

# THE WEEK.

Seventh Year.  
Vol. VII. No. 2.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 13th, 1889.

\$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. O'LOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

### CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
Attorney-General Longley on Independence	19
Dr. Bourinot on "Comparative Politics"	19
The Mormon Endowment House	19
Tree-Planting on the Prairies	19
Church Union	20
Rev. Mr. Cruchet's Paper	20
One Man, One Vote	20
The Death of Jefferson Davis	20
The Brazilian Revolution	20
The Stanley Expedition	21
That Portuguese Protest	21
DIVINITY DEGREES	21
PARIS LETTER	21
LOUGH SWILLY (Poem)	22
FANTASIA	22
MONTREAL LETTER	22
PARISIAN LITERARY NOTES	23
HALCYON (Poem)	23
SOME COLLEGE MEMORIES	23
SATIRE AND SATIRISTS	24
THE TREAD-WHEEL OF LIFE (Poem)	25
THE FRIENDSHIP OF BOOKS	25
THE HOME OF CHARLOTTE BRONTE	26
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Imperial Federation	27
The United States Crusade	27
Separate Schools	27
TRUE TALE	27
ART NOTES	28
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	28
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	29
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	29
CHESS	30

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.

ARGUMENTS against the possibility of Canada's existence as an independent nation are largely based on the diversity of sentiment and interest that is alleged to exist between the various Provinces. Nova Scotia and Quebec, in particular, are constantly held up as bugbears before the eyes of anyone who seems disposed to favour Independence. We have had it so often dinned into our ears that the Secession programme of the one Province and the Nationalist movement in the other effectually preclude all idea of a united Canadian nation that it is most refreshing to those who believe, as very many now do, that Confederation is not the last word in Canadian political progress, to find evidences that so far from these movements putting an end to the dream of a full Canadian nationality, in the idea of independence lies the very means of overcoming these disintegrating forces. An evidence of this character was last week afforded in the city of Quebec, where Attorney-General Longley, of Nova Scotia, lecturing on the destiny of Canada, put himself on record as favouring Independence. Mr. Longley is a prominent member of the Fielding Government, which, as our readers are aware, swept Nova Scotia a few years since on the Secession issue, and he has been frequently described as an Annexationist and a Provincialist of the deepest dye. His attitude on this question affords cheering evidence that the Secession movement was, after all, merely an ebullition of feeling, and did not show a rooted desire for disruption on the part of our Nova Scotian countrymen. To this interpretation, indeed, the inaction of the Fielding Government in the matter of Secession lends countenance. Mr. Longley's utterances were supported by the Hon. F. Langelier, mayor of Quebec, Mr. Laurier's first lieutenant from the French Province. Premier Mercier's presence on the platform did not, of course, imply his assent to the position taken by the speakers, but his remarks to a Baltimore reporter, as interpreted by himself, show him to be at any rate not an active opponent of the idea. Ex-mayor Beaugrand's paper, *La Patrie*, under its new editorship, has rushed to the support of Independence with Gallic vehemence, and its course has been followed by other

Nationalist papers. These facts may well lead thoughtful men to ask themselves whether a policy that can thus unite in its support Maritime Secessionists and Quebec Nationalists may not be the most hopeful policy for all who desire to see the spread of such a spirit of Canadian patriotism as alone can place the permanence of a united Canada beyond a doubt.

WE are told on excellent authority that those who measure themselves by themselves and compare themselves with themselves are not wise. Whether the converse of this proposition holds good depends, we suppose, on circumstances. It certainly is very natural and cannot be very unwise for a people situated as Canadians are, side by side with a great and flourishing Republic, to compare their own institutions with those of their neighbours. The writer of a certain pamphlet noticed a few weeks since in these columns has, as we showed, instituted such comparisons with a vengeance, and reached results which seem rather too flattering to our self-love to be reliable, and some of which loyal citizens of the United States would indignantly reject. A more dispassionate and, as we may probably say, without offence, more competent critic has recently undertaken the same service. We refer to Dr. Bourinot's first lecture at Trinity College, on "Comparative Politics." As the learned lecturer pointed out, the grounds for comparison are many and inviting, seeing that the two peoples have a common origin and a contemporaneous history. If Canada rather profits by the comparison it must not be forgotten that she had at least one great advantage in that it was her good fortune to have her institutions developed more slowly, and "to have been able to survey at a reasonable distance the details of the political structure raised by her neighbour," when called upon to remodel her own. Some of the points of comparison noted by Dr. Bourinot are well worthy of attention; though in the nature of the case the facts are not new, they are none the less deserving of study by any who might feel disposed to favour merging our political fortunes with those of our great neighbours. In two most important respects the Canadian constitutional system has a very decided superiority over that of the United States. These two points are referred to by Dr. Bourinot as follows: "The application of the elective principle to the judiciary was a grave departure from the wise British practice, which Canada has carefully avoided with great advantage to the administration of justice. The United States has no Executive like that of Canada, working in unison with and dependent on Parliament, ready to inform the Houses and country on all matters of administration, initiating and controlling all measures of public policy and directing generally public legislation." Canada has also among other political superiorities a better electoral system, which, however, the States are now rapidly adopting. She is free in large measure from the great social evils resulting from a lax and demoralizing divorce system, or rather multiplicity of systems. The great contrast between the two countries in regard to this vitally important social institution is strikingly shown by the fact mentioned by Dr. Bourinot that from 1867 to 1886 there were only 116 divorces granted in the Dominion against 328,613 in the United States during the same period. These and other differences between the political systems of the two countries brought out by Dr. Bourinot should have a good effect in strengthening Canadians in their resolve to retain, at all hazard, their own national individuality and work out their own political destiny.

