THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS LITERATURE SCIENCE AND ART

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00 Subscriptions payable in advance.

ADVETTISMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in num ber, 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 terms following;—One year, 12s. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. Remittances P.O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the bligher.

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

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

Topios-	PA
The Financial Statement	
The Veto Power	
The Stanstead Election	
The Alliance Meeting	•
The Jubilee of Queen's	
The New Biological Hall	
What about Vivisection?	
Organized Labour in England	٠
The South African Dispute	
PROPERTIUS V. XI. (Poem)	
CHRISTIAN UNION	
BROWNING'S LAST VOLUME	
A HEROINE OF NEW FRANCEBlanche L. Macdonell	
Among the Orchards (Sonnet)	١.
HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN Agnes Maule Machar	
HELEN KELLER	
A MONODY (Poem)	
THREE RONDEAUX William McGill	ļ,
INNISCO'S ADVENTURE ON MOUNT CHIPPACO (Poem)	
A. Enelyn.	
FOUR SONNETS A. Evelun. Samuel M. Bayliss. Sarepta. Hugh Cochrage.	
Sarepta.	
(III III III III III III III III	
PAGAN RITES AND CHRISTMAS FESTIVITIES F. S. Morris	
PROSPECTS OF THE FISHERY QUESTIONO. A. Howland	
LITERATURE, NATIONALITY AND THE TARIFFG. Mercer Adam	
AN INCIDENT BY THE SEALouis Lloyd	
DE LIANCOURT AND SIMCOE	
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	
Энева.	

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters vertaining 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.

A REVENUE of more than thirty-eight and threequarter millions of dollars—the largest in the history of the Dominion; an expenditure of almost thirty-seven millions—a fifth of a million more than that of the preceding year; a surplus of receipts over expenditure of nearly two millions; such is in brief the financial statement of Canada for the year ending June 30th, 1889. Whether the showing affords on the whole matter for congratulation is a question in regard to which there is room for difference of opinion. That such difference of opinion is expressed goes without saying. That is a matter of course under the party system, at least as that system is understood and worked in Canada. This difference we may expect to see elaborated and emphasized when Parliament meets. The merits of the question depend upon the sources of the increased revenue and the results of the increased expenditure. It would be idle to claim that the mere fact of an increase of revenue is an infallible proof of prosperity and progress, though the presumption is certainly on that side. It must be confessed that it is one of the first duties of a government to collect, if possible without inflicting downright hardship, an income sufficient to meet all lawful and necessary expenses, thereby fulfilling the simplest requirements of honesty and maintaining the good name of the country. So far at least the Canadian Government is entitled to credit. In order to go into the question more deeply, and ascertain to what extent the increase of revenue is an indication of growth and prosperity, we should need more information than is now available. Important points would be those touching increase in the volume of trade, increase in population, and increase in wealth, whether the latter were the product of greater industry at home or came into the country from abroad. These are matters on which we may hope for some further light when Parliament meets. We prefer to take, as far as possible, the hopeful view, yet it must be confessed that there does not seem much reason for congratulation in the announcement of a surplus of less than two millions when it is more than offset by an increase of the Dominion debt by three millions. The business man who finds at the close of the year that he has

borrowed considerably more than the amount of his profits on the year's transactions may be in a solvent and prosperous condition, but first appearances are against him, and his creditors will be naturally anxious to know just how the borrowed funds have been invested and what it is proposed to do with the surplus on hand. Borrowed money may be so well employed as to bring a decided profit to the borrower. No doubt a good part of Canada's borrowings have been pretty well invested. At the same time a national debt of two hundred and thirty-seven millions and a half is a formidable affair for five millions of not very rich people, and an annual outlay of ten and a half millions in the unproductive article of interest, a heavy draft on their energies. On one point both parties should surely agree, viz., that it is now time to call a halt in new expenditure on a magnificent scale, and to enter upon a period of economy and retrenchment, so far, at least, as may be necessary to bring about some reduction of indebtedness during the prosperous years on which we may hope we have now entered.

