

The *Week* of October 2nd contained a contribution entitled "A Person's Ponderings on 'Supporting Your Supporters,'" which touched feelingly on the new Frauds Bill. Everyone knows, or should know, that the Ottawa disclosures as to bribery, testimoniais, etc. were the exciting cause of the amendment to the Frauds Bill, which makes it a misdemeanor for any Government contractor, or person supplying the Government with goods, or person having unsettled claims against the Government, to contribute to any political fund, and forbids the bestowal of gifts or commissions upon officials of the Departments by persons doing business with them. The contributor to the *Week* draws a parallel between the State and the Church in this matter, and wants to know if a person who supports his supporters by dealing with the members of his congregation, for the sake of manifesting peace and goodwill, though often to his own inconvenience, is a "Boodler." He says he has often been guilty (or the victim) of this species of "Boodling," and asks, "How would it be for the Government to enact that 'Whosoever shall join any congregation or church and subscribe to its funds in order to obtain the custom and patronage of the members of such church or of the pastor thereof, shall be judged guilty of Boodling;' or again, 'If any pastor of a church shall patronize any shop or store, and so make bad purchases or bargains, simply in order to secure or retain the attendance in his church of the master or owner of such shop or store, he shall be judged guilty of Boodling.'" The writer thinks that all acts against "Supporting Your Supporters" should reach even the churches, and says, "Alas! if such laws were passed I wonder how many would cease of all the preachers who have of late aroused the indignation of the land with their eloquence concerning wickedness in high places!" This is true enough. The practice is almost impossible to eradicate, but by proper oversight such a check might be kept on proceedings that it would be reduced to a minimum.

We are not accustomed to find fault with fashions that come and go so long as they are not carried to extremes, in fact we try to make the point of "temperance" in all our articles and notes, and when temperance in anything is forgotten, purposely or otherwise, we endeavor to point out the folly of such a course. Observances at recent social functions, balls and such things, led us to cast some reflections upon the modesty of a few Halifax matrons, whose mode of dress shows plainly that they do not know where to draw the line in their décolleté gowns. Happily we see scarcely any young girls making themselves the subject of derogatory remarks in this way; the married women of various ages and degrees of comeliness are the chief sinners, and are greatly to be blamed for the example they are setting the young girls. We believe in evening dress; a woman never looks more charming than when she shows her pretty neck and arms—provided, of course, that they are pretty,—but she should not make the mistake of overdoing the matter. The "low and behold" style of dress is seldom becoming from an artistic standpoint, and never from the social and moral view. At a few recent balls we have seen the mothers of grown-up daughters whose appearance suggested nothing but the need of a shawl, and amid the prevailing nakedness a graceful lady gowned in a silk of soft texture and tint with long sleeves and high collar appeared to our eyes the most womanly and charmingly dressed person present. This, despite our liking for evening dress; and we venture to say there are many who agree with us that the pretty mode (when used in moderation) is being abused to such a degree by some Halifax ladies that people are becoming rather disgusted with it. There are always some members of every community who carry things to extremes, not caring what may be thought or said of their actions, and they do not seem to suffer much inconvenience from it. If they lower the tone of society, or show a sublime contempt for the eternal fitness of things, it is nothing to them; they are going to do what they please without reference to anyone else, and will never see that they ought, especially if leaders in society, to count the cost to others of their example and practice. If some of the leaders who transgress in this way could hear the criticisms passed upon their well-displayed charms by their male friends they would certainly blush for their folly.

A deepening appreciation of the Tennysonian muse is observable in the magazine writings of the day. A great deal is being said about the beauty and perfection of the verse of England's laureate, and some people appear to be only just discovering what a poet he is. Andrew Lang has been bestowing his high praise as is in the power of a critic to give. Writing in the *Illustrated London News* of the "Lotus-Eaters," he says, "It is a modern hand which changes the brief sketch of Lotus-Eaters into that immortal poem of the Laureate's, which we may pity the Greeks for never having heard." Mr. Frederick Greenwood in the same paper says, "More magnificent praise was never bestowed," and goes on to supplement it with a critical review of the poem, pointing out its perfections. He says: "There should be some way of crowning 'The Lotus-Eaters' as the most perfect, the most sparkling piece of rhythm in English poetry. Nowhere else is there such continuous and sustained meaning in the music, or rather in the poem in which meaning and music draw each other to perfection so nearly." Anyone who reads anew the poem after this eulogy will see, if he has not done so before, its peculiar beauty. In another weekly illustrated paper, the *Chicago Graphic*, we find Vance Thompson discoursing as follows: "Lord Tennyson is one of the few men who have made illustrious the rather barren line of the laureates. The Colley Cibbers, the Nahum Tates, the Amos Cottles—all these Pymys and Pistols of the ballad-mongers army—have been the rule, the Tennysons and Wordsworths and Ben Johnsons the glittering exceptions. Now that this

