

THE WEEK.

Sixth Year.
Vol. VI, No. 22.

TORONTO, FRIDAY MAY 3rd, 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 \$4.00 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. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. 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
Principal Grant's Rejoinder	339
Matters of Common Interest	339
Why Not Have Faith?	339
Reaction Against Prohibition	339
The North-West Half-Breeds	339
The Extradition Act Passed	340
The Anti-Combines Bill	340
The Jesuits vs. The Mail	340
The Railway Horror	340
The Behring's Sea Question	340
A Complicated Situation	340
Boulanger in England	340
Militarism in Germany	340
Prison Labour in New York State	340
A Tortured President	341
A Newspaper Combine	341
GROCERS' LICENSES	341
ABBOTT'S HISTORY OF GREECE (Review)	341
OTTAWA LETTER	Rambler. 342
IN THE CHERRY ORCHARD	Archibald MacMechan. 342
BALLADE	Sarepta. 342
LONDON LETTER	Walter Powell. 342
A SCOTTISH SCHOOL EXAMINATION	Jessie Kerr Lawson. 343
MONTREAL LETTER	Ville Marie. 344
LOVE AND I (Poem)	Ethelwyn Wetherald. 344
THE HISTORY OF PROFESSOR PAUL—Continued	Stuart Livingston. 344
THREE TENSES (Poem)	Annie Rothwell. 346
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Principal Grant on Imperial Federation	346
Imperial Federation	J. H. Long. 346
Woman's Medical College	J. McFwen. 346
DID SHAKESPEARE STUDY LAW?	Thomas O'Hagan. 346
WASHINGTON FROM AN ENGLISHMAN'S POINT OF VIEW	Goldwin Smith. 347
GEMMILL ON DIVORCE (Review)	348
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	348
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	B. Natural. 349
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	349
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	350
CHESS	350

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.

PRINCIPAL GRANT quite mistakes the gist of the paragraph on Imperial Federation in our last issue, if he deems it an attempt to settle this great question by authority. It struck us that Lord Derby had happily phrased the chief characteristic and a chief difficulty of the Imperial Federation—what shall we call it if not "dream?" We can hardly say "scheme" or "proposal," seeing that nothing approaching the definiteness of a scheme or a proposition has yet been put forward by the believers in the possibility of a "a complete union of the Empire." If we had confidence—as we have not—in the method of determining such a question by a balancing of great names, we might perhaps find it not difficult to offset those Dr. Grant has given us with others also Canadians of no less weight. We might also query whether, seeing that Joseph Howe was poet as well as statesman, it may not have been in the former rather than the latter capacity that the vision which he impressed upon the minds of his admiring disciples passed before him? If so the fact might justify the term used by Lord Derby. We might even question whether the maturer judgment of Mr. Blake should not outweigh his earlier opinions, or whether much value can be attached to the approving views of other leading Canadian statesmen, so long as those views are sedulously kept in the background at home and reserved strictly for use on festive occasions in the Mother Country. We quite agree, however, with our respected correspondent in his evident preference of argument to authority. Putting authority aside we are not only willing but anxious to give the best consideration in our power to the argument. Nor are we by any means unwilling to be convinced that the dream is in this case but the prophetic foreshadowing of the coming event. We have to confess, however, that we find argument exceedingly difficult, in the absence of any tangible project, even in faintest outline, which can be made the object of criticism.

IMPERIAL Federation implies common action and the submission of the minority to the majority." These words of Lord Derby sound very like a truism, but they, nevertheless, suggest very real and very formidable difficulties. Does the addition of the words "in matters of common interest," which Dr. Grant suggests, remove those difficulties, or open a way of escape from them? What would be under the projected "union"—we cheerfully substitute the word of Dr. Grant's preference—matters of "common interest"? Surely all questions of Imperial policy. If, for instance, some Jingo Premier should propose to enter on another great struggle with Russia, on some Turkish, Black Sea, or Indian question, would not that be a "matter of common interest"? Or would not a proposal like that now before Parliament to expend a hundred millions of dollars or so in the doubtful attempt to provide against an almost inconceivable contingency, by making the Imperial navy more than a match for the combined navies of the world,—would not that be a matter of "common interest"? Canadian taxpayers would no doubt have to bear their share of the burden. But how much real weight would the representatives of the Canadian minority have in deciding such questions in the Imperial Council? It is hard enough, sometimes, for a Canadian minority to submit to a Canadian majority in matters which affect both the public policy and the private pocket. It would be a very different and a much harder thing for the whole Canadian people, as an insignificant minority, to submit in such matters to an overwhelming majority, composed of those whose interests, aims and ideals would all differ widely from those which obtain in this Western world. Dr. Grant's reference to India suggests its own answer. The basis of analogy is wanting between the relation of commercial and political equality, and that of commercial and political supremacy and subjection. British absolutism is, no doubt, in many respects, a blessing to India, though even many of the natives are now becoming tainted with the western heresy that "taxation without representation is tyranny." Such a relation certainly secures unity, but Dr. Grant would scarcely recommend it for Canadians.

