

THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.
Vol. V. No. 36.

Toronto, Thursday, August 2nd, 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. 6d. 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, 6 Jordan Street, Toronto.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE.
The Canal Tolls Difficulty	567
The Other Side of the Question	567
The Fisheries Treaty	567
The Sugar Bounty System	567
The New Education	567
Paper Immigration	568
Origin of the Skeena River Trouble	568
Manitoba Railway Policy	568
Judge Love's Forum Article	568
The Match Girls' Strike	568
The Prison Congress at Boston	568
The Prison-Labour Problem	569
Downfall of Boulanger	569
German, Russian and French Relations	569
PUNISHMENT AND REFORMATION	569
THE PROMISED LAND (Poem)	W. H. Morrison 570
LONDON LETTER	Walter Powell 570
MONTREAL LETTER	Louis Lloyd. 572
LOVE'S PHASES	A. Ethelwyn W. therald 572
CANADA'S GREAT RESERVE	J. Dryden Jr. 572
SAUNTERINGS	Sara J. Duncan 574
CORRESPONDENCE—	
McGill University	W. H. Turner 574
ACROSS THE YEARS (Poem)	Emily McManus 575
ROBERT ELSMERE	J. R. W. 575
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	576
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	577
CHESS	578

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.

Few will dispute the proposition that a nation, like an individual, should regard the spirit as well as the letter of its agreements. Is Canada doing so in the matter of the canal tolls? The Acting Secretary of the United States Treasury reports to the House of Representatives that the Order in Council of the Canadian Government, authorizing a refund of 18 cents of the 20 cents per ton paid by vessels passing through the Welland Canal to those which pursue their voyage by way of the St. Lawrence River and Montreal, operates as a discrimination against American ports, railways, canals, and vessels. It is clear that if the order did not have that effect it would fail to accomplish its object. If it operates also as a discrimination against certain Canadian vessels and ports, that fact cannot atone to the United States for the injury done to her commerce, though it may suggest a doubt as to the wisdom and fairness of the regulation, even from a Canadian point of view. Since all the advantage accruing to the United States from this provision of the Treaty of Washington depends upon the absence of any such discrimination, actual or virtual, it is no wonder that the regulation in question is complained of as a violation of good faith. It is no answer to this complaint to say that the order applies alike to Canadian and American vessels, and so does not infringe upon the letter of the compact. The question is whether it honourably regards its spirit. Congress has, probably, the means of effective retaliation in connection with the St. Clair Flats Canal, and seems disposed to use it. If so, the Canadian Government will have to give way in the end, as it did in the free-list affair. But it would have been, to say the least, more dignified, had Canada interpreted more broadly her obligation in the matter, and observed it from a high sense of honour, instead of acting only on compulsion, through fear of retaliation.

It is alleged, *per contra*, that the United States Government has, on more than one occasion, in its dealings with Canada, given to treaty obligations the narrowest and most literal interpretation. This certainly was done in the case of the famous tax imposed on lobster cans under the agreement to admit lobsters free of duty. It is alleged that, even now, in the matter of the reciprocal use of canals, that Government, in failing to

secure for Canadian vessels the use of the Champlain, Erie, and other canals, on the same terms as American vessels, has come short of fulfilling its engagements in their spirit and intent. If this be so the case is one for remonstrance, and, if necessary, protest, or open retaliation. But the remonstrance in such a case would come with double force from a Government whose own observation of the terms of the treaty had been such as to challenge comparison. Whatever other nations may do, Young Canada cannot afford to allow her escutcheon to be tarnished with even a suspicion of sharp practice in international dealings.

THE arguments urged by the Republican Senators of the United States against the ratification of the Fisheries Treaty have certainly not been remarkable for breadth of view, or freedom from prejudice, or international goodwill. They have not in all cases been free even from *ad captandum* appeals to the petty dislikes and purblind passions of some of the worst elements in American society. But it cannot be denied that there is much force in one argument on which speaker after speaker has dwelt. The treaty lacks the element of finality. It does not remove but rather intensifies the danger of future misunderstanding. We have from the first pointed this out as the great defect of the document considered as an attempt to settle the dispute. As Senator Dawes said, it is not a treaty of peace. It is full of the elements of strife and contention. If ratified, the occasions for dispute and ill feeling would probably multiply rather than decrease under its operation. From this point of view the probable refusal of the Senate to ratify it cannot be regarded as an unmixed evil. If that refusal should happily lead to some more comprehensive and less equivocal arrangement in the future, some agreement which may be accepted as a final settlement of the whole dispute, both countries will be well repaid for waiting a little longer.

WE have never been able to understand why the British Government should be so anxious to secure the repeal of the system of sugar bounties which prevails on the continent. From England's free trade point of view the payment of those bounties by the French, German, Austrian, and Russian Governments must be beneficial rather than otherwise to the British people. It gives them cheap sugar at the expense of foreign nations. Not even from the protectionist point of view does the system work any harm to Englishmen. On the contrary, statistics seem to show that the sum total of their industries is swelled rather than decreased by the cheapness of sugar. The manufacture of preserves and other articles into which sugar enters as the raw material has been greatly stimulated. Sir Thomas Farrar maintains that in this way the effect of the continental sugar bounties has been to give employment to a larger number of hands than were employed in the closed sugar refineries. Sir Thomas argues, with much force, that so long as foreign nations are willing to make the people of Great Britain a present of tens of millions of dollars every year, as represented by the decreased price of sugar in consequence of their bounties, it is unwise on the part of the British Government to attempt to induce those nations to restrain their generosity.

AMONGST the abounding innovations of the time one of the most remarkable is the movement in educational circles in the direction of industrial training in the schools. Quietly, but swiftly, a revolution is being wrought in the minds of educators that will tell most powerfully upon the general weal a generation hence. Old ideas in regard to the proper work and mission of the school are passing away and new ones taking their place. The public school of the future promises to be a very different institution from that of the past and the present. The universal and exclusive reign of the text-book is nearing its end, to be succeeded by a *regime* under which all the faculties of the pupil, the physical as well as the mental, will be called into play, with a view to their training and development. There is no reason to believe that the mind will be in any sense the loser under the new order of things. Experienced and thoughtful educators will not hesitate to accept the testimony of those who, after actual experiment, are declaring that the development of brain-power, which alone has been considered true education, is accelerated rather than retarded, when half the