

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. B. 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.

AGAIN the report is cabled that the Dominion Premier is to be raised to the Peerage, and to become our next Governor-General. The Opposition organs, of course, scout either idea as incredible. Why Sir John's proposed elevation to the Peerage should be incredible, when titular honours of all kinds are eagerly sought for, and have already been freely conferred upon Canadians, it would be difficult to say. There is more reason for doubting that he will be made Governor-General, though, now that the duties of the office have been all but abnegated, any Canadian of blameless life and good standing may fitly assume the barren title. But why should it not be fitting that Sir John Macdonald should get the appointment? The Opposition organs supply the answer, and in supplying it they condemn themselves and all whose trade is faction. "Of all Canadians," says the *Globe*, "the life-long leader of a political party is the last man who should be placed in a position where perfect impartiality is the first requisite." But this argument, which, by the way, would close the Bench to every practitioner at the Bar who had entered political life, only shows to what straits party politics have brought us in Canada. Why should engagement in politics debar any man from filling the highest, or even the lowest, position in the land, except on the ground that no man can touch Canadian politics without being either defiled or defamed? If this is our contemporary's argument, will our contemporary do something to wipe away its disgrace?

Now that the last of the constituencies have acquitted themselves of their duty in the exercise of the franchise, it will be curious to note, at the approaching meeting of the Dominion Parliament, whether those members who were returned as "Independents" will defy both Party-whips and maintain their political neutrality, or whether they will speedily and greedily range themselves under the banner of one or other of the existing Parties. It may be said that the policy or the measures to be voted upon will furnish no true tests of their independence, for they can only vote "Yea" or "Nay" on questions submitted to their consideration, and on which they may be called upon to register their opinions. But this reasoning proceeds on the supposition that there is in politics no *via media*, no middle course to be taken or suggested between the extremes of party policy, the following of which may be the true fulfilling of public duty. To affirm this is to set at nought the experience of everyday life in other matters than politics, for in almost every decision we come to, if we are wise, we take the safe path which generally lies midway between two extremes. Why cannot we apply the same principle of action in politics, and commit ourselves alone to that line which nine times out of ten right and reason suggest as the best and safest to follow? It has already been said in these columns that it is no law of Nature that there shall be but two political parties; and while these parties are simply and only those of "the outs" and "the ins," without definite objects, in the main, consistent with patriotism and the public wants, slavish adherence to either of them cannot be the dictate of expediency or of reason. Ours is the day of trial for all things, and both in Canada and in the mother land the day of trial has come for Party Government. If the system is to maintain itself unarraigned, and party selfishness and rancour are not to make shipwreck of the nation, the old virtues of Party must manifest themselves and number within its fold men of fair and independent minds.

THE haggling over the Fisheries matter by the United States, and the apparent unwillingness to do Canada justice, are not creditable to the political representatives of the great neighbouring nation. Their attitude on this question, which is no more complex than a simple obligation of duty and right, shows how far we have gone in these degenerate days from that old-fashioned statesmanship which, whatever the cost, could not be got to shuffle or evade, and would scorn to swerve from the path of honour for the sake of the popular vote. Nor does journalism seem to make good the deterioration in modern politics, for it seems also affected with the palsy of a like disregard of honour. The other day an American newspaper, in discussing this more than Lenten Fish matter, made the heroic suggestion that the United States should ignore the treaty of 1818, and fall back on the provisions of the Treaty of 1783, which, in recognising the Independence of the revolted colonies, granted Americans more favourable fishery privileges than they obtained by the later Convention. In commenting upon this reckless suggestion, the *Montreal Gazette* very aptly reminds its American contemporary that the Treaty of 1783 was abrogated by the War of 1812, and that the Convention of 1818 is the sole international arrangement existing. If this latter Convention be annulled, the return will be, as the *Gazette* very properly points out, not to the Treaty of 1783, which is non-existent, but to the first principles which govern nations in the absence of any treaty whatever. "In that case," says our *Montreal* contemporary, "away would go all the privileges which the Americans now have, and which their fishermen have long abused; and Great Britain would be justified in looking at, and in acting towards American fishermen as foreigners of an unfriendly sort, men who have just revolted successfully, and who had deprived themselves of all rights and privileges in the heritage of British subjects on this Continent." This view of the case, doubtless, has not occurred to the writer in the American journal, and, if it has, to him and his kind it may not be very alarming. But there is little need, we should hope, to argue the matter on these lines or in any but the most reasonable and conciliatory spirit. The conditions of the Treaty of 1818 will be only justly and righteously insisted upon by Canada, in any negotiations with our neighbours, and by them, when they fully understand their obligations, and until some other agreement is come to, will no doubt be as justly and righteously observed.

IN this year of jubilee we can afford to look for a moment to Germany to congratulate the Kaiser on the anniversary of his ninetieth birthday, and to pray that he may be spared yet many years to avert war and its horrors from the Continent. Though his reign dates back only to 1861, the intervening period has been an eventful one to Germany, and as a soldier, if not as a statesman, he has been no unimportant contributor to its glory. There are comparatively few alive now whose eyes have seen the light of the eighteenth century. When Emperor William was born, Pitt was forming the second coalition of the Powers against France; and in the struggle with the great Corsican that ended at Waterloo, he was in the field as a soldier, never dreaming in all likelihood of succeeding to the throne, or of rivalling the career, of Frederick the Great. Whatever his shortcomings as a Constitutional monarch, his services to the Fatherland have been many and patriotic, and under him Germany has attained to the full stature of a nation. Though he has not made Parliamentary Government a reality, he has been no despot; and while he has kept his nation armed to the teeth, and become the arbiter of the Continent, he has ever counselled peace, and like a true soldier has sought always, and in the most effective way, to enforce it. Nor are the moral influences of the Kaiser's court and his unblemished personal life the least of the glories of his reign.

THE state of things in unhappy Ireland, thanks to its foreign enemies who, in the disguise of friends, serve it with every form of outrage, becomes worse and worse. To-day the country, in large measure, is so given up to lawlessness and crime that legislative remedies must for the time be laid aside, and safety for the nation at large be sought in the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act and the proclamation of martial law. This, unquestionably, is a dread resort; but how else can the evil be combated, life and property be cared for, and the high ends of justice be served? Well nigh every constitutional means of pacifying Ireland, so far as native agitators and foreign conspirators would allow them to be applied, have been tried and have failed; whilst almost the whole machinery of law in the country has broken down. How else can this state of things be met, if the foundations of all government are not to be upset, and society be reduced to elementary chaos, than by the resort to some such measure as seems now to be contemplated by Government? If this means martial law, suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and withdrawal of the franchise from those constituencies that return Nationalists and traitors to Westminster,