

THE WEEK.

Seventh Year.
Vol. VII. No. 48.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31st, 1890.

\$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. O'LOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
As Others See Us.....	755
A Radical Question in Politics.....	755
Some Pros and Cons.....	755
Some Preliminary Questions.....	755
The Proposed Dominion Teachers' Association.....	756
The Convict becoming a Hero.....	756
The Birchall Petitions.....	756
The British Farmers' Delegates.....	756
Stanley and Barttelot.....	756
Seven versus One.....	756
The Andover Case.....	757
CHORAMBIOS—PLAINT OF THE NURSE IN THE "MEDEA." (Translation).....	757
PARIS LETTER.....	757
A MODERN MYSTIC—XIII.....	758
PARISIAN LITERARY NOTES.....	759
TO CERTAIN NATURE POETS. (Poem).....	759
THE PASSION PLAY AT OBERAMMERGAU—(Concluded).....	759
CORRESPONDENCE—	
The Deadly Railway Crossing.....	761
THE RAMBLER.....	761
AN AFTERGLOW. (Poem).....	762
H. P. LIDDON—IN MEMORIAM.....	762
ART NOTES.....	763
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	763
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	763
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	764
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	765
CHESS.....	766

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 American *Law Review*, in a recent article, pays a generous tribute to the general excellence of Canadian character and institutions, and especially to its "educated and disciplined Bar, which has not lost, in the scramble of the tradesman, the dignity and honour of the legal profession." The Bench of our country it regards as "composed of learned, high-minded and honourable judges, who hold their offices during good behaviour; whose judgments are, therefore, not in any sense subject to the danger of being warped by popular clamour, or by the impressions of the hour." It will be observed that the writer recognizes clearly not only the fact, but the cause of the fact, in that permanency of their tenure of office, which enables our judges to rise above the influences which must, to a greater or less degree, tend to affect the judgments of all except the very best of those who hold their positions by popular favour. In this one important particular alone, those of our neighbours who are as impartial and dispassionate as the writer from whom we quote, may readily find a weighty reason why Canadians should prefer their own institutions to those of their neighbours, and be resolved to perpetuate them. And what is true of our judicial system is true, in many respects, of our social and political institutions. In thus prizing our own methods it is by no means necessary to foolishly disparage those of our neighbours, who, we may cheerfully grant, have taught the civilized world many valuable lessons in the art of free, popular government. All that Canada need ask or desire in this matter is liberty to pursue the even tenor of her way unmolested, and an opportunity to develop her strength and resources in accordance with the genius and traditions of her people. We are not of the number of those who suspect the powerful nation on our borders of any design or desire to interfere with our liberty and independence in these respects. We cannot avoid regretting that, in the pursuit of what we believe to be a narrow and false theory of political economy, that nation has just now adopted a fiscal system which tends to injure both peoples, and to create artificial barriers to that freedom of trade and intercourse which beneficent nature so manifestly intended. These unnatural restrictions, we confidently believe, will be but temporary. Wiser counsels will prevail, and the two nations, sharing between them the empire of the continent, will live side by side in friendship and good neigh-

bourhood, in the future as in the past, each steadily and rapidly advancing along its own distinctive lines of progress. What we may hope those lines to be for Canada the *Law Review* well indicates as follows:—

Canada, though having a nominal connection with the Mother Country, is really an independent nation, and must soon take its place as such in the family of great states. That connection at the present time, while not diminishing its independence, increases its strength and importance. We may confidently expect from that people, in the near future, many important additions to the stock of the world's knowledge, many improvements and advances in science; and we may confidently look to the Bench and Bar of that country for works on jurisprudence equal to anything which has hitherto been produced in the Mother Country, or in the young republic.

DEMOSTHENES said, in effect, to the Athenians, in one of those inimitable speeches which remain to this day among the best models of effective popular oratory, that if by ignoring disagreeable facts he could do away with the facts themselves it would be a statesman's duty to say only pleasant things, but that if the stubborn facts would remain in spite of being passed over in speech, then the people were fools who would not insist on knowing and facing the whole truth. Similar language might well be used just now by any patriotic statesman of either party in Canada. The Dominion is manifestly near a parting of the ways. Upon her choice of path will depend, to say the least, the rapidity and extent of her future growth. We have sometimes in the past had occasion to emphasize the fact that no great principles were at stake between the two old political parties in Canada, that their fierce struggles were in the main struggles for office. Much as we deprecate the party spirit, we can say that no longer. Recent events are differentiating very clearly and very widely between them. The Government and its supporters have committed themselves to a certain trade policy for the Dominion and are pursuing and pushing that policy with great energy and persistence. The leaders and supporters of the Opposition have not only committed themselves to a radically different policy, but are now staking all their hopes of office upon the acceptance of that policy by the people of Canada at the next election. The question for every intelligent Canadian to consider and to reach a decision upon is clear and well defined. Shall Canada accept the McKinley Bill as the final word of its rich and powerful neighbour, maintain or increase her own protective tariff and rely upon her great railroad systems and subsidized lines of fleet steamships on the Atlantic and Pacific for enabling her to find new markets for her exports and new channels for her trade? Or shall she accept it as a fiat of inexorable nature that she can find permanent prosperity and work out her national destiny only in close commercial intercourse with the United States, and shape all her legislation and diplomacy with reference to that decree? Manifestly the issue is a broad one. The resultant difference of policy and of politics is radical. It matters not, on the one hand, that the leaders of the Government declare their readiness, or even their anxiety to have reciprocity with the United States, so long as the limitations, which they make their *sine qua non* are such as it is well known the United States will not accept. Nor does it matter, on the other hand, that the Opposition leaders declare their approval of energetic measures to promote Canadian trade with Great Britain and the colonies, so long as they distinctly relegate all such possibilities of enlarged traffic across oceans to a secondary place and are quite prepared to discriminate even against the Mother Country in order to gain the boon of free trade with their next-door neighbour. The question for the Canadian elector still is: Shall I vote for or against an attempt to secure absolute free trade with the United States, with a high tariff against the rest of the world?

