

# The Dominion Illustrated.

\$4.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

THE SABISTON LITHOGRAPHIC AND PUBLISHING CO

RICHARD WHITE, PRESIDENT.

ALEX. SABISTON, MANAGING-DIRECTOR

The Gazette Building, Montreal.

WESTERN OFFICE:

4 King-street, East, Toronto, Ont.

London (England) Agency:

JOHN HADDON & CO.,

3 & 4 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C.

SOLE AGENTS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

All business communications, remittances, etc., to be addressed to "THE SABISTON LITHOGRAPHIC AND PUBLISHING CO., MONTREAL."

Literary communications to be addressed to "THE EDITOR, DOMINION ILLUSTRATED."

8th AUGUST, 1891.



## The Census.

It is now over four months since the census enumerators commenced their work, and it must be many weeks since the last of their reports was sent in to head-quarters; and yet no official statement, either exact or approximate, has so far been given to the public. It may be remembered that in Great Britain and Ireland the census was taken on the same day as that in Canada; and although the system there adopted radically differs from ours, it evidently has the advantage of being more speedy, the results having been published by authority several weeks ago. If our officials, who have charge of the work, keep on long enough, the publication will be unnecessary, as the figures gathered will date back too far to be of much value. Many people living on this side of the Atlantic have a vague idea that we are ahead of our English brethren in most matters, especially in speed in attaining results. On many points of doubtful value we certainly are ahead; on those of public interest—markedly so in the publication of official results—we are far behind; as instance, most, if not all, of our departmental reports reaching the public this year about twelve months after the period to which the figures referred. In this census matter also—a subject of great interest to those who care about noting the progress and development of the country—we are completely out of the race. Can no means be employed by which this and similar statistical information may be made public at a date approximating closer to that to which it refers?

## An Unfriendly Criticism.

The first fruits of the pessimistic seed planted by DR. GOLDWIN SMITH are apparent. In a review of "Canada and the Canadian Question" (the latest work of that gentleman), published in so able a magazine as the *Atlantic Monthly*, a most extraordinary picture of Canadian affairs is presented—one that must make the cheeks of any Canadian who takes the faintest possible interest in national affairs, burn with indignation as he reads. Had the work on which the criticism was based been a reliable one, the anger might well be turned into shame; but it is needless to say that the matters stated are in many cases so far from fact, and the

conclusions so unfair and misleading, that the most casual student—if an impartial one—of recent Canadian history must, on studying such a doleful series of pictures, be impressed with their general inaccuracy. We have no wish to attempt to palliate many of the errors that have been made in Canadian government since Confederation; but every one knows that no system is perfect, nor are the affairs of any nation under the sun administered invariably in a manner according closely with the accepted principles of high morality, and at the same time most conducive to the general welfare of the state. In the constitution of even Great Britain appear many extraordinary inconsistencies; and her political life, at a period when she had many times our wealth and experience, was administered in a manner very far from one of ordinary morality. On the ground of national progress we have only to look back a very few years, and we see her in anything but an enviable condition, with internal trouble and dissatisfaction in almost every line; while her foreign policy—thanks to bungling mismanagement—would have been a disgrace to a fourth-rate power, such as Spain or Portugal. What politics and government have sunk to in the United States are matters of common notoriety; there is probably not a country in the civilized world so defective in orderly procedure, and so lax and corrupt in the conduct of its political affairs. In such matters Canada may be bad enough, but she is considerably better than her neighbours; while her progress in every way, during the past quarter of a century, has been remarkable. While the apparently unquestioned acceptance by the *Atlantic* of DR. SMITH'S statements speaks volumes for his high reputation in the world of letters, it is rather difficult to understand why—if only on the ground of courtesy to a neighbouring and friendly country—a high literary authority such as that magazine should pin its faith on any one man's statement, when such takes the form of an unremitting decryal of every feature of that country's political life. If a man across the street tells us that his host—with whom we have exchanged many civilities—is an unmitigated scoundrel, it might seem fair to enquire why he continues to reside with such a party, or what proof existed of his statement, before publishing to all the world the *ipse dixit* of the lodger supplemented with our own unfavourable comments. Such would seem, at any rate, the more courteous course to pursue. The reviewer of the book in question has also evidently little knowledge of the country and people which it berates so soundly. The remarks on the Senate and on the railways are no doubt very prettily put, and would be very effective if they were not at entire variance with facts. When we see him holding up his hands in evidently sincere horror at the existence of seven Provincial governments, would it not be well for him to be reminded that the territory thus legislated for is almost as large as the United States with its array of forty-nine state governments, each of them—it might be noted *en passant*—possessing far more autocratic and independent rule than our poor little seven, even to the extent of repudiation of their debts when in financial distress; and that the territory thus divided into seven would have been far in excess of that belonging to our southern friends, had it not been for concessions of large areas made by weak-minded English Premiers in compliance with the greedy demands of the Americans for more land, repeatedly and persistently urged on

claims based on the most trivial and frivolous grounds. And in his rather sneering mention of the C. P. R. line to St. John, running through American territory, would it not be well to recollect—when bemoaning our political immorality—by what means the greater part of that area was obtained? The story of the forged map has been often told; it must be rather disagreeable reading for ardent admirers of the policy of the Great Republic. We do not wonder at the "cold chill" which the reviewer states crept over him while reading DR. SMITH'S book, but we must confess surprise that he should accept its conclusions as absolute fact and give his *clientèle*—a large proportion of whom would naturally follow the subject no further—his evident firm belief in its correctness.

## Imperial Elections.

To the average reader interested in Imperial politics, the result of many of the bye-elections held in Great Britain during recent years must be a considerable surprise. When the last appeal to the country was made, the Tory and Unionist majority was 120, which has been so reduced by the popular vote in constituencies which have since become vacant as to leave a majority of 85 in the last straight party division. An unbiased comparison of the state of the country during MR. GLADSTONE'S second and third tenure of office—1880-1886—in his domestic as well as his foreign policy, as opposed to the present *régime*, is so markedly unfavourable to the former, as to excite wonder at the composition of the reasoning faculties in the average British voter in wishing a renewal of Liberal ascendancy. Had the vigorous and honourable foreign policy of Lord Salisbury involved the country in disastrous and costly foreign wars, or entailed much additional outlay in the maintenance of an unusually expensive armament; had it curtailed the area of the outlying dependencies of the Crown, or by treaty made Britain subservient to any foreign power, little surprise might be expressed at the depleted pocket of the taxpayer insisting on his vote being in favour of a change of policy. But when these evils—the first of which was a marked feature in Mr. Gladstone's rule—have been totally avoided by the present administration, and that, on the contrary, the area of the Empire has been largely increased, and the Income tax—that great bogey to the ratepayer—considerably reduced without any counter-irritant in the shape of new taxation, we must look elsewhere than to its general policy to understand the *raison d'être* for the growing opposition to the Government. It is altogether probable that on the question of self-government for Ireland has the result of recent elections hinged; the sentiment in favour of that measure evidently spreading rapidly throughout Britain. Now that the present administration have stated that they would next session legislate in this direction, it is more than likely that we will hear little in future of Liberal gains. A return to the disastrous foreign policy that almost without exception characterized the whole period from 1880 to 1885 would be fatal to the best interests of the Empire.

## Note.

The Literary competition closed on 1st inst. Answers to the Question competition will be received until the end of this month. The title page and index to Vol. VI. will be ready next week; it was unavoidably delayed owing to the issue of our Montreal special number.