

THE WEEK.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 34.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JULY 22nd, 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 Newcaste Street, Strand London.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, *Publisher*.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Engineership	531
Commercial Fallacies	531
An Important Anniversary	531
Annexation Denounced	531
Party Government in Canada	531
Voting Railway Subsidies	532
The Manitoba Elections	532
Industrial Co-operation	532
Labour Contests in the United States	532
The War with the Pinkertons	532
Political Movements in Belgium	533
THE DOMINION EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION: The First Meeting in Montreal	533
AUSTRALIAN LETTER	534
THE ARCHIE MAN—V	534
THE CHILDREN OF THE LIGHT. (Poem)	535
TWO KNAPSACKS: A Novel of Canadian Summer Life	536
PARIS LETTER	538
LIFE. (Poem)	538
THE MELCHIOR SKETCHES	538
FORCE AND ENERGY	539
THE RAMBLER	540
TOO SOON. (Poem)	540
CORRESPONDENCE—	
The Canadian Question	540
ART NOTES	540
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	540
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	541
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	541
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	541
CHESS	543

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 comforting to know that at last Toronto has an engineer presumably competent and endowed with the authority and the responsibility requisite for the proper discharge of the duties of that important position. All parties, even those who would have preferred that a tried and faithful servant had not been passed over, will, no doubt, unite in giving Mr. Keating a fair chance and all the aid in their power. That the present demands of the position are sufficient to test the strength and efficiency of the ablest man is beyond question. In addition to all the duties that will devolve upon him in connection with the carrying on of the large operations to which the city is already committed, there are the still larger problems arising out of the unsanitary condition of the water front, Ashbridge's Bay, etc., to which his earnest attention should at once be given. If he can find the best means of purifying these great sources of danger and nuisance, and can succeed in getting his plan adopted and successfully carried out, he will deserve to be enrolled high on the list of civic benefactors, and will have earned the gratitude of posterity as well as of the citizens of to-day. We sincerely hope that this summer will not be allowed to pass away without some effective means having been adopted to deliver us from the sore reproach of that polluted cesspool into which we have turned the clear waters that laved the shores of our beautiful bay when Governor Simcoe pitched his tent upon them. Had the centennial celebration been held in this city instead of at Niagara, the orators of the occasion might have found a fruitful theme for indignant denunciation in the foul state to which the city of which we are so proud has reduced the beautiful harbour which should be one of the chief delights of its citizens.

THE fallacy of reasoning from the sequences, we do not say the effects, of a given fiscal policy, e.g., a highly protective tariff, in the United States, to the results of a similar policy in Canada, is obvious on the slightest reflection and has often been pointed out. And yet that same fallacy is perpetually recurring in the arguments of the advocates of prohibitive tariffs or Government bounties for Canada. For instance, we have several times of late met with something like the following: If the United

States with a population of sixty-five millions can give profitable employment to 269 blast furnaces, with a yearly output of over nine millions of tons of pig iron, surely Canada with nearly five millions of population can afford profitable employment for one such furnace, with a capacity for a yearly output of, say, 35,000 tons. Now, we do not say that a blast furnace, situated in a central locality like Toronto, might not find within a practicable and paying distance a market for the product of a furnace of that capacity, though the fact that no shrewd capitalist with an eye to the main chance, on either side of the border, has taken advantage of the opportunity to make a profitable investment rather favours an opposite conclusion. But it is clear that any one who wishes to ascertain the exact force and value of the above argument must not fail to take account of some very material differences in the conditions. He must remember, for instance, that, according to good Canadian authorities, the five millions of Canadians are scattered over a territory larger than that occupied by our sixty-five millions of neighbours. Of course, no one needs to be told that in the marketing of so heavy a commodity as pig iron accessibility is quite as important a consideration as numbers in determining the value, or the possibility, of a given market. From this point of view, no one with a map of Canada before him, and some knowledge of the physical features of the country, can fail to perceive how grossly misleading it would be to count upon the people of Cape Breton or British Columbia, or even those of parts of the Dominion much less distant, as among the possible consumers of the product of a blast furnace in Toronto.

