

THE WEEK.

Sixth Year.
Vol. VI. No. 24.

TORONTO, FRIDAY MAY 17th, 1889.

\$3.00 per Annum
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

THE WEEK :

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS LITERATURE SCIENCE AND ARTS

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 \$1.00 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. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. 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. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Educational Commission.....	371
The Question of Policy.....	371
A Constitutional Question.....	371
The Canadian Pacific Report.....	371
Who are the Canadians?.....	371
The Anti-Jesuit Legislation Mismanned.....	372
The Proposed Imperial Congress.....	372
Should Colonies Pay Their Legislators?.....	372
The Vice-Royalty Difficulty.....	372
Mr. Parnell's Explanation.....	372
Anti-Bribery Legislation in the U. S.....	372
Associated Press Despatches.....	373
The Sugar Bounties Question.....	373
Execution by Electricity.....	373
PROFESSOR HUXLEY IN REPLY.....	373
ROYAL SOCIETY OF CANADA.....	Rambler. 374
AT SEA (Poem).....	Theodore H. Rand. 374
LONDON LETTER.....	Walter Powell. 374
MONTREAL LETTER.....	Ville Marie. 375
CANADIAN NATIONAL LIFE.....	C. A. Boulton. 375
BAISER.....	Archibald MacMechan. 376
PARTING (Poem).....	Emily McManus. 376
A POLITICAL RETROSPECT.....	Octogenarian. 376
AN OPEN WINDOW.....	A. H. Morrison. 377
IN MUSSELBURGH, SCOTLAND.....	Jessie Kerr Lawson. 378
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Proposed Imperial Congress.....	A. M. B. 378
FLEMING—IN MARCH (Poem).....	Seranus. 378
THE HISTORY OF PROFESSOR PAUL—Continued.....	Stuart Livingston. 378
A BRITISH HERO.....	380
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	380
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	380
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	B. Natural. 381
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	381
CHESS.....	382

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.

THE Minister of Education for Ontario has done wisely to issue a commission, or assent to its issue, for the settlement of the vexed question whether every teacher in the Public Schools of Ontario is capable of teaching English, and whether English is efficiently taught in every school. Public interest in the matter has been aroused by the contradictory evidence heretofore published, some of it from sources politically friendly to the Government of which Mr. Ross is a member. It is to be presumed that the investigation will be so above board and thorough that the question of fact may be definitely settled. Nor will that be, by any means, the only advantage which should result. The veracity of the Minister and the extent and reliability of the information given by his Department are important matters in themselves, and it is in the interests of both Minister and Ministry that the serious doubts that have been raised should be quelled, and the damaging aspersions disproved by irrefutable evidence. But it is of even greater importance that the people should be enabled to know just how the matter stands at present, and to decide what is the right policy to be pursued in this difficult and delicate business. The report of an efficient commission should be most valuable to both Legislature and people as a basis for future action. The Cabinet, too, can have no real interest different from that of the public in such a matter. Should it unfortunately prove that Mr. Ross's statements in the House were hasty, or based on insufficient or misleading information, it will be much better for all concerned that the fact should be frankly admitted, and satisfactory assurance given that the policy of the Department will be promptly corrected.

WHEN the facts shall have been fully ascertained, and the report of the commission given to the public, it will, perhaps, be soon enough to consider more fully the course that should be pursued, and the principles that should govern, in the future. Some of the views that have been from time to time expressed are certainly

narrow and unreasonable. The argument which has been drawn from the policy of the British Government, in dealing with the Welsh, lacks the closeness of analogy which is needful to give it weight. None but an extremist will deny that the ratepayers in a district essentially French, are entitled to have their children instructed in their own language. Nor can any one whose opinion has weight suppose it possible that a school composed mainly of French children, knowing only their own mother tongue, can be efficiently instructed without the use of that language, particularly in the earlier years of the course. The real question is whether in an English Province, the English tongue cannot be taught and have the first place in every school receiving Government aid. We have seen no evidence to show, and we see no reason to suppose that any French parent, or, to say the least, any but a very few of the most ignorant and prejudiced, would object to have his children taught the language of the country in which they are to live—the language in which all the important business of the Province is carried on. On the contrary there seems good reason to believe that in the great majority of cases the parents are willing and anxious that their children should have the advantage of knowing English. All those higher considerations which should have especial weight with the Government, such as the necessity of a common language to the unification of the country, are so manifestly on the same side that it is scarcely necessary to present them. The main difficulty, we venture to say, springs from the lack of teachers with an adequate knowledge of both languages, or the difficulty of procuring such for the meagre salaries offered. This is no doubt a serious but surely not an invincible practical difficulty. Seeing how over-crowded all the avenues to the teaching profession admittedly are, and to how low a figure the salaries are brought down by competition, it must be safe to assume that a very small encouragement or premium would be needed to bring forward an abundant supply of teachers qualified in both languages, if such qualification were declared legally indispensable in certain localities.

