

CORRESPONDENCE.

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—The editorial note in the last issue of THE WEEK upon the Annual Meeting of the Imperial Federation League, held in London on the 15th November last, while kindly and appreciative, is somewhat discouraging to those who entertain the hope of the ultimate success of this cause.

After expressing your doubts as to the practicability of the scheme, you say, "But leaving sentiment for the moment out of the question, the self-interest of the mother country and that of the colonies seem to bear upon the movement at right angles to each other, so to speak."

I cannot agree in this; I believe the opposite to be the case. But assuming it as to Great Britain, let us consider the proposition as regards ourselves. Among civilized men self-interest is not the all-powerful factor in regulating conduct which cynics would have us believe, and further, true self-interest may be opposed to apparent self-interest. Thus, if a stranger offered gratuitously to support me and my family, self-interest as construed by cynics would urge the acceptance of the offer; the arrangement would enable me to live without labour and to enjoy ease and leisure not at my command at present. Would any one commend me for accepting such an offer?

Yet this is somewhat the position of the colonies and Britain at this moment. The mother country supports fleets and armies for the common defence of all, and towards the vast expense of them the colonies contribute nothing. It is said to be the "interest" of the colonies to perpetuate this state of affairs so long as the generosity of the mother country is willing to maintain it. It appears to be self-interest to accept all favours which can be got for nothing; but I doubt if colonists who consider the matter are accustomed to take any pride in the fact.

But wherein is Imperial Federation opposed to the self-interest of the colonies save in this one question of expense? Critics tell us that "the colonies would not care to be mixed up in England's foreign wars"; as if our present danger from this source could in any way be enhanced by a federation of the Empire; as though war at the present day with any power, European or otherwise, possessing a navy, would not directly menace our seaports on both oceans, as well as the third merchant shipping fleet in the globe. At present the war would be none of our making; under Federation we should have at least a voice as to whether it should be entered upon or not.

I can understand why the Briton of the home-island, proud of his success in governing it, is unwilling to concede to the colonist representation at Westminster, or any voice in Imperial councils. I can understand his indifference—his neglect (of which you complain in the matter of the Behring Sea Seizures) of the interest of men too poor-spirited to demand as their birthright a share with him in the government of the Empire, of which their country forms so important a part.

As regards Canada the colonial relation cannot last. Five million people may be content to have their foreign affairs managed by men in whose election they have no voice; thrice that number, possessed of accumulated wealth and the vast interests of a rich and rapidly growing country, will not. They will not, even though that management should always be as wise, conscientious, and just as has been that of the Imperial Parliament during the past half century. They will not be, as we are, content to be "protected" if only some one else pays the bill.

Other forces of attraction come into play. We lie within the long and deep shadow of a great and prosperous republic, which tempts our people with the offer of an absolute self-government we do not now possess, and with a distinctive name among the nations of the earth which we cannot under existing circumstances lay claim to. Federationists strive to counter-balance this offer with an offer of an equal partnership in a yet wealthier and grander confederation of men of our race. Should their efforts prove abortive through the apathy of statesmen in England, or our own timorousness, can one fail to see the ultimate result?

W. S. G.

THE UNITED STATES CRUSADE.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—In your issue of the 29th ult. another Republican crusader, Mr. W. E. Raney, of Saco, Maine, emulating our modern "Peter the Hermit," the great and only Erastus, seeks to set the Canadian heather on fire with what he modestly calls "a few dry facts."

The reference to the decaying industries of the New England States in my letter to THE WEEK, quoted by Mr. Raney, was a reference to an alarming and disastrous state of facts which is regretfully admitted by the United States press, and which is a cause of great anxiety to the statesmen of New England. Mr. Raney's ingenious suggestions as to what he thinks are the probable causes of "the decaying industries" of his States of "the rock-ribbed hills," can no more stay their inflowing tide of manufacturing decay and commercial disaster, than can his boastful array of "fat dividends" of the famous "thirty-three cotton companies of Fall River, Mass.," delude Canadians into the belief that all's well across the border. Mr. Raney must remember that the Canadian people live too near the great Republic to fail to distinguish between bombastic assertion and well-grounded argument. Have

not things come to a serious pass in the New England States when a Commission has to be appointed by their Government to visit important centres, and to seek out the causes of the manufacturing and commercial depression? Perhaps if Mr. Raney were to draw the attention of his Government to the famous "thirty-three cotton companies" and their "fat dividends," not excluding the "three" in his own neighbourhood, more especially that of the "plethoric surplus," it would at once recall its Commission, whose occupation, like Yorick's, "would be gone."

