

GRIP

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF HUMOR AND
CARICATURE.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

BY THE

Grip Printing and Publishing Co.

26 and 28 Front Street West, Toronto, Ont.

President
Manager

J. V. WRIGHT.
T. G. WILSON.

Terms to Subscribers.

PAYABLE STRICTLY IN ADVANCE.

To United States and
Canada.

To Great Britain and
Ireland.

One year, \$2.00; six months \$1.00 | One year \$2.50

Remittances on account of subscriptions are acknowledged by change in the date of the printed address-label.

In remitting stamps, please send two-cent stamps only.

Messrs. JOHN HADDON & Co., Advertising Contractors, Fleet St. London, Eng., are the sole agents for Grip in Great Britain.

NOTICE

As many people, either thoughtlessly or carelessly, take papers from the Post Office regularly for some time, and then notify the publishers that they do not wish to take them, thus subjecting the publishers to considerable loss, inasmuch as the papers are sent regularly to the addresses in good faith on the supposition that those removing them from the Post Office wish to receive them regularly, it is right that we should state what is the LAW in the matter.

1. Any person who regularly removes from the Post Office a periodical publication addressed to him, by so doing makes himself in law a subscriber to the paper, and is responsible to the publisher for its price until such time as all arrears are paid.

2. Refusing to take the paper from the Post Office, or requesting the Postmaster to return it, or notifying the publishers to discontinue sending it, does not stop the liability of the person who has been regularly receiving it, but this liability continues until all arrears are paid.

Artist and Editor
Associate Editor

J. W. BENGOUGH.
PHILLIPS THOMPSON.



Comments

ON THE

Cartoons.

THE SPHINX.—Mr. Blake's "testament" continues to furnish food for discussion in and out of the newspapers. As is usual in the case of documents which have been written in a peculiarly lucid manner, and divided up into carefully numbered paragraphs to ensure still further clear-

ness, it appears to be pretty hard to understand. Most commentators have arrived at the conclusion, however, that Mr. Blake's opinion was that Annexation was the inevitable destiny of Canada, whether we persisted in the protection policy, or exchanged it for a free trade arrangement with the States. The only question which remained open to discussion was as to whether the inevitable destiny was agreeable or otherwise to Mr. Blake personally. There was nothing in the document to decide it definitely, and the commentators took to more or less interesting speculations. Then, the "Tribune of the People" broke the oppressive silence with a single sentence—though a tolerably long one—to the *Globe*, in which he said that Annexation "though becoming our probable, is neither our ideal nor as yet our inevitable destiny." And now we want to know what Mr. Blake's opinion, our ideal or inevitable future? But the great ex-leader has relapsed once more into sphinx-like silence.

TICKLISH SKATING.—It will be a new experience for Sir John to conduct affairs with a majority representing only the extreme edges of the country. Quebec has utterly gone back on him, and Ontario is not much more friendly. Sir Richard Cartwright is credited with the belief that the Government will be unable to carry

on business under the circumstances. It is premature, however, to make calculations about the size of the working majority. It may be much larger before the session is a month old than the returns now indicate. Indeed, if Sir John's followers in the House are as faithful and obedient as usual, we see no reason why he could not go on with a majority of one, if necessary.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER has been exposing, in his eloquent and trenchant manner, the scurvy conduct of the Grit party, which, baffled in its attempt to seize the offices, has now turned round and is doing its unpatriotic best to "prevent the Government from securing a fair measure of reciprocity and relief for the farmers." A Party that would act in this contemptible fashion deserves the strongest epithets that even a Tupper can apply, and—But, by the way, isn't this the same Tupper who declared night after night and day after day all through the late campaign that the farmers didn't require any relief, but were enjoying all manner of prosperity? There must be a mistake lurking round here somewhere.

* * *

IT is time that we came to an understanding about this man Tupper. He seems to be endeavoring, with some success, to carve out for himself a special place under our constitution. While, as a matter of fact, he is only a member of the Civic Service—and a particularly expensive and useless one at that—he assumes all the airs and functions of a cabinet minister. His appearance in the campaign as General High Commissioner of the Government party going up and down the country in a special car brow-beating and bellowing at the people who pay him his salary was an intolerable affront to decency, and a spectacle which would have been impossible in any country but Canada. Perhaps, however, his ruffianly attack on the Grand Trunk Railway Company (because, according to Sir Henry Tyler, that company refused to be bribed to do partizan work for the Government during the election), was the brassiest of all his performances. Tupper must be made to mind his own business in London (if the sort of thing we pay him his salary for may be called business), or to come into the public arena on the same basis as other politicians and take the responsibility of his utterances. At present he is simply intolerable.

* * *

CANADIANS are right in holding as they do almost without exception that our institutions are, on the whole, superior to those of the neighboring Republic, but the Canuck, who in the exuberance of his patriotism ventures to point the finger of scorn at American political morals, as compared with our own, lays himself open to a very flattening reply. Take the latest illustration—the case of Senator J. J. Ingalls, of Kansas. Here was a bright and able man, one of the national leaders of the Republican party. In a moment of candor Ingalls happened to say, in a public speech or document, that moral reform in politics was, in his opinion, "an iridescent dream," and that there was no room for the Decalogue in public life. Swift vengeance followed this cynical utterance. At the late election in Kansas Ingalls was snowed under, and now, with all his wit and eloquence, he is regarded as a political "dead duck." On this side side of the line his fate would have been much happier. His jaunty dismissal of the Decalogue from politics would most likely have been applauded, and would have entitled him to the proud soubriquet of "Canada's Greatest Statesman."