

# THE WEEK.

Seventh Year.  
Vol. VII. No. 43.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 26th, 1890.

\$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, \$1.50  
Subscriptions payable in advance.

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.

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.

No advertisements charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

### CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
One-sided Reports.....	675
Dominion Ministers on Reciprocity Is Fair Reciprocity Unattainable?.....	675
The Civil Service.....	676
A Novel Punishment.....	676
The Proposed Technical Schools.....	676
Toyabee Hall and its Work.....	676
Obstruction: When Justifiable.....	676
The Arrest of Irish Leaders.....	677
The Late Canon Liddon.....	677
Germany and the African Slave Trade.....	677
The Limit of Population.....	677
PROMINENT CANADIANS—XXX—SIR A. A. DORION.....	677
WILFRID LAURIER.....	677
CANADA TO BRITANNIA (POEM).....	680
BASIL TEMPEST.....	680
PARIS LETTER.....	680
Z.....	680
A MODERN MYSTIC—X.....	681
NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN, M.P.....	681
THE RAMBLER.....	682
FIDELIS.....	682
SEPTEMBER (SONNET).....	682
M. E. HENDERSON.....	682
AMONG THE AUTOGRAPHS IN THE KING'S LIBRARY, BRITISH MUSEUM.....	682
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Irony and Humour.....	X
THE COMING CATAclysm OF AMERICA AND EUROPE.....	682
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	683
SHADOWS (POEM).....	684
JAMES HANNAY.....	684
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	684
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	684
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	685
CHESS.....	686

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.

### TO CANADIAN WRITERS.

#### PRIZE COMPETITION.

PRIZES of \$50, \$30, \$20 and \$10 will be given for the FOUR BEST SHORT STORIES by Canadian writers only on subjects distinctively Canadian, on the following conditions:—

- 1.—The MS. must not exceed six thousand words and must be written on one side of the paper only.
- 2.—It must be delivered at THE WEEK office, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto, not later than 1st November, 1890.
- 3.—Each competing story must bear on the top of the first page a motto and be accompanied by a sealed envelope marked with the same motto and the words PRIZE STORY COMPETITION, and enclosing the name and address of the writer.
- 4.—All the MSS. sent in to become the property of THE WEEK.
- 5.—THE WEEK will award the prizes and will be judge of the fulfilment of the conditions.

Owing to a generally expressed desire THE WEEK has decided to accept MSS. sent in for the Short Story Prize Competition whether typewritten or not.

SPEECHES of a semi-public character have recently been made by several members of the Dominion Cabinet, including the Premier. More than ordinary importance attaches to these utterances, by reason of their relation to the very serious trade questions which are now being so earnestly discussed on both sides of the boundary line. It is, we think, to be regretted that these speeches have not been more fully reported by the Opposition press, just as it is to be regretted that important speeches by Opposition leaders are not more fully reported by the press on the Government side. We can think of nothing so easy of accomplishment which would do more to increase the public intelligence and tone down the asperity and one-sidedness of party politics than the adoption, by our leading newspapers, of the English practice in this respect, by reporting the speeches on both sides of political questions with equal and impartial fulness. As it is, as every one who resolves to hear both sides in Parliamentary debates must have found out by experience, one must either turn alternately from one to another of the leading papers, or await the tardy appearance of Hansard. Comparatively few, of course, will have time or patience to do the one or the other, and the consequence is that the great majority of Canadian readers are never in a position to judge of the full force of the arguments presented on more than one side of a public question. This, however, is by the way.

THE Premier, and the Ministers of Justice, Agriculture and Finance have, each in turn, touched upon the burning question of the McKinley Bill, and the trade relations, present and prospective, of Canada and the United States. All have frankly admitted, what it would be folly to deny, that the operation of the Bill in question cannot fail, at least at the outset, to be injurious to Canada, and that it will make it incumbent upon Canadians to seek out as far as possible new markets for many of their products. All the Ministers speak with becoming confidence of the extent of our resources, and the spirit and enterprise of our people, and look forward hopefully to the result of the efforts that are being made, especially by means of the present and projected steamboat routes, for the extension of our trade with other peoples, even to the antipodes. Much can be done in this direction, no doubt. The fact, which is now a matter of history, and which was referred to with natural pride by more than one of the speakers, that Canada rallied with remarkable facility and spirit from the blow that she received in the abrogation of the old Reciprocity Treaty, gives abundant reason for confidence in her ability to survive that now impending, the more especially since, as Mr. Foster pointed out, her position is now very different from that which she occupied when that Treaty was repealed. The sum of the whole matter is that, granting the premise from which all the Ministers reasoned, no true Canadian will gainsay their conclusions. That premise, as assumed by all and formally stated by more than one, is, in effect, that Canadian statesmen have at all times been favourably disposed towards reciprocity with the United States and have from time to time done all they could, with due regard to the dignity and self-respect of their country, to secure it, but that American statesmen have either persistently declined it, or been willing to grant it only on terms which could not possibly be accepted, and that they still maintain that position. If this be so; if it be true that enlarged trade with the United States cannot be had on any terms, or can be had only on terms involving compromise of independence, or unfair and dishonourable discrimination against Great Britain, all true Canadians will be agreed that there is an end to the matter, and that, at whatever cost, Canadian independence, self-respect and honour must be maintained.

