

THE WEEK.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4th, 1891.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 1.

THE WEEK:

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. CLOVERHEE, Business Manager, 6 Jordan Street, Toronto.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

Topic—	PAGE
Sir Edwin Arnold in Toronto	3
The Question of Copyright	3
The Woodstock Annexation Meeting	3
Mr. Chapleau at Providence	4
What Did it Prove?	4
The Quarrel with Newfoundland	4
The Birmingham Conference	4
A Radical Programme	4
Lord Salisbury's speeches	5
THE WOMAN MOVEMENT	5
ANIS LETTER.	5
INEROS. (Sonnet)	6
THE MEANING OF THE WORD "TORONTO."—II.	6
THE RAMBLER.	7
To W— (Sonnet)	7
A PARSON'S Ponderings: WHAT IS A LUXURY?	7
HISTORY IN AN ODD CORNER	8
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Free Trade or Protection	9
The Growth of Insanity	9
THE HOUSES AND TOMBS OF THE BASQUES	9
MEMORIES. (Poem)	10
ART NOTES	10
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	10
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	11
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	11
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	11
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	12
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY	14
CHES	15

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.

WHATEVER may be the fact with regard to other of the world's great poets of the day, no charge of selfish exclusiveness can be laid at the door of Sir Edwin Arnold. It was a genial and graceful act of the world-renowned Orientalist to give his one evening in Toronto to the entertainment of a public audience. The somewhat rare spectacle of one who stands but a very few removes from the top of the list, always a short one, it is true, of those who have really received the divine afflatus, reciting his own poems in the presence of the people, must have carried the thoughts of the students of classical literature present back to the sacred foretime when this was the only mode in which the productions of the immortal seers could be given to the world. Elocution, at least in these days of imperfect articulation, is an art and almost a talent in itself. Other things being equal the author of a great work should be its best interpreter in speech, and every reader of such works must often have wished, when puzzling over some sentence or sentiment which has set the commentators by the ears, and which refuses to yield a single clear note of meaning to his most earnest efforts, that the author were present to give the key for its interpretation by his own emphasis and inflection. As a matter of fact, however, distinguished authors have not always proved successful in rendering for the popular ear even their own productions. If such is, as has sometimes been asserted, the rule, the author of the "Light of Asia" must be regarded as one of the exceptions, as all who were present seem to have been delighted with his natural and effective reproductions of choice passages from his own poems. An English *litterateur* recently went a little out of his way to pronounce Canada the least literary of all the Colonies. It is, therefore, all the more gratifying to be able to hope that in an audience comprising many of the students and thinkers of Toronto, presided over by Mr. Goldwin Smith, Sir Edwin found an audience not wholly unappreciative, either of the beauty of his thought and diction, or of his kindness in giving them the benefit of his own renderings.

SIR DANIEL WILSON'S letter in our last number, on the Canadian Copyright Act, presents the case from the point of view of the author's right to the product of his own brain. That right is indisputable. That it is the first question to be considered in an honest Copyright Act, every honest man must admit. That this should be the sole consideration, even on moral grounds, is not so clear. Like most other questions of legislation in which various rights and interests are involved, the subject of copyright is a complicated and difficult one. One might almost suppose from our respected correspondent's way of putting the case, that he regards the brainwork of the author, his time, study, labour, etc., as the only elements which enter into the production of a book and give it value. A little reflection will show how very far this is from being the fact. In the first place, there is no such thing as absolute originality in book-making. The "time, study and labour" expended are, as a rule, expended to a large extent upon the works of preceding thinkers, writers and book-makers, which have become in a manner public property, but which could never have become such had the principle for which Sir Daniel Wilson seems to contend prevailed to the fullest extent. The very possibility of publication, in the modern sense of the term, is dependent upon the invention of printing, of paper-manufacturing, etc., and upon the thousand and one improvements in all the mechanical arts involved. Each one of these was in its turn the product of someone's brain, and someone's time, study and labour. These have all now become public property. May it not be fairly questioned whether the author has morally, or should have legally, the exclusive right to monopolize for his own personal gain all the advantages derived from the use of these appliances? The question may seem a nice one, but, as all these arts are essential to the production of a book, it can hardly be claimed that the resultant book—the material, transferable, merchantable book, which alone has pecuniary value—is the author's sole production and property. Only so long as he retains it in his own brain, perhaps not even so long, can it be so regarded. To put the matter more concretely, what is it that gives pecuniary value to a book? Is it solely the toil and talent or genius of the author? By no means. That is the first and indispensable element. But in how few cases comparatively has the author the capital necessary to put the book on the market and push it into circulation? We hold no brief on behalf of the publisher, but few persons, perhaps few authors even, have any adequate conception of the expenditure of money and labour, yes, and of brains, too, which are necessary to the successful publication and sale of the work of even the most brilliant author. We may go further. The talents, time, and labour of the author, and the money and machinery of the publisher would be all alike in vain in the absence of a wide constituency of purchasers with a taste for reading. The accessibility of books at reasonable prices, and even in the despised cheap editions, is the main factor in the cultivation of this taste. Thus the pecuniary value of, say, Arnold's "Light of the World" is largely the result of the spread of cheap editions of the works of other great poets which have developed whatever taste and created whatever demand exists for poetry of a high order. The demand for good literature in Canada is not such as we all could wish it were. But suppose that all such works as those to which Sir Daniel Wilson refers had been locked up in English high-priced editions, what would the product of the brain, the time, toil and study of the most brilliant author be worth, pecuniarily, in Canada, under the most rigid protection of the author's rights? We have not left ourselves space to speak as we intended of the peculiar circumstances in which Canada is placed in this matter. Probably it is not necessary. Everyone can see that to shut Canadian readers up to the expensive English copyright editions would be to debar all but a favoured few from access to the best literature of the day, and that, too, with loss instead of gain to the authors. Once more. Is there not some misapprehension underlying Sir Daniel's remark that "the fact that he (the English author) has disposed of his copyright for the British market is no reason why he may not negotiate with the Canadian printer and publisher for its issue here"? Why,

