

# THE WEEK.

Sixth Year.  
Vol. VI. No. 14.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MARCH 8th, 1889.

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

## THE WEEK :

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS LITERATURE SCIENCE AND ARTS.

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 \$4.00 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 prepaid, 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.

No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHIER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

### CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE.
The Toronto Registrarship .....	211
The Judicature Act .....	211
The Franchise for Women .....	211
Mr. Weldon's Extradition Act .....	211
The Imperial Federation Movement .....	211
Mr. Cattanaeh's Letter to the <i>Globe</i> .....	211
Some Suggested Questions .....	212
The Boundary Disputes .....	212
Offer of Commercial Union .....	212
The Parnell Developments .....	212
President Harrison's Inaugural .....	212
The New French Cabinet .....	212
COMPETITION AND THE TRUSTS .....	212
THE JESUITS ESTATES ACT .....	213
SLEEP (Poem) .....	214
LONDON LETTER .....	214
MONTREAL LETTER .....	215
GEORGE PAXTON YOUNG (Poem) .....	215
CHAPTERS FROM OUR NATIONAL HOUSEKEEPING.—II .....	215
IMPERIAL FEDERATION.—I .....	216
A QUESTION (Poem) .....	217
A LAYMAN ON THEOLOGICAL DIFFICULTIES .....	217
THE PROGRESS OF CANADA.—I .....	217
IN LOVE WITH YOU (Poem) .....	218
CORRESPONDENCE—	
The Parnell Letters .....	218
The Star Chamber .....	218
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE .....	218
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA .....	219
LIBRARY TABLE .....	220
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP .....	221
CHESS .....	222

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any other person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

WE publish elsewhere in this issue a paper on the absorbing question of the Jesuits Estates Act by a well-informed and thoughtful writer, which may lead to a modification of some, at least, of the opinions that have been so vehemently expressed in the press and on the platform. Public interest in the matter will continue, but full and accurate information on many points is still greatly needed.

IT has been well said that he who causes two blades of grass to spring up where but one grew before is a public benefactor, but no such gratitude can be thought due from ratepayers to the man who causes two public officials to take root where but one flourished before. Every true friend of Premier Mowat must regret that he and his Government have persisted in adding to their patronage by creating an additional Registrarship and appointing another Registrar for the City of Toronto. The action is indefensible on any sound principle of politics or morals. The occasion was most opportune for establishing a good and honest precedent in the management of public affairs, and Mr. Mowat might have easily done at the same time a service to the city, and an honour to himself and his administration. If the work is really too much for the Registrar, which does not seem to have been proved, how easily might clerical assistance have been provided, and a considerable sum still saved by reducing the emoluments of the office to a reasonable figure. Mr. Mowat has chosen instead of the wholesome economy of the faithful steward the unbusinesslike prodigality of the crafty politician. No severer condemnation of the measure could easily be pronounced than that contained in his own defence. It was the familiar *tu quoque* in its weakest form, applied not to any practice of the Opposition leader, but to the alleged methods of the Dominion Administration. Well might Mr. Meredith say that nothing would tend to clear the political atmosphere and purify politics so much as the abolition of Government appointments.

MR. MEREDITH'S Bill, now before the Legislature, to amend the Ontario Judicature Act, seems, as its object is explained, to be emphatically a move in the right direction. To do away, as far as consistent with the claims of equity, with the power so often used or abused by wealthy corporations of appealing on mere technicalities, and carrying cases from court to court, must be in the interests of justice. The Bill, as explained, provides that hereafter there shall be no appeal to the Court of Appeal from any interlocutory order, whether made in court or chambers, in any matter of practice or procedure only. It is, of course, a nice question, and one which lawyers should be most competent to decide, to what extent the ends of substantial justice are served, and the best interests of society safeguarded, by strict insistence on the niceties of legal procedure, but it would be pretty hard to convince any but the wealthier classes of litigants that mere technicalities are not resorted to to retard or defeat much oftener than to promote the cause of right.

THERE are certain matters in regard to which sentiment and logic seem to be, for long periods at least, in almost hopeless conflict. The question of Woman's Suffrage is one of these. The conception of our mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and lady friends generally quitting the quiet retreat of the home or the social circle for the political club, the polling booth, and the legislative hall—all of which are but logical sequences of the acceptance of the franchise—is one from which most men, whether by force of habit and prejudice, or some higher and sounder motive, find themselves shrinking with deep dislike. More significant still, perhaps, a large, probably much the larger, number of the most estimable women recoil from the picture with still stronger aversion. There is something in the thought of taking part in public affairs and popular contests which seems altogether repugnant to the finer feelings and instincts of the sex. But, on the other hand, when we come to discuss the question on the basis of common justice, perhaps even when we consider it on the ground of public utility, many of us are forced to confess with Premier Mowat that we are unable to answer the arguments of the advocates of female suffrage. Historically, it is demonstrable that women have suffered serious hardship and wrong from the inability of masculine legislators to put themselves in their place, or to see beyond the range of their own selfish interests and narrow prejudices. It is also undeniable that the modern "Woman's Rights" movements, distasteful as they may often be, have already resulted in the abolition of many a hoary injustice, and in giving to women an influence for good which is being turned to excellent account in effecting many moral and social reforms. Logic in the end must prevail over sentiment. The former is of adamant, the latter changes with the times and customs; and the failure of Mr. Waters' Bill in the Ontario Assembly, is probably one of those failures which have in them the potency and promise of coming success. The concession to women of the right to vote in school and municipal elections foreshadowed the ultimate concession of the larger franchise which has just been refused; and opponents of the measure may as well perhaps bow to the inevitable and begin to school themselves to resignation if approbation is impossible.

