

THE WEEK.

Sixth Year.
Vol. VI. No. 48.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1st, 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. 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, 6 Jordan Street, Toronto.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Late Hon. Alexander Morris.....	755
Canadian Exports and Imports.....	755
Secular v. Separate Schools.....	755
A Constitutional Question.....	755
An Illogical Franchise.....	756
The Baptists and Tax Exemption.....	756
Tree Planting on the Prairies.....	756
Navigation of the Mackenzie.....	756
The Destiny of America.....	756
Canada and the United States.....	756
Federation in Australia.....	757
Recent Events in Portugal.....	757
The German Emperor's Address.....	757
THE PROFESSORSHIP OF PHILOSOPHY.....	757
NOVEMBER (POEM).....	758
SUICIDE.....	758
PARIS LETTER.....	759
INDIAN SUMMER (POEM).....	759
MONTREAL LETTER.....	759
THE SONNET.—VIII.....	760
SOME PARIS ATELIERS.....	761
DOUBT (POEM).....	761
CORRESPONDENCE—	
A Curiosity of Literature.....	76
From a Subscriber.....	762
TRUE TALE.....	762
ART NOTES.....	763
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	763
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	764
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	765
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	765
CHESS.....	766

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 death of the Hon. Alexander Morris, which occurred on the 28th ult., removed from our midst one who was for many years honourably prominent in Canadian public life. Mr. Morris was the eldest son of the late Hon. William Morris, who was for nearly forty years, prior to 1859, a member of the Legislative Council of Canada. The son, Alexander, was born at Perth, in 1826. He was educated at the University of Glasgow and McGill College, Montreal, and, having studied the profession of law, was admitted to the Bars of both Upper and Lower Canada in 1851. He entered public life ten years later as the member for South Lanark in the Canadian Legislature, and continued to represent the same constituency in the House of Commons for several years after Confederation. In 1864 he was largely instrumental in breaking the deadlock between the two parties in the Canadian Assembly, and thus opening up the way to the Confederation, of which he was an earnest advocate. It was mainly at his instance and through the exercise of his tact and influence that Sir John Macdonald and the late Hon. George Brown, the leaders of the two hostile factions, were brought to consent to a truce, and enter upon the negotiations which led eventually to the union of the Provinces. Mr. Morris is said to have always, and no doubt rightly, regarded this as his best service to his native country. His subsequent career in the honourable offices of Cabinet Minister, Chief Justice of Manitoba, Commissioner of Indian Affairs for Manitoba, and the North-West Territories and Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, will be comparatively fresh in the memories of our readers. While Indian Commissioner he was instrumental in negotiating several treaties with the Indian tribes, which have been of great service in the pacification and management of the North-West Indians. Mr. Morris was one of those public men whose influence, though more quietly and unostentatiously exerted, is really more potent for good, and will live longer after him, than many a man more prominent to the public eye and better known to fame.

THE trade returns of Canada for the first three months of the current fiscal year are of a most encouraging character. The increase in value of imports during the quarter over that for the corresponding months of 1888-89 is nearly two millions of dollars, while the increase in value of exports during the same period reaches the astonishing and almost incredible figure of about five and a half millions. The figures, as published, are as follows: Imports for the three months in 1888-9, \$29,566,000; for 1889-90, \$31,558,000. Exports for the three months 1888-9, \$27,294,710; for 1889-90, \$32,782,190. These figures, which are given in the *Empire's* Ottawa correspondence, are astounding, and, as we have said, well nigh incredible. There surely must have been some change in the Government system of book-keeping, or of collecting reports, or of estimating values, to account in part for these returns. We are all glad to believe that the trade of the Dominion is fairly prosperous, but very few, we venture to say, will have noticed any indication of so great an expansion in its value as would be needed to account for an increase of more than 20 per cent. within the short space of a single year. Without adhering to any special theory in regard to balance-of-trade theories and disputes, we may, we think, safely congratulate the Dominion on the fact that the exports seem to be growing so much more rapidly than the imports that another year of the same tendency would place the former in excess of the latter. A people cannot buy goods in foreign markets without paying for them, and, unless they resort to borrowed capital, they must pay for them with that which has been in some way produced at home. But there is a double satisfaction in being able to show that the amount of exports has been such as to explain the expenditure for importations and show that the country is abundantly able to afford it. It is clear, however, that in this case further light is needed.

