

THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.
Vol. V. No. 41.

Toronto, Thursday, September 6th, 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 \$1 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. CLOUGHIER, Business Manager, 6 Jordan Street, Toronto.
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

| TOPICS— | PAGE |
|--|------------------------|
| Mr. Laurier and <i>The Empire</i> | 647 |
| Canada's Strength and Danger | 647 |
| The London Press on "Retaliation" | 647 |
| Convention of St. George's Societies at Philadelphia | 648 |
| Mr. Mercer's Coaticook Speech | 648 |
| Manitoba Railways | 648 |
| The Mansion House Experiment | 648 |
| Playing at War | 648 |
| The Clash of Reform | 648 |
| Unsettled Naval Problems | 649 |
| Party Reconstruction in the United States | 649 |
| The Coming Partition of France | 649 |
| Public Debt of France | 649 |
| Chinese Nervousness | 649 |
| Dr. Ward and the Prohibition Party | 650 |
| Life Insurance: The Canada Life | 650 |
| THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE | 650 |
| To Docility (Poem) | A. T. 651 |
| PARIS LETTER | M. A. B. 651 |
| MONTRÉAL LETTER | Louis Lloyd. 652 |
| KESWICK BAY (Poem) | J. D. E. 652 |
| PROHIBITION IN THE TERRITORIES | Frank Oliver. 652 |
| CHARON'S SECOND VISIT (Poem) | Geo. Inglis, M. A. 653 |
| THE BETRAYER OF LA SALLE | 654 |
| READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE | 655 |
| OUR LIBRARY TABLE | 656 |
| LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP | 656 |
| CHESS | 658 |

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.

MR. LAURIER has drawn upon himself the fierce wrath of *The Empire*, and even a mild criticism from *The Globe*, by ascribing, in a recent address, the present hostility of the United States to the unfriendly and irritating past policy of the Canadian Government. The charge has an unmistakably partisan flavour, although Mr. Laurier has not hitherto shown himself one of those politicians to whom every national event is of value in proportion as it affords material for the manufacture of party capital. The main question is not, however, as *The Empire* would have it appear, one of patriotism, but of truth. The impending crisis renders it specially desirable for all parties to put aside, as far as possible, both passion and prejudice, and calmly review the steps which have led up to the present state of affairs. "To see ourselves as others see us," to put ourselves as honestly as we can in our neighbour's place, is no less a duty and is no less difficult in national than in personal and social relations. Though no one with a grain of discernment can doubt that President Cleveland's message, like the Senate's contemptuous rejection of the Treaty, was dictated by partisan motives, and that much of the rhodomontade indulged in by Congressional orators is equally insincere, it is obvious that neither partisanship nor insincerity can suffice to explain the situation. Why is it that such small anti-Canadian thunder is deemed useful and necessary for party purposes? It is grateful, evidently, to the popular sentiment. But why should such a sentiment exist amongst our neighbours? "The wrongs of Ireland" may furnish the answer in part, but not in full. Can it be that some of the Acts of the Canadian Government in the past have been, as the *New York Witness*, a paper not unfriendly to Canada, says, "unfriendly and unjustifiable"? Can it be, as the *Christian Union*, another paper of friendly tone, remarks, that "the Canadians have shown a very small spirit in the matter"? May it not be true that some of our Customs' regulations have been needlessly vexatious; that in the recent tolls' business the spirit of the treaty has been violated; that in the regulation taxing the packages in which free fruits are brought in, our Government is not only again violating the spirit of the Treaty, but too successfully copying the picayune policy of our neighbours in the lobster-can affair? That Canada cannot and will not yield one tittle of her territorial rights in the fisheries, under any menace, goes without saying. Her

present care should be to put herself so clearly in the right in every particular that she can fearlessly face all consequences and challenge the verdict of the nations. Grant, as the *Globe* urges, that the harsh customs and anti-bonding regulations are necessary to enable us to guard effectively our fish preserves from poachers. That may be our misfortune, but we can hardly expect our neighbour to see with our eyes, or to take any the more kindly an unfriendly exclusion because it is prompted by suspicion of his honesty.

THAT the fisheries dispute cannot and must not eventuate in war between the two great English-speaking nations, every true man on either side the line will declare. Such an issue is too absurd, as well as too horrible, to contemplate. And yet it cannot be denied that there is much of real danger in the situation. The history of the world is full of instances in which great wars have arisen out of just such petty disputes and irritations. The chief safeguard and the real strength of Canada's position in the case lie in the fact that both Great Britain and Canada are and have always been ready at any moment to submit the whole matter to friendly arbitration. The weakness of the United States contention is shown in the fact that in rejecting, without an attempt at amendment, a treaty which her own Government and at least one-half her own statesmen have pronounced just and fair, she has openly declared herself unwilling to settle the dispute save on her own terms. The nation which acts thus and then refuses to arbitrate, puts herself obviously in the wrong and becomes the real aggressor. Not only so, but when she happens, as in this case, to be an enlightened and Christian nation, she puts herself in a position in which the appeal may safely be taken from the action of her rulers to the sense of justice and the Christian sentiment of her people. That appeal Canadians may now boldly make. It may not be heard at the moment amidst the din of the raging party conflict, but it will be heard and responded to as soon as the tumult is over and reason has regained her seat, provided, and here is the real source of the deepest anxiety, the exigencies of partyism on the one hand and natural pride and resentment on the other, do not, in the meantime, hurry both parties into positions from which retreat without humiliation will be no longer possible. In the face of such exigencies there are two courses which a country situated as Canada is may pursue. The one is to stand on her mettle, to refuse to admit even the possibility that any fraction of the blame may be hers, and to meet every taunt and threat with an answering note of defiance. The other is to mingle firmness with "sweet reasonableness," to discuss every issue with calmness, to be ready to right every demonstrable wrong, and thus to place herself, in case of the worst, in the position of the man who is thrice armed because he "has his quarrel just." The true Canadian patriot is he who urges his Government to take the latter course. The fear of being thought a coward makes the worst of all cowards.

SOME of the cabled utterances of the *London Times* and *Standard*, which come to hand as we are preparing for press, make it pretty clear that colonial editors have not a monopoly of rashness and indiscretion. If anything could be more injudicious than the *Times'* boast that Canada courts the encounter with the United States, the *Standard's* reference to British ironclads and the "Trent" affair supplies it. We do not think that any fair interpretation of the speeches that have been made by Dominion Ministers warrants the assertion of the *Times*. If it did, the Ministers in question would stand convicted, in the minds of all calm and thoughtful Canadians, of gross indiscretion and something worse. As to the coarse Jingoism ascribed to the *Standard*, we find it hard to believe that its words can have been correctly reported. If otherwise, the *Standard* will no doubt be quickly reminded by Americans, on the one hand, that the United States stands to-day in a very different position from that it occupied at the time of the "Trent" affair, and by the masses of its own countrymen, on the other, that they are not so ready to engage in a costly and bloody fratricidal war, whose issue no one could foresee, for the settlement of a colonial fisheries' dispute. The buncombe speeches of American politicians are sufficiently exasperating, but no civilized nation could now make the denial of commercial privileges a *casus belli*. A British Government of a former day might send its fleets to force a semi-barbarous nation