

# THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.  
Vol. V. No. 51.

Toronto, Thursday, November 15th, 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. CLOUGHIER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

### CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Trans-shipment Question.....	807
A Question of Principle and Policy.....	807
Official Salaries.....	807
The Claims of Social Science.....	808
The Possibilities of Labour Unions.....	808
A Sweeping Contention.....	808
The Moral Question.....	808
Ill-timed Sneers.....	808
The Queensland Incident.....	808
The Great Contest Ended.....	809
Some Factors of the Result.....	809
How Canada is Affected.....	809
The Educational Struggle in England.....	809
The Railway in China.....	809
Recent Church Discussions.....	809
SCOTTISH HOME RULE.....	811
THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.....	811
PARIS LETTER.....	M. A. B. 811
SONNET.....	Mary Morgan (Gowan Lea). 812
WASHINGTON LETTER.....	B. 812
THE NORTH-WEST FARMER.....	Nicholas Flood Davin. 812
A NATIONAL HYMN.....	A. C. 814
NEW YORK LETTER.....	A. 814
PROFESSOR CLARK ON "ROBERT ELSMERE".....	814
MUSIC.....	B. Natural. 815
DICTIONARY OF NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY.....	815
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	816
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	817
CHESS.....	817

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.

REFERRING to what has from time to time appeared in THE WEEK and other Upper Province journals in regard to the propriety of re-considering the Canadian position on the trans-shipment question, the Halifax *Chronicle* is of opinion that the proposal is "refreshingly cool." "Coming," says the *Chronicle*, "from a section of the Dominion that does not produce a salt water fish, and has not a dollar invested in the fishing enterprise, it is carrying magnanimity to the verge of heroism to propose that the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces should give up the only leverage now remaining to secure fair play, in order that the Government should be relieved of any further embarrassment." This remark follows a lengthy argument showing that the privilege in question is of great value, under present conditions, to the American fishermen. No proof was needed. The anxiety of our neighbours to obtain the boon sufficiently attests its value. But the fact that the thing asked for would be of great value to our neighbours is in itself surely no reason for refusing it—quite the contrary. The *Chronicle* declines to offer an opinion as to "how far the enforcement of the terms of the old treaty of 1818 is in accordance with the enlightened trade views of the day." But this surely is a most pertinent and important question, if we wish to play a truly neighbourly part.

THE main point of the *Chronicle's* well put contention is that the value attached by American fishermen to the trans-shipment-in-bond privilege makes it the most powerful leverage Canada has for obtaining what she desires in return. The United States fishermen had the right under the treaty which was abrogated by the act of their own Government. They can have it again at any time under a fair new treaty. There is unquestionable force in this way of putting it. But it suggests two questions, one of principle, the other of policy. As a matter of principle—that is, of right-doing,—are we fully justified in refusing to a friendly nation a privilege which it would do us no harm to grant, simply because we hope by the refusal to extort a desired concession in return? That is to say, is not

Canada bound by international courtesy to deal with her neighbour in accordance with "the enlightened trade views of the day," irrespective of any advantages she may desire in return? There is here, we freely admit, some room for argument. But as a matter of policy, has not this "leverage" business proved a costly and disappointing failure? Is there any reason to hope for its future success? Does not persistence in a course which our neighbours regard as contrary to neighbourliness and international comity perpetuate an irritation which tends to defeat the very end in view? Has not the experiment of forcing the United States to accept our terms been tried long enough to test its value? If the case were reversed, would Canadians be likely to yield to the same kind of pressure? Moreover, if by virtue of a treaty which antedates the railways which make trans-shipment possible we may refuse to let our neighbour's fishermen enter our ports and use our railways, can we complain if they retaliate by refusing similar privileges to our merchants without a treaty? In fine, would not Canada's chances of obtaining the tariff concessions her fishermen wish for be improved rather than injured by her adoption of a more friendly, or, if the *Chronicle* pleases, "magnanimous" course? We have no wish to dogmatize in the matter, and we certainly do wish to see Ontario and the Maritime Provinces stand shoulder to shoulder in the defence of what is just and right. But in view of a possible deadlock, or something much worse, in the near future, it can do no harm for East and West to re-consider the grave questions at issue, putting themselves, for the time, as nearly as possible in the place of their neighbours.

THE announcement that the Hon. Oliver Mowat, Premier of Ontario, has found it necessary to resume the practice of his profession in order to supplement his too scanty official income, has given rise to some discussion as to the inadequacy, or otherwise, of the salaries now paid Members of the Provincial Cabinet. It is quite probable that, judged by a reasonable standard, \$5,000 a year for the First Minister, and \$4,000 a year for each of his Associates, are sums quite too small to secure the degree of comfort and financial independence to which the ministers of a wealthy province are fairly entitled. But it will be obvious, we think, on a little reflection, that it would be both impracticable and undesirable to attempt to make the earning capacity of the respective ministers in other pursuits the measure of their official salaries. It is highly probable, as *The Globe* says, that Mr. Mowat could easily earn \$20,000 a year in the practice of his profession, but it would hardly be a logical inference that his salary as First Minister should be raised to anything like that amount. It is fair to assume that to make money, above the amount necessary for the ordinary purposes of life, is not the ruling motive, or even a strong motive, with Mr. Mowat, or with any man worthy of the high office in which he has been placed by the suffrages of his countrymen. The same may be said in regard to all the other members of the Ministry. The honour of the position, the grand opportunity it affords for serving his country, the high satisfaction which attends the conscious discharge of duty in the sphere for which his talents are best adapted—these and kindred considerations have a value in the eyes of the true statesman and patriot which cannot be reckoned in dollars and cents. In Cabinet offices, as in all other of the highest professions and pursuits, it must be expected in the future as in the past that the best service will as a rule be rendered by men who, were money-making their chief aim, could gain wealth much more rapidly in some other employment.

PROFESSOR ASHLEY'S inaugural lecture at Toronto University marks the commencement of a new and much needed departure in higher education in Canada. Many may not fully sympathize with Professor Ashley in his dread of innovations in University courses, but all will agree that his address fully vindicated the claims of Political Science to the place which has been too tardily made for it in the Provincial University. Professor Ashley's remark that the universities are not likely to confound Political Science with Sociology, taken in connection with his careful outline and limitation of the sphere of the former, suggests the query whether he was exactly accurate in describing Political Science as the last new claimant for admission to a place in the university courses. As he is no doubt aware, Sociology proper, or at least considerable groups of subjects which