

with the former, such as will consolidate the resources of the whole for national purposes. Mr. Parnell's views, as stated, do not appear to take the Colonies specially into the account. He hesitates, as well he may, to express an opinion upon the larger question of Imperial Federation. His is simply a plan for the reorganization of the United Kingdom on a federal basis. Its chief significance results from the two facts, that it is taken to indicate that Mr. Gladstone is willing to so far revise his scheme as to retain Irish Representatives at Westminster, and that the Home Rulers are willing to aid the other great sections of the Kingdom in obtaining the same local autonomy they ask for Ireland. In this latter aspect Mr. Parnell's avowal is undoubtedly a powerful bid for the consideration of the Liberal Unionists of England and Scotland, who have long recognized the need of some subdivision and redistribution of the vast functions which the one Imperial Parliament now vainly strives to perform. It cannot be denied that there is a certain logical consistency in Mr. Parnell's views as reported. The beginning of Home Rule would be as the letting out of waters. Should Ireland ever obtain it in any form Scotland would not be long in demanding it, and her demand it would be impossible to resist. It is no wonder that the representatives of the ancient kingdom are slow to consent to so revolutionary an experiment.

AN interesting debate took place in the British House of Commons a week or two since on a motion of Mr. Fenwick "That in the opinion of this House it well deserves the consideration of Her Majesty's Government whether, and under what circumstances, it would be expedient to revert to the ancient custom of paying members for their services." It is only about two hundred years since the old custom of paying members on a graduated scale, so much a day for a burgess, and so much more for a knight of the shire, died out. The money, under the old system, was paid by the constituencies. They, no doubt, found it burdensome, and would be disposed sometimes to accept gratefully the services of a representative who was willing to relieve them of the charge. The old argument from the presumptive deterioration the House would undergo if the work of legislation should fall into the hands of an impecunious class of people, who would enter upon politics for a living, drew from Mr. Gladstone a somewhat effective retort, intended to shew that the present members are scarcely actuated by motives of pure patriotism or philanthropy. "Gentlemen," he said, "came to that House from mixed motives, but undoubtedly they did not come in a spirit of martyrdom. Some were attracted by official salaries, some by unofficial salaries, some by the early prospect of official advancement, and some by the social distinction which a seat in the House conferred." Admitting, however, that members at present do not work without remuneration of some sort, it does not follow that some kinds of remuneration are not higher and likely to secure a better class of representatives than others. Still there is force in the argument that under the non-payment system the constitutional right of every citizen who has a vote to serve his country in Parliament is limited, in the case of those who are too poor to do so at their own charges, by a social disability. The trend of feeling, in Parliament and out, is probably in the direction of some such middle course as that suggested by Sir Charles Trevelyan. Let £300 be the highest sum, and make the receipt of it optional, dependent on a declaration of poverty like that which is so pleasantly made by the gentlemen in receipt of political pensions, of whom there are several in the House, ex-members of previous administrations, receiving £1,200 to £2,000 a year.

SPECULATION naturally abounds in regard to the character of the interviews between the German and Russian Emperors, but anything that may be published on the subject may safely be accepted as guesswork. It is evident, however, that, even apart from any concerted agreement as to future policy, the meetings and friendly intercourse of the two monarchs must have a pacific tendency. The Russian newspapers, it is observed, exhibit a remarkable change of tone in regard to the relations of the two peoples and the prospects of European peace, and have become suddenly very complimentary to the Imperial guests. If the London *Telegraph's* correspondent is, as he claims, reliably informed that the Czar consents to leave Prince Ferdinand undisturbed in Bulgaria, in the confidence that he cannot long maintain himself there, and that his deposition will afford an opportunity for Russia to nominate a successor, the most immediate source of danger has been temporarily removed. Whether William II can successfully allay the jealousy with which Austria may be assumed to be watching his movements in Russia, remains to be seen. The immediate effect of the visit is reassuring; that it will have any permanent influence in lessening the tension of the European situation, and placing peace on a stable basis is, it may be feared, extremely doubtful.