OUR present design is not to attempt to give a categorical answer to the foregoing question, but to state it as clearly as we can, and to point out that some of the data which are necessary to a fair consideration and a wise decision are as yet wanting. It is surely unnecessary to premise that Canadians will lay themselves open to the keen reproach levelled by the great Athenian orator against

his countrymen, if they do not resolutely put away all party bias, and calmly and judiciously look at both sides of the question. Every Liberal should study dispassionately the views presented by the Premier and the Minister of Justice in recent addresses. Every supporter of the Government should read no less attentively the speeches of Mr. Laurier and Sir Richard Cartwright. A question upon which the future of the Dominion so largely depends should not be used as the shuttlecock of politicians or left to the manipulation of the ordinary electioneering agencies. Some of the statistical facts bearing upon the question, as set forth by Sir Richard Cartwright in his Pembroke speech, are eloquent in regard to the consequences which hang upon the decision that must be made in a year or two at the farthest. It is no light matter to be shut out from the market which last year took almost one-half of our total \$80,000,000 worth of all kinds of produce, which took \$3,753,000 out of \$4,419,000 worth of the products of our mines; \$11,000,000 out of \$23,000,000 worth of products of our forests; and \$9,125,000 out of \$13,414,000 worth of products of our farms and gardens. Many arguments used by advocates on both sides need careful scrutiny. Those who would try to persuade us that the loss of this market, or even the reduction of its demands by one-half, can be easily compensated for by the gains in distant markets which can be reached only by subsidized steamboats, and in which, when reached, much of our trade will be met with the keenest competition in the world, are evidently making large drafts on the credulity of their hearers. On the other hand those who talk so glibly of the market of sixty millions at our doors, as if every one of the sixty millions would become a purchaser of our products, even under the freest trade imaginable, are simply seeking to bewilder us with the size of their figures, when they themselves must know that the probabilities of our coming into actual business contact with one in five of that sixty millions are infinitesimally small. That some millions of the people of the United States living nearest our border would prove excellent customers, and that free trade with these wealthy communities would stimulate almost every branch of productive industry in our country to an enormous and profitable degree, very few thoughtful and candid Canadians will deny.

AMONG the preliminary questions which will need to be answered with some degree of precision and conclusiveness, before the people of Canada will be likely to entrust their future to the hands of Sir Richard and his friends, are evidently the following: (I.) Is free trade with the United States a political possibility, even on the conditions of making it unrestricted and maintaining a high tariff against other nations, Great Britain included? (II.) Is such free trade desirable, on the only basis on which it is possible, if possible at all, namely, that marked out by the above conditions? (III.) Assuming an affirmative answer to both these questions, is such an arrangement compatible with, we need not even say loyalty to the Mother Country, but with fair and honourable dealing, in view of our past and present relations with her? We do not state these as mere rhetorical interrogations to be met either with confident affirmatives or with indignant negatives, but as plain questions which every Canadian addressed has a right to ask. The first is clearly fundamental. It may be that Sir Richard Cartwright is in possession of facts to warrant him in answering it, as he does, in the affirmative, but he must produce those facts if he would silence wide-spread scepticism. It may be that the more unrestricted the international traffic the better for all concerned, but the question is debatable as well as vital. It may be, as Sir Richard intimates, that the indirect benefits which would result to Great Britain from the settlement of all pending questions between the United States and Canada, in view of the immense amount of capital her people have invested in both countries, combined with those further benefits which would result from the rapid growth and increased prosperity of Canada, would more than compensate her for the discrimination against her merchants and manufacturers, and that her statesmen would see it in that light. But on all these points evidence, and evidence of a very convincing kind, will be needed to persuade the people of Canada to commit themselves to so revolutionary a programme. Will such evidence be forthcoming? We shall see.