SINCE the paragraph in the last number of *THE WEEK*, touching on the Mormon Question, was written, American papers have come to hand with particulars of the remarkable evidence in connection with the Mormon Endowment House, which was recently given before a United States Court in Salt Lake City. This evidence was taken in the case of certain applicants for citizenship, who had been through the Endowment House, and bound themselves by its obligations. Eleven witnesses, all of whom had been members and some of them Bishops of the Mormon Church, testified that every member of the Church was expected to go through the Endowment House. "It was further shown," we quote from the *New York Inde-*

*pendent*, "that these ceremonies occupy the greater part of a day and include the taking of an oath, obligation, or covenant by each, that they will avenge the blood of the prophets, Joseph and Hiram Smith, upon the Government of the United States, and will enjoin this obligation upon their children unto the third and fourth generations; that he or she will obey the priesthood in all things, and will never reveal the secrets of the Endowment House under penalty of having their throats cut from ear to ear, their bowels torn out and their hearts cut out of their bodies. The right arm is anointed that it may be strong to avenge the blood of the prophets. An under garment, called the endowment robe, is then put on and is to be worn ever after. On this robe, over the heart, are certain marks or designs intended to remind the wearer of the penalties that will be inflicted in case of violation of the oath. The fourteen witnesses who testified in favour of the applicants refused to state specifically what the oaths are, and their testimony did not shake that which had been offered." Could we imagine any possibility of invention or distortion to account for this horrible story, we should be disposed to place it at once in the category of hobgoblin visions conjured up by terrified bigotry or superstitious hate. Even when it comes in so direct a manner from so unimpeachable a source, we find it very hard to give full credence to ceremonies which seem more befitting East Indian thuggism than American civilization. But the hard facts remain, in spite of scepticism: they are crystallized around the decision of Judge Anderson. That decision refuses the sacred rights of citizenship to the adherents of a so-called Church which imposes such disloyal and murderous obligations upon its members. We should be very loath, indeed, to be the means of stirring up unjust or needless suspicion against any body of immigrants seeking citizenship in Canada. But the logic of facts is irresistible, and carries with it duties which the journalist cannot honestly shun. If, as has been stated, it is proposed to have an Endowment House in the Mormon settlement now being formed in the Northwest, it is imperative that these facts should be pondered well by our authorities, and such means taken as shall be effective to prevent the granting of Canadian citizenship to anyone pledged to implicit obedience to a Church which imposes such oaths and inculcates such morals.

WE are glad to see that the subject of tree-planting on the North-West prairies is awaking considerable and, as we hope, increasing interest. We would gladly do all in our power to augment that interest, because we believe the cultivation of trees to have a vital relation to the future prosperity of our great prairie land. Our correspondent of last week is no doubt right in his opinion that better results can be gained by the growth of a small number or plot of trees on every farm, than by the cultivation of forests at remote intervals. We quite agree with him, too, that the Government Experimental Farms should have the oversight of the business, or should at least be enabled and empowered to stimulate individual effort in every way possible. Why should not those farms, for instance, make experiments—we hope they are doing so—on a large scale with different kinds of forest and fruit trees, both native and imported? Why might they not be instructed to supply every farmer with a limited number of young trees, either free of cost, or at the lowest possible price, exacting reasonable guarantees for their proper care and cultivation? Subsidiary to such efforts should be careful analyses of soils, and experimental trials of the conditions requisite for growth, so as to enable the farm overseers to give the necessary instruction to those to whom trees were given or sold, to insure proper care and cultivation. As an evidence of what may be done with proper effort and with moderate outlay in the way of stocking the prairies with trees, the following from a paper published in St. Paul, Minnesota, is of interest. The writer says:

"Everywhere thrifty groves of small trees are to be seen where there was nothing but open prairie or farm lands before. The land owners seized upon the advantages offered by the Forestry Bounty Act with such avidity, indeed, that the Legislature of last winter found it necessary to cut down the amount of the bounty from \$3 to \$2.50 per acre. As it now stands, each land-owner may