greatest of modern singers is going down to his grave there is unusual speculation and chatter among literary-minded people as to his successor." From this he launches into the said speculation, which "belongs to another story." Not only has the Laureate himself been the recipient of these well-merited praises, but his brother, Mr. Frederick Tennyson, who has published a volume entitled "Daphne, and Other Poems," has been gently handled by the critics. These poems we have not yet had an opportunity of reading; they are said to be distinctly an appendage to the poetical work of his illustrious brother, but not on that account to be characterized as superfluous. Richard Garnett, in reviewing the volume, says: "We cannot promise Mr. Tennyson that his volume will live as poetry, but it will not, we think, escape the future historian of the thought and feeling of the Victorian epoch."

Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner for Canada, has an article in the *Nineteenth Century* entitled "A Colonial View of Federating the Empire." In it he gives the following outline of what might accomplish that which is desired in the way of Imperial Federation. "I regard," he says, "the time as near at hand when the great provinces of Australasia will be confederated under one Government. I consider that a most vitally important movement, not only to those colonies, but to the Empire itself, because it is in that direction that I look for a great advance with regard to Imperial Federation. I know there may be differences of opinion upon that point; but I believe that, great as are the difficulties which lie in the way of inducing provinces to give up their autonomy and merge themselves in a larger body in which they may be overweighted, the advantages and necessities to Australasia of being united under one central Government are so great that they will steadily overcome all obstacles which stand in the way of such a movement. When that has been done it will be followed, I doubt not, at a very early day by a similar course on the part of South Africa, and then we shall stand in the position of having three great dominions, commonwealths, or realms, or whatever name is found most desirable on the part of the people who adopt them—three great British communities, each under one central and strong Government. When that is accomplished, the measure which the Marquis of Lorne has suggested, of having the representatives of these colonies during the term of their office here in London, practically Cabinet Ministers, will give to the Government of England an opportunity of learning in the most direct and complete manner the views and sentiments of each of those great British communities in regard to all questions of foreign policy affecting the colonies. I would suggest that representatives of those three great British communities here in London should be leading members of the Cabinet of the day of the country they represent, going out of office when their Government is changed. In that way they would always represent the country, and necessarily the views of the party in power in Canada, in Australasia and in South Africa." The *Standard*, commenting upon this article, says, "To a considerable extent the suggestions of Sir Charles Tupper are not merely acceptable, but have been anticipated by the action of Lord Salisbury's Cabinet." It criticizes Sir Charles' treatment of the defence question, evidently considering that the colonies should be called upon to contribute to the expense of Imperial defence direct, and not only by the means now being taken in the expenditure of public money.

Continuing, Sir Charles takes up the subject of defence, with which he deals as follows:—"In my opinion, no contribution to the army and navy of England on the part of Canada would have contributed to the defence of the Empire in a greater degree than the mode in which the public money in Canada has been expended for that purpose. We have expended, in addition to an enormous grant of land, over a million pounds sterling per annum, from the first hour that we became a united country down to the present day, in constructing a great imperial highway across Canada from ocean to ocean, not only furnishing the means for the expansion of the trade and the development of Canada, but providing the means of intercommunication at all seasons between the different parts of the country. . . . In 1889 Canada expended no less than two millions of dollars on the militia and the North-West mounted police, which any one who knows the country will admit is a most effective means of defence. . . . One of the most effective means adopted by the Imperial Parliament for the defence of the Empire is by subsidising fast steamers built under Admiralty supervision, with armament which can be available at a moment's notice. These steamers could maintain the position and keep up mail communication in time of war, or be used for transport of troops. Canada has contributed £15,000 a year to a splendid line of steamers, such as I have described, now plying between Canada and Japan, and China, and has offered no less than £165,000 per annum to put a service like the *Teutonic* between England and Canada, and a fast service between Canada and Australia. All these splendid steamers would be effective as cruisers if required for the protection of British commerce and the transport of troops and thousands of volunteers from the colonies to any point that the protection of the Empire demanded. These actual facts illustrate, in my opinion, the best mode of contributing to the strength and defence of the Empire. In my judgment, instead of adding to its defence, the strength of a colony would be impaired by taking away the means which it requires for its development and for increasing its defensive power, if it were asked for a contribution to the army and navy. Any such contribution would be utterly insignificant in its value compared with what is now being accomplished. The same may be said of Australia."

K. D. C. has proved itself to be the Greatest Cure

of the Age. Sample Package of the

Wonder Working K. D. C. sent to any Address.

K. D. C. COMPANY, New Glasgow, N. S.