

affairs; the country was almost in a state of latent revolution; and an outbreak in Hungary, promoted by foreign agents and foreign gold, with Klapka doing Count Bismarck's bidding, was in the highest degree probable, and would, had it occurred, have led to almost overwhelming disaster. Knowing this, I felt bound to advise the Emperor to accede to the views of the Déak party, securing the solidarity of the Empire by the guarantees afforded through the systems of delegations and joint budget. Mr. Gladstone cannot urge upon your House of Commons the same reasons for granting Home Rule to Ireland. England has not been, and I trust never will be, beaten as Austria had been beaten. No foreign foe has been dictating terms at the gates of London. No revolution is latent, and, a point also worthy of consideration, the population of Ireland is only about five millions, including those Protestants who are against the Home Rule scheme, as compared with what I should think was the wish of the great majority of the thirty millions composing the population of Great Britain; whereas the area of Hungary is greater than that of Austria proper, and its population is nearly one-half of the total population of the Empire.—*Memoirs of Count Beust.*

## CORRESPONDENCE.

## THE TRIAL SCENE IN "PICKWICK."

To the Editor of THE WEEK:—

SIR,—In a late number of THE WEEK you give some of the most interesting particulars respecting the Pickwick papers. You may not know (indeed, it is not likely you would know) that every member of the "Trial Scene" is a portrait, and a most excellent one. I used, for several years, to attend the Assizes at Winchester, and knew the face of every judge and counsel who attended the Assizes there on the western circuit. I knew every board in the wooden partitions, and may say every knot-hole.

The picture shows the Southern Court in the so-called Castle of Winchester (it was more like a great stone barn than a castle). The view of the court is correct; the portraits of the barristers are perfect. The little attorney in black, sitting just under the judge, was Mr. James Hoskins, to whom I was articled; Mr. Serjeant Buzfuz was Mr. Serjeant Bompas, and Dickens must have heard the style of that gentleman's oratory or he could never have so perfectly paraphrased his speech in the report of the trial.

It is more than sixty years ago, or I could have individualised every one of the counsel; I knew them all as well as I know the leading counsel in the courts in Canada.

In the court partitioned off at the northerly end of the castle, fastened to the wall at the back of the seat of the judge, was the ancient and veritable King Arthur's Round Table, a massive oaken structure, the names of the knights sitting round, and the king, on a faldstool in the middle. The history of this most venerable piece of furniture is fully set forth in the "Encyclopædia Londinensis," which also has a plate of the table exactly as it has been restored in modern times.

The sketch of that plate must have been taken in court at assize time, some time after the first number of "Pickwick" was published.

Port Perry.

E. L. C.

## THE EXCLUSION OF IRISH MEMBERS.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—In your issue of July 14 you express some doubt as to the truth of the report that Mr. Gladstone has explicitly agreed to the retention of the Irish members at Westminster as a condition of the creation of an Irish Parliament. Why should there be any doubt in the matter when Mr. Gladstone said in the Home Rule debate that he was willing to retain the Irish members at Westminster, if any one would show him how it could be done? It was never Mr. Gladstone's desire to exclude the Irish members from the House of Commons, and the exclusion clause in his bill was due simply to the difficulty of so arranging matters that while the Irish members would be able to take part in business relating to the Empire at large, they would be debarred from taking part in business relating only to England or Scotland. A moment's consideration will show how hard a problem this is to solve, and neither Lord Hartington nor Mr. Chamberlain has ever offered a solution. Mr. Morley's attitude on the subject is not one of hostility to the retention of the Irish members. It is simply a recognition of the difficulty above referred to. The meaning of the telegrams on the subject probably is that some understanding has been arrived at—not as to the desirability of having Ireland represented in the House of Commons, for on that point all the Liberal members have always been agreed—but as to the footing on which the Irish contingent will be placed at Westminster. The true remedy is a federal constitution, with a provincial parliament for Scotland, and another for England; but for this the time does not seem to have quite arrived. Pending the greater change, Mr. Gladstone's plan of leaving the Irish members out of the House of Commons is probably the least objectionable solution of the difficulty.

Toronto, July 14, 1887.

WM. HOUSTON.

