

THE WEEK.

Seventh Year.
Vol. VII. No. 28.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MAY 30th, 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, \$1.00
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. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. 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
A Disgraced Constituency.....	403
General Middleton's Sang-froid.....	403
The Newfoundland Question.....	403
Hon. S. H. Blake on Nepotism.....	403
The Report of the Commission on Mines and Minerals.....	404
Admirable Form of the Report.....	404
Results and Prospects.....	404
The Pacaud-Whelan Affair.....	404
A Logical Dilemma.....	405
The Behring Sea Question.....	405
Nova Scotia Politics.....	405
The Sweating System.....	405
MR. GLADSTONE ON RUSSIA.....	405
PARIS LETTER.....	Z. 406
BEFORE AND AFTER (POEM).....	Sarepta. 406
IS CONFEDERATION A SUCCESS?.....	Cyril. 406
SHAKESPEARE AS A PLAYWRIGHT.....	Charles F. Benjamin. 407
THE SEASONS (POEM).....	Basil Tempest. 408
THE ASCERTAINMENT OF ENGLISH.....	C. C. McCaul. 408
WHO CAN SAY? (POEM).....	X. 409
THE RAMBLER.....	409
SPARKS FROM THE ANVIL.....	The Blacksmith. 409
BASS FISHING ON RIDEAU LAKE.....	410
HOW BRITISH COLONIES GOT RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.....	411
ART NOTES.....	Templar. 412
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA.....	412
OUR LIBRARY TABLE.....	413
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP.....	413
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE.....	414
CHESS.....	415

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.

INCREDIBLE as such a supposition seemed before the event, the County of Lincoln has actually further disgraced itself and the Dominion by returning Mr. Rykert at the head of the poll. We are glad that the smallness of the majority marks the revolt of a large number of Conservatives against the outrage, and we sympathize with them in the chagrin and humiliation which the result must have caused them. But nothing can excuse the insensibility to moral considerations of those who have shown by their votes that in their view the lack of honour, honesty and truthfulness is no disqualification for the position of their representative in Parliament. The fact that the choice was between Mr. Rykert and a Liberal would scarcely have been a palliation of the offence against public decency even had the constituency been shut up to those alternatives. This it clearly was not, since a firm attitude on the part of a large majority of influential Conservatives at the outset would have compelled the retirement of the unworthy candidate. So far as we can see, the attempt to put the blame upon the Opposition is without reason, unless, indeed, as is alleged by some, their putting a candidate in the field was in violation of a promise expressed or implied. This seems very unlikely, as the Liberals could hardly be expected to deprive themselves of the opportunity of voting for a man of their own political faith in order to save the Conservatives from the necessity of re-electing a representative whose conduct had been declared by the unanimous voice of the Commons to be "discreditable, corrupt and scandalous." In the absence of better information it would be useless to speculate upon the character of the influences and agencies by which the result was brought about, though it seems impossible that they can have been of a legitimate kind. It may be hoped that the courts will be called on to investigate. Failing relief from that quarter, or the voluntary action of Mr. Rykert, it is pretty clear that Parliament can do no less than purge itself of the stain by prompt action at the earliest opportunity.