THE Bill introduced in the Commons by Mr. Weldon, of Albert, for the extradition of criminals, is a simple, straight-forward measure which Parliament may do itself credit by passing. The proposal to refuse any longer to allow Canada to be made an asylum for the large class of thieves, embezzlers and other rogues who now infest our land, is one which commands the approval of every right-minded citizen. The Act, if passed, must, of course, provide ample safe-guards against surrender for anything but positive, unquestioned criminality. With such safe-guards it is not easy to see any ground on which it can be objected to, save the absurd one that the United States, or other countries may not reciprocate. They probably will do so, but if not, why should that prevent our legislating for our own good? If for any reason any country wishes to retain Canadian criminals, let them keep them, but let not Canada keep others in return. We cannot afford to do so. Their very presence and example is demoralizing. An

American journal, we observe, seems to think that such an Act is *ultra vires* of the Canadian Parliament, on the ground, we presume, that only British law or treaty can refuse a refugee the right of asylum on British soil. But as Mr. Weldon is an expert in both Canadian and international law, it is to be presumed that he has carefully studied the legal and constitutional aspects of the question.

THE promoters of the Imperial Federation project certainly attest their sincerity and faith by the persistent energy with which they are striving to fasten their great idea upon the public mind. The eloquence and enthusiasm of such advocates as Mr. Parkin can scarcely fail to produce a powerful, if not permanent impression. As is, we dare say, necessary and proper, these platform efforts aim rather to stimulate the popular imagination and loyalty to British institutions and ideals than to throw light upon the hard practical questions that lie thickly beneath the surface of the grand scheme, ready to emerge and rear their formidable fronts the moment the discussion comes down to earth, quitting the regions of poetic fancy for those of practical statesmanship. This reference to the absence of definite outlines and tangible proposals is so common that one shrinks from repeating it, yet repetition does not weaken the force of an objection so long as that objection remains unanswered. That it does as yet remain without an answer is not only obvious to all who have followed the history of the movement, but is tacitly or openly admitted in the elaborate arguments brought forward by the advocates of the idea, to show why the definiteness of a distinct scheme is for the present both impossible and undesirable.

PERHAPS the most direct attempt that has yet been made in Canada to grapple fairly with the standing charge that the Imperial Federation League has not yet come down from the clouds into the realm of things practical and practicable is that contained in a letter to *The Globe* by Mr. A. J. Cattanaeh, President of the Toronto Branch of the League. Mr. Cattanaeh's statement of the difficulties in the way of formulating such a definite scheme as is demanded is strikingly frank. "Great Britain," he says, "has her own peculiar interests, and the interests of the different Colonies and dependencies are as various as these are numerous. The interests of Canada differ from those of Australia; and those of the African Colonies from both of them." This brief summary of the case seems, in itself, formidable enough to beget despair in any mind not under the influence of a very sanguine temperament. Mr. Cattanaeh gives it, however, merely to show the folly of expecting that any one section of the Empire could propound a scheme which would meet universal acceptance. What is essential, he thinks, is that there should be some definite end in view. That end is union; discussion the means by which it is to be reached. Discussion, "with a view to arriving at the best conclusion, with the aid of public opinion," was laid down as the main object of the League at the London Conference in 1884. But is "the proposal to form a union of all the members of the British Empire for purposes of mutual benefit and defence," a sufficiently definite object to make discussion fruitful or hopeful? Is it not rather discouraging that, after nearly five years of discussion, neither the central body nor any branch of the League has even tentatively outlined a single feature of the scheme in such shape that it could be brought before other branches, or the public, for serious criticism? Mr. Cattanaeh admits that Canada has reached a critical point and must soon "accept the responsibilities of a nation." Can she then afford to wait for the fruition of a project which takes root so slowly?

THE other questions in connection with Imperial Federation, suggested by Mr. Cattanaeh's letter, are too many to be stated, much less discussed, in a paragraph. To one or two, which we do not remember to have seen dealt with elsewhere, we may just refer. What would be the real status of the outlying members, or, let us say for the sake of definiteness, of Canada, in such a federation? The word "federation" suggests a compact entered into by two or more parties on equal terms. Is there not confusion, if not contradiction, in the notion of a federation between a great Empire and one or more