As to shrinkage in value of New England farm lands and Mr. Raney's plausible explanation "that the sons of New England preferred . . . the big garden farms on the prairie to the rock-ribbed hills of Maine," etc., Mr. Raney will bear with us as we cull from one of his "big garden farms on the prairie" an actual not a rhetorical "dry fact," and present it to him to make such "application thereof" as may be most pleasing. It is but one of many referred to by our Dominion Statistician, Mr. George Johnston, in his very able letters on the subject. Professor Henry, lecturing in Richmond, Wisconsin, said: "One of the richest prairies in the United States is that of the St. Croix Valley in Wisconsin." Of that valley he said: "To-day the richest part of it is almost without fences; the majority of the farm buildings, especially the barns, are poor, and the people complain bitterly of hard times."

Another "dry fact" from over the way. The New York Times says: "The farmers of the United States are staggering under a burden of mortgage indebtedness approximating nine thousand millions of dollars."

Will Mr. Raney permit the suggestion that the "fat dividends" of his New England factories be at once applied as strengthening plaster to the overburdened backs of the United States farmers.

As to our comparative progress in population with the United States Mr. Johnston says: "The Dominion had a half a million of people in 1810. The United States in that same year had seven and a quarter million. Canada has increased ten times; the United States but nine times. Had the United States increased their population as rapidly as the Dominion of Canada, they would now have seventy-two and a half million instead of say sixty-five million."

Mr. Raney asserts that the "sons who have left the farms of New England have not left the country;" and again, "the places of those who leave are eagerly taken by Canadians." I would ask Mr. Raney, Are there not hundreds, nay thousands, of natives of the United States permanently and prosperously settled in Canada? and as to the second assertion, Does Mr. Raney think that there is a Canadian so bereft of his senses as to leave Canada and attempt to reanimate "a decaying industry," to occupy "a deserted factory," to rebuild "a ruined foundry," to purchase "a shrunken farm," or to dispute the "loss in population" of the New England States, or even to seek to revive ship-building on the dreary coast of Maine?

Toronto, Dec. 10th, 1889.

T. E. MOBERLY.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—Although I no longer reside in the Province of Manitoba, I shall retain a strong interest in everything which affects the Province where I have spent so many years of my life; and in following in your journal the discussion on the Separate School question I have read the letters of Mr. F. Beverley Robertson, John W. Dafeo, and Mr. A. E. McPhillips, together with your editorial notice in your edition of the 22nd ult., replying to the letters of Messrs. F. Beverley Robertson and A. E. McPhillips. You commend the arguments of Mr. F. Beverley Robertson, and say that Mr. A. E. McPhillips' reasoning fails at the crucial point. I have not now before me either of the letters, but I may take it that the part referred to by you is the crucial part. You say that the conclusiveness of the reasoning turns upon the question whether Catholic Schools existed in "practice" in Manitoba before the union. This I do not dispute, but you go on to say that that question is not merely a question of whether such schools were in operation, but whether these schools were in any way recognized as part of a Public School system and aided by public funds. This I most positively deny. The discussion on this matter is a question of construction, and rests upon the meaning of clause 22 of the Manitoba Act. As I have not the Statute before me, I take the section from Mr. Dafeo's letter. It reads as follows:—

"Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law or practice in the Province at the union."

I think Mr. Dafeo has quoted correctly. To make this section support your argument the word *or* must be read *and*. Read as it stands, and without such a change of meaning, it is clear that the Act was meant to cover a "right or privilege" by "practice," without any express authorization of law as distinguished from a system authorized and carried on by express legislative enactment "by law."

To argue that in order to partake of the benefit of this section the schools must not only have been in operation and recognized as part of the school system, and aided by public funds, is as I said before to agree that in the section the word *or* means *and*. This is a question of legal construction which I am willing to argue with Mr. Robertson, should he be willing to support the opposite contention

after I have pointed out to him the length to which his argument has led him.

