

among us. It always has struck me that the originator of the idea of the United States coming a courting to Miss Canada fell far short of his mark when he fancied he was indulging in ridicule. The figure is one which implies no such wholesale annihilation of rights as he would have us believe, but suggests the happiest and noblest distribution of rights and blending of interests. With all respect to my esteemed friend, Principal Grant, our future must be in connection with this continent and not with another, and either through a friendly commerce and intercourse with the United States, or, as THE WEEK rightly advocated in its last issue, by shaking out its little wings and learning to fly. Britain, like all great powers in history, must some day live herself to death, as Greece and Rome did. The new glory of the world shall be built up on this continent, and not in Europe, and Canada shall make her share of it.

Nevertheless, when the 24th comes round we shall hoist our brightest banners, and blow our loudest trumpets for Her Most Gracious Majesty. England has not, so far, deserved the awful fate I have described. But the world moves, and its destinies are not always ruled by human law.

Our volunteer officers have met and outdone each other in their regimental rivalry to welcome in a becoming fashion the celebrated Queen's Own, from Toronto, and the no-less famous Governor-General's Foot-Guards, from Ottawa, on the auspicious occasion. Our most *recherché* hospitality awaits these sons of Mars. A field day is being arranged, with a review on the mountain slope. The Guards will occupy the Drill Hall, and the Queen's Own will bivouac on St. Helen's Island. His Excellency is to be invited; garrison games and prizes will be competed for; the city will subscribe; general magnificence is to be displayed, and grand dinners will take place under marquees surrounded with music. What more can we do? I have no adjectives left. An Imperial Federationist could do no more.

A dainty and lovely affair was the luncheon given by the Donaldas to the graduating class of the year, the first semi-public feast of women which, I believe, has ever been known in Montreal. In the theatre of the museum stood a table, shaped à la lettre T, around which smiled seventy fair young maidens, with a sprinkling of matrons from the Arts professors' families. The waiters, abashed, jinked behind the screens, and prayed, no doubt, they might have been Donaldas. Speeches, too, and songs, and toasts, from two of the clock till half-past five, kept up a merry flow of tongue and eye, of past and future, of retrospect and prospect. The guests of the hour, the graduating class, were only three, and call themselves, with glee, the *Small-Pox Year*, having entered upon their studies at the time when the dread epidemic cast us beyond gates. Miss Reid carries off the gold medal for modern languages, while Miss Reid, in philosophy and logic, and Miss Squire, in natural science, ran so close upon their brother competitors that the decision of giving them each a medal prize, if not the medal, seemed almost more than the medal itself. Among the women, not one has broken down in health; among the men, several have. So much for the physical incapacity theory. The only thing at the luncheon which was wanted was a deputation from the *great unseeing* theorists (if any of the species be still extant) to take notes on how the Donaldas have succeeded in cheating them of their prize. Of new ideas, not a few enlivened the charming utterances, called speeches, by the young ladies: i.e., that they shall claim a representation in the corporation of the University; that they may themselves be eligible for such; and that the graduates, now eleven in all, organize themselves into a Graduates' Society.

On Monday, the law and science faculties held their convocation, and the arts on Tuesday. Prizes were distributed, degrees conferred, speeches, statements, and valedictories delivered. The lady graduates of last year, in full academics, took their places on the platform among the other magnates. It is a misfortune that, in his official *resumé* of the year, the learned Principal invariably throws in a begging appeal. The audience is chiefly composed of "the sisters, the cousins, and the aunts" of the students, who do not appear to be slow in applauding the appeal out at the ventilators, and the appeal itself, as if thoroughly conscious of its want of harmony with the academic surroundings, seems little loath to disappear. Both the Principal and Dean, in their addresses, made pointed reference to the reprehensible action of one of the Governors of the University in the pages of THE WEEK a few months ago.

VILLE MARIE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE WEEK AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Permit me a few words with reference to the manner in which you recently treated the subject of Imperial Federation. It occurred to me when reading your remarks, that the ability with which you marshalled the objections was only equalled by the difference between what you understand by that phrase and what its advocates believe it to mean. As I understand the words, Federation of the Empire, they simply mean a closer union, than that now existing, between the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and the Cape, for the purpose of joint action upon certain subjects in which we have a common interest, and in them alone.