IT was a happy thought which led the Pioneer and Historical Association of Ontario to prepare so fitting a celebration of the establishment of responsible, or rather of constitutional, government in Upper Canada, as that which took place on the 16th inst., at Niagara-on-the-Lake. The division of the old Province of Quebec into the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, the advent of Col. Simcoe, and his proclamation subdividing the Upper Province into counties, with a view to the choosing of representatives and the formation of a Legislative Assembly, were events of the first importance, in the evolution of the largest and wealthiest Province of the Dominion. The arrival and settlement of the Loyalists who formed the nucleus of the small population to whom Simcoe's memorable proclamation was issued, was one of the most picturesque incidents in Canadian history. There are, indeed, few events in the history of any nation which appeal more powerfully to the imaginations and to the loyal sentiments of the descendants of the pioneers. Though the constitution which was thus established afterwards lent itself to serious abuses, and had to be amended through long years of fierce political strife, it nevertheless was in a true historical sense the origin and the palladium of the liberties we now enjoy. As was to be expected on such an occasion, the speeches were full to the brim of patriotic Canadian sentiment, and aimed at supplanting any incipient political unrest with feelings of gratitude that we have so goodly a heritage, and so free and flexible a system of machinery for self-government.

THE addresses of the principal speakers at the Niagara centennial celebration, and notably that of Sir Oliver Mowat, bore unmistakable evidence that the tendency to a policy of "drift," to which we alluded last week, is more or less clearly perceived. Indeed, some might fear lest some of these loyal orators may, by protesting too much, throw suspicion, not upon their own sincerity, but upon the loyalty of the fellow-citizens whom they think it necessary to ply with arguments so cogent and copious against casting in their lot with their great southern neighbour. Be that as it may, the speeches, and especially that of Ontario's Premier, are well worth being read by all Canadians who wish to count the cost of so revolutionary a change in our political relations. If we might venture a word of criticism, we should say that the most

effective passages in Sir Oliver's speech, considered as an appeal to the young Canadians for whom it seems to have been specially intended, were those in which he held up before them the ideal of a future Canadian nationality as the goal of their ambition. In these remarks Sir Oliver recognized a distinction which the other speakers, like the great majority of those who deliver loyal addresses to young Canadians, seem unable to conceive, between loyalty to their own country as citizens, and loyalty to the Empire as colonists. It is useless and unwise to ignore this distinction. The feeling which is its outcome is already strong in the breasts of thousands of native Canadians, and it must, in the nature of things, grow stronger with every passing year. No matter with what sentiments of admiration and even of affection the young man, born and nurtured on Canadian soil, may turn to the mighty nation whose flag waves over his native land, he knows and feels that in the eyes of the people of Great Britain he is but a colonist, and that the term carries with it to their ears a connotation of inferiority. He feels, too, the difficulty, the impossibility, of being passionately loyal—and loyalty itself is a passion—to an empire scattered over the surface of the globe, and embracing peoples of all races and all degrees of civilization. We feel sure, therefore, that the best, not to say the only effective way in which the as yet feeble plant of Canadian patriotism can be developed into a sturdy tree, to live and grow through centuries, is to foster the hope and purpose of Canadian nationality. Let this idea be kept prominent, even if its realization is set at some distance in the future, and Canadian patriotism has something to think about, to look forward to, to feed and grow strong upon. We will only venture to add that there is some room to question the cogency of Sir Oliver's logic when he argues in effect that the young people of Canada must wait until the spirit of Canadianism has been developed through the medium of common loyalty to the Empire, before we can venture to trust it and act upon it. This is much like urging one to propagate the maple by cultivating the oak. Modern science has taught us that in order to develop any given organ or faculty we must call that organ or faculty itself into play and strengthen it by exercise and use.

AS our readers well know, we are no admirers of government by party. The fact that it is so commonly if not uniformly resorted to wherever the people govern themselves, or are supposed to do so, may be regarded as but one of the many proofs of the incompetence of the human family, under present conditions, to work together wisely for the promotion of their own best interests. But accepting party government as for the time being a necessary evil, it is clearly desirable that it should be intelligently administered, with a view to the nearest approach possible to the ideal of true self-government, viz.: government of the people, by the people, for the people. The *Globe*, the chief organ of the Liberal party in Ontario, has of late had several articles the design of which seems to have been to show, as they certainly have shown, that the system as at present administered in Canada falls very far short of this goal. We have had, in short, for some years past, instead of government by the party, government of the party, by the leaders. And, to make the matter worse, neither these leaders nor the parliamentary delegates who choose and follow them have been, strictly speaking, chosen by the party. The *Globe* and the other papers which have from time to time pointed out the same anomalous condition of things, do well in seeking to bring about a change. The evil equally affects both parties. It is but a short time since the Conservatives had, in the case of the Toronto local election, a striking illustration of the working of the method under which the choice of candidates is usurped by self-appointed leaders or factions, and the rights of the party limited to the poor choice of voting for the candidate of the caucus, in whom they may have no confidence, voting for the candidate of the party to whose policy they are opposed, or not voting at all. The same thing occurs in regard even to the fundamental and vital business of determining the policy of the party. No one can say that the present leading planks in the plat-