MR. MEREDITH, in his London speech, took high ground in favour of the Federal veto. He even went so far as to lay down the doctrine that "the veto power in the hands of the Federal Executive is the sheet anchor of Federation," without which the Dominion cannot stand. If the Dominion ship has no better bower to cast to windward in case of a storm than the arbitrary veto of a partisan ministry in Ottawa, we fear the chances of her being saved from the breakers would be but small. Mr. Meredith supported his view with the following argument, or rather illustration: "Without the veto," he said, "there might be established to-morrow in the Province of Quebec a State Church, and the Protestant people might be compelled to contribute to the maintenance of that Church; and yet, according to the doctrine of extreme provincial rights, there would be no power whatever by the exercise of the veto to prevent legislation of that sort." It would be pretty hard, we fancy, to convince the Protestants of Quebec that they are so weak and helpless that they could find no means within the Province itself of preventing the consummation of such an act of tyranny, even were it conceivable that it could be attempted. With regard to the protection afforded by the veto in such a case, it may suffice to point out that the Confederation is a voluntary union. The provinces entered into it on certain specified condi-Such an Act as that imagined by Mr. Meredith either is within or it is beyond the limits of the legislative powers reserved to the individual provinces by the Act of If it is beyond the scope of those powers, the passage of such an Act would be nugatory and no veto of the Dominion authorities would be needed to make it invalid, while if it comes within that scope the Federal veto would be an attempt at absolutism, to which no province of the Dominion would submit. The aggrieved minority would have to seek redress in some other way, not involving a violation of the constitution and so a breach of the Federation compact on the part of the Federal Government. Mr. Meredith must admit, we are sure, that two wrongs could not, even in such a case, make a right. It is, of course, conceivable that the British North America Act. candidate whose general politics he approves and in supmight some day be found defective or unworkable, in consequence of the too great powers of independent action reserved under it to the provinces. In such an event the proper way would be to amend not to break the original compact. It is, surely, unnecessary to add that it would be unfair to make any such amendment without either securing the consent of each of the original contracting parties, or granting any dissentient one the option of returning to its original state of isolation. It may be that a Federal union is not the strongest or best kind of union for a number of scattered communities situated as were the original Provinces before Confederation, but that cannot change the fact that the Dominion is a federal union, pure and simple, nor can it justify an attempt to ignore that fact. This is a point which it seems specially difficult for minds of a certain type, with certain predilections and and prepossessions, to see. It is somewhat unexpected that Mr. Meredith should fail to see it after it has been

so distinctly recognized even by Sir John A. Macdonald,

THE result of the Stanstead election probably surprised no one, even of the friends of the defeated candidate. Whether the cause represented by the Equal Rights Association has been helped or harmed by the policy pursued in this case is a question on which we do not feel called on to express an opinion. At first thought it might seem that the occasion was in some respects exceptionally favourable for bringing forward an Equal Rights candidate. The constituency was in Quebec, the Province in which the English-speaking and Protestant citizens might naturally be expected to espouse the cause represented by Mr. Le-Baron with greater enthusiasm than those of any other Province. Then, again, this section of the population is particularly strong in Stanstead, comprising as it does about two-thirds of the total number of the residents in the constituency. These advantages were of course heavily counterbalanced by the personal popularity and influence of Mr. Colby, and still more by the fact of his elevation to a seat in the Cabinet. Still, had the convictions of the promoters of the new movement been strongly held by the Protestants of Stanstead, the fact that the defeat of Mr. Colby would have been a tremendous blow to the Government which refused to veto the Jesuits' Estates Bill would have been a powerful incentive to do their best to bring about that result, regardless of all minor considerations. On the whole, then, it is very difficult to reach any other conclusion than that the Protestants of Stanstead, and by inference, of Quebec, are not terribly in earnest in resenting the non-disallowance of the Jesuit Estates Act. At all events loyalty to party is still the paramount political motive. Mr. Colby's claim on the floor of the Commons that his attitude fairly represented the prevailing sentiment of his constituency is certainly not disproved. We have always thought it unfortunate that the really just demands formulated in the Equal Rights programme were compromised by their connection with the agitation for the disallowance of the Jesuit Estates Bill, inasmuch as a movement for constitutional reform by constitutional means could scarcely fail to be prejudiced by being identified with an agitation for the disallowance of an Act which nineteenth-twentieths of the people's representatives in Parliament regarded as constitutional. Whether the Equal Rights platform would meet with more favour in Stanstead on its merits, apart from this objection, can be only conjectured.

THE recent meeting of the Ontario Branch of the Dominion Temperance Alliance in Toronto derived its chief interest from the attempt made on behalf of the "Third," or "New Party," to "capture" en masse the Prohibitionist vote. The net result of the discussion was the passage of the following resolution:

"And it is the opinion of this Convention that the ends in view will be attained most quickly and effectually by heartily supporting the candidates of 'Canada's New Party' when the candidates of neither of the other parties will accept the platform of the Alliance."

This resolution may be consistent with the general principles and policy of the Alliance, but it places those who are bound by it in a very peculiar position in their relation to the State. In accordance with it a member of the Alliance may find himself required to vote against the port of one whose general politics he disapproves, even though he may be morally certain that there is not the slightest chance of success for the measure on behalf of which he makes this sacrifice of his political convictions. A good many members of the Alliance have also taken a deep interest in the Equal Rights agitation. Some of them have very likely declared themselves resolved to vote for no unrepentant one of the one hundred and eighty-eight who voted against Col. O'Brien's motion in the Commons. What would be the duty of such an elector should the Equal Rights candidate in a given contest be unwilling. and his opponent, one of the one hundred and eighty-eight, willing, to give the required pledge? Suppose, again, as is quite conceivable, that of two rival candidates, one of whom is known as a man of high character, thoroughly honourable and reliable, and the other a man of loose morals and looser political principles, the latter pledges himself to Prohibition and the former refuses to do so, is the conscientious Alliance man to follow the resolution?