



PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

BY THE

GRIP PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.

26 and 28 Front Street West, Toronto, Ont.

President	J. V. WRIGHT.
General Manager	T. G. WILSON.
Artist and Editor	J. W. BRINGOUGH.
Manager Publishing Department	H. HOUGH.

Terms to Subscribers.

PAYABLE STRICTLY IN ADVANCE.

To United States and Canada.	To Great Britain and Ireland.
------------------------------	-------------------------------

One year, \$2.00; six months - \$1.00 One year - - - - \$2.50

Remittances on account of subscriptions are acknowledged by change in the date of the printed address-label.

In remitting stamps, please send one-cent stamps only.  
Messrs. JOHN HADDOX & Co., Advertising Contractors, Fleet St., London, Eng., are the sole agents for GRIP in Great Britain.

Comments on the Cartoons.



**THE ONE-MAN-POWER.**—The characteristic tendency of the present day is in the direction of concentration. It is in obedience to this impulse that we have trusts, combines and consolidations in business, and we fail to see that the principle might not be applied with equal success in politics. Indeed, so far as the Federal Government of Canada is concerned, the principle is already in operation. We doubt if there exists anywhere a more complete combine than is here presented. The whole power and authority centers in one man—Sir John A. Macdonald. For several years past he has to all intents and purposes been the autocratic ruler of the country, though he has administered our affairs through

a cumbersome Parliamentary system. What GRIP begs respectfully to suggest now is that this clumsy contrivance be done away with in the interests of economy and the despatch of business. Seeing that the only function of Parliament (or a decided majority, which amounts to the same thing) is to carry out the will of the One Man, the only question to decide is how can this be done most easily and cheaply? The country's financial condition does not seem to warrant the expense of the present plan, which involves the payment of some hundreds of legislators (so called) and an army of sessional clerks and other officials. Isn't the inventive genius of the age equal to the production of a couple of automatic figures which could, by means of ingenious internal machinery, be made to decide weighty questions in accordance with our One Man's wishes by dropping a vote in obedience to his pulling of a string? If so, then our present Commons and Senate are a wicked and indefensible waste of money—not to mention time and wind. The man who opposes this proposition

is no friend to the country's purse. It may, of course, be pleaded that, constitutionally, Canada has no right to be ruled by One Man. Very true; but in the immortal words of Cleveland, "It is not a theory which confronts us, it is a condition." We are so ruled; and while present facts continue, Parliamentary forms and ceremonies are a mere legal fiction.

**WOMAN'S SPHERE.**—Mr. Waters' Bill in favor of extending the political franchise to those classes of women which at present enjoy the power of voting in municipal affairs, has been once more defeated in the Ontario Assembly. The argument against the measure was as able as the advancing intelligence of the world will permit, but when boiled down to its essential elements it meant that women should be denied full political rights because they are—women. The majority of the House echoed and endorsed the elderly opponent of the Bill who admonished the women folks to stay home and mind the babies, which function, he hinted, was their real and only one. In this he was astray, to our thinking. The domestic realm is, of course, woman's special charge, but there are babies in the political world, too, that require looking after in a motherly fashion, for there are wrongs in the political world which have a most intimate influence on the home. One of the greatest questions of the present day is the liquor traffic, and where is the home that does not suffer more or less from it? Should woman, the chief sufferer, have nothing to say upon this question? And what can she say effectively without the ballot in her hand?



**HON.** Mr. Foster acquitted himself most admirably in his Budget speech. Finance is not the most attractive subject that could be chosen for a display of oratory, although it affords scope for figurative language, and the Budget speaker who can succeed in keeping his audience awake is entitled to congratulation. Mr. Foster did much more than this; he managed to keep Parliament interested. Sir Richard Cartwright, at all events, fairly "hung upon his lips," though it may, perhaps, be fairly doubted whether this was because he was thrilled with the classic periods of the Minister. From the way in which he "went for" that devoted personage, as soon as he got the floor, we should judge that he had been just watching for weak spots. Needless to say he found some,—small blame to Foster. The speech, in short, meant this: No reduction of expenditures; no probability of increased receipts; no relief to the overburdened taxpayer; no response in the shape of tariff changes to the discontented manufacturers. Nothing but the mixture as before—with the Old Flag, of course. To have sung this dirge with anything approaching the sweetness of the nightingale is indeed a tribute to the ability of our new Finance Minister.

**ISN'T** there some ambiguity here? The *Globe* correspondent at the Capital says:—"Mr. Charlton followed after recess, and made a convincing and exhaustive address that it would be folly to summarise here." If a summary of John the Noble's speech would be "folly," are we to understand that the speech itself was, notwithstanding its convincing and exhaustive character, devoid of good sense?

**THE** Hon. Mr. Tupper has information (which he conveyed to the House the other day) to the effect that the wages of workingmen in England have lately been reduced 100 per cent. What a pity the young gentleman had not sent this remarkable bit of news to his friends the