WHETHER that premise is correct is really the fundamental question at issue between the Government and the Opposition leaders. It is a question which it is at present impossible to answer. Time alone can show. One thing is, however, too clear to admit of doubt. The United States will not again grant reciprocity on the lines of the old treaty—exchange of natural products only. If when Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Foster reiterate that the Canadian Government has always been favourable to reciprocity, they mean simply that they have been in favour of that particular kind of reciprocity, they evade or disguise the real issue. Our neighbours have long since made it clear that no system of free exchange will again be accepted by them which does not include their manufactured products, or at least some goodly proportion of them. An exchange of natural products would be, they maintain, a one-side bargain, to which they can never consent. Nor, looking at it from their point of view, that of the protectionist, can we blame them. If some agreement resembling that of the Treaty of 1854 is all our leaders have ever intimated their readiness to offer or accept, they can hardly make good the claim that they have shown themselves friendly to reciprocity. Of course the question whether it would be for the best interests of Canada to have free exchange of all kinds of products, manufactured goods included, is a debatable one, on which protectionists and free-traders would take opposite sides. That question we do not now attempt to decide. Our point is that there are really growing indications that complete reciprocity of this kind may be attainable in the not distant future, if Canada wishes it. With whatever discount it may be wise to accept such rumours as that Mr. Blaine is shortly to declare in favour of such a measure, and that it is likely to be favourably considered by Congress at the autumn session, no one who has followed the trend of events and discussions in political circles in the United States during the

past months can doubt that the movement of thought is clearly in the direction of freer trade relations. The heaven is evidently at work, and the more the matter is discussed the more apparent will become the great injury which the Republic is inflicting upon many of its own industries by its restricted trade policy. Such changes of opinion and sentiment are not wrought in a week or a month, but it is, to say the least, far from unlikely that, within a very few years, it may be easy for Canada to obtain unrestricted reciprocity, if she wants it. Would it be to her advantage to have it? That is really, as we have said, the question that demands discussion and decision. It should be discussed on its merits, that is, on pure commercial principles. All cries of disloyalty, danger of annexation and so forth, not only tend to confuse the issue, but are really most uncomplimentary to the Canadian people, implying that they do not know their own minds, and cannot trust themselves to trade with their neighbours, even should it be proved that such trade would be profitable. However as such discussion will probably occupy years, and as the final decision of either party is uncertain, it is evident that nothing better can be done in the meantime than to follow out the vigorous policy outlined by the Premier and the Minister of Finance, and use every legitimate effort to open up new channels for commerce and enter new markets wherever they can be found available and profitable.

SEVERAL of our contemporaries having quoted approvingly our criticism of the reasons assigned by the *Globe* for Dr. Chamberlain's appointment to the office he now holds, the *Globe* of the 18th inst. makes reply. The defence is disappointing. It says: "No one supposes that Sir John Macdonald would appoint a Liberal to office if a Tory fit for the job may be found." That may be, but since when has the Liberal party of Ontario, which we had supposed claimed to be the party of purity and progress, accepted Sir John Macdonald as its model, or his practice as its standard of conduct? Unless our memory is sadly at fault, one of the charges of corruption against Sir John, on which the changes have been most persistently rung, is his alleged prostitution of Government patronage to partisan uses. Be that as it may, it is hard to see how any paper or party can consistently call itself "Liberal," and yet refuse to make "appointment to office on merit alone" one of the planks in its platform. The *Globe* says further:—

It is a gross injustice to remove a man from office because he is not a supporter of the dominant political party. But it is no injustice for a Liberal Government to appoint a Liberal to any vacant place he is competent to fill; and if the appointee happens to have been influential in the counsels of the party or to have had the confidence of a constituency, that is not to his discredit. The *Globe* does not believe that Dr. Chamberlain or any other man ought to receive appointment because he has been active in support of a party; but why should not a Government reward its friends if that can be done without injustice or injury to the public service?

It might be going a little too far to say that the distinction implied in the first sentence is wholly without a difference, and yet it is not easy to see why, if the Government has a right to use the public offices to "reward its friends," it may not also use them to punish its enemies; or, to put it more mildly, why it should permit the fact that its enemies happen to hold certain positions to stand in the way of its rewarding its friends. The second sentence compels us to remind the *Globe* that in its former article nothing was said about "happening to be influential," but the fact of having been useful to the party was distinctly given as one of the qualifications for, or at least justifications of the appointment. In regard to the third sentence, it cannot, we think, be too emphatically pointed out that this very practice of using public offices for the "reward" of political friends is the tap-root of one-half the corruption which is the reproach of democratic Government in Canada and the United States. What right has any Government to use its power of appointment to positions in the civil service to "reward" its friends? Is not this power a sacred, cath-bound trust, into the administration of which no consideration but that of fitness should be permitted to enter? Or, supposing that any such consideration were proper, surely an honest Government, consulting as it is bound to do, the rights