

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## CANADIAN LOYALTY.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—In your last issue you speak editorially of "a distinction . . . between loyalty to their own country as citizens and loyalty to the Empire as colonists." If sincere in your advocacy of Independence, and I think your columns prove that to be the case, what is your opinion of a loyalty to Canada nurtured upon disloyalty to flag and Constitution, Sovereign and Empire? Can good come out of evil? There really should be no distinction, and to the true loyalist there is none, between Canada and the Empire of which she is a part. No greater distinction at any rate than may be found between any Ontario man's feeling towards his Province and towards the Dominion, or a Scotchman's regard for his native land and his sentiment towards the United Kingdom.

The interests of Canada are bound up in those of the Empire. Its independence of the United States depends upon the maintenance of that union, its commercial, financial and political welfare is intimately connected with that of Britain. Why then try to cultivate an antagonistic sentiment of nationality? A British citizenship as truly exists as does a Canadian. An Englishman is the Queen's representative, here, successor in that position to a Scotchman and an Irishman; Edward Blake, as a British subject, sits in the Imperial Parliament, whilst this common citizenship is everywhere recognized throughout the vast bounds of the British Empire. Meantime we are also Canadians and proud of it. Thus we have a double privilege—a local citizenship and an Imperial one.

The best way to "foster the hope and purpose of Canadian nationality" is to imitate the ideal of Thomas D'Arcy McGee, W. A. Foster, Sir John Macdonald and George Brown, recognize and develop a British-Canadian sentiment, two kindred feelings voicing one great union—a Canadian and an Imperial idea bound up together in the hearts of our people.

True, the name of colonist is unpleasant. But whose fault is it? So long as we decline to aid in Imperial affairs so long we must remain outside the pale of British nations, and though one in reality, will have to bear the nominal stigma of being called colonists. Accept Imperial Federation and that difficulty will be settled.

Toronto, July 22.

J. CASTELL HOPKINS.

## THE DOMINION ELECTORATE.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—In an editorial that appeared in an issue of THE WEEK the following startling and significant remark was made: "At the last general election in Canada about one-third of the legally-qualified electors neglected to cast their ballots."

Surely every thinking man sees that here we have that which must give us pause. Such an incident is assuredly most pointedly suggestive and indicative. Verily such a sentence is pregnant with thought and fraught with meaning.

No patriot should refuse to give it his utmost attention to discover the meaning, and if possible to suggest a remedy.

The conclusions to be drawn are few, but obvious, lamentable and such as call for action and men of action.

It is the purpose of the writer to endeavour to make it clear that the delinquent third had sufficient reason for abstaining from voting, and in conclusion to suggest a remedy for the existing deplorable state of affairs.

In the first place, it is as plain as a pikestaff that the third who did not cast their ballots, for the most part, is made up of incorruptible electors, while it is equally clear "that they whose voting is least desirable are the surest to be at the poll." It may be taken for granted as axiomatic that both parties polled every vote that could be polled, and that every means, straight and crooked, right and wrong, fair and foul, was employed to poll said votes. Those, then, who did not exercise the franchise had manifestly other motives than those either of expediency or self interest for abstaining themselves from the polls. They, at least, were above the breath of suspicion; of them it dared not be said they were venal, base or self-seeking. If the "bosses" failed to move them by hook or crook, it goes without saying that they had high motives and worthy reasons for abstinence. And is not such the case? How many of us can tell of this one and that one of our fellow-countrymen who remained at home because there was nothing to vote for—the policies of both parties were arrant nonsense, catch-trap cries, hollow mockeries.

Disgusted were they with Conservatism because it had no bill of fare—nothing which could command either the respect or the support of an intelligent electorate. It was naught else but a weak-kneed cry about British connection and a vain attempt to attract the public gaze from corruption, political jobbery and stagnation. Not a whit more worthy was Liberalism of an honest man's second thought, much less of his vote. Here was to be found a party with a policy, manifestly trumped up at the last moment, without the slightest pre-consideration, without the smallest regard for consequences, without an idea as to the effect such a measure might have upon the business of the country. In fact, they could not explain their policy; they were at sixes and sevens among themselves

in re this El Dorado—unrestricted reciprocity. There was no sane man but would rather endure those evils he had than fly to others that he knew not of, nor could be enlightened upon. Such was the burden of their respective songs. On the one hand, a hypocritical cry about British connection being an attempt to make political capital out of their opponents' policy, a cry that was truly as good an illustration of a whited sepulchre as was the Pharisee of old.

