

twenty or thirty millions whom it could so easily support. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." Is there no legitimate means of hastening the process of national development?

THAT is a sensational story told to the *Pall Mall Gazette* by the Rev. Dr. Howley, of Newfoundland, concerning the outrages suffered by the residents on the west coast of the island, at the hands of the French fishermen. If the half of it be true it would be a wonder if the people of the island were not in the state of unrest and semi-revolt described. "The Frenchmen stretch nets across the mouth of our salmon rivers, netting our fish; they drive away our fishers, tearing up their nets; they pull down and break up our factories which are erected on the coast." In the Island of St. Pierre, which they were allowed by treaty to occupy on condition that they erect no buildings and do not occupy it with a garrison of more than fifty men, they have set up a town and established permanent buildings, gaols, citadels, and the whole apparatus of government. Nay more, within the last few weeks they have actually conceded to St. Pierre the right of electing a deputy to the French Chamber and are treating it as if part and parcel of French territory. This is bad enough, but it is not the worst by any means, if the statement of Mr. Howley, who is the elder brother of the Apostolic Prefect of St. George's Bay, Newfoundland, is to be believed. According to that statement the male residents of a small settlement of Newfoundlanders were recently seized, tied hand and foot, and severely flogged by a regiment of French fishermen, for no other crime than that of manfully defending their wives and daughters against brutal assault. This, it is said by the reverend gentleman, is only one of similar instances which are occurring up and down the coast under the very nose of the British gunboat which is supposed to be stationed there for the protection of the interests of the Empire and its colonists. It may be hoped that these accounts are greatly coloured and exaggerated by the exasperation of the witness, but it is evident that the state of things is becoming serious. "One of two things" Mr. Howley declares "will happen: either our men, driven desperate by the destruction of their property and the insults to their women-folk, will take the law into their own hands and deal death among their unwelcome visitors, or if they do not do that they will in self-defence be compelled to appeal to the United States to extend to them the protection which the British Empire seems unable or unwilling to afford." The Americans, he avers, understand, as the British do not, the enormous importance of the Newfoundland fishery, and overtures for annexation would not fall upon deaf ears. This excited language is in marked contrast with the drowsy, easy-going answers given by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, to questions put in the House of Commons in regard to the matter. These answers, though very indefinite, seem to indicate that the Government think that things are going on pretty well as they are, and are inclined to a policy of *laissez faire*. It is to be hoped that they may not have a rude awakening.

REFERRING to the half-grown youths who congregate in some of the low-class boarding dens of the city, and who are continually being brought before the Police Court for juvenile depredations of one kind or another, a Toronto paper says that their ranks are largely recruited by newsboys who, having become too old to sell papers, have neither ability nor disposition for any other occupation, and consequently take to preying upon society. In Hamilton, a sentence of three years in the Reformatory, pronounced upon a boy for stealing a bird, is withdrawn by the magistrate, who finds that he has exceeded his powers, and fifteen days in gaol substituted. These two typical instances illustrate the astonishing shortsightedness of many of our methods of dealing with vice and crime, while we vaunt the high civilization we have reached. If our descendants in the twentieth century happily reach a higher plane, with what wonderment will they look back to a time when the dwellers in cities deliberately permitted hundreds of children to follow a course which inevitably left them in a few years in a *cul de sac* where they were hopelessly shut up to lives of idleness and crime, and then, whenever one of them was convicted of some offence against the laws of property, forbade the dispensers of justice to send him to a reformatory where there might be some hope of his being reclaimed to a life of honesty and usefulness, but required that he be sent to herd with confirmed criminals, thus almost surely condemning him to become one of their number. It is hard to say which

is the more culpable, the indifference or assumed helplessness with which we look on while these waifs are in training for the dark future which lies before them, or the heartlessness with which we condemn them to the society and the career of criminals as soon as we have detected them in some of the depredations which are the sure outcome of the course which we have permitted them to follow day by day before our eyes. Private philanthropy is, it is true, having its eyes opened to the stupidity and folly of which we, as a civil society, are thus guilty, and is doing something to counteract the evil. But private effort can do little to check the current, so long as organized society does nothing to remove its perennial source.

THE interesting speech delivered by Senator Hoar before the Massachusetts Club at Point of Pines, a week or two since, has naturally attracted a good deal of attention in Canada. This is due no less to the well-known ability of the speaker and the broad and liberal spirit of his address than to his official position as a member of the Committee appointed by the U.S. Senate to investigate the subject of commercial relations with Canada. Though Senator Hoar does not think the scheme of Commercial Union between the two countries likely to be practicable, his expression of opinion was made under such reservation, and most of the arguments by which it was upheld might so easily be made to tell on the opposite side, that one cannot avoid the impression that those Canadian advocates of the scheme who have been convinced of its hopelessness by his words, must have been already very faint-hearted in regard to it. No one in Canada who has paid any attention to the discussion needed to be told by an American Senator that it might be difficult for the people of Canada to maintain a political relation with Great Britain and at the same time have absolute freedom of commercial intercourse with the United States, "admitting the manufactures of the latter without a tax, and establishing against the country of which they are a part a protective, still less an excluding tariff." This is the burden of Senator Hoar's difficulty, as it has been the burden of hostile argument in Canada ever since the scheme was mooted, but it is peculiarly hard to see why an objection, drawn from our own political relations, which was regarded as having no conclusive weight when urged by Canadians, should be considered decisive as soon as urged by an American statesman. THE WEEK has never advocated Commercial Union, nor has it, while admitting that great benefits would flow from freer commercial intercourse with our neighbours, ever supposed unrestricted reciprocity possible on any other terms than uniformity of tariff against all outsiders. At the same time it is quite unable to see why Senator Hoar's opinion as to what is or is not possible as between Canada and Great Britain should be accepted as decisive.