As far as Canada and Australia are concerned the solution of the question is dependent upon whether those

colonies wish in the future to acquire the full privileges of national existence. If they do not, we had better remain as we are. If they do, we should prepare by means of discussion and consideration for the future spread before us. Then comes the important question, if this change is to take place, and who can doubt that it will, would it not be best to take up the burdens and responsibilities of national existence in accordance with the principles of British development, and with the preservation and enhancement of our present privileges as British subjects, and citizens of a world-wide Empire.

Then if we take the question of our future national existence upon the lowest possible basis, that of dollars and cents, would it not pay us, when we are prepared to take upon ourselves the duties of a nation, to do so by means of a stated contribution to the Imperial Navy and representation in a Council from the countries mentioned which should have a supervision of all questions of foreign Imperial policy, giving us privileges which we have not yet received? Such a policy would raise us from our position of colonial dependence to that of allies and states having a really national existence without one-fourth of the enormous expense which we would have to incur as an independent nation, and with a power which would be magnificent in comparison with the position of humiliating dependence upon the United States, which we would occupy were your proposal to be carried out.

I have upon previous occasions ventured to outline our policy as follows:

1. Combination for defence.
2. Co-operation for commercial purposes.
3. The gradual consolidation of existing political relations.

It is hardly necessary to point out that this great Empire is dependent upon the fleet of Great Britain for the protection of its enormous commerce of 5,500 millions per annum, for the safety of its coast cities and sparsely populated territories, and I would point out that if we only agree upon a stated contribution from the great self-governing colonies at some future date, towards the efficient maintenance of the Imperial fleet, that navy can be rendered so powerful as to sweep the seas of opponents and enable this vast Oceanic Empire to say to the world, "You cannot injure us by sea because we are too strong for you, and the only place where you can touch us by land is on the American and Afghanistan frontiers. On the former we always hope to be at peace, on the latter we can command an immense and overwhelming number of loyal and brave subjects."

Of the second part it is only necessary to say that the constant agitation now being quietly and steadily carried on in England is bringing us to a time, now within measurable distance, when Britain will discriminate in favour of Colonial produce in return for a discrimination in her favour, and it is for this we, in Canada, are now working. We want to see the United Colonies, Canada, Australia, the Cape and the West Indies approach the mother country with parliamentary resolutions in their hands, that when she is prepared for this discrimination, they, the Colonies, will be willing to do their share.

The political part of the problem is more difficult to handle, but we feel that in accordance with the time-honoured principles of our constitution, we should continue in the line of our present development, and must receive in time the representation in the control of our foreign affairs to which we are now becoming entitled. I cannot help feeling that the true line of action is the development of the consultative conference of two years ago into a great legislative council. This, however, can only be obtained by the frequent holding of deliberative conferences, until, as our vital interests become more and more united, it will become a political necessity to constitute a permanent conference and, eventually, the Imperial Council will arise as the result of slow and natural growth. Is this impossible? Would it not be advantageous? Yours, etc.,

Toronto, 6th May.

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

TRADE COMBINES.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Since the appearance in THE WEEK of my two communications on the above subject, I have been the recipient of a number of letters commending and criticizing my proposed solution of the great commercial problem. As a reply to those who were not at one with my plan would necessarily take the shape of a further explanation of the proposition, I trust that I am not too greatly imposing upon your good nature to ask you to once more open your columns in the matter.

While most of my critics admit that the idea of the Government *regulating* rather than *annihilating* combines is a "grand" one, still with singular unanimity they bring forward two objections:—1st. The cost of maintaining a commission for the adjudicating and management of combines would be an unjust burden upon the taxpayers of the country. 2nd. No Government has a right to interfere with the liberties of the commercial subject to an extent sufficient to determine at what price he is to dispose of goods he has become legally possessed of.