that is the very thing, as we understand the matter, that the Canadian Copyright Act is designed to encourage and induce the English author to do. By so doing, under that Act, he can secure the fullest protection of his rights.

A FEW such meetings as that held at Woodstock last week should suffice to convince all who have any doubts on the subject that whatever questions touching the future of Canada may just now be awaiting settlement, political union with the United States is not one of the possible answers. It is well that such meetings should be freely held so long as there are any persons of respectability and influence who think that any good purpose is to be served by holding them. Such decisive expressions as that of the Woodstock meeting are scarcely needed to convince those who are thoroughly familiar with the sentiments of the great mass of the people of the Dominion that annexation is not a living question, and that it is in the least degree likely to become such in the future. But these meetings may not be without good effect, not only in enlightening the minds of the few of our own people who have in some way received a different impression, but in conveying to our neighbours on the other side of the border a knowledge of the true state of the case. We have never seen any good reason to believe that either the politicians or the people of the United States are by any means looking for the annexation of Canada with the intensity of desire and expectation which a good many among us seem to suppose, but there are undoubtedly a good many of both classes among our neighbours who do fancy that the people of the Dominion are really longing in their hearts for such a consummation, and that nothing but the iron hand of British rule prevents them from seeking to attain it. It might help not a little in smoothing the course of future negotiations were it once for all distinctly understood that the mind of Canada is settled on this point, and that the question of a change of allegiance neither is nor is likely to be open for discussion under any circumstances. A few such meetings as that at Woodstock, showing how fully we are at liberty to discuss the whole question of our own future without reserve, could scarcely fail to make this important fact so clear as to eliminate it from the background of international conference and intercourse. From this point of view, as well as from that of our own freedom of speech and national dignity, it is matter for congratulation that the discussion was so free from bombast, or attempted intimidation, or excitement of any kind. Any such display of feeling would have weakened the effect. Mr. Sol. White, the leader of the few who favoured political union, complained, it is true, that his arguments were met with sentiment, not with argument. But seeing that those arguments were based wholly and avowedly on commercial considerations, this fact is all the more significant. With those who replied to him the matter was, no doubt, one of sentiment. To have argued it on the ground of commercial expediency would have been a seeming admission that to prove that Canada would be better off commercially under the flag of the great republic would be tantamount to proving that she ought to seek a place beneath its ample folds. This the loyal Canadian is by no means prepared to do. He believes, with Rev. Mr. McMullen, that there are things of vastly greater importance than even increase of material prosperity, and that some of these things would be involved in and sacrificed by the proposed union.

HON. MR. CHAPLEAU'S speech before the Commercial Club of Providence was certainly not wanting in eloquence. Indeed, one of the first thoughts which suggests itself to the Canadian reader is one of wonder that the voice which uttered that speech is not more frequently and influentially heard in the Canadian Parliament. A reason no doubt could be found, but it would perhaps be rather ungracious to stay now to seek it. There is much in the ring of the Providence speech that will commend it to true Canadians, irrespective of party; as for example, its uncompromising assertion of the determination of the people of Canada to work out their own national destiny and to preserve their national self-respect at all hazard. To some minds the glowing tribute to Roger Williams, and to the great and grand principle of religious liberty of