SEEING that we are disposed to criticize his specific for the political instability from which Canada is admittedly suffering, Dr. Grant asks us what is ours. The question is certainly a fair one, or would be, had Dr. Grant first given us some more definite information about his own than is contained in the one vague word "union." Has he or any other advocate of Imperial Federation done so? It would be unreasonable, of course, to ask at this stage for an elaborate and complete scheme. But surely, before answering the retorted question, we might fairly require some information upon such points as the following:—Seeing that Canadians are now British subjects, in what way would the proposed union give them fuller citizenship? What are the particulars—just two or three of the leading ones—in which Canada would be the gainer politically by the new arrangement? Assuming, as we think we may confidently do, that the British people would never consent to abandon their settled policy and to have their food taxed for the benefit of outlying members of the Empire, what material benefit could possibly accrue to Canada to offset the loss of revenue that must follow from the free admission of imports not only from England, but from every part of the world-wide Empire? Pending, however, the receipt of fuller information on such points, we will not plead the journalist's right to play the part of a purely destructive criticism. Nor will we take the sceptical or pessimistic rôle and ask, What if there be no remedy for Canada's state of political instability? We will say frankly that so far as we are able to see the only hope of our country's escape from present disabilities and of her rise to the dignity of full citizenship lies in the direction of independent Canadian nationality. We do not say that the time has come. The Dominion may not yet be ripe for the change. But to say to the young Canadians of to day that they may not look forward to a future when they shall be citizens of a Canadian nation is to cut them off from the one strong incentive and the one grand ambition which can make them permanently loyal to the land of their birth or adoption. We know the staple

objections. We do not admit their force. The only answer for which we can now find room is, When the principle of national life is concerned, why have not men, Canadian men, faith?

A REACTION is evidently setting in against the heroic measures which have been so popular with temperance reformers for a few years past. The principle of Prohibition has, within a few weeks, suffered severe defeats from two opposite directions. In Canada, the repeal of the Scott Act in so many municipalities and by so decisive majorities, was plausibly explained as a failure, not of Prohibition, but only of local prohibition on a small scale. What was declared to be needed for success was Provincial or Dominion Prohibition, in order that the efforts of the people in one locality might not be constantly thwarted and neutralized by the inflow of liquors from the surrounding districts. In Massachusetts, on the other hand, the people have just pronounced emphatically against State Prohibition on the solid basis of a constitutional amendment. In round numbers the vote was 88,000 for, to 182,000 against the amendment, in a total of 222,000. This result is all the more significant from the fact that the people of Massachusetts stand in the front rank of American citizens for both intelligence and morality. As was to be expected, the larger cities, with Boston leading the van, went overwhelmingly against the amendment. But even the country towns and rural districts did not throw their votes in favour of constitutional Prohibition with any such enthusiasm as was expected. The New York Nation thinks it probable that a majority of the towns having a population of less than 2,500, especially in the farming districts, favoured the amendment. But according to the count of the Boston Beacon, of 160 towns which cast 200 or fewer votes, only 79 gave a majority for the amendment, indicating that in the villages and country places opinion was about equally divided. It would be unfortunate, indeed, if the result should operate as a victory for the saloon, but that by no means follows. Many of those who were most earnest in opposing the amendment will co-operate heartily in any measure for curtailing the baleful influence of the saloon. It is evident that both in Canada and in Massachusetts a long process of education by moral influences is still necessary before stringent Prohibition is either attainable or would be capable of enforcement if secured. Of course those who believe that Prohibition is the only right and effective means of checking the evils of intemperance will keep up the agitation, as they have a perfect right to do. But it is to be hoped that they may now see the wisdom of combining with other temperance workers to secure practicable reforms, seeing that the radical one for which they are working is at present quite out of reach.

MR. D'AVIN has championed the case of the disaffected Half-breeds of the North-west, and there is undeniable force in his statement of the case. The Government is, he says in effect, claiming that because the Half-breeds of Manitoba years ago accepted certain terms from the Government in lieu of their claims as original settlers, therefore the Half-breeds of the Territory who had nothing whatever to do with those of Manitoba, and were in no sense a party to the compact, are bound by the same arrangement and must accept the same terms. Apart altogether from the fairness or otherwise of that agreement and those terms, this mode of treatment would hardly be submitted to by any people of spirit. "If," says Mr. Davin, with logical directness, "you want the extinguishment of the Indian title, as it is known to rest in these North-west Half-breeds, you must go and bargain with them and with their children." This is sound and sensible advice. The failure of the Government to act upon this simple, reasonable principle in dealing with these first settlers has already cost the country dear. Mr. Davin's suggestion that a clause liberally recognizing the claims of the Half-breeds of the North-west and providing for granting land scrip to them and their children, should be added to the act, and the Judge of the Supreme Court in the North-west empowered to administer it, seems simple and practicable. Putting ourselves in the place of these poor people, does it not also seem just? And is it not in