

ment which is to govern the municipality. As the voting is to be done by ballot, the cottager's vote will weigh just as much as the Squire's or the parson's. It would occupy too much space were we to attempt to outline the provisions of the Act in detail. How thorough-going it is may be inferred from its provisions in relation to the all-important land-question. The Act aims to open the land to the people. The Parish Council is to be empowered to hire or to buy land, by compulsion if necessary, to underlet. Unhappily this unheard-of opportunity for the industrious labourer to get possession of a few acres to cultivate on his own account, comes at a time of great agricultural depression. Many of those who have land can no longer work it at a profit. Under such circumstances it would probably be vain to expect so much as we might otherwise do from this great innovation, yet even this unfortunate fact may conduce to the easy introduction of the great changes provided for in the Act.

Another change, scarcely less radical in character, though affecting only a limited territory, is that which is recommended in the report, made public only two or three weeks since, of the Royal Commission appointed to consider the conditions under which the amalgamation of the various parts of the little world of London might be effected. The report is said to be very elaborate in its details, but its main outlines are easily understood. One of the most difficult questions was what is to be done with that which is now the city proper, as distinguished from the rest of London, and which has long concentrated in itself great privileges and immunities not shared by other parts of the metropolis. Under the proposed scheme, what is now known as the County of London is to become the City, while what is now "the City" will become "the Old City." The central governing body is to be a Council, elected in the same way as the present County Council, but the Old City is, in view of its special position and prestige, to have double representation in the Council. A Lord Mayor, elected by the Council, is to be its chairman, and is to enjoy all the rights, offices, dignities and privileges now appertaining to that dignitary. The areas outside of the existing county, or the metropolis that is to be, are to be developed into municipalities, to the number of nineteen to commence with, each with its own mayor and corporation. What will be the relation of these local municipalities to the metropolitan Council is not made clear in the summary before us. The whole scheme, like that of the County Councils now established, and the Parish Councils shortly to be in operation, affords an illustration of the working of the powerful influences which are ever pressing in the direction of change, in the Motherland. The old is everywhere giving place to the new, whether for better or for worse the future only can determine.

Those who are accustomed to sneer at Irish patriotism have, it must be admitted, abundant material in the squabbles which are constantly taking place among the leading Irish patriots, both in Ireland and in America. But it will be hard for them to explain, on other grounds than pure love of country, the sacrifices which are being made from time to time on behalf of the Irish cause, or what they deem to be such, by such men as Edward Blake. With a certain class of minds, it might be possible to regard the honor of a seat in the British Parliament as an equivalent for the sacrifices which are involved in the surrender of large emoluments, with a position either of political leadership or of a high professional distinction in Canada, for the the turmoil and bitterness of party strife in Ireland. But it will be hard for even the most unfriendly critic to account on any such grounds for the crusade which Mr. Blake is just now carrying on in the United States for the furtherance of Home Rule for Ireland. In itself, the mission must be peculiarly distasteful, so far, at least, as its financial objects are concerned, to a man of Mr. Blake's mental and moral temperament. It is well known to many of his friends that one prime cause of his comparative lack of success in the leadership of the Liberal Opposition in Canada, if not of his retirement from that position, was the necessity involved of soliciting funds from the adherents of the Party for the legitimate and absolutely necessary purposes of a political campaign. Though he did, on one or two occasions, so far yield to the pressure of circumstances as to engage in money raising, the thing was utterly distasteful to him, and he finally declared with emphasis that he would do so no more, and unless the Party could supply the funds necessary for carrying on a vigorous campaign, without his personal solicitation, the campaign could not be carried on under his leadership.

Many of our readers will remember the somewhat surprising injunction issued by a Judge Jenkins, in the United States, last December, restraining the employees of the Northern Pacific Railroad, then in the hands of a receiver, from quitting their employment. Judge Jenkins laid it down as a fundamental principle that employees must be restrained from "combining and conspiring to quit, with or without notice, the service of said receiver with the object and intent of crippling the property in their custody or embarrassing the operation of said railroad." We think we commented at the time on the peculiarly unfair position in which this decision, if confirmed, would place the railroad and other employees, for the principle, if sound, was evidently capable of indefinite extension. It would wrench from them their only effective weapon and place them completely at the mercy of corporations whose power of combined

action was placed under no such limitation. We are not, therefore, surprised to learn that Judge Harlan, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, on the appeal taken by Arthur and others, representing the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, dissents broadly from Judge Jenkin's fundamental proposition. Judge Harlan points out that Judge Jenkin's injunction is equivalent to a command by the court that the employees should remain in the active service of their employers, and must perform their duties "until they could withdraw without crippling the property or preventing the operation of the road." In other words, it claims for the court the right "to prevent an individual from quitting the personal service of another."

"It would," he says, "be an invasion of one's natural liberty to compel him to work or to remain in the personal service of another. One who is placed under such a restraint is in a condition of involuntary servitude—a condition which the Supreme Court of the United States declares shall not exist. The rule, we think, is without exception, that equity will not compel the actual affirmative performance by an employee of merely personal services any more than it will compel an employer to retain in his personal service one who, for no matter what cause, is not acceptable to him for services of that character."

#### CHILD-SAVING.

To save the children is to save the nation. There is no sounder political economy than that which finds expression in the Children's Act which was recently passed by the Ontario Legislature, at the instance of Hon. Mr. Gibson. There is no wiser philanthropy than that which brought together a large number of the friends of children in this city, on Friday and Saturday of last week, to discuss the workings of that act, and agree upon measures for the better accomplishment of the purpose for which it has been placed on the statute book.

It may be said with confidence at the outset that the State, with its official machinery, cannot, single-handed, do the work of child-saving which is so greatly needed in every civilized state. It is one of the most pleasing, as well as one of the most hopeful, facts in the history of the Ontario Act that it was framed and passed largely at the instance of those who had gained their knowledge of the necessity for such an Act, and the shape it should take, by experience in the work of child-saving by voluntary effort, and that, instead of taking the work out of the hands of the voluntary organizations, the Act aims at utilizing to the utmost the agency of all such workers. Its main purpose is, in fact, to remove obstacles, otherwise insurmountable, out of the way of the voluntary agencies, and to aid in making their efforts more effective. Chief among the obstacles referred to is the excessive, not to say absurd, regard which has hitherto been paid to what are sentimentally