IT is fair to assume that the almost tumultuous outburst of popular feeling which greeted Mr. S. H. Blake's scathing reference to the Middleton affair, at the Pavilion meeting, was the spontaneous expression of honest indignation at dishonesty and meanness in a public officer, rather than the offspring of any less worthy feeling. So regarded, the demonstration, however painful, was the outcome of a moral instinct which is healthy in itself and useful in its influence. The persons immediately affected would do well to heed it and learn how completely their usefulness in any public capacity is gone. It may seem hard that a single dishonourable act should thus count more with the public than years of faithful service, but no one can doubt that the popular impulse is right and wise. An occasional error in judgment, committed with honest intention, may be atoned for and forgotten, but a single lapse from the path of honour and rectitude for the sake of a petty, sordid gain is a permanent disqualification. This is nature's law, and though severe it is both just and salutary. Gen. Middleton denies, it appears, that he has any intention of resigning. If this, conjoined with the other fact that he has continued to address audiences, and perform various public functions as if nothing were wrong, indicates that he intends to brave public opinion and even take no notice of the verdict of the Commons, he is surely reckoning without his host. Neither the Government, Parliament nor the public can afford to have its judgments set aside in that high-handed fashion. It cannot be that the Imperial Government will come to the rescue with a sudden recall. A prompt resignation, accompanied with evidences of proper regret, might have left the Government free to consider what degree of leniency would consist with public duty. Cool disregard or disdain of Parliament leaves it no alternative, if it would not itself share the popular indignation. We spoke above of the "persons" concerned. We used the plural advisedly. It cannot be that Gen. Middleton is to be made the scape-goat for the sins of his accomplices. The Government which has, through Parliament and through the voice of its Premier, called him to account cannot pass by the cases of Mr. Hayter Reed and Mr. Benson, both of whom occupy positions of public trust which demand the strictest integrity and the most scrupulous sense of honour. Mr. Reed's position, in particular, is one of the last which should be left in the hands of any one whose reputation for delicate regard to the rights and property of those who may be to some extent in his power is not above suspicion. It is also a question whether the one who suggested and instigated the act of spoliation should not be held even more guilty than his fellows. The fact that the resignations of all three were not promptly placed in the hands of the Government is so surprising that nothing but stern action on the part of the latter can save it from a suspicion of connivance.

claimed, when that claim deprives them both of ordinary territorial rights and of the means of livelihood nature has provided for them. But the Frenchmen stand upon their bond and that bond as contained in the declaration made by Great Britain in 1783, and re-established in 1814, unhappily goes far to sustain some of the French contentions. It provided, for instance, that the King of Great Britain should take measures "for preventing his subjects from interrupting in any manner, by their competition, the fishery of the French during the temporary exercise of it which is granted them upon the coasts of the Island; but he will, for this purpose, cause the fixed settlements which shall be formed there to be removed." There is also a complication arising out of the more recently established lobster fishing, the question being whether the fishing privileges conceded in the old treaties are fairly construed as covering the lobster business, which was not then in existence. Even this question, as will be seen on a little impartial reflection, is not so easily settled against the French claim as the Newfoundlander naturally supposes. But whatever doubts may exist as to the fair interpretation of the treaties, no one can deny that the colonists were harshly and unfairly treated by the British Government when it concluded a *modus vivendi* with France, conceding temporarily about all that the French claim, not only without the consent but even without the knowledge of the Island Government. This took place, too, notwithstanding that in the Treaty of 1857 was a clause making the consent of the Newfoundland Legislature necessary to the operation of the Treaty. And even after that consent had been refused and the Treaty rendered inoperative in consequence, it was declared in an Imperial despatch, somewhat ambiguously, we admit, "that the consent of the community of Newfoundland is regarded by her Majesty's Government as the essential preliminary to any modification of their territorial or maritime rights." But while it must be admitted that it is not so easy for the British Government to accept and enforce the Colonial view as the people of the Island may think, it is evident that their situation is one of great hardship. Not only so, it is a situation full of the elements of danger. In the present mood of both the French and the Island fishermen, a collision may any day occur which may lead to the most serious consequences. In such circumstances it seems both the duty and the interest of the Mother Country to enter at once into negotiations, and to press them to an early conclusion, looking to a final adjustment of the whole question, on terms consistent with the full recognition of the territorial rights of Newfoundland.