The first objection has really so little ground for existence that it is a matter for surprise that it should have been so frequently brought forward, and I can only view it as the result of the prevailing idea in Canada that we are being expensively governed, the believers in which would cry economy in the face of the most necessary expenditure. It will need but little consideration, however,

to see that the interests at stake are so enormous as compared to the expense that none but the most mercenary would continue to press this objection. Moreover, should it be attempted to enforce the present law, amended as Mr. Clarke Wallace would propose, the cost of litigation in the courts of justice would be quite equal to the expenses attached to the maintenance of a specially appointed board of commissioners, whose comprehensive knowledge of the matters brought before them would enable them to adjudicate not only with greater despatch, but with more satisfactory results than could be looked for from judges whose attention is given to such a varied range of questions. Supposing, however, for argument's sake, that we admit the contention. The expenses could easily be met by a special tax on the incorporated combines, the costs being in this way paid by those most benefited. At best the objection is one of detail and should not be considered at this juncture.

The second objection, however, has the appearance of being more difficult of solution, for, on this continent, anything that looks like tampering with the so-called "liberties of the subject" meets with an unintelligent opposition.

As I understand it, it is the duty of a popularly elected Government, such as ours, to enact and have carried out such laws as they consider advantageous to the country at large, irrespective of the claims of certain individuals that their freedom is being interfered with. Should the Government overestimate their rights in this respect a recourse is ever in the hands of the people through the constantly occurring opportunities of showing their approbation or otherwise at the polls.

It is on this principle that we admit the right of the Government to exact import and excise duties upon merchandise; nor has it ever been questioned that it was their *privilege* to pass an Anti-Combines Act, although the disapproval of such a measure has been very strong in commercial circles. On these grounds, therefore, it cannot but be admitted that, should they deem it wise, the Government have the right to regulate the selling prices of certain staple commodities. Now, what I contend is that it is the duty of the Government, instead of forcing upon the country the many evil results of over competition by disallowing all combines, to allow these same combines to exist under their supervision.

As has been shown by the resolutions and actions of the different Canadian Boards of Trade, it is the verdict of our most prominent business men that, with perhaps one or two exceptions, the combines now in existence in the Dominion are more beneficial to the public than otherwise. From this, however, it cannot be argued that the Government are not right in enquiring into and legislating upon the question. In the neighbouring Republic, whose system of protection to native industries we, in reality, imitated, the combinations and trusts have assumed such huge proportions, controlling as they do the very Cabinet at Washington, that it is difficult to see how the people are to be released from their merciless bonds. It would indeed be a very short-sighted policy on our part were we, with our eyes open, to allow our imitation to be carried to such lengths as to include the apparent faults as well as advantages of a system that others before us have experimented upon. Nor can it but be supposed that Combines in Canada—though in a less proportion, as our population is less—would, if left alone, shape themselves in just such dangerous ways as we see them in the States. Legislation of some kind is therefore necessary; but care must be taken that in our eagerness to prevent abuses we do not do more harm than good. Some half-way measure must be adopted, and I believe that the incorporating and regulating of all who wish to combine—the request for such incorporation being made by a large majority of those interested—and the prices so regulated that only a fair interest on the capital invested can be earned is the only feasible plan. For the consumer to try and obtain his goods at prices less than cost is quite as selfish and more short-sighted—if he has his country's welfare at heart—than for manufacturers and dealers to combine together to unreasonably enhance those same prices.

Toronto, May 6, 1889.

H. K. S. HEMMING.

THE LOGIC OF ANNEXATION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—“It has passed into a maxim,” says Professor Bryce in his admirable work, “The American Commonwealth,” “that of all the agencies of civilization commerce is the most important.” Congressman Reed, who is to be the next speaker of the American House of Representatives, expressed the same truth the other evening at the annual banquet of the New England Club in New York. “Loftiest motives,” said he, “often leave smallest returns. It is a hard thing to say, but it is the truth, that an honest persistent desire for six per cent. interest, with a willingness to take ten, has done more to civilize the world than all the courage of the crusaders.” He might have added, “than all the constitutions and laws ever devised or written.”

There is, perhaps, no more perfect system of jurisprudence in the world than that of Canada, or let me say, of the Province of Ontario. The laws of the New England States, the admitted centre of the intellectual life of the continent, are not to be compared with them in comprehensiveness, perspicuity and adaptability to the highest good of society. There is here, for instance, little or no State supervision of the medical, legal and teaching professions. The ill effect is apparent to one accustomed to Ontario's