

pretty certain that Canadian law does not tolerate bigamy, and it would, we fancy, puzzle even a Mormon saint to espouse a third or a thirtieth wife, during the lifetime of the first, without incurring the penalty prescribed for the crime of having unlawfully married a second. But be that as it may, all who believe that monogamy is the only practice in respect to marriage compatible with the well-being of society, and that polygamy is a violation of the most sacred laws which nature, sociology and religion unite to impose upon civilized humanity, will look with the most serious distrust upon any movement which threatens to involve our country in the troubles and evils which the practice of the Mormon creed in regard to this matter has brought upon the people of the United States. Lord Stanley did well, we dare say, to welcome the Latter Day Saints to Canada and to assure them that this country is free, as it undoubtedly is, to all creeds, and so to as many of their people as choose to come. It was quite proper that in replying to a loyal address, he should assume that the people on whose behalf it was presented were honest, law-abiding citizens. It is, none the less, a serious thing that a sect with so bad a record in regard to a practice which all Canadians are agreed is immoral and pernicious should have been able to secure not only the statutory 320 acres of land for each individual settler, but also a block of thirty square miles for special church purposes. If it be true, as the *New York Independent* has stated, that an official of the Washington Department of the Interior has visited the Canadian Mormons and reported them to be, for the most part, fugitives from Utah, the fact demands serious consideration. Everyone knows that their chief, if not sole, object in fleeing from Utah is to escape the strict enforcement of the laws against polygamy. It is, we suppose, only by vigilance that the danger can be guarded against. It would never do to refuse admittance to any body of immigrants on account of an article of their faith. But it is in the highest degree desirable that the movements of a people who have proved so troublesome to our neighbours should be observed with some degree of strictness, and with a firm determination to suffer no infraction of either the letter or the intention of our laws touching this important matter.

THE politics of Quebec are just now quite as mixed up as those of Ontario. It is, therefore, no less difficult to assign a value to the defeat of Premier Mercier's candidate in Brome than to the success of Premier Mowat's in Lambton. The defeat in the one case is certainly as real as the success in the other, and it is to as little purpose for the partisans of Mr. Mercier to point to the diminished majority of their opponents as for the opponents of Mr. Mowat to dilate on Mr. Mackenzie's failure to secure an absolute majority. It is scarcely possible that the Equal Rights agitation did not have a good deal of indirect influence in determining the result in Brome, and yet the promoters of the Equal Rights movement themselves admit, we believe, that had the battle been fought directly on that issue their candidate would have been signally defeated. This is equivalent to an admission that the anti-Jesuit, or anti-Ultramontane agitation has not made any considerable headway among the Protestants of Quebec, or at least among those of the constituency of Brome, in which two-thirds of the electors are said to be English-speaking. None the less the election of Mr. England is a decided check to Mr. Mercier, and must injure his prestige, if only as an exception to a long series of victories. Events may, perhaps, prove that we should not be far astray were we to regard it as one of the various indications that the clever and somewhat audacious leader of the Nationalists has at length passed the zenith of his career and is entering upon a declining course. The dissensions among the journals hitherto favourable to his side of politics, and the resuscitation of Liberalism as distinct from Nationalism, and more or less opposed to it, may be mentioned among other indications, while the seemingly inevitable financial difficulties looming on the horizon threaten to become, at an early day, a very effective cause of the possible eclipse of his popularity.

THERE is no question more closely related to the well-being of society and the State than that of the best means of preventing the increase of the idle, vicious and criminal classes. The statistics of our police courts and gaols make it but too clear that these classes are being steadily recruited in our midst, not simply or even mainly by immigration, but very largely from the ranks of children who are permitted to grow up under our eyes without education, training or healthful discipline of any kind. It was urged at the recent Congress for the Promotion of Pri-

son Reform that if it is wished to check the growth of the classes referred to, one of the first things to be done is to make universal elementary education a reality by seeing to it that every child of school age actually attends school. In view of the compulsory clauses of our Education Act, many may be ready to suppose that this is already provided for, but facts tell a different story. A lady has written a very sensible letter to the morning papers, pointing out that not only are there at present very many children growing up in the city in idleness and ignorance, without any other education than that of the street and alley, but that the red-tapeism of the school arrangements in some respects seriously hinders instead of facilitating the admission of the children of the poor into the schools. This correspondent further calls attention to the startling statement made in the last annual report of the Toronto Relief Society, on the authority of the superintendent of one division in an outlying district of the city, that out of seventy children coming under her notice during the past year only ten attended school. It is reasonable to suppose that the same state of things, in kind, if not in degree, exists in many other districts. This is surely a matter that demands immediate attention and vigorous action on the part both of the civic authorities and of the Government. Our detectives and constables are constantly at work laying hold of criminals, our costly courts of justice in trying them, and the doors of our gaols, penitentiaries and asylums are perpetually opening to admit them. What a Sisyphean toil it all is, so long as the chief agencies for the production of these enemies of society are permitted to continue their operations unchecked. It is as unnecessary as it would be absurd to claim that compulsory attendance at the public school is an infallible preventive of the development of criminal instincts and tendencies, but few can doubt that it is one of the most effective preventives it is in the power of the community to apply. The remedy is doubly efficient in that it acts negatively in keeping the waifs off the streets and out of the way of the temptations there abounding, as well as positively in increase of intelligence and training for usefulness. By all means, then, let those responsible be required to do their duty. The best interests of all classes of citizens are at stake. If the present provisions of the law in respect to compulsory education are sufficient, let them be rigidly enforced. If they are not sufficient, let immediate steps be taken to secure the necessary amendments. It is a reproach, a folly and a suicidal crime to allow any child to grow up in Toronto or any other Canadian city without learning, at the very least, to read, write and cast accounts, and so becoming fitted to earn a decent livelihood in some honourable occupation.

