

# THE WEEK.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JANUARY 23rd, 1891.

Eighth Year.  
Vol. VIII., No. 8.

\$3.00 per Annum.  
Single Copies 10 Cents.

## THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

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. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. 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. CLOGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.  
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

## CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
Chancellor Blake's generous gift.....	119
The "Canadian Manufacturer" on Protection.....	119
A Hypothetical Case.....	119
The "Manufacturer's" Thesis Amended.....	119
The Acme of Civilization.....	120
The Future of our Commercial Mariner.....	120
The Object of the Game and Fish Commission.....	120
Great Britain and The Colonies.....	120
Shall We Have Peace?.....	120
The Indian Crisis Probably Past.....	121
Is the U. S. Government Offended?.....	121
THE ANGLICAN CLERGY AND THE SUNDAY STREET CARS.....	121
COMBINES.....	121
A MILICIAE LEGEND. (Poem).....	122
PARIS LETTER.....	123
FRONEY. (Third Prize Story).....	123
A PUBLIC READER. (Sonnet).....	126
CHRISTMAS IN ROME.....	126
POETRY AND PROSE.....	127
THE RAMBLER.....	127
ART NOTES.....	127
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	127
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	128
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	128
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.....	128
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	128
CHESS.....	129

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

THE University of Toronto is fortunate in its repeated choice of a Chancellor, who has not only a thorough appreciation of liberal culture, but also both the means and the disposition to aid effectively in bringing that culture within the reach of those who might not otherwise be able to attain it. Mr. Blake's proposal laid before the Senate at a recent meeting, and gratefully accepted, was certainly a noble and generous one. In transferring his subscription of \$10,000, made last February after the fire, for building or other purposes, and adding thereto another \$10,000, the whole sum of \$20,000 to be applied to the endowment of matriculation scholarships, the holders of which shall be exempt from fees during the tenure of their scholarships, he has certainly supplied a powerful incentive and stimulus to literary culture among Canadian students. Very many of those throughout the Province who value higher education not only for its own sake, but for the sake of the advantage it is adapted to bring to the country which fosters it, will unite with the Senate most cordially in trusting that the generous donor may find some adequate return in the attainments of many gifted students who will hereafter owe their successful entry on the University course to their winning in honourable rivalry an Edward Blake matriculation scholarship. The present is no time for raising the question as to whether the encouragement and extension of the competitive system is the wisest and best way in which such gifts can be applied to promote the ends in view, a point in regard to which there may be honest differences of opinion. But it is a fitting time to point out how desirable it is that those who are possessed of means which they wish and pursue to have devoted to philanthropic uses, should constitute themselves the almoners of their own bounty, and the executors of their own wills, rather than trust to the uncertain issues of testamentary bequests. The lesson is emphasized by an event of recent occurrence in the United States. The large bequests made by a millionaire, recently deceased, to various institutions of learning, are, we believe, in some danger of being lost to those objects, through some defects in the legal conveyance. Be that as it may, and there is always some danger of such mis-carriage, there is no comparison in point of generosity or public spirit between the act of a man who parts with his

money for good objects only when he can no longer retain or use it, and the man who voluntarily bestows what he has to spare, while, though it may cost him some self-denial to part with it, he is able to see that it is used for the purposes intended. And if the generosity of the one is vastly larger and more genuine than that of the other, so doubtless must be the inward satisfaction in the bestowal, which is one of the legitimate rewards of all well-doing.

THROUGH some oversight we failed to observe before going to press last week that our able contemporary, the *Canadian Manufacturer*, had favoured its readers, in its issue of January 2nd, with two elaborate articles based upon a paragraph in a previous number of THE WEEK. These articles are a vigorous defence of protection, not as a temporary expedient to give the manufacturing industries of a younger and weaker nation a fair start in the race with those of an older and stronger one, nor yet as the lesser of two evils forced upon the choice of a people by the mistaken economy of a powerful neighbour, but as a policy desirable and wise in itself and conducive to the general prosperity. Now we need not inform our readers that THE WEEK is not and never has been a free trade journal in the sense which our contemporary seems to suppose; that is to say, it has never held that Canada is bound by allegiance to any abstract principle, however sound in itself, to throw open her markets freely to her next door neighbour, so long as that neighbour in return bars out her products by an exorbitant and unfriendly tariffs. On the contrary, THE WEEK has always acknowledged the force of the considerations which led the majority of the Canadian people to adopt the basis of the present National Policy, on the principle that the refusal of reciprocity of trade by the United States, justified and in a manner compelled the establishment of a reciprocity in tariff. That, which we have always understood to be the view of the advocates of the National Policy, is clear and consistent. But it does, we must confess, surprise us that any thoughtful mind, looking below the surface and studying the question on its merits, with all merely accidental and incidental circumstances abstracted, can believe the policy of universal protection defensible and commendable on broad general principles, whether of patriotism, of statesmanship, or of political economy. It will be clearly understood that the observations which follow are made from a theoretical not a practical stand point. The comparison is made between universal free trade and universal protection as a universal policy for enlightened nations.

