

# THE WEEK.

Seventh Year.  
Vol. VII. No. 29.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JUNE 20th, 1890.

\$3.00 per Annum  
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

## 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.

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. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. 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 Quebec Election .....	451
Some Remarkable Statements.....	451
A Prospective Dilemma .....	451
Does America Hate England? .....	451
The North is Not the Nation.....	451
A Conference on the Negro Question.....	452
English Journals on the Behring Sea Question.....	452
Troubles of the British Ministry.....	452
Radical Legislation in Spain.....	452
What's in a Name?.....	452
A Correction.....	453
A STUDY IN TENNYSON.....	454
<i>Charles F. Benjamin.</i>	
THE SONG OF THE LAURENTIDES (Poem).....	454
<i>Rev. Prof. K. L. Jones.</i>	
PARIS LETTER.....	454
<i>Z.</i>	
ONE OF NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE'S HEROINES.....	455
<i>Katherine B. Coultis.</i>	
A DREAM AND ITS SEQUEL.....	456
<i>Katharine Leslie.</i>	
THEN AND NOW: A WELCOME (Poem).....	456
<i>J. M. Harper, M. A.</i>	
THE RAMBLER.....	456
A CANADIAN RAMBLE WITH ROD AND TENT.....	457
CHARACTERISTICS OF RUSSIAN LITERATURE.....	458
FROM THE HAMMOCK (Poem).....	459
<i>Alme.</i>	
CORRESPONDENCE—	
An Offence in Terms.....	459
<i>T. W. Paterson.</i>	
Official Precedence.....	459
<i>P.</i>	
Free Text Books.....	459
<i>C. W.</i>	
The Distribution of Wealth.....	459
<i>T. Galbraith.</i>	
Robert E. Lee.....	459
<i>T. E. Moberly.</i>	
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	460
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	461
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	461
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	462
CHESS.....	462

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.

AGAIN the unexpected has not happened. Premier Mercier has, as was generally foreseen, secured a considerable majority. It is too soon, as we go to press, to rely, with any confidence, upon the figures given, but there can be no doubt of his substantial success. Had he been opposed by a body of able and reliable men, bound together by sound and progressive political principles, the result might be regrettable. As it is we see no good reason to believe that, with all its faults, Premier Mercier's Administration is not likely to be more efficient than any which could have taken its place had it been overthrown. The Nova Scotia, Ontario and Quebec elections, all teach the same lesson—the futility of attempting to overthrow a strong and popular administration, having on its side all the advantages which accrue from actual possession of power and patronage, unless by an Opposition which is well organized and has a clear, definite and attractive alternative policy. The fatal weakness of the Dominion Opposition for many years past has been the want of such a policy. A similar weakness has been apparent in the Opposition, in the case of each of the three provinces named, in the recent elections. It is not sufficient even that the leaders have a good reputation for character and ability. They must also have a strong platform. They must be able to say just what changes they will make, if successful, in the policy of the Government. They must be able to show that these changes are of great importance to the well-being of the country. Failing to do this the only alternative that can give any promise of success is the being able to show that the existing Government is contemptibly weak, incapable or corrupt. This is contrary, as the mathematicians would say, to the hypothesis. It is also contrary to the fact in each of the three cases named. The moral is that in order to be successful any one of the Oppositions, Dominion or Provincial, must either prove the Government it seeks to overthrow guilty of some great delinquency, or must come forward with a policy which they can persuade the people to believe will produce decidedly better results than that of the existing Government.

THE resolution touching the vexed educational topic, which was moved by Rev. Dr. Langtry during the recent meeting of the Synod of the Church of England in the Toronto Diocese, recalls a very interesting matter on which we had intended to comment at an earlier date. We refer to the singular statements made by the Commissioner of Public Works, and endorsed by the Premier himself during the educational debate a few weeks since in the Ontario Legislature. These statements, as reported in the *Globe* of March 28th, were to the effect that Roman Catholics have no special privileges in respect of the establishment of Separate schools, that are not common to all other denominations. Hon. Mr. Fraser went so far as to say that "five Methodist families might, by the mere presentation of a petition to the trustees of any school section, establish a school of their own, and have their school taxes applied to its support." Premier Mowat himself, in the course of the same debate, endorsed to the full the position of the Commissioner of Public Works, and said: "It is complained that Roman Catholics have privileges which Protestants have not. But we have in the statute book, as the Hon. Mr. Fraser has shown the other day, a clause providing for the establishment of Separate schools for Protestants as well as for Roman Catholics." These remarkable statements, so far as we can now remember, passed unchallenged at the time. Though they must have surprised every one that heard them, no one, we suppose, would suspect a member of the Government, much less the veteran leader, of making such assertions without being fully assured of the facts. Dr. Langtry, however, in the preamble to his resolution offered in the Synod, did not hesitate to pronounce the inference that would naturally be drawn from these statements "altogether misleading," and to declare that no such right exists except in school sections where the teacher of the Public school is a Roman Catholic, and that even then there is no right to establish either Methodist or Presbyterian or Church of England schools, but only the non-denominational or secular schools of the land. The question is, and it is a most important as well as curious one, which is right, the two members of the Government, or Dr. Langtry. The leader of the Government certainly owes it to the public to explain, or cause to be explained, the exact meaning of his extraordinary statement. It cannot be that he meant to call the Public schools "Protestant schools." He spoke distinctly, if correctly reported, of *Separate* schools for Protestants as well as for Roman Catholics, whereas it is well known that the children of Roman Catholics have equal rights with children of Protestants to all the privileges of the Public schools, and that, as a matter of fact, many children of Roman Catholics are educated in these schools.