## SUNDAY STREET CARS.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Permit the expression of a few considerations on this question on the opposite side to those which have lately appeared in your columns. I suppose it will be conceded that in the abstract, and but for strong

and outweighing reasons to the contrary, this species of labour ought not to be carried on on Sunday any more than any other kind of toil. Why then should the work which Sunday street cars will entail upon man and beast be an exception to the rule against Sunday labour? Is there any over-mastering necessity, any unquestionable advantage, to justify so marked a deviation from the ordinary rule in regard to the observance of the Lord's Day.

It is argued that cars are required to take people to church, but in Toronto there are places of worship belonging to all churches and denominations within easy walking distance of everybody's residence. Surely the gratification of a whim, or predilection for any particular preacher or service, is not sufficient cause for breaking in upon the Sunday's rest of the over-worked car horse and his driver. But, say the advocates of Sunday cars, they are needed to carry the people to the fresh air and green fields. Have the oxygen and verdure which can be enjoyed in such streets as Beverley, St. George, Jarvis and Sherbourne, and in such parks and squares as Riverside Park and Clarence Square become exhausted? Although the dimensions of the Queen's Park have been grievously curtailed, to the great loss of our labouring classes (and a thousand pities it is that this should be so), there is still a good deal of space left in it for Sunday strollers. Why should not the grounds which surround the Normal School, St. James's Cathedral, the Metropolitan Church, and Osgoode Hall be utilised, under proper police regulations, as places of resort and recreation on Sunday, as are the Horticultural Gardens? All these places would afford as much pleasure as those at a distance from the city, and in many cases be found more convenient.

Another argument advanced in support of Sunday cars is, that since the rich man rides in his carriage, the poor man ought to have his Sunday street car. To this I submit there are several obvious answers: (1) The use by a comparatively few persons of their private carriages does not involve anything like the same amount of hard and continuous labour for man and horse that street car service for half or any part of Sunday would. It is probably no hardship at all to a gentleman's horse to be driven to church and back, but far different must it be for the unceasingly worked car horse; and the same difference exists, to a considerable extent, between the case of the gentleman's coachman and the street car driver. (2) The authorising of the running of the street cars on the Lord's Day would be a public and official act; if not a Sabbath desecration, at all events, of interruption of the quiet and calm of Sunday, and differs considerably from the interference with the rights of private liberty, and of individual conscience, which the putting down of private carriages would involve. It would be well, however, that this liberty and conscience were exercised in the direction of using these as sparingly as possible on the day of weekly rest. (3) But granting that both are equally wrong, "two wrongs don't make one right."

In discussing a question of this kind, there is a consideration which seems too often ignored or lost sight of, and it is this: that the inferior animals which yet depend

"Not more on human help than we on theirs,  
Whose strength, or speed, or vigilance were given  
In aid of our defects,"

have their rights, which it is the duty of their superiors of the human race to regard, and of which man cannot deprive them without incurring a serious moral responsibility. Of these rights none is more indisputable than that of rest on one day in seven, except in cases where some real necessity to the contrary exists.

A proper sense of the divine precept contained in the fourth commandment, a due cultivation of that righteousness which causes a man to regard the life of his beast (while the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel), should certainly lead our civic authorities to defer as long as possible the evil day when our Toronto Sunday shall be marred by the jingle of street car bells and the sight of fagged horses struggling under the weight of overloaded cars. Such sights and sounds will be anything but promotive of the mental and moral well-being of our citizens.

"Distinguished much by reason, and still more  
By our capacity of grace divine,  
From creatures that exist but for our sake,  
Which, having served us, perish, we are held  
Accountable; and God some future day  
Will reckon with us roundly for the abuse  
Of what He deems no mean or trivial trust."

It seems superfluous to dwell upon the yet greater objections which might be urged against the invasion of their right to rest, recreation, and worship which Sunday cars will bring upon drivers and conductors. The argument as to them is of course much stronger. It is worth remembering that the incident which gave occasion to the famous saying, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," was a Sabbath walk through the fields, but the walk did not involve any extra labour for either man or beast.

X. Y. Z.

Toronto, July 17, 1887.

Of all the Jubilee offerings which Her Majesty has been asked to accept none has been simpler than two new-laid eggs which a poor Irishwoman sent the Queen by a bishop, hearing that the bishop of the diocese was going to London the Jubilee week. This Irish loyalist asked him if the Queen would accept two eggs for her breakfast from an Irish widow. The bishop brought them across St. George's Channel and transmitted them to Windsor with a description of the donor's poverty and loyalty. They were accepted by the Queen, who is making inquiries as to what would be the most useful present in return.—*Edmund Yates, in N. Y. Tribune.*