

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. aid, 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. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

THE QUEEN'S JUBILEE.

Notice to Canadian Writers.

A PRIZE of one hundred dollars will be given for the best POEM on the Queen's Jubilee, to be competed for by Canadian writers, under the following conditions:—(1) The poem not to exceed one hundred lines; (2) To be delivered at THE WEEK office not later than May 1st next.

A similar prize of one hundred dollars will be given for the best ORATION on the Queen's Jubilee, to be competed for similarly by Canadian writers, under the following conditions:—(1) The oration not to exceed three thousand words; (2) To be delivered at THE WEEK office not later than May 1st next.

The right of publication of both poem and oration to be reserved to THE WEEK.

The competing poems and orations must bear on them a motto, and be accompanied by a sealed envelope marked with this motto and the words QUEEN'S JUBILEE PRIZE COMPETITION, and enclosing the name and address of the writer.

THE WEEK will award the prizes and will be judge of the fulfilment of the conditions.

THE paper on the present state of the education laws with reference to religious teaching in schools, and the system of separate schools, read by the Rev. Mr. McLeod at the meeting of the Toronto Ministerial Association, is instructive; and one rises from its perusal almost agreeing with Mr. Milligan that perhaps it would be better to secularise the schools, if by so doing the separate school system could be done away with. But yet, some religious instruction is given in the schools under the present system, while if they were secularised, this advantage, partial as it is, would be lost; so perhaps it would be wiser to choose the lesser of the two evils. Only the mischief is that the existence of a separate school system leaves a door open unavoidably to just such interference with the school regulations as have been suspiciously frequent in Ontario since 1878. For these the Government are clearly responsible; and if they would purge themselves of the suspicion that attaches to them they will accede to the request of the Association and return to the regulations in force prior to 1878, under which, amongst other things, the public schools were opened and closed with the reading of Scripture and with prayer. The selection of passages of Scripture for this reading, on the principle adopted in the International Sunday School Lessons, is also a recommendation in which we can heartily concur. But, on the other hand, we cannot agree with the Association in recommending the compulsory teaching of the English language and use of the Ontario text books in certain Roman Catholic schools in the eastern part of the Province. These schools are mainly French Roman Catholic, and to insist on the use of the Ontario text books, instead of the Quebec ones they are accustomed to, might give the Catholic Church in Quebec a precedent—which it is not likely to make use of, however,—for insisting that all the Protestant children in the public schools of that Province should use Roman Catholic text books. And so might the compulsory teaching of the English language in these schools: it is doubtless right that English should be taught there; but the Association would have met the needs of this Dominion better, as inhabited by a bi-lingual people, if they had recommended that the teaching of French as well as English should be compulsory in all the schools of the Province.

THE Gloucester fishermen are not pleased with the President's declaration that the Retaliation Act will, if at all, be put in force, not to give Gloucester a monopoly in American fish markets, but to vindicate the honour and dignity of the nation. They probably foresee that if the difficulties they and their representatives in Congress have fomented should culminate in damage to the general business interests of the country, away might go the monopoly they have had all along in view in their recent procedures. Meanwhile, the President's letter is distinctly hostile to England as well as Canada, for when he wrote it he had in hand the despatch of the British Government supporting the Canadian position. And what is to be the result? Canada would deserve to be treated with contempt if she gave way to the unjust demands of however big a Power; England will not force her to do so; this is precisely one of those cases where the States excels in arrogant pretension; and so—is there to be war over these codfish? Or has the United States Government sufficient faith in the justice of its cause to submit its claims to arbitration?

In an interview with Mr. Butterworth, of Ohio, the Apostle of Commercial Union, a Washington newspaper correspondent has learned the

interesting fact that what first called Mr. Butterworth's attention to the subject of Reciprocity was the strained relations between the United States and Canada, growing out of the Fisheries question—"Concurrently with which," said Mr. Butterworth to his interviewer, "I observed an attempt on the part of prominent persons in England and in Canada to make the Canadian Provinces a part of the Empire of Great Britain. The relations between Canada and the Mother Country were to be made closer, commercially and politically, by having the several States or Provinces of the Dominion represented in Parliament: the Lords and Commons to legislate for Canada, much as our Federal Government does for the several States." Mr. Butterworth, we fear, is not a very accurate observer; such ludicrous ignorance as he displays of the nature of the connexion between Great Britain and Canada is ominous for the success of the panacea he would apply to the present difficulty. However, being satisfied that the result of these negotiations, whatever it might be, must be a condition of estrangement between his country and Canada, he framed his Reciprocity Bill, which, it must be admitted, shows that his insight into the advantages that would accrue to his country under it is much better than his political knowledge. Referring, for instance, particularly to the lumber trade, he avows himself a Protectionist. But, he says: "We are contemplating the possibility of a lumber famine in the not remote future. According to careful estimates the fact is made apparent that the forests of this country [the States] will be used up long inside of twenty years, and as the area of timber-producing districts grows smaller the price of lumber increases. Well, there are limitless forests in Canada. We need that lumber, and it is absurd to say that reciprocity was against the system of protection, as it relates to the lumber business." So it seems our forests are to be denuded to pay for the surplus manufactures the fiscal system of our neighbours excludes from every other foreign market, and which we shall have poured into this country as a convenient sacrifice market, with doors wide open under Commercial Union.

It looks much as if the Prohibition movement in the States is about to give way to a true Temperance movement—a High License crusade against spirit drinking. In the State of New York a bill, affecting, however, only the cities of New York and Brooklyn, has passed both Assembly and Senate and now awaits the action of the Governor, which discriminates between spirit licenses and wine and beer licenses, and between saloon licenses and shop-keepers' licenses, imposing a license fee of \$1,000 on saloons where spirits may be drunk on the premises, as against a fee of \$100 on places where only wine and beer may be drunk and on shops for the sale of both spirits and wine and beer not to be drunk on the premises. The objection often raised that under any such discriminating system of licenses spirits will be sold clandestinely by the holders of wine and beer licenses only, is met by a provision that if any person shall keep on hand [the sale need not be proved] any intoxicating liquors other than those permitted in his license, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and his license shall be forfeited. This bill was carried through the New York Legislature by the Republican party, and similar bills have been introduced by the same party in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey; and the *Christian Union* is inclined to the belief that the Republican party is about to take hold of the temperance question in earnest, and upon a platform of restriction and regulation, as against Prohibition on the one side, and free trade in liquor on the other. In so doing, the *Christian Union* believes the Republican party is moving in the right direction, though it has not yet reached the goal: that goal, in its judgment, being the prohibition of all saloons, but not the prohibition of all liquor selling, an end to which a High License system may gradually lead.

SOME statistics bearing on the relative efficiency of restrictive and prohibitory legislation, published lately in the *New York Evening Post*, seem to place the greater efficiency of the High License system beyond a doubt. The figures are taken from the reports of the inland revenue officers (who are thought to be independent of local political sentiment) and were gathered by a lawyer of Michigan, and presented by him to a recent meeting in favour of the tax system of that State. They show that the numbers of persons engaged in any way in selling liquor were as follows in the several States mentioned:—

PROHIBITION STATES.			
	Before Prohibition.	After Prohibition.	Increase.
Iowa	3,834	4,033	199
Kansas	2,339	1,850	(decrease) 489
Maine	30 years' prohibition.	1,256	Not given.
Rhode Island.....	1,471	1,369	(decrease) 112
HIGH LICENSE STATES.			
	Before High License.	After High License.	Decrease.
Michigan	6,444	3,461	2,983
Ohio	High tax; 1 year's result.		1,019
Illinois.....	13,000	9,000	(approx.) 4,000