions filled by Federal officers which affect the individual States of the Union are those of certain United States judges and also postmasters.

The Governor of a State is a monarch, elected, however, not hereditary, and his term a short one. For his term of office powers of life and death are in his hand; he commutes sentences, pardons and signs death warrants. There is no provision by which a State bill can be vetoed by the Federal Government, though in certain cases it may come before the Supreme Court to be dealt with there.

The elective system is in vogue in the Republic to a much greater extent than in our country. There is, however, a misapprehension among Canadians on the subject. With one exception, only State officials are elected by direct vote of the people. The President, the Federal judges, Federal Senators, and postmasters and other Federal officers are not elected directly by the people. The Electoral College elects the President; State Legislatures elect the Senators; postmasters and Federal judges are appointed by the President, leaving only Representatives to Congress,

who are elected by popular vote. For State offices, however, election runs riot. From Governor down to bailiff all are elected, and great is the turmoil connected with the choice of the people upon such occasions.

It is most surprising to find that under the British monarchical régime the people's representatives are more responsive (and we may say responsible) to the will of the people than under the Republican Constitution; not only is an amendment to the American Constitution a laborious task to complete, but the ministry of the day—the Cabinet—is altogether, or may be altogether, unmoved by popular demand. An American Cabinet Minister derives his official life from the President. To him he is answerable, and to no other. He occupies no seat in the House, and popular clamour cannot affect him in the least. A Government measure may be rejected by Congress—a Cabinet may become odious—but there its members remain until a new President comes in, unless, indeed, the President himself appoint new Secretaries. After all a monarchy, even an unlimited one, could hardly give a man much greater power than this—the power to appoint Ministers who are not responsible to the people, and veto bills passed by both Houses. The Senate may of course refuse to sanction his appointments, but this is a course so seldom taken by that body that it is practically inoperative.

This brings to light another remarkable feature of the American Constitution. Throughout the British Empire the lower House is always the active power and the moving force. In England and in Canada the Houses of Commons rule the country, the House of Lords and the Senate possessing and exercising much less power. In America the Senate is the stronger body, limited in numbers and its members appointed for six years. It is the most serious check on the powers of the President, and when (as during the last régime) the Senate is hostile to the President it may frustrate many of his plans; but it is in turn checked only to a slight extent by the House of Representatives. Members of the House are elected for two years only; they have little power of checking either President or Senate so that the elaborate series of "checks" which the Constitution was supposed to embody has not proved altogether efficacious.

One of the most striking features of the American system is that relating to elections. In some States votes are required to register within a certain time before election day; in others, no such provision is made, and everyone may vote who will stand a challenge from election officers. There are no official nominations. Everyone may vote for whom he pleases, though, with party feeling running so high few venture beyond party nominations; but, in theory at any rate, the election is the expression of the will of the people untrammelled by form or ceremony. That the practice does not carry out the theory so as to please observers is quite clear, because on all sides demands are made that the election system should be changed, and it is only a few weeks since *Harper's Weekly* contained an account of the system followed in Ontario as one very complete and satisfactory. It is a fact that in Omaha during the late elections voting early and often met with positive encouragement, because by that means the population of the city would seem greater and real estate men would be proportionately benefited. It seems absurd, too, that each State should regulate its elections for Federal offices in its own manner.

Other differences there are well worthy of note, some resulting from the Constitution and some from the temperament of the people, and each Government has its peculiar excellences. But it may be said dispassionately that the Canadian who leaves his native land because he does not like its system of Government will find no better in the United States. The progress and wealth of the people of the Republic is no more due to their form of Government than to their name. It has not retarded them; that much may be said. But that much revision will be necessary if they wish to render it sufficiently elastic—as much so as that of Canada for instance, none of their unprejudiced observers will deny. J. H. B.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TRADE COMBINES.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—I do not desire a controversy: literary work is not my field. However, THE WEEK is, I believe, disposed to be fair, and if I can clearly point out mistakes in your reference to combines, I trust you will candidly consider them.

You say if you "were disposed to be captious" you might ask wherein the present system of selling sugars differs so widely from the former system. Look at the two positions fairly. Speaking of these staples: they were formerly sold for less than cost. The plans resorted to for selling were dishonest. Our salesmen were being trained in the devious ways of misrepresentation and deception, and the position of business was deplorably corrupt. Now they are sold on a uniform basis—no cavilling, no deception, no dishonesty. They were in the old time sold at a loss, besides the cost of handling them. Now they are sold at a slight advance on cost, and if the profit does not entirely pay for handling them, it at least contributes something towards it. You can surely recognize a vast difference in these two pictures.

But proceeding to the argumentative portion, you say: "Excluding those who do not choose to enter into the