At present I will content myself with giving my opinion that no such construction can be placed on the word. The meaning is plain, and on its face there is no reason which a court could reasonably give for changing the plain meaning of the word. I refer you as to this to pages 24 and 284 of Maxwell on Statutes.

Taking the section, then, to mean as it reads, the word "or" being disjunctive, and eliminating for the present the word "law," the section will read, "Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have . . . by practice in the province at the union."

That the Catholics of Manitoba had a right or privilege "by practice" with respect to denominational schools cannot be and is not denied, and the question now is, will the proposed legislation "prejudicially affect" that "right or privilege." It does not need any great clearness of perception to see that a law which will compel the supporters of denominational schools to support also public schools from which they will derive no benefit will prejudicially affect the "right or privilege" which the Catholics of Manitoba have with respect to their denominational schools.

I think I have shown that it is not at all necessary for Mr. A. E. McPhillips to show you that the Catholic Separate Schools existed in the form and sense you contend for, and the difficulty is not one for him and the supporters of Catholic Separate Schools but for Mr. F. Beverley Robertson and those who propose to destroy them.

In conclusion I will only say that if the advocates of Public Schools will only take time to consider the unjust position in which they will place their Catholic fellow-citizens by the enactment of such a law as is proposed, and will remind themselves that this is an era of religious and civil liberty, no such law will ever appear on the statute book.

It matters not that our reasons are such that they cannot understand them, they are religious reasons; and the law has no more right to compel a man to pay taxes to or send his child to a school to which he objects for religious reasons than it has to compel him to pay money to or attend a church to which he objects for similar reasons; and to enact a law compelling him to pay taxes to one school from which he can conscientiously accept no benefit, while he has at the same time to send his children to and support another school which receives no support from the taxes he pays, is to enact something which is tyrannical in the extreme.

L. G. MCPHILLIPS.

Vancouver, December 3rd, 1889.

TRUE TALE.

PEOPLE who are familiar with London at all, particularly that part of it known as Buckingham Palace Road (pronounced "re-oad," of course, by the aboriginal population), may remember a certain poor, shabby, overcrowded and not over-clean lane called Stanley Crescent. It leads from the Royal Mews back into Buckingham Palace Road, and is tenanted by some of her Majesty's most shiftless and unpromising subjects. Drink and crowding and centuries of poverty are to blame for the squalor of the houses, for the irresponsibility of the inhabitants. Such as these can never be reclaimed while they remain where they are; the only hope is in breaking up the neighbourhood, killing the old off—humanely enough, too, for the workhouse and the home do kill such people off in a marvellously short time, the change of residence affecting their spirits—and sending the young away. Of the latter, some go down into the sweet hedged lanes of the provinces, others get apprenticed, become smart joiners, milliners, factory hands, cab drivers, always passing with a certain wilt of horror the entrance to Stanley Crescent, and some—most fortunate of all—get shipped off to the Colonies, and either go weakly to the wall there as they would have done anywhere, or else become infected by the strength and purity of the life around them and so end by making good citizens.

Of the children in Stanley Crescent, Lyddy was at one time the very worst. Lyddy *what*, you might ask her again and again; she could never tell you. Beaten, bruised, prematurely old and almost ugly with the mark of a sinful over-production in her face, poor Lyddy grew to be thirteen—not perhaps bad, but certainly low, with but one bright side to her life, and that simply the existence, round a couple of corners, of a group of peacocks. Any day, if you choose, you may dawdle about the iron railings that surround Buckingham Palace, and peer at the peacocks that strut gaily inside. Tourists do so, Londoners do so, all sorts and conditions of men, women, nursemaids, messengers, soldiers, tramps and children do so, and they are certainly worth the waste of time. And what wonderful things they were to Lyddy! She might have gone farther into the Parks if she had liked, or along the broad walk up which every morning at ten came the handsome soldiers to exchange guard, but even if she had fresher fields and newer pastures in her eye she rarely yielded, but brought up daily, or almost daily, whenever the glint of the gorgeous tails caught her enraptured vision at the familiar iron railings.

Now, let it not be thought that Lyddy was an embryo artist, or poet, or anything of that sort. She was simply an embryo woman, and the sight of those spreading tails, bronze and crimson, green and gold, opal and russet, fired