TWO cases now pending before Canadian Courts involve a question which is worthy of more consideration than it has hitherto received. In both instances an angry parent is indicted for assault upon a school teacher, by way of retaliation for the flogging of his child in the public school. In both cases it happens that the parent charged with the assault was a trustee of the school. The latter fact is probably not material, as it is hardly supposable that the trustees in question are prepared to claim that their official position gives them an authority over the persons of teachers similar to that exercised by the latter over those of their pupils. Each assault seems to have a feature of special aggravation, the one having taken place in the presence of the school children, and the other having been, it is alleged, marked by special brutality. Both are, of course, indefensible from either the legal or the moral point of view, and will, no doubt, if substantiated, bring upon their perpetrators the penalties of outraged law. And yet it can scarcely be doubted by any one who understands the parental instinct, that the offenders will not fail to receive a good deal of sympathy, silent or expressed. The not infrequent occurrence of such cases suggests that possibly the time has arrived for a careful reconsideration of the question of the expediency, not to say rightfulness, of continuing to teachers the arbitrary powers which they have been permitted from time immemorial to exercise in regard to corporal chastisement. There is, in the minds of many of those whose opinions on such a subject are not least worthy of attention, room for serious doubt as to the propriety of permitting any one, not the actual parent, or one who has succeeded legally to the parental relationship, to inflict blows upon children placed temporarily in his or her charge. The familiar argument that the possession of such power is necessary to discipline is more or less effectively met by the fact that in many schools of the highest standing in every respect

no corporal punishment is found necessary or permitted. It is further argued, and the argument is certainly not without weight, that the very fact of the conscious possession of the right to use physical force acts in many cases injuriously upon the teacher, by removing the necessity which would otherwise rest upon him of relying upon those sources of mental and moral power which, all will agree, supply, so far as they can be made effective, much more healthful and elevating motives for study and good conduct. We cannot here enter fully into the question, but it may not be amiss to observe that the statement ascribed to the plaintiff in one of the cases in question, that the flogging administered was, in part, for impertinence, is in itself very suggestive in regard to the teacher's state of mind, and the propriety of allowing the stronger party to be both judge and executioner in a matter in which personal feeling is so much involved.

THE police of Toronto must bestir themselves if they do not wish unpunished rowdiness to bring discredit upon the high reputation of the city as a law-abiding and orderly community. It is but two and a half years since Mr. William O'Brien and his friends were hooted and stoned through the streets of Toronto. The authorities at that time confessed themselves unable to bring the perpetrators of the outrage to justice, and the brickbat brigade took courage. Since [then the] city has been disgraced by at least three exhibitions of rowdiness of a similar kind, directed against our Irish Catholic fellow-citizens. The last, and perhaps the most serious, of these was the cowardly and unprovoked attack made on the new Archbishop of Toronto and the friends who escorted him from the station to the cathedral on the night of his arrival. As on the previous occasions, the cowardly miscreants who made the attack have escaped punishment, and the police seem disposed to make light of the affair. While this state of things continues Toronto can certainly not afford to point the finger of scorn at similar exhibitions of intolerance in Quebec or Montreal. The lawless gang of ruffians who championed Protestantism in this peculiar manner is doubtless small in numbers, but so long as its outrages go unpunished, it will not fail to bring disgrace upon the whole city. A step in the right direction would, we think, be a civic ordinance forbidding bands to play offensive party airs in the streets and public places. This favourite recreation of the junior Orange lodges is a constant menace to the peace of the city. However we may be disposed to admire what is truly manly and loyal in the principles and practices of genuine Orangeism, we cannot help thinking that the gentlemen, reverend or otherwise, who, by injudicious praise, lead the not too intelligent members of these juvenile organizations to regard themselves as heroes and defenders of the faith, must bear a responsibility in the stirring up of strife no less serious than that assumed by lecturers, native or foreign, who, entrenched in Protestant strongholds, delight to fill the credulous ear of bigotry with scurrilous abuse and innuendo directed against the clergy and adherents of the Catholic Church.

A RECENT cablegram states that Mr. Alexander Stanley Hill, a Conservative member of the British House of Commons, has written a letter to the *Times* on the Behring Sea question, having first qualified himself by a visit to Canada and the Pacific coast. Mr. Hill seems to have observed a fact that we have on previous occasions pointed out. That fact is that the apathy, or apparent apathy, of the home Government in regard to this matter tends directly to alienate the people of the Dominion, especially those immediately affected, from the Mother Country and to sap the foundations of Canadian loyalty to British connection. This result is natural and inevitable. Perhaps no feeling has a stronger influence in binding fast the people of this country in allegiance to the Old Land than the conviction that they are still regarded as citizens of the Empire, and that any infringement of the rights of a British subject in Nova Scotia or British Columbia will be as promptly resisted as if he dwelt in London itself. Rightly or wrongly this Behring Sea business has given that conviction a serious shock in many minds, a shock from which they will not soon recover. THE WEEK would, we trust, be among the last to favour any high-handed or irritating measures, or any course calculated to imperil the lasting peace and good-will which should subsist between the two great Anglo-Saxon nations. But the Behring Sea outrages are only in a technical sense the act of the United States. They are the act of a few politicians, trading, in all probability, upon the well-known and honourable reluctance of the British Government and people to quarrel with their trans-Atlantic kinsmen. The