

THE WEEK.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 29.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JUNE 17th, 1892.

\$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.

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.

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.

No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 6 Jordan Street, Toronto.

European Agents—SMITH, AINSLIE & Co., 25 Newcastle Street, Strand, London.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The "Tu Quoque" Argument.....	451
One Man, One Vote, One Value.....	451
The New York Times on Reciprocity.....	451
What Inference is Warranted?.....	451
The Minneapolis Convention.....	452
The Republican Platform.....	452
American Citizenship.....	452
OUR UNIVERSITIES.....	452
THE POET. (Poem).....	Arthur Weir. 453
OTTAWA LETTER.....	T. C. L. K. 453
TWO KNAPSACKS: A Novel of Canadian Summer Life.....	J. Caudor Bell. 453
THE ARCHIC MAN—II.....	Nicholas Flood Davin. 456
PARIS LETTER.....	Z. 456
CANOE SONG.....	G. H. Needler. 457
A CURIOUS CORRESPONDENCE.....	457
THE CRITIC.....	457
CORRESPONDENCE—	
The Origin of the Word Spadina.....	A. F. Chamberlain, M.A. 458
THE FISHERMAN POET.....	458
TO L— (Poem).....	D. 458
ART NOTES.....	458
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	458
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	459
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	460
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY.....	462
CHESS.....	463

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 man who resorts to the "tu quoque" argument gives up his case. He admits that he is willing to do wrong because he believes someone else to have been guilty of the same wrong before him. High-minded Canadians must blush to remember how often this singularly worthless argument was used by men from whom better things might have been expected, during the debate on the second reading of the Redistribution Bill, last week. Grant, as we fear we must, that even Mr. Mowat, with all his high claims, fell under the temptation and took a mean and unrighteous advantage of his opponents because his position enabled him to do so, does that fact afford the slightest excuse—justification is out of the question—for an iniquitous "gerrymander" by the Dominion Government? All honour to the two Conservatives who were loyal to conscience and refused to follow the Party, where they believed that they were called on to sanction an iniquity! But just in proportion to the honour due Mr. McCarthy and Col. O'Brien, is the reproach that attaches to the scores who set loyalty to party above personal honour and self-respect. We assume, of course, that no man of intelligence could really deceive himself in regard to the true character of the Redistribution Act. A thing of striking significance in this connection was the fact that no one was found after ten years to defend the previous Redistribution Act or to deny that it at least was an indefensible and odious "gerrymander." That fact speaks volumes. It should have made another deed of similar character impossible. We are glad to perceive some indications that the manly course of the two gentlemen we have named is already bearing fruit. Rumours of change or excision of some of the grossest features of the Bill are abroad. So mote it be.

AFTER half a century of reforming, it must be rather discouraging to the British elector who sets before his mind any ideal system of popular government, to see how many and serious are the anomalies that still remain

as blots upon the electoral plan, and how much yet remains to be done before any such system can be even approximated. The discussion which took place two or three weeks since in the British House of Commons, upon Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's "One man, one vote" Bill, brought some of these anomalies very conspicuously to the front. The soundness of the principle underlying the Bill in question is so obvious that it is difficult to see how any fair-minded man can object to the reform. What could be more unjust than that under a constitution which claims to make the legislators the choice of the people, the electoral machine should be so constructed that while one man is lawfully entitled to but one vote, his neighbour, not a whit more intelligent, or more patriotic, and perhaps not even having greater pecuniary interests at stake, may have a number limited only by his physical ability to reach a dozen or fifty polling places at the proper time. Yet such is still the case in England, as it is to some extent in Canada. Indeed, so great is the abuse in the Mother Country that almost incredible stories are told as facts, touching the number of times some electors, even clergymen, have on some occasions succeeded in depositing their ballots by flying from one to another of the different localities in which they chanced to have sufficient property to secure them the franchise. Upon the introduction of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's Bill, the Liberals no doubt expected to have at least a grand oratorical field-day and a logical triumph. But their argumentative walk-over was sadly checked by Mr. T. W. Russell's counter proposal, to the effect that in order to achieve the results aimed at by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's Bill, they must supplement that Bill by another to cause each elector's vote to have an equal value with that of every other man. That is to say, the constituencies must be made equal in point of numbers, must be so arranged that the vote of one man shall count neither more nor less in point of representative value than that of another man. Some of the figures given by Mr. Russell, to show how far this is from being the case at present, are rather startling, and quite throw the inequalities which have lately been so much discussed in Canada into the shade. To give a single illustration out of several which he quoted: The three boroughs of Galway, Kilkenny and Newry, with a collective electorate of 5,169, send three members to the House; while Belfast, with 35,000 electors, sends only four. Of course the retort was open to the advocates of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's Bill, that it is a very poor argument for perpetuating one great abuse, that another equally glaring will still remain to be removed. On that principle reform progress would be slow indeed. But on the other hand, it is hard to see with what consistency the advocates of the one reform could refuse to pronounce in favour of the other, much less how they could defend, as some of them did, the second injustice while denouncing the first. But, not having the full text of the speeches before us, we may be unable to do full justice to the arguments in either case.