We heard nothing that was calculated to arouse us to the fact that the most important, because the most serious, event in a nation's life was at hand, a general election. The honest man who went to get bread was offered a stone. The thinking man was sent home with no pabulum upon which to ruminate. No; he heard cries of "Loyalty," "No Discrimination," "the Old Man," "the Old Flag," "the Old Policy," but nothing new.

In the other camp he heard declaimers who knew not whereof they spoke. They were not even agreed on their policy. They dared not consider its possibilities; the electors did that for them.

They bragged and boasted of the reign of prosperity that was already in sight, ay, to be had for the asking, to be gained by the voting.

It was cant, without even the semblance of truth or reality. It could not even boast stout supporters or doughty champions. It sank into well-deserved obscurity, though it deserved the better fate, of seeing its advocates disappear first. And still the prayer goes up to heaven—would that some Unseen Power would bless our poor country with a few honest and honourable politicians. Diogenes might have been kept busy looking for an honest man in Athens; he would have had to sublet his contract had he had the misfortune to abide in Ottawa.

Is a man chosen to represent or run for a county because of his principle, his ability and his knowledge of affairs, political and constitutional? Are the representatives of the people (so-called) always men who understand even the elements of political economy? In many cases they seem rather to be masters of ways that are dark and tricks that are not vain; tricks in jobbery and rascality that would turn a Machiavelli pale with envy.

The men of thought and principle were not at the polls last election, but they should have been. Yes, and more than that, they should have had candidates for whom they could have voted without misgiving. What was and is required are independent candidates: let them be supporters of either great party, for third parties are dastardly failures, but such supporters as are not nominated from Ottawa, such as are not servile followers of any leader or coterie of leaders, as will vote as they believe in accordance with the best interests, not of themselves nor of their party, but of their country. Let them be men—men who will strive to better their party by ridding it of parasites and scoundrels, and establishing it on a firm basis, both as regards policy and personell.

Perchance Diogenes would have found perhaps one or two who would form a nucleus for such an independent coterie. There is one member in the House whom I feel certain would make an ideal leader of such an organization. He already commands the respect of the country. Would that he would champion the cause, which we can rest assured would be supported by that third. Let this party of independents establish an organ in one of our great centres that will promulgate their opinions. Let it organize its forces and appeal to the electors—the honest and patriotic citizens. If the helping hand and loyal vote is not extended them, then God help Canada.

CIVIS CANADENSIS.

## PLAISIRS DE FROISSART.

After Charles d'Orleans.

To drink a glass full fain am I  
And to be clothed becomingly.  
At sight of victuals rich and sweet,  
On table fine in order meet,  
Right joyfully my heart does beat.  
Violets in their season true,  
Roses freshly dipped in dew  
Charm me; 'tis no more than right.  
Rooms ablaze with candle light,  
Cards and dances half the night;  
Beds well furnished, soft and deep,  
And, to tempt a sounder sleep,  
Dainty meats and rosy wine.  
When these pleasures do combine,  
Where the heart so young as mine?

J. ROSS-WETHERMAN.

A NUMBER of stone idols, supposed to be six hundred years old and of a type differing from any heretofore discovered, have been unearthed among Aztec ruins in New Mexico.

THE amount of whalebone taken annually does not now exceed 200,000 pounds. The largest part of this is taken by the whalers sailing out of ports on the Pacific coast. A few years ago the amount taken reached as high as 500,000 pounds annually, and in some years it went above these figures. The price has gone up from fifty cents a pound to \$6 wholesale.—*Boston Transcript*.