CANADIANS could not if they would, and would not if they could, refrain from sympathizing deeply with their brother-colonists in Newfoundland, in their present troubles. The Boards of Trade in the cities which have been visited by the Island delegates have but expressed the general feeling when they have strongly declared their earnest hope that the views of the Government and people of Newfoundland may prevail, and have adopted resolutions urging these views upon the attention of the British Government. Our readers are, no doubt, familiar with the chief points of the dispute, and we need not recapitulate them. If we set out with the assumption that Newfoundland belongs to the Newfoundlanders, all the conclusions urged by the delegates follow as a matter of course. It seems intolerable that the people of the Island should not only be denied concurrent, not to say exclusive, rights in a large portion of the fisheries on their own coasts, but should be even debarred to a considerable extent from the use of their own shores. The trouble is that according to the claim resolutely and persistently urged by France and to some extent acquiesced in, either tacitly or temporarily, by the British Government, the Island as a whole does not belong to the people of the Island, but, so far as a considerable and valuable part of the coast waters and shores is concerned, to the Newfoundlanders and the French conjointly. As in the case of our own dispute with the United States, it is a question of the interpretation of an old treaty, in the light of subsequent modifications and agreements. It is, of course, very easy and very natural for the Government and people of the Island to deny that these documents can have the meaning

IS it a necessary evil of the Party System that the champions of the respective parties must defend and even laud the mistakes and faults of their leaders, equally with their best qualities and achievements? It would almost seem so. Sir John A. Macdonald is popularly credited with having said, on a memorable occasion, that he would not give a fig for the friend who would stand by him only when he was right. The friends worth having were those who would stand by him when he was wrong. It is quite likely that Sir John may never have made such a statement thus baldly, but the story suggests not unfairly the attitude which even excellent men of strong partisan feeling sometimes assume in the heat of political controversy. An illustration was afforded in the course of Mr. S. H. Blake's powerful and eloquent defence of Mr. Mowat's administration, at the Pavilion meeting the other evening. Mr. Blake is a member of a profession which should, more than any other, develop the ability to see both sides of a question, albeit it unhappily fosters also the habit of presenting one side only in the strongest possible light. But as a man of eminence in the profession, who has had also the benefit of experience in a judicial capacity, Mr. Blake might have been expected to depart from the common order of the political harangue, and have given the local Government the benefit of a discriminating as well as a powerful advocacy. The opportunity was a fine one for so doing. Both Mr. Mowat's personal qualities and his long administrative record are of such a character as to make a strong and successful defence upon their merits easy. The inevitable faults which have to some extent

claimed, when that claim deprives them both of ordinary territorial rights and of the means of livelihood nature has provided for them. But the Frenchmen stand upon their bond and that bond as contained in the declaration made by Great Britain in 1783, and re-established in 1814, unhappily goes far to sustain some of the French contentions. It provided, for instance, that the King of Great Britain should take measures "for preventing his subjects from interrupting in any manner, by their competition, the fishery of the French during the temporary exercise of it which is granted them upon the coasts of the Island; but he will, for this purpose, cause the fixed settlements which shall be formed there to be removed." There is also a complication arising out of the more recently established lobster fishing, the question being whether the fishing privileges conceded in the old treaties are fairly construed as covering the lobster business, which was not then in existence. Even this question, as will be seen on a little impartial reflection, is not so easily settled against the French claim as the Newfoundlander naturally supposes. But whatever doubts may exist as to the fair interpretation of the treaties, no one can deny that the colonists were harshly and unfairly treated by the British Government when it concluded a *modus vivendi* with France, conceding temporarily about all that the French claim, not only without the consent but even without the knowledge of the Island Government. This took place, too, notwithstanding that in the Treaty of 1857 was a clause making the consent of the Newfoundland Legislature necessary to the operation of the Treaty. And even after that consent had been refused and the Treaty rendered inoperative in consequence, it was declared in an Imperial despatch, somewhat ambiguously, we admit, "that the consent of the community of Newfoundland is regarded by her Majesty's Government as the essential preliminary to any modification of their territorial or maritime rights." But while it must be admitted that it is not so easy for the British Government to accept and enforce the Colonial view as the people of the Island may think, it is evident that their situation is one of great hardship. Not only so, it is a situation full of the elements of danger. In the present mood of both the French and the Island fishermen, a collision may any day occur which may lead to the most serious consequences. In such circumstances it seems both the duty and the interest of the Mother Country to enter at once into negotiations, and to press them to an early conclusion, looking to a final adjustment of the whole question, on terms consistent with the full recognition of the territorial rights of Newfoundland.