

THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.
Vol. V. No. 49.

Toronto, Thursday, November 1st, 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. 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. B. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Situation in Manitoba	775
Is It a Purely Legal Question?	775
The Injunction Continued	775
Co-education at McGill	776
Co-education not Co-residence	776
Technical Training at Woodstock College	776
Sir Lionel West's Blunder	776
Forewarned, Forearmed	776
Will Lord Sackville resign?	777
The Ocean a Non-conductor	777
Lord Rosebery's Plea for Imperial Federation	777
Lord Bramwell on Political Science	777
A New Plan for Party Newspapers	777
Sir Charles Warren's Defence	778
The Portuguese in Africa	778
Premier Floquet's Revision Scheme	778
THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE—DOCTRINE AND WORSHIP	778
THE CLAIMS OF INDUSTRIAL CO-OPERATION	779
TRIOLET	780
LORD SACKVILLE AND HIS LETTER	780
PARIS LETTER	780
AT FERN-LIFF ON THE ST. LAWRENCE (Poem)	781
METHODS OF MCGILL	781
CHARADE	782
CORRESPONDENCE— Grenville O. Cunningham	782
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	783
LIBRARY TABLE	784
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	784
CHESS	785

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.

THE situation in Manitoba at the date of this writing is, so far as known, that the Provincial Government is awaiting the decision of the court on the renewed application of the Canadian Pacific for an injunction to prevent the crossing. Should the injunction be granted, it is not known what action the Government will take. Should the injunction be refused, and that in force *ad interim* be dissolved, it is expected that the legal advisers of the Canadian Pacific will immediately make a fresh application on some other ground. The policy being so clearly one of obstruction, the Government will, no doubt, be strongly advised and disposed to brook no further delay, and to attempt to put in the crossing by force. As Superintendent Whyte says that his instructions are to resist to the utmost of his power, and as he has already a strong force in readiness on the spot or in the vicinity, there is undoubted danger of a deplorable collision. In the event of the refusal of the injunction—and it is not easy to see how it can be granted in the face of the affidavits of members of the Government that the road for which the crossing is sought is a Government work—the question will assume an aspect which we do not remember to have seen discussed. Has a private corporation, such as the Canadian Pacific Company, a right to resist, of its own motion and by force, the action of the Provincial Government within the Province, under any circumstances? Is not such resistance an unlawful and rebellious defiance of the constituted authorities? Grant, for the sake of the argument, that the Local Government is wrong in its contention, and that its act is in violation of the paramount law of the Dominion under which the railway holds its charter, does this justify the private corporation in taking the law into its own hands without warrant from the Dominion Government, instead of relying upon that Government for the defence of its rights and property? If the Canadian Pacific has no right of resistance, save that given by its strength—and the converse proposition would surely involve absurd consequences—then the affair resolves itself into a struggle as to whether the duly constituted and responsible Government or the irresponsible and self-seeking railway corporation is to rule the Province. Surely in such an issue the Dominion Government

is bound either to prevent the Company it has created from forcibly resisting Provincial authorities, or to encourage those authorities to assert their local supremacy by the use of all the resources at their command. If laws become silent when arms are taken up, if the Dominion Government can rely upon all good citizens to come to its aid to suppress rebellion, irrespective of their private views as to the causes of that rebellion, the same principle should surely apply to the Provincial authorities within the limits of their own jurisdiction.

It is speciously argued, on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and against the Manitoba Government, that the question in its present stage is a legal one, pure and simple, and that "when the existing laws have been applied to the case by the competent judicial authorities, then will be the time, if necessary, to consider questions of policy." This argument ignores important matters of fact. It ignores the fact that the question, so far as it is a legal question, was made such by the action of the Railway Commission, in referring the matter to the Supreme Court, instead of granting the order authorizing the crossing, which order was asked for and expected as a matter of course. It ignores the fact that the technical objection raised by the Canadian Pacific contravenes the obvious intention of both Houses of Parliament in the Special Act of last Session. It ignores, too, the fact that the action of the Canadian Pacific authorities in forcibly obstructing and resisting the Manitoba Government has, of itself, taken the question out of the purely legal category. It would surely be absurd to contend that a private company may, by raising a technical legal question, and by upholding its own view by force, balk the intention of the Government, Parliament, and people of Canada for "two or three years." That this is what is aimed at is clear, not only from the actions of the Canadian Pacific Company, but from the express words of its legal agent before the Manitoba Court. If so monstrous a doctrine were admitted, how would it be possible to resist the claim of the Province of Manitoba to be indemnified for the enormous loss that it might and would probably suffer, in consequence of the failure of the Dominion Government through defective legislation, to secure the fulfilment of its pledge to the Province and the Dominion?

SINCE the foregoing was in type the unexpected has happened; Judge Killam has given judgment continuing the injunction, not, however, on the ground of the contention on which we assumed he was to pronounce, viz., that the railway wishing to make the crossing was really being built by the Northern Pacific Company, not by the Manitoba Government, but on the general ground of the paramount right of the Dominion Legislature to govern in the premises. "It seems to me very clear," said the learned Judge, "that the Dominion Parliament must have the power to enact both for the protection of the company it has created and for the protection of the public in the use of an important work constructed under its authority." Thus stated, the judgment seems unassailable, and its effect is to throw back the responsibility for delay, and for all the consequent loss, irritation, and danger upon the Dominion authorities, without, however, relieving the Canadian Pacific Company from the appearance of pursuing a course of obstruction which is in violation of the spirit of its implied contract, under last winter's legislation. It is understood that the Manitoba Legislature will be summoned to deliberate in regard to the matter.

THE question of co-education of the sexes is still being earnestly discussed by the friends and patrons of McGill University. The opinion is evidently gathering strength and must eventually prevail that the reduplication of the college lectures for the exclusive benefit of the young women of Donalda Ladies' College, while the latter are pursuing substantially the same courses as those followed in the male department, is an unnecessary, and therefore an unwise, expenditure of time and energy. A friend has forwarded us a letter from Mrs. Lucy Stone, the editor of *The Woman's Journal*, of Boston, in which the history of Oberlin and other colleges in the Western States, and of the School of Technology in Boston, is referred to as fully warranting the statement that co-education is no longer an experiment in the United States, and that there is no longer a question either of its value or of its safety and wisdom. We have no doubt that the well-nigh unanimous testimony of those educators in Canada who