A QUESTION of importance both financially and constitutionally, is likely to be raised in connection with the survey of the so-called Short Line route between Harvey and Salisbury. The Bill authorizing the construction of this line was, as our readers will remember, passed in the Commons, but thrown out by a large majority in the Senate. During the discussion in the Senate, in reply to an inquiry by Senator Miller, Hon. Mr. Abbott is reported as having said: "I may say most positively that no expenditure of any kind will be made on this road until it is sanctioned by Parliament." On the other hand, an Ottawa dispatch of the 13th inst. announces that the Railway Department has nearly completed all the arrangements for the survey of the Short Line route between Harvey and Salisbury, and that two surveying parties will be sent out almost immediately under the charge of Mr. Vernon Smith, C.E. The question is, by what authority or right the Government can go on to expend money on the survey, in view of the defeat of the Bill providing for such expenditure, and in spite of the seemingly distinct assurance of the Government leader in the Upper House? Its proposed action can hardly be justified on the ground that expenditure for surveys is not expenditure on the road, since the appropriation asked and refused was for surveys, and the words "of any kind," in Mr. Abbott's unequivocal promise would certainly exclude this form of expenditure. It can hardly be that, having the sanction of the Commons, which represents the power of the purse, the Government feels at liberty to disregard the action of the Senate in what may be considered, in one of its aspects, a purely financial matter, since the Senate is a constituent part of the Parliament from which all the powers of the Ministry are derived. It must be that the Government, having at its disposal a certain sum granted for the purpose of unspecified surveys, feels itself at liberty to use a portion of the fund in the manner indicated, relying on its ability, with the report of the surveyors in hand, to meet all objections and carry through the Short Line at the next session. To say nothing of the doubtful constitutionality of such a course, it is not easy to conjecture

what pressure the Government can hope to bring to bear to induce the Senate to reverse its decision.

ALL good Canadians will have listened with pleasure to the undertone of confidence and hope which runs through the speeches in which at the recent annual meeting in Montreal, President Van Horne and Sir George Stephen, respectively, moved and seconded the adoption of the report on the affairs of the company for the year 1888. The fact that, notwithstanding the effect produced by the exceedingly light crop of 1887 in Ontario, upon the receipts of the road—very little of the crop having been left for carriage in 1888—the net earnings were larger by nearly \$370,000 than those of 1887, and larger by \$170,000 than those of 1886, is encouraging. There is, however, matter for thought in the accompanying statement by Mr. Van Horne that while the serious effect of the falling off in freight business in Ontario was more than made good by business along the main line, and of through traffic to and from the Pacific Coast, the "through traffic had to be carried at rates affording comparatively small profits," and that in consequence this increase in the net earnings of the road was not in proportion to the increase of its gross earnings. This means, of course, that the local traffic has to pay more than its own proportion of the whole expenses and profits of the road, and so, by inference, a part of those which belong of right to the through traffic—an injustice analogous to that which called into being the Interstate Railway Commission of the United States. It is unfortunate but perhaps inevitable that the magnates of our two great trunk lines should deem it necessary to lecture each other at these annual meetings. The mutual recriminations detract a good deal from the dignity of these occasions. When President Van Horne says gravely, "What is not to their interest the Grand Trunk people will not do if they know it," the truism may be readily accepted, but one is inclined to ask curiously, not to say incredulously, whether the speaker meant to imply, and if so what evidence he could adduce to prove, that the Canadian Pacific people are accustomed to act on more disinterested principles. It may be that a good time is coming in which the managers of each will be as tenderly careful of the interests of the rival road as of those of their own, but when that day arrives the millenium will not be far off. Meanwhile the public will be satisfied if they engage in fair and honourable competition, without unnecessary quarrelling.

IN his interesting address before the Royal Canadian Society, at its recent annual meeting, Rev. Principal Grant asked and answered the question, "Who are the Canadians?" In his answer, as reported, he classified them according to their four constituent parts, or, as we should prefer to say, origins: First, the *habitants*, the original colonists; second, the U. E. Loyalists; third, the Scottish clans; fourth, the emigrants from Britain. The descendants from each of these classes have no reason to be ashamed of their ancestors, and will not readily forget them. But may it not be pertinently said that this classification is, after all, an answer to the question, Who were the Canadians? rather than to the one proposed? It would be most unfair and precarious to base a criticism upon a condensed newspaper report. Our object is not to criticize Dr. Grant's paper, which we do not doubt was excellent, but to point out a fact that is not made sufficiently prominent in many discussions of the future of Canada. The typical Canadian of to-day is, we take it, quite distinct from either of the classes described. He is the man born and bred in Canada. His father or his grandfather may have been English, or Scotch, or Irish; but the type has been remoulded by the influences of environment. We have no sympathy with nativism in any of its exclusive forms, but we are, we think, but stating a fact that will be obvious on a little reflection, and that must have a most important bearing on Canadian development, when we say that it is this native Canadian who must be reckoned with in all federation or other schemes. To him, Canada is native land, just as England is to the English, or Scotland is to the Scotch, emigrant. In nine cases out of ten, the native Canadian has never seen Great Britain, and never expects to see it. However he may revere the land of his forefathers for its glorious history, it is not to him, and