THERE is little or nothing that is new in Senator Hoar's description of the natural relations between the various sections of Canada and the corresponding localities of the United States, as affecting commercial conditions and tendencies. Every student of Canadian and American geography knew that the facilities for trade between British Columbia and the towns on Puget Sound; between Manitoba and St. Paul and Minneapolis; between Western Ontario and the cities of Western New York and Michigan; between the Maritime Provinces and the cities of New England, are much greater than those existing between each of those various sections of Canada, and the centres of trade and commerce in any other section. No Canadian needed to be told of the formidable though not insurmountable barriers which nature has interposed between the Pacific and the prairie provinces, between the latter and Ontario and Quebec, and again between the last named provinces and those on the Atlantic coast. No profound statesmanship was needed to draw the obvious conclusion that Nature has pronounced most unmistakably in favour of a vast and ever-growing flux and reflux of trade from north to south and south to north across the international boundary line, and that nothing but the most purblind and inveterate folly could permanently maintain hostile tariffs between the two countries. "It seems to me absolutely impossible," says the shrewd Senator, "that hostile or different commercial systems, or fiscal systems, can be maintained when that great country has been filled up along our border." If not impossible, such action would be culpable in the extreme, not to say suicidal. That for which we may specially thank Senator Hoar is his reminder that there is scarcely "an instance in history where two separate peoples of two separate nations were

ever brought together by a spirit of cool calculation of their commercial or material interests." Nevertheless the Senator's inference, though it is but obscurely hinted at, seems to be that the forces which are drawing Canada in the direction of political union are so powerful and so constantly being multiplied that sooner or later the amalgamation must come. We submit that his facts and reasonings are at least equally valid in favour of the possibility of an Independent Canada, with distinct political institutions, but with freer and fuller commercial intercourse than has ever yet been enjoyed between the two nations.

THE Western Australia Constitutional Bill, which recently passed its third reading in the House of Lords, is likely to call forth an important discussion in the Commons. It will be something new under the sun for the Lower House to take exception to the legislation of the Upper on the ground of too great liberality, but this seems likely to occur in the present instance. The Bill in question endows the people of Western Australia with responsible government on pretty much the same lines as those of other self-governing colonies. The chief peculiarity is the novel feature incorporated in the constitution provided for the Upper House of the Legislature. This House is to be neither wholly nominated nor wholly elective, but a compromise between the two methods is employed. For the first six years the Council is to be a nominated one; after that date, or after the inhabitants number sixty thousand, whichever event happens first, it is to be elective. But the chief objection is likely to be made to the immense size of the Province. Though the new colony is to have control of but about half the vast territory marked on the map as Western Australia, it will still come into possession of a tract of no less than 500,000 square miles, or a country, as the *Spectator* puts it, "as big as three Frances." As the present population of the colony is but little over 40,000, their lordships are thought by some to have rather overdone the business in the matter of giving the fledgling Colony room to grow. Power is, however, reserved to the Queen, by Order in Council, to divide the Colony hereafter as may be thought fit, a provision rather suggestive of possible strife at some future day. A clause is significantly inserted in the Act intended to prevent the Parliament from forbidding immigration.

AS a princely pageant the ceremonies attending the marriage of the daughter of the Prince of Wales to the Earl of Fife seem to have been an unqualified success and worthy of the old traditions of British Royalty. The two circumstances, that the bridegroom is a British subject of the highest personal character, and that the union is believed to be one of mutual choice and affection, render it beyond question extremely popular throughout Great Britain. But the marriage has an interest deeper and more permanent than any arising from personal considerations. There can be little doubt that it marks a new departure in British monarchism. It is not of course the first instance in modern times in which a member of the Royal Family has married a subject, but it is the first case in which a possible future sovereign has done so. The union has made it distinctly conceivable that a Scotch nobleman may one day be Prince Consort to a British Queen, or that his son may be King of England. The not improbable rumour that this contingency renders the event very distasteful to some members of the old English nobility, accentuates the fact that it is a step in the transition from older to more modern notions. The old idea of the divinity that is still supposed in such circles to hedge in a king must have received a rude shock, and another long stride has been taken in the direction of the democratic conception of the monarch as the chosen head of the State, deriving his supreme right to rule not from the accident of birth, but from the consent of a willing and loyal people.

MANY of our readers have no doubt been following with interest the various stages of the controversial duel which has been for some time going on between Professor Huxley and his clerical antagonists in the columns of the *Nineteenth Century*. To such Professor Huxley's last article will suggest some hard questions. Especially worthy of note is what may, we suppose, be regarded as his amended definition of Agnosticism. That which is essential in its faith is, he now tells us in effect, the conviction that it is wrong for a person to say he is certain of the truth of a statement which he cannot prove by reasons logically justifying that certainty. This seems to