BOTH sociologists and philanthropists may learn an instructive lesson from an experiment recently made by an officer connected with the Board of Public Charities in Paris. Having previously arranged with certain manufacturers to give employment for three days, at a fixed rate of wages, to all whom he should send to them with letters, he offered such letters to all applicants for aid who seemed able to work. An account was kept of the applications and the results. Of 727 letters which in eight months were offered to beggars, 415 were refused point blank, 138 were taken but not delivered, and of the 174 persons who accepted and delivered the letters, only 18 stayed out the three days. The incident contains many morals in regard to the effect of indiscriminate giving, but this one stands prominent. Every institution for the relief of the destitute, and every person who wishes to help the really deserving without fostering laziness and begging, should, if possible, provide some simple and reasonable work-test, and apply it on all suitable occasions. If all, or the great majority in any community should do this, the effect would, we venture to say, be astonishing as well as beneficial.

MR. JUSTICE WURTELE AND THE COSGROVE-McCABE CASES.

ON the last day of the summer term of the Court of Queen's Bench for the district of Ottawa writs of *nolle prosequi* were entered, at the instance of the attorney-general, in the cases against Cosgrove and McCabe, who had been recently sentenced to a short term of imprisonment on pleading guilty to one of the minor charges against them. Mr. Justice Wurtele, whose very lenient sentence occasioned a good deal of adverse press criticism, upon the production of the writs made some explanatory remarks, which, although the matter has been made sufficiently clear in these columns, we have much pleasure in laying before our readers so that there may be no possible misapprehension as to "the fair and impartial administration of justice" in the adjoining Province.

The action of the court in sentencing the two defendants, Cosgrove and McCabe, to a slight term of imprisonment has been severely commented upon by some of the most respectable newspapers of Ontario and the United States; and I deem it my duty to explain why the sentence in question was pronounced, not because of any effect the editorials may have upon my personal character or reputation, but because such publications, if allowed to pass unchallenged, may diminish the confidence of the outside world in the fair and impartial administration of justice in this district, and may lead the community to the impression that here, in this court, the political complexions of prosecutor and defendant are not unknown.

On the morning of the day when the plea of guilty was recorded the representative of the Crown and the counsel for the defence called upon me, in chambers, and told me that it had been agreed that the defendants would plead guilty to the smallest of the offences charged, and that the plea would be accompanied by explanatory remarks in their behalf, and that the Crown, thereupon, would withdraw the other eleven more serious accusations of felony; and they requested my concurrence to the extent of inflicting only a nominal sentence upon the accused. Mr. Fitzpatrick, for the Crown, stated that from the information he had received he was prepared to state that the Government would be satisfied with a nominal punishment, and that its desire was merely to show the people that it would no longer tolerate the irregularities which had become widespread in connection with the distribution of colonization moneys. Knowing that the Crown could, if it desired, enter a *nolle prosequi* after the plea of guilty, should I refuse my sanction to the conciliatory arrangement, and thereby attain the mutual object of the parties, I acceded to the views of the Government and of the defence, and agreed to impose the penalty of six hours imprisonment suggested by the parties. In open court the parties pleaded guilty to a charge of misdemeanor—obtaining money under false pretences—and their counsel stated that in reality all the funds entrusted to them had been expended for public purposes on colonization roads, that they had not benefited personally to the extent of one cent by the expenditure, and that they pleaded guilty because of the absence of the book-keeper who could verify their statement. Mr. Fitzpatrick then declared that he withdrew the charges of forgery and embezzlement, adding that the Crown would be satisfied with a nominal punishment, and did not contradict in any way the statement of the prisoner's counsel. He promised that the *nolle prosequi* would be forwarded from Quebec as soon as possible. The statement of the defence being uncontradicted convinced me that it was in accordance with the truth, and, in addressing the accused, I expressed my belief that they had not made false representations with the object of defrauding the Government to their own personal advantage, and that the moneys they had received had been expended for public use, but that they had, however, deceived the Department of Public Works by making incorrect and misleading returns, and had paid out moneys in a manner differing from the details of their reports. It was time, I said, that the community should understand that in dealing with Government moneys the same rules should be followed as were usual in business intercourse between private parties; and that though in the cases then before me there was no indication of moral turpitude, still, in view of their plea of guilty and of the irregularities admitted to have been committed, I was constrained to inflict some punishment in order to make it known that