BUT a question of far greater importance than even that of the meaning of Mr. Fraser's and Mr. Mowat's declarations is that raised by Dr. Langtry's motion.

"Therefore resolved, that this Synod do petition the Government of Ontario to adopt such legislation as will secure to every Christian denomination in the country the privileges which these ministers evidently thought they already possessed, and will also secure to them equal rights with their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens in regard to the religious education of their children. Resolved, that this Synod invites the synods and assemblies of the different denominations now meeting or about to meet to appoint delegates for the purpose of agreeing upon as wide a basis of Christian teaching as may be with a view of urging the Government of Ontario to make the same a necessary part of the curriculum of every public school in the land."

These resolutions were, after considerable discussion, allowed to stand over as a notice of motion until next session of the Synod. But suppose the first one had been carried and petitions sent to the Legislature accordingly. If the prayer of these petitions were granted, or if it were maintained, in accordance with the obvious meaning of Mr. Mowat's and Mr. Fraser's statements in the Legislature, that the privilege asked is already provided for, we should find the Province committed to the fostering and support of two distinct and rival if not incompatible educational systems—the public and the denominational. It can hardly be assumed that, if it were once distinctly understood that any five Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Church of Eng-

land parents might, by the mere presentation of a petition, establish a school of their own and have their school taxes applied to its support, such schools would not spring up in abundance, all over the Province, as rivals of the public schools. On the other hand, suppose the Government should deny the prayer of the proposed petition, explain away as best it could the utterances of its own members, the injustice of refusing to other branches of the Church the privileges accorded to Roman Catholics would be glaring and palpable, and a vantage ground would be afforded for the assaults of those who are marshalling themselves under the banner of "Equal Rights," such as has not hitherto been possessed. The very arguments of Mr. Mowat and Mr. Fraser in connection with the above utterances were an admission that there would be inequality and injustice in denying to other churches the same privileges in respect to Separate schools which are granted to Catholics. It may be that the great majority of the members of the Church of England and of other denominations are too loyal to the system of unsectarian public schools, to permit of so embarrassing a request as that proposed in Dr. Langtry's motion being made; otherwise the Government may find itself confronted, at an early day, by the horns of a very troublesome dilemma.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH'S article in the May number of the *North American Review* has called forth several rejoinders in the current issue of that magazine. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that the occasion afforded by that article has been used by the Editor to secure a series of interesting short essays on the feelings cherished by the people of the United States towards the people of the Mother Country from which they seceded a century ago. The articles, seven in number, are by Colonel Higginson, Mr. Carnegie, Murat Halstead, General Porter, Rev. Dr. Collyer, General Wilson and Mr. M. W. Hazeltine. The last named writer is the only one who discriminates carefully between the widely different, and, in some respects, strongly contrasted, elements of which the American nation is composed. There can be no reason why the Germans, Scandinavians and Italians, for instance, should hate, or particularly dislike the British. If the Irish-Americans, or a large majority of them do the one or the other, it is as Irishmen rather than as Americans they cherish the feeling. The chief interest of the question is clearly in relation to those who are Americans proper, by birth and education. All the writers are pretty well agreed that "hatred" is altogether too strong a term to denote the dislike entertained by large numbers of the true American people for those of England, though their estimates of the reality and intensity of the feeling itself vary considerably. So far as this aversion has regard to personal traits, such as arrogance, superciliousness, and general notion or affectation of superiority, it may be said that the sentiment is not confined to Americans. It may be questioned whether it is not in some measure universal. One does not need to mingle long with the younger generations of Canadians, born and educated on this side of the ocean, to find a feeling precisely similar, sometimes pretty strongly developed, alongside of a profound appreciation and admiration of the sterling traits in the national character. But the most salient feature of the articles as a whole is the consensus of opinion of most of the writers in ascribing whatever unfriendly feeling now exists to the conduct and sympathies of the ruling classes in England during the Rebellion, as its chief cause. The recognition of the Southerners as belligerents, the Alabamas and blockade runners, and above all the Mason and Slidell affair, burned deeply into the sensitive mind of the nation, and are not easily obliterated.

NOW we can readily understand and to a certain extent sympathize with the soreness still felt, even by the better classes of the American people, on this score. Nevertheless, it has always seemed to us that their view of the matter is strangely illogical. In the first place it assumes that the North, the victorious party in the great struggle, was the nation, whereas to the people of other countries the Southerners were no less Americans than the Northerners. Is it not rather absurd for one of the parties in a great civil war, albeit the stronger