CLOSELY connected with the proposed abolition of Separate Schools in Manitoba is the complete secularization of the Public Schools. The one is the logical sequence of the other. From articles in the Winnipeg newspapers we infer that Mr. Martin, who seems to be the leader of the Government in this particular movement, clearly recognizes this fact, but that he may meet with some difficulties arising from the objections urged by some of the leaders of thought in one or more of the denominations against a purely secular system. It is to be hoped that such objections may not avail to mar the completeness of the contemplated reform. It is, indeed, hard to understand how those who object most strenuously and with so good reason to the Separate School system can fail to see the goal to which their arguments clearly point, and to muster courage to follow their arguments to their logical conclusion. It should be characteristic of enlightened Protestants to cherish as scrupulous a regard for the conscientious convictions of others as they claim for their own. Those who maintain that Scripture reading and certain forms of religious teaching or worship should be enforced by legislation in every Public School, seem to forget that these very acts involve the principle of private interpretation, to which Roman Catholics most strenuously object. Their doctrine may be, as we believe it is, wrong in theory and pernicious in practice, but it clearly belongs to the category of religious opinions with which the State should not be permitted to interfere. The convictions of a Catholic must be as sacred in the eyes of the Government as those of a Protestant, else the State constitutes itself the arbiter in matters of faith. Against such an assumption of authority all Protestants would very vigorously protest, should the Government at any time become Catholic or Agnostic in sentiment and govern itself accordingly. It by no means follows, as some might hastily conclude, that the State is bound to forbid religious teaching or exercises in schools. The matter is one with which it simply has nothing to do, save to see that the rights of the minority are fully protected. The rest may safely be left to local option. It is, moreover, strange that those who believe in the subjectivity and spirituality of all true religion should fail to see the inconsistency and danger of permitting the Civil Government to make any prescription with regard to it. To compel an unbelieving

teacher to go through with a form of religious exercise or instruction, all must see would be not only useless but mischievous and dangerous. Yet it is evident that when religious teaching and worship are enforced by statute, such a result could be avoided only by the Government undertaking to supply a religious test in the licensing of teachers—an alternative which no Protestant free church would tolerate.

THE Ottawa correspondent of the *Empire* reports the following as part of an opinion given by Dr. Bourinot, our leading constitutional writer, on a question submitted to him:—

"The power given by the fundamental law to the Governor-General-in-Council of disallowing any Provincial Act within one year from its receipt is one of the evidences which the Constitution affords of the subordinate position in certain particulars of the Provincial authorities. It illustrates the fact that the Dominion Government now occupies those relations towards the Provincial Governments that England before the Confederation held with reference to the Provinces, and still does in the case of all colonies outside of Canada. . . . The Imperial Government has practically by these clauses given to the Dominion Government that power over the Provincial legislation which the Crown originally held and exercised immediately before Confederation."

It would ill become us to question the opinion of so high an authority upon a constitutional question, were it not that that opinion is evidently not in harmony with those of Sir John A. Macdonald (*vide* quotation we gave a week or two since from a recent speech), and of other statesmen high in office, who should be qualified, in virtue both of their responsible positions, and of the part some of them individually bore in the framing of the British North America Act, to pronounce upon the question at issue. Apart, however, from the conflict of authorities, there seem to be important points of difference between the relations the Provinces now bear to the Dominion Government, and those which they originally bore to the Imperial authorities. The Provinces were colonies and their people subjects of Great Britain through no act of their own. The British Government ruled them in virtue of no delegated or conceded authority. On the contrary, whatever rights of self-government they possessed were theirs simply as the result of a series of concessions made from time to time by the Sovereign authority. The right to grant implies the right to take away, and theoretically, there was and is nothing to prevent Great Britain from cancelling any or all such concessions hitherto made to the Provinces, whether in their individual or in their collective capacity. Great Britain is bound by no written constitution or compact. Whether the Provinces would peacefully submit to the deprivation of any important concession they may have gained after years of persistent effort is another matter. The point is that the Mother Country has the abstract right to rule her colonies as she pleases. But the Dominion Government can claim no such authority, save in so far as it is specially bestowed in the B. N. A. Act, and we do not think that Dr. Bourinot will maintain that that Act was intended to confer upon the Governor-General-in-Council any such unlimited powers. Were it otherwise what need to specify particulars or to define jurisdictions? None were specified as between the original Provinces and Great Britain. Certainly, if we were bound to accept Mr. Bourinot's interpretation—always assuming that his views are correctly reported—the word "federation" or "confederation" would be a misnomer in this case. Apart, however, from all such arguments, of one thing those who are familiar with the discussions and negotiations which led up to Confederation must feel sure. The contracting Provinces never consented, nor could they by any process of persuasion or pressure, have been brought to consent, to give to the General Government the right of absolute veto over local legislation. The first practical assumption of such power would arouse a storm that would shake the fabric of Confederation to its very centre. Surely the understanding and intention of the contracting parties should have some weight in determining the meaning of an Act of Parliament.