OUR attention has been called to a very able and interesting article which appeared a few weeks since in the New York Times, probably the most independent and reliable of the great New York dailies, on the subject of trade between the United States and Canada. The object of the writer, whose competence is proved by the internal evidence afforded in the article, as well as vouched for in the editorial pages, is to show that the mass of the American public, or of such of them as pay attention to questions affecting trade and commerce, have been seriously misled in regard to the facts touching the trade between the United States and Canada. The general impression among business men, and even in high political circles, is that Canada would be greatly the gainer by any reciprocity arrangement that might be agreed to. The fact is, on the other hand, as the writer in question makes very clear from statistics, that the balance of trade has hitherto been, and would surely continue to be, largely in favour of the great Republic. Let us hasten to add, in passing, lest any Canadian reader should jump to an erroneous conclusion, that this by no means proves that such trade has not been and would not continue to be very profitable to Canada. It is in the very nature of sound commerce

that it is beneficial to both parties, though not necessarily in the same proportions. But this is by the way. The main cause assigned for the erroneous and misleading impression which prevails among our neighbours on the point in question is found in the fact that their discussions of it are naturally based on the tables furnished in the annual reports published by the Bureau of Statistics at Washington. But under the present customs regulations, exporters in the United States are, it seems, required to report only such merchandize as is exported by water. Thus no account is taken of the very large quantities which are annually exported by rail. In order to remedy this very serious defect, the Bureau publishes annually a statement in detail of the quantities and values of the merchandize exported from the United States into Canada, as shown by the Canadian trade and navigation returns. But, owing probably to the later date at which the Canadian statistics are published, the corrected figures obtained from the latter do not appear in the annual reports of the Bureau of Statistics, but in a later quarterly report, and hence generally escape notice in discussions of the question. The Times and its writer do not hesitate to intimate that the deception is intentionally used by the Washington politicians for purposes of their own, but some allowance must evidently be made just at that point for partisan bias. In illustration of the seriously misleading character of the returns found in the annual reports of the Bureau, the following figures are adduced: According to the report the exports of merchandize, foreign and domestic, from the United States to all the Provinces of Canada, for the year ending 30th June, 1890, were valued at \$40,282,108; the imports at \$39,042,977, leaving as the excess of exports \$1,239,131. According to the quarterly report dated Jan. 8th, 1891, the value of imports into Canada from the United States, as corrected by the Dominion trade and navigation returns for the year, was \$60,449,366; and the balance of trade for that year in favour of the United States, was given as \$21,406,389.

REASONING from these data, the writer proceeds to build up a strong argument to show that in the event of a war of tariffs, resulting in commercial non-intercourse, which he thinks cannot much longer be delayed, the United States would be by far the greater sufferer. We do not think that there is much danger that Canada will be tempted by such arguments to try the plan of "striking back," which this writer seems almost disposed to advise. Canadian politicians may not be very wise, but they are not likely to forget that before engaging in a war of any kind there are other considerations to be taken into the account, besides the amount of harm that can be inflicted on one's opponent. Even if the *lex talionis* were as worthy to govern the policy of a modern state as it is obviously unworthy, it would need to be borne in mind, before resorting to it, that injury and suffering are relative terms. The strong man may laugh at a blow, one-half the absolute force of which would inflict permanent injury upon his weaker opponent. But without following up a line of thought from which every citizen of right feeling in either country will recoil, we commend the facts presented in the article as setting in an admirably clear perspective the gross folly of all legislation the object of which is to hamper trade between two contiguous peoples. It is indeed difficult to conceive how any open-minded American can read the article in the Times without beginning to see the egregious folly of the legislation which tends to shut off from the people of the United States a trade which is and would be immensely profitable, and which it would be the part of wisdom and statesmanship to foster by every available means. The Republicans are joined to their idol. There is no hope from them at present. But an immense number of the most intelligent citizens of the Union are more clear-sighted and their influence is daily becoming more powerful. Even now, should the Democrats prove wise enough to stop their internal dissensions over minor issues, cease their faction fights, and unite their forces on a broad platform of tariff reform, their chances of success would be excellent, for the army of thoughtful independents is increasing year by year in the Republic. Meanwhile let us hope that no party in