

THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.
Vol. V. No. 53.

Toronto, Thursday, November 29th, 1888.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

The Week,

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, SOCIETY, AND LITERATURE.

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 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 pre paid, 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.

All advertisements will be set up in such style as to insure THE WEEK's tasteful typographical appearance, and enhance the value of the advertising in its columns. No advertisement 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
Mr. Blake on Imperial Federation.....	839
The Equity of the Railway Case.....	839
General Laurie's Defence.....	839
The Transshipment Question.....	839
The Country not Agitated.....	839
The Protest Against Scholarships.....	840
The Great Educational Reforms.....	840
Checking Undesirable Immigration.....	840
Economics in American Colleges.....	840
The Irish Vote in America.....	840
Civil Service Reform in the United States.....	841
Emperor William's Speech.....	841
Parliamentary Power vs. Militarism.....	841
The Last News of Stanley.....	841
IRELAND.....	842
PARIS LETTER..... M. A. B.	843
KNIGHTLY INSPIRATION (Poem)..... William P. McKenzie.	843
A PROFESSOR OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE..... A. M.	843
HEARTH..... Archibald MacMechan.	844
SONNET..... A. Cox.	844
"HARVEST FESTIVALS AND HARVEST HOMES."..... S.	844
"SNOWFLAKES AND SUNBEAMS."..... A. Ethelwyn Wetherald.	845
THE CHAPERON AND HER FRIENDS IN AMERICAN NOVELS..... L. O'Loane	845
BURIED TALENTS (Poem)..... J. St. Leger McGinn	846
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Methods of McGill..... Rev. Prof. J. Clark Murray.	846
The Fisheries..... Spectator.	846
"..... International Comity.	847
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	847
SIR WILLIAM E. LOGAN'S LIFE AND WORK..... G. M. A.	848
MUSIC..... B. Natural.	848
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	849
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	849
CHESS.....	850

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 Hon. Edward Blake's reply to an invitation to speak at Ingersoll on the question of Imperial Federation has attracted considerable attention. Mr. Blake's declaration that he cannot participate in the movement has a significance over and above that given to it by his own personal character and ability, from the fact that he himself suggested many years ago a movement in that direction. He is now of opinion that the drift which was even then adverse has now carried the country far away, and that "apart from this, very much has since occurred here and elsewhere, tending to convert difficulties into impossibilities." Amongst other reasons alluded to for declining to identify himself with the federation movement, Mr. Blake says that he had not, either as a Canadian, or as a citizen of the Empire, any sympathy with some of the views prominently brought forward by chief supporters of it. The only one of these views he particularizes is that which deems it "either desirable or possible to restrict the importation of the food of the masses of England, even through this might at once raise rents there and prices here." No doubt Mr. Blake has here in a sentence indicated the rock upon which the project is doomed to founder if it has not already done so. It is idle to allege that the taxation of the food of the people of Great Britain is not a necessary feature of the scheme. Its advocates will find it hard to point out any other advantages which, in the absence of some such tariff arrangement, could form any sufficient inducement to a distant colony to incur all the cost and responsibility of junior partnership in the business of the Empire. The movement has never shown much vitality in Canada and Mr. Blake's open repudiation will go far to deprive it of whatever it may have hitherto had.

PENDING the decision of the Supreme Court upon the arguments submitted to it last week, it would be premature to discuss the main question involved, to wit, that of the powers of the Provinces in regard to the construction and control of public works within their respective boundaries.

There is however, one aspect of the controversy which possesses an interest of its own, independently of the legal issue. Did the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have in view the present contention when they were negotiating with the Dominion Government for the surrender of their monopoly? Did the Dominion Government have that contention distinctly in view? Assuming that they did—and the contrary assumption would not be complimentary to their astuteness—how is the fact to be reconciled with good faith, not only to the Manitoba Government, but to the Dominion Parliament? Or, if we give the company the benefit of their President's plea and admit that as their transaction was exclusively with the Dominion Government they were under no obligation to show their hand to the Manitobans or to Parliament, how can Sir John A. Macdonald and his colleagues free themselves from the imputation of want of frankness to the Manitoba commissioners on the one hand, and to Parliament on the other? It would be absurd to deny that the arrangement made with the company for the extinction of the monopoly was made at the urgent instance of Manitoba, or that the consent of Parliament to the guarantee of the Company's bonds was given simply and solely in view of the necessity of redressing the grievances and complying with the demands of that Province. In other words the one motive of Parliament was to secure for Manitoba the right to the free construction of railways within its own borders. If the Dominion Government knew or believed, as it is now tolerably certain they must have known or believed, that both the Government of Manitoba and the people's representatives in Parliament were being deceived, or were deceiving themselves in the matter, and that the consideration in return for which the guarantee was voted would actually be withheld from Manitoba under the operation of the General Railway Act, was the transaction characterized by the frankness and good faith which are to be expected from those entrusted with the control of Canadian Legislation? Equity is surely as worthy of being considered in such a matter as law. We should like to hear the course of the Canadian Government defended on the side of equity.

OUR thanks are due to Major-General Laurie for a letter—not for publication—explaining at length the incidents upon which the current statements to which we referred in a previous issue, were based. We gladly admit that the explanations shew those incidents to have been much exaggerated and somewhat distorted, and place General Laurie's personal relations to them in quite a different light. At the same time the subtle interposition of Government influence and the powerful use of that influence on behalf of the candidate still appear. That similar arguments, based on a prospective change of Government, were plied on behalf of the Opposition candidate, we do not doubt. Our only aim was to deprecate such a mode of political warfare, by whomsoever used. The reference to the Shelburne election was merely incidental, but having made it, justice demands that we should state the fact of General Laurie's emphatic denials. It would bode well for Canadian politics were every candidate equally sensitive in regard to the point of honour involved in such charges.

Two correspondents in another column find fault with our remarks in previous issues on the fisheries dispute. What we have said in regard to the transshipment-in-bond question has been rather interrogative and tentative than dogmatic. We have queried first, whether as a matter of "international comity" the refusal to our neighbours of the privilege of sending their fish across our territory is defensible, and second, whether as a matter of policy it is wise. The gist of our critic's replies may be summed up in the propositions that the treaty of 1818 gives us the right of refusal, and that to grant the permission, as an act of courtesy, would be to give the wily and unscrupulous American fishermen facilities for poaching on our fishing grounds which they would not hesitate to use to the utmost. It is not unlikely that the subject may come up as a practical question before many months, when there will be opportunity for fuller discussion. At present it must suffice to say, still tentatively, that it may be doubtful whether a seventy-year old treaty is the best basis on which to settle a question of present day neighbourliness; whether an argument based on the assumed depravity of a whole class, (the American fisherman) can be regarded as