

THE WEEK.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 19.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 8th, 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*, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.
European Agents—SMITH, AINSLIE & Co., 25 Newcastle Street, Strand, London.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, *Publisher*.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
Sir Charles Tupper's Speech	291
An Administrative Irregularity	291
Incidental Protection	291
A Threatened Monopoly	291
A Clumsy Expedient	292
The Newfoundland Difficulty	292
Audi Alteram Partem	292
The Superannuation System	292
Ballooning	292
Parisian Anarchists	293
TWO LOST LEADERS	293
OTTAWA LETTER	T. C. L. K. 293
WENTWORTH AND PYM: THE GREAT EARL OF STRAFFORD AND THE GREAT COMMONER	J. A. Allen 294
THE MEANS OF LIVING OF LITTERATEURS IN CANADA	Alchemist 295
NEW YORK LETTER	Sophie M. Almon Hensley 295
THE RAMBLER	Z. 296
PARIS LETTER	Z. 296
THE CENTURY DICTIONARY	297
ART NOTES	297
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	298
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	298
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	300
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	300
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	301
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY	302
CHESS	303

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.

It is reassuring to find, from the fuller report of Sir Charles Tupper's speech before the Associated Chambers of Commerce, that the Canadian High Commissioner did not indulge in the mysterious threats against the United States with which he was credited by the cable correspondent. As Sir Charles did distinctly advocate a tariff for Great Britain discriminating against other nations in favour of the Colonies, it is not difficult to perceive whence the misconception may have arisen. Should Sir Charles' counsels be followed, a blow, more or less "vital," would be indeed struck at the commerce of the United States, but it would be struck by the Mother Country, not by Canada. On the inherent improbability that Great Britain will at any early day adopt a policy so contrary to the economic principles on which she has for so many years based her fiscal policy with unexampled success, we need not dwell. But we are under obligation to Sir Charles for giving us the first direct answer which we have seen to the pointed question put by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, President of the British Board of Trade, in the House of Commons, at the beginning of the session. As our readers will remember, we have ourselves on several occasions put the same question to the advocates of an Imperial trade-union in this country. The Board of Trade President put it thus: "Supposing a duty is imposed upon those articles (corn, etc.) coming here from foreign countries, what would be the natural effect? The price would be raised by something more than the duty. If the price were not raised, what good would it be to the colonies?" The High Commissioner did not shirk the point. His answer involves two things. In the first place, he does not believe that a duty of five shillings a quarter on corn would necessarily raise the price of bread. "The price is regulated at Mark Lane, and depends not upon the cost of getting it to the market, but upon demand and supply. The seller has to pay the cost of freight and insurance, and would have to pay the duty in the same way if it came from a foreign country, and he would have to compete with the corn from India, Australasia and Canada. When the American had paid this small duty, this would still be the best market

he could find." British economists will be ready enough to admit that the price of corn or of any other commodity depends upon demand and supply, but they will probably have to leave it to Sir Charles Tupper to explain how that statement is to be reconciled with its companion one, that Mark Lane, which has no control of the supply, can still regulate the price, or with the strange assumption that the cost of getting the grain to the market does not affect the supply and so become an important factor in determining the price. The idea that the colonies which furnish but a fractional part of Britain's food could keep the price down by competition with the chief sources of supply, will we fear strike the hard-headed British consumer as little less than absurd. Grant that the amount produced in the colonies and India would rapidly increase under stimulus, what is going to reconcile the English artisan to dear bread while the process of development is going on? Sir Charles' reply to the second half of the question has, it must be admitted, more plausibility, at least at first thought. The colonies, or to be more specific, Canada is to be benefited, not by finding a better market and a higher price for her grain, but by the effect which the discrimination against the United States will have in diverting the currents of immigration, which have hitherto flowed into the Western States, to her fertile and illimitable prairies. There might be something in this were it not that in order to gain the advantage of the slight discrimination in the British market, the immigrant farmer would be obliged to lose the sixty million home-market for the many other products which he could not send across the ocean. However, we agree with Sir Charles that practical demonstrations are best, and we may as well leave this part of the question to the test of experience—when we get the discriminatory tariff.

