

THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.
Vol. V. No. 47.

Toronto, Thursday, October 18th, 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.; half-year, 6s. 6d. 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
Abusing Our Neighbours	743
An Imaginary Affront	743
England's Stake in the Quarrel	743
The Buckley Sentence	743
A Question for Jurists	744
The Changed Sentence	744
Inebriety a Disease	744
The Galt Atrocity	744
A Forgotten Compact	744
A Brilliant Light	744
The Religious Thought of the Age	745
Dr. Mackenzie's Book	745
Colonization of Africa	745
Imperial Visiting in Europe	745
Politics in France	745
OUR CRIMINAL CLASSES	746
THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE: CARE OF EMIGRANTS	746
MY LOVE (Poem)	747
THE NORTH-WEST FARMER	747
PARIS LETTER	748
AUTUMN DAYS (Poem)	749
LOUIS LLOYD'S LETTERS	749
"THE SILENCE OF DEAN MAITLAND"	750
VAIN REGRETS (Poem)	751
THE WORLD'S APPLE ORCHARD	751
HAS AMERICA PRODUCED A POET?	752
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	752
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	753
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	753
CHESS	753

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.

It surely cannot be with the approval of the Dominion Government that certain of the newspapers which are supposed to speak for it are assiduously striving to create ill feeling between the people of Canada and those of the United States. There is nothing in the present situation to warrant a policy of abuse. Canada has received neither injury nor insult to justify, if anything could justify, such a policy. Certain politicians have, it is true, for purposes transparently partisan, spoken offensively and even menacingly, but there is no reason whatever to regard these ebullitions as representing the feeling of the nation. Quite the contrary. That feeling, as expressed in words by the better class of United States speakers and writers, and in actions by the people at large, is by no means unfriendly. In spite of the great political excitement there has been little to complain of in the tone of the more influential of their journals. Most of the latter, naturally enough, espouse their own side of the Fisheries dispute and do not hesitate to characterize the Canadian refusal of what they regard as the right of trans-shipment, as narrow and unfair. Our own papers, in their turn, describe the policy of their neighbours in terms equally uncompromising. But these differences of opinion are by no means incompatible with the continuance of friendly intercourse between the two nations, and of mutual respect and good will on the part of their citizens. There can be little doubt that an influential New York weekly voiced the strongest as well as the best sentiment of both peoples, when it said, the other day, "the whole scheme of settling this petty quarrel, which even the greatness of the contestants cannot dignify, first, by a resort to foul words, then to wry faces, finally to blows—whether with gloves or without them—is unworthy of two Christian peoples."

THE latest and worst offence alleged as justification for a good deal of incendiary writing, and some laborious attempts to revive old issues which have been buried so long that they might have been hoped to be now past, resurrection, is the offer of annexation, said to be under consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate. We expressed, in a previous issue, our astonishment and incredulity in regard to this alleged action. It is now pretty certain that no such ill-advised

course was even seriously considered, much less resolved on, by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any other. But, had it been otherwise would there have been anything in such action to warrant a furious outburst of Canadian wrath? The chagrin and loss of dignity, as well as the stupidity, would have been all on the part of our neighbours. Both Great Britain and Canada could have afforded to dismiss the matter with a sarcastic but good-natured laugh at so conspicuous a display of the lack of political knowledge and statesmanlike sagacity. Had there been the slightest hint of attempted coercion, either commercial or military, the case would have been radically different, and righteous resentment in order. But how unjustifiable is such resentment, verging on the abusive, after it has become abundantly evident that the alleged affront never existed save in some fertile imagination; and after the Senatorial leaders whose names are connected with it, have disavowed in the most unequivocal terms any wish to interfere in the slightest with Canadian autonomy, or freedom of choice!

THERE is yet another consideration that should carry great weight with any journals disposed to chime in with the note of hostility to the United States which is being sounded in certain quarters. It is, of course, needless to point out that the first effect of such newspaper articles as those referred to must be to stir up, to the extent of their influence, be that little or much, ill-feeling in Canada against our neighbours, and that the second and reflex effect must be to cause that ill-feeling to be returned with interest by those against whom it is directed. It would surely be superfluous to ask any thoughtful reader to consider whether anything could be more deplorable in itself, or more detrimental to the best interests of Canada, than to have the cordial good will which has so long prevailed between us and the people of the United States supplanted by mutual distrust and enmity. He can be no true friend to Canada who would not exert his influence to avert such a calamity. But how about the Mother Country? It so happens that Canadian diatribes against the United States are generally associated with professions of deepest loyalty to Great Britain. The chief, almost the only, source of possible misunderstanding between England and the Great Republic is Canada. Whoever or whatever causes a quarrel between Canada and the United States involves England in the hostilities. But what could be more disastrous to the world's peace and civilization than a war, such as has been so flippantly spoken of of late on both sides the Lakes, between the two great English-speaking nations? Still further. It does not need the eyes of a pessimist to see the indications of a great combination of European Powers, which, be its immediate objects what they may, bodes no good to England. In view of a crisis, which is but too probably drawing near, what can be more desirable in the interests not only of England but of the world-wide freedom of which her banner and that of the United States are the best symbols and safeguards, than that the great Anglo-Saxon communities should be drawn together in the bonds of the closest sympathy and good will, if by no more tangible tie? Canada, if true to herself and to the great advantages conferred by her position, may become a most potent factor in working out a result so grand.

WE suppose such a thing would be contrary to all judicial etiquette, else one might wish that Chief Justice Galt would take the public into his confidence and explain the processes of reasoning by which he reached the conclusion that justice would be satisfied and the safety of the community best secured, by a sentence of five years' penal servitude for the man Buckley. There surely must have been some peculiarities in the case, some mitigating circumstances, or some judicial principles, which the lay reader of the evidence is utterly unable to discover, but which impressed themselves clearly and powerfully upon the trained mind of the judge. Meanwhile it is not to be wondered at if, in consequence of the sheer inability of the common mind to detect or appreciate any such considerations, the result of the trial is a great surprise, and little less than a painful shock, to the public. The distinction between murder and manslaughter, so clearly pointed out by the learned judge, is obvious to the simplest comprehension. The only remaining question on that score is one of fact, or rather of opinion. Many, we doubt not, will still find it extremely difficult to believe that the man who could do his helpless victim to death by brutal blows and kicks, repeated in spite of her touching appeals for mercy, did not mean her death. This would