SUPPOSE a nation has a foreign trade of say a hundred millions a year, importing fifty million worth of foreign products, and exporting fifty million worth of domestic products. According to the theory of THE WEEK and of free traders generally, this would indicate the prosperity of that country. But a change appears, and instead of that country being engaged in the production of a fifty million export it increases its lines of industrial enterprises; and these require the consumption at home of all of the fifty million of its own produce. This change implies that these new industrial enterprises produce fifty million worth of just such things as had previously been imported, obviating the importation of that value of merchandise, and it is clear that this entire foreign trade of a hundred million dollars would thus be wiped out. Would this new situation indicate national prosperity or adversity?

This passage involves, we think, the gist of the argument with which the *Canadian Manufacturer* undertakes to refute the proposition incidentally stated in THE WEEK "that hostile tariffs amongst trading nations tend to counteract each other, and to leave each nation in the same relative position it would have occupied under a system of universal free trade, save that the necessaries of life have been made artificially dear." Let us first try to answer the *Manufacturer's* question, "Would this new situation indicate prosperity or adversity?" That answer will depend upon a variety of circumstances. It is of course implied that the change described is brought about by means of a protective tariff, else the supposition has no bearing upon the point under discussion, for the most pronounced free-trader would delight in all the increased power of both home production and home consumption

which can be gained under normal conditions. The *Manufacturer*, it is true, argues in another place that THE WEEK "ignores the interior commerce entirely." THE WEEK is not, we hope, so absurd. It simply said nothing about interior commerce because it was not discussing that subject. But it recognizes, and is prepared to maintain that, other things being equal, the greater the volume of home production and of home interchange, under normal and healthy conditions, the greater will be the capacity for foreign commerce. We cannot answer the *Manufacturer's* crucial question until we have first asked and obtained answers to a number of subsidiary questions which promptly present themselves. Would the nation lose or gain in intelligence by being cut off from intercourse with other nations. What would be the general effect upon the national character? Would the people as men and citizens lose or gain in individual strength, manly independence and the development of self-reliant energy, enterprise and inventiveness, by having the area of competition forcibly restricted, and by relying upon a protective or prohibitory tariff instead of upon their own skill and industry for commercial success? What is the effect of the restriction of personal liberty of buying and selling and the consequent inducement to smuggling, upon the national morals? National prosperity, all must admit, does not consist wholly in money-making or money-saving. But our space-limits compel us to waive all such considerations, simply suggesting them for the consideration of the thoughtful, and confine ourselves to the economic aspects of the question. Here again we must content ourselves with asking a few leading questions, which will suggest to the thoughtful reader at least the direction in which the answer to the *Manufacturer's* query may be sought and found. What is the cost to the nation of the Government machinery necessary to secure the change described, since laws do not enforce themselves? It is, of course, evident that all those employed, not in collecting the revenue, for there will be, by hypothesis, no revenue, but in guarding the ports and boundaries, will be of the class of non-producers. In other words they will have to be supported by the labour of other citizens, and the *Manufacturer* will hardly deny that the increase of the proportion of this class in a nation means loss, not gain, to the industrial classes. What is the effect upon the prices of the goods formerly exported and of the new goods manufactured to producers and consumers respectively? These producers and consumers, it will be observed, constitute the people whose interests are in question, and it is evident that if these receive either smaller prices for the products they sell or have to pay larger prices for the products they buy, the result is loss, not gain; adversity, not prosperity. Subsidiary to this is the question whether the interchange between buyer and seller is effected at greater or smaller cost for freight, etc. Still further, the fifty millions of goods now produced at home instead of being imported as formerly, must be produced either by a diversion from other industries of the amount of labour necessary, or by the importation of that labour from abroad. If the former then we shall require to know whether the labour so diverted is more or less productive than before. If the latter, which the conditions seem to make necessary, since there is to be no falling off in other productive industries, it will still be in order to enquire whether the labourers so imported add really to the wealth, or to the burdens of the original population; and in either case whether their industry is directed into the most productive and profitable channels.

IT will appear, we think, from the foregoing, that the *Manufacturer's* problem, instead of being so simple as seems to be supposed, is really a very complicated one. Whatever conclusion the reader may reach in a given case, we venture to believe that when he has studied the question in all its aspects he will be ready to agree with us that the thesis which the *Manufacturer* nails to the factory doors with so much confidence, viz., that "when all nations produce all they require for home consumption, and export only such things as other nations require but cannot themselves produce; and when they import only such things as they cannot themselves produce, the acme of national prosperity will be reached," should be re-writ-