"IRREGULAR, not illegal," was in effect Premier Mowat's defence against the charge of illegal expenditure in connection with the building and equipment of Upper Canada College, brought against the Government last week. There was no serious dispute about the facts. These, briefly put, are that whereas according to the statute which embodied the result of the compromise agreement reached in 1887, between the friends and enemies of the College in the Legislature, the Government was authorized to expend \$120,000 for building purposes and \$35,000 for site, in establishing the College in its new quarters, there has actually been expended under the direction of the Minister of Education and the Trustees of the College no less than an aggregate of \$319,450 on site, building and equipment. An over-expenditure of more than \$160,000 is surely a pretty serious "irregularity." The money of the College and University, like all other public funds which are in the hands of the Government and under its control, is a trust fund. We are unable to see that it makes the slightest difference in the principle of the thing whether the University of Toronto or some other department of the public service, is to be the loser. Nor can we see that it matters in the least that a part of the amount of the unauthorized expenditure was derived, as Mr. Ross claimed, from the proceeds of good management of the College endowment by the managers of that institution. So long as the College is the property of the Province the income is, equally with the principal, a part of that property. Neither the one nor the other can be disposed of save under the direction of the Government, with the consent and authority of the people's representatives. Mr. Mowat's distinct affirmation that the over-expenditure was not illegal, deservedly carried great weight with the Assembly. But it might have been worth his while to have given some reasons for his opinion, or at least to have made a little clearer the distinction he makes between irregularity and illegality. He might also have intimated whether he thinks such irregularities desirable, and whether they are likely to be of frequent occurrence in the future. The fact upon which he chose to dwell, that there was no suspicion of corrupt use of the public funds, was aside from the question, as was also Mr. Ross' long dissertation upon the history and merits of the College. These side issues were of use simply to beg the real question before the House. It surely is not desirable

that the Assembly should refrain from asserting its right of control over the public funds until it can substantiate a charge or corruption in every unauthorized appropriation. The incident is, it strikes us, worthy of more attention than it has received, as illustrating a tendency on the part of the Executives, both federal and provincial, to rely upon the loyalty of their supporters to sustain them in stretching their prerogatives beyond the limits prescribed by healthful usage and precedent, if not actually beyond those prescribed by the letter of the constitution. It is unnecessary to add that such a tendency is fraught with danger to representative government.

"WE were compelled to adopt a tariff which would give us revenue, and in imposing it we had regard to its incidental effect in stimulating the industries adapted to the country." Such is Sir Charles Tupper's explanation of the origin and character of the "National Policy," given in his speech before the members of the Associated Chambers of Commerce in England. That it is, with the modification noted below, a correct description of the grounds upon which that change in the fiscal policy of Canada was advocated and defended during its original passage through Parliament, will be within the memory of those of our readers who can recall that memorable discussion and the events which preceded it. The reminiscence is suggestive, as indicating to what extent Canadian legislation since that date has followed the inevitable trend of all public policies which are shaped so as to subserve the selfish interests of individuals or classes. If any of our readers have had the curiosity to read the numerous reports which have been given in the papers of interviews which have taken place during the current session and some of the preceding sessions, between Ministers of Customs and Finance and parties seeking changes in the tariff in the interest of certain industries, and will take the trouble to recall the kind of arguments which have been brought forward in support of the changes asked for, and which have had weight with the Government, they will be able to judge how far the present Canadian tariff is a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection in the background. Failing such recollection, a re-perusal of the debate of last session over the Bill for the reduction of the duties on sugar, or, better still, a careful reading of one or two of the articles which from time to time appear in the *Canadian Manufacturer* dealing with the present state of the sugar monopoly, will answer the purpose. The mention of the sugar duties reminds us, by the way, how baseless is the claim of credit which has been put forth again and again by and on behalf of the Dominion Government for the remission of the sugar taxes, seeing that everyone who pays the slightest attention to public affairs must know that the change was not made nor contemplated by the Government until it was in a manner forced upon them by the action of the American Congress. But that is aside from our present object, which is simply to point out that the description which Sir Charles Tupper gave of the Canadian high tariff in its inception is very far from a correct representation of it as it now stands. Was it quite frank on the part of the High Commissioner to fail to give his English hearers any inkling of the change which has come over the spirit of the "N. P." since the time to which he refers? Should he not have told them, moreover, that it was first proposed as a retaliatory measure, which was to force the Washington authorities into giving us reciprocity?

MR. EDGAR has done well to call the attention of Parliament to the astounding movement which is alleged to have been effected for combining into one vast monopoly all the cotton factories in Canada. If the facts be as represented, the users of this indispensable fabric throughout the Dominion, which means of course the whole population, are threatened with a state of things under which they would be at the mercy of a few individuals, who might proceed to levy taxes at their own sweet will, and quickly outrival even the sugar barons. Such a condition would be simply intolerable, and we are glad that Sir John Thompson so promptly intimated, on behalf of the Government, that if action is found to be