## THE DIALOGUES OF PLATO.\*

IT would be superfluous to speak at this late date of the supreme merits of this translation of Plato, which is a product of the best thought and scholarship of the Oxford of to-day. To render such a master of style as Plato into English is no easy task. As Mr. Jowett remarks, "a translation, like a picture, is dependent for its effect on very minute touches. . . It ought to be idiomatic and interesting, not only to the scholar, but to the unlearned reader. Its object should not simply be to render the words of one language into the words of another, or to preserve the construction and order of the original—this is the ambition of a schoolboy, who wishes to show that he has made a good use of his dictionary and grammar, but is quite unworthy of the translator, who seeks to produce on his reader an impression similar, or nearly similar, to that produced by the original." No doubt the scholar will always prefer the actual words of the master, but even the most accomplished scholar will learn much from a translator like Mr. Jowett, whose fulfilment of the task of love he has set himself comes so near to the ideal he has conceived.

This third edition, like the second, has the advantage over the first of marginal analysis, and of various essays on modern philosophy, and on political and social life. The chief subjects discussed are Utility, Communism, the Kantian and Hegelian Philosophies, Psychology, and the Origin of Language. Nor should we forget to mention the convincing, and almost contemptuous, way in which, in the preface, the forced interpretation of the development of Plato's ideal theory, given by Dr. Jackson of Cambridge, is disposed of. To our mind the view of Dr. Jackson sins not only by its failure to apprehend that Plato's ideas are, to apply Luther's words, "living things with hands and feet," but it completely inverts the probable development of his thought. German commentators, as Mr. Jowett contends, have been almost as ready to apply a "vigorous and rigorous" method to Plato as to the sacred writings; but at least they have not made his philosophy stand upon its head. That feat was unfortunately reserved for an English scholar trained in that "scientific" method which in literature and philosophy is foolishness. One of the most valuable lessons which the open-minded student of these volumes may learn is, that the attempt to confine the thought of a great master in philosophy within the narrow and rigid frames of an abstract theory is as fatal to real insight as the attempt to exhaust the infinity of the universe by stubbornly shutting our eyes to all its less obvious features.

Besides the essays already mentioned, this third edition contains new essays on the following subjects: (1) Language, (2) The decline of Greek Literature, (3) The "ideas" of Plato and Modern Philosophy, (4) The myths of Plato, (5) The relation of the Republic, Statesman, and Laws, (6) The legend of Atlantis, (7) Psychology, (8) Comparison of the Laws of Plato with Spartan and Athenian Laws and Institutions. It need hardly be said that all of these essays are more or less suggestive, but the space at our command will not allow us to do more than refer, and that in an inadequate way, to the essay which stands third on the list.

Plato's doctrine of ideas, the translator contends, "has attained an imaginary clearness and definiteness which is not to be found in his own writings." The popular view really consists of a series of unmeaning propositions. "Poetry has been converted into dogma, and it is not remarked that the Platonic ideas are to be found only in about a-third of Plato's writings and are not confined to him." What is great in Plato is "the spirit of idealism, which in the history of philosophy has had many names and taken many forms, and has in a measure influenced those who seemed to be most averse to it." It is this spirit which forms the bond of union in all the various and even contradictory utterances of Plato—the spirit which "places the divine above the human, the spiritual above the material, the one above the many, the mind before the body." There is a great deal in modern philosophy which is inspired by ancient. "To the fathers of modern philosophy, their own thoughts appeared to be new and original, but they carried with them an echo or shadow of the past, coming back by recollection from an older world." The principle of ancient philosophy which is most apparent in modern is scepticism; we must doubt nearly every traditional or received notion, that we may hold fast one or two. The Eleatic notion that being and thought were the same was revived in a new form by Descartes. Like Plato, Descartes insists that God is true and incapable of deception, and that thought and extension are united by a special divine act. Spinoza is related to Descartes very much as Parmenides to Xenophanes. His teaching might be described generally as "the Jewish religion reduced to an abstraction and taking the form of the Eleatic philosophy. Like Parmenides, he is overpowered and intoxicated with the idea of Being or God." The grand description of the philosopher in the Republic as "the spectator of all time and all existence" may be paralleled with the famous expression of Spinoza, "*Contemplatio rerum sub specie eternitatis*." In the "pre-concerted harmony" (as Mr. Jowett calls it) of Leibnitz we catch a reminiscence, both of Anaxagoras and of Plato in the *Timæus*. In the "forms" of Bacon there survives a crude conception of the

\*"The Dialogues of Plato translated into English with Analyses and Introductions." By B. Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College, etc. In five volumes. Third edition. New York: Macmillan and Company. 1892.