

# THE WEEK.

Fifth Year.  
Vol. V. No. 32.

Toronto, Thursday, July 5th, 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 \$4 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 pro ad, on terms following:—One year, 12s. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. 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. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.  
C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

### CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE.
The Esquimault Fortifications .....	503
Niagara Falls Park .....	503
"M. M." on the Aylmer Assizes .....	503
Dr. Mackenzie's Alleged Admissions .....	503
Jobbery in English Municipalities .....	503
Conjectures about Stanley .....	504
The Behring's Sea Question .....	504
Mr. Harrison as Mr. Depew's Heir .....	504
Religious Voluntarism at Harvard .....	504
The German Emperor's Address to the Reichstag .....	504
Internal Affairs in Germany .....	504
Cremation in Switzerland .....	505
Religious Revolution in Japan .....	505
THE "AYER CASE" AND ITS LESSONS .....	505
THE PRIVATE DETECTIVE AGAIN .....	505
SHAKESPEARIAN GHOULS (Poem) .....	506
LONDON LETTER .....	506
AUTOCRACY IN MCGILL COLLEGE .....	507
MONTREAL LETTER .....	508
THE ARTIST'S PRAYER (Poem) .....	508
LIQUOR LAW IN THE TERRITORIES—A SUGGESTION .....	509
A PROJECTED SWINDLE .....	509
TO ALEXANDER MACLACHLAN (Poem) .....	510
PILOT BOAT No. 24 .....	510
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Judge Wurtele at Aylmer Assizes (Que.) .....	510
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE .....	511
LINGUA .....	512
LITERARY GOSSIP .....	512
CHESS .....	513

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.

THE announcement recently made in the British House of Lords, in regard to the plans for the defence of the British Columbia coast, is of interest to Canadians. The design, which has the approval of both the military and naval departments, is to complete the fortification of the harbour of Esquimault, an arrangement which will, it is thought, sufficiently provide for the safety of Burrard Inlet and the town of Victoria. The British Government are, it appears, now waiting for the concurrence of the Canadian Government in the proposed plan, as a preliminary to proceeding with the work. Whether all that is required of Canada is mere assent to the arrangement, or whether and to what extent she may be expected to assist in the work, does not appear. The remoteness of any danger of an attack upon the British Columbia coast, is, we suppose, no sufficient reason for neglecting to take suitable precautions for defence, especially if, as seems probable, Esquimault is to be made a rendezvous, and, in case of war, a base of operations for the British fleet in the Pacific. As Canada has no enemy to fear in that quarter, it is probable that the matter will be treated as one of Imperial concern and policy.

A good deal of discussion is still being had with reference to the Niagara Falls Park. To us the affair appears to be in a nutshell. Unless we greatly mistake, the understanding of the people of Ontario, and of their Legislature, as well as of those of New York State, was that the park was to be free. It cannot properly be said to be free so long as a charge is made for visiting any spot accessible by carriage or on foot. The islands are surely a portion of the park proper. If so, why should a fee be exacted for the use of the bridges any more than for the use of the roads or walks? With regard to the use of the elevators, waterproof suits, etc., required for going beneath the falls, the case is different. No reasonable person will object to pay for these, or doing without them, as these arrangements involve a constant and serious expense, and are in no wise essential to a view of all the beauties of scenery and cataract. The charge for the use of the bridges is unexpected and vexatious in a so-called free park. That for the machinery, guides, waterfalls, etc., will not be so considered by the average visitor. As to the *Globe's* strange threat

that if criticism and remonstrance continue, the park may be handed over to a private corporation, it is incredible that it can emanate from the Government or have its approval. Such a transaction would be a violation of faith, at least implied faith, both with the people of Ontario and with the neighbouring State. Surely the press may criticise the management of public property without being gagged by a threat of its alienation, and that too under a Liberal Cabinet.

We gladly publish the explanation given by our correspondent, "M. M.," in another column, of the mitigating circumstances which led Judge Wurtele to impose the extraordinarily light sentence on which we commented in a previous issue. In the interests of public morality, as well as of justice to individuals, it is desirable that the facts should have wide currency, as otherwise the judgment in question would seem to establish a most mischievous and dangerous precedent. Those facts, if established to the satisfaction of the court, and admitted by the prosecuting counsel, will be accepted by most impartial minds as fully justifying the singular leniency of the court, which is the point just now in question. That being so, it would be aside from the point to comment, as we should otherwise feel bound to do, upon the more than questionable means adopted by the trustees, Messrs. Cosgrove and McCabe, and, as appears by several others, to correct the parsimony of the authorities who made the appropriations. The habit of making and attesting false returns is surely a most reprehensible one, by whomsoever sanctioned, and it is certainly hard to understand how any men of ordinary probity and intelligence, not to say of the high character and standing ascribed to the defendants in this and similar actions, could ever have been betrayed into lending it their countenance, or making themselves parties to it. It was high time for the authority of the court to interpose, as we presume it has effectually done, by the imposition of even a nominal sentence, to put an end to a practice which not only opened the way to unlimited abuse, but must have been in itself a snare to the conscience of every official who was taught to resort to it.

If Sir Morell Mackenzie really made the statement ascribed to him, to the effect that he knew from the first that the disease from which the late Emperor was suffering was cancer, but concealed the fact for political reasons, the German press does well to be angry. It is to be hoped, for the sake of the reputation of the physician whom Frederick and his wife delighted to honour, and of the nation he represents, that he will be able to give the explanation demanded, and to prove that he was incapable of betraying his high trust and trifling with the constitutional affairs of a great nation. It would be altogether out of keeping with the honourable and chivalric character of the deceased Emperor to suppose him capable of being a party to such a deception as that alleged, even in the interests of his beloved consort. Furthermore, it seems impossible to accept the statement ascribed to Dr. Mackenzie without impugning either the honour or the professional skill of the distinguished German physicians who were associated with him throughout, excluding those renowned specialists to whom the diseased matter from the patient's throat was repeatedly submitted for analysis. On the whole, and until Dr. Mackenzie is heard from, it seems much more reasonable to suppose that he has made no such assertion as that ascribed to him, especially as the making of it under the circumstances would be as little creditable to his Scotch shrewdness as to his personal and professional honour.

JOBBERY for caste's sake or jobbery for money's sake, which is the worst? These are, according to the *London Spectator*, the alternations now before the English people. The question is suggested by the revelations which are being made before the Commission charged with the enquiry into the operations of the Metropolitan Board of Works. The Board has not yet been heard in its own defence, but unless the evidence, documentary and verbal, has been artistically cooked, which the *Spectator* thinks impossible under the circumstances, corruption has been rife under the management of this most important of English municipal authorities. "Men influential in guiding its decisions have been paid hard cash to misguide them." "Applicants seeking grants of sites and other favours have obtained them by bribing employes or others of influence with the Board." The Board, as a Board, is almost certainly inno-