

Spring has arrived in the vicinity of Calgary, Alberta. Seeding commenced there last week, and it was expected to be general this week.

The Minnesota legislation against tights makes it pretty expensive work for actresses or dancers to expose the contour of their lower limbs in public. The bald-headed men in the front seats will feel themselves deeply aggrieved. Dakota is legislating against drunks, so between these two States the people ought to be able to live soberly and decently.

The birthplace of Shakespeare at Stratford-on-Avon has suffered various vicissitudes, but the danger of that and other memorial places connected with the Bard passing into the possession of Americans is now over. A bill has been passed in Parliament vesting the Corporation of Stratford, County of Bucks, as trustees, with power to purchase Anne Hathaway's cottage and Wilcote cottage, which belonged to Shakespeare's mother.

Despite all the difficulties in the way the American Copyright Bill has become law. President Harrison signed it on Wednesday the 4th inst., after its hurried passage by the Senate and House of Representatives. The Senate's amendment, moved by Mr. Sherman, providing for the importation of copyright books on the payment of a duty of 25 per cent., was rejected by the House of Representatives, and the bill as passed is little more than an American Publishers' and Printers' Protection Act. The essential condition is that the book, to be copyright, must be printed in the United States. This will insure to their printers and binders plenty of work. The Act will, however, protect American authors, which accounts for their support of the Bill. Publishers will not now be able to obtain from a British source a new supply of matter, as good, if not better than the American article, for nothing.

During the five years ending March, 1885, Great Britain expended \$45,000,000 on new men-of-war. In the five years ending March, 1890, the sum so expended was \$77,500,000, and by March, 1894, \$80,000,000 will have been provided for the same purpose. In the five years ending with the present year 21 iron-clads, 21 protected cruisers and 56 smaller vessels will have been built. This is an enormous expense to the British Nation, but barring slight protests in Parliament there does not appear to be much objection to it. The navy estimates for 1891-2 show an apparent increase over the present year of \$2,142,500 and a net increase of \$1,790,000. Of this amount \$390,000 is accounted for by the increase of duties involved in the transfer to the Admiralty of the custody of naval ordnance stores, and it is largely met by a reduction of \$352,500 in the army estimates. Britain seems determined to yield to none the sovereignty of the seas.

The British army, it appears from the speech of Mr. Hanbury in the House of Commons a few weeks ago, is far below its normal strength, due to a falling off in the number of recruits and also the enlistment of many under the standard of measurement. The shortage in the army last year was 4,693 men. Militiamen moreover numbered 1,865 less than last year, being 22,559 below the establishment, while the yeomanry numbered 3,500 below its proper strength. This falling off is attributed by Sir Edward Hamley to commercial prosperity, and he also holds that the British army has "touched bottom" as regards physical competency. Hon. Mr. Stanhope, Secretary of State War Department, naturally defended the army, and gave quite a list of improvements in the condition of the British soldier. His pay has been increased and many things done to make the service attractive. As to the question of length of service, which Mr. Hanbury wants increased, or rather a return made to the old plan, a committee is to be appointed to deal with it and also with the question of deferred pay. The matter of ranges for rifle practice is also to receive attention.

There has just been an outbreak in Philadelphia against the nude in art. Fourteen ladies, representing 500 others, sent a written protest to the directors of the Academy of Fine Arts against several pictures in the present exhibition, several of which belong to the permanent exhibition of the Academy. They claim that the exhibition of such pictures is an offence to their womanhood, and an attack upon the delicacy of their daughters and the morality of their sons, and beg that the pictures indicated be excluded from public view. The hanging committee in answering, protested against the extravagance of these expressions and defended their course. Opinions on this subject have clashed at times for a long period, and it appears to us to be, like *decollete* dress, more a matter of custom and education than of morals. We have all heard of the American lady who draped the legs of her piano forte, and we know that many people consider it indelicate to say leg at all—limb is the correct expression. Happily these people are few and far between, and such overgrown modesty is not often met with. Nevertheless the Philadelphia matrons may be right. The nude is not always high art because it is nude, and when an object can be achieved otherwise it is better so. Clothes have nothing to do with morals, and if the *ipse dixit* of prudishly reared women were to be obeyed it would banish from sight the finest works of art in the world. Public opinion is with these ladies of Philadelphia to a large extent, and it is thought that many of the nude pictures had better have been left out. Some of them were admitted for no reason apparently than that they were the work of popular artists. But this crusade against the pictures reminds us of Elizabeth Stuart Phelps' attack on the *decollete* gowns some months ago. Is she not of the same stock as the Philadelphia matrons? And did her strictures have any effect upon those who read her article? It is far from likely that either of these things—certainly immodest and therefore objectionable in some cases—will ever be suppressed, unless by legislation, which we opine is an evil in itself.

The importance of the offices of stoker and fireman on swift ocean steamships is little realized. Many people think that all that has to be done is to throw in the fuel and poke up the fiery furnaces occasionally, but the fact is that firing is an art in its way. The stoker must know how to put the coals on so that they will not burn too quickly or deaden the fire. He must know how to get the best results with the Welsh coal he burns on the westward passage and the American coal which he uses on the return voyage. These coals require different handling, and often the result of an ocean race has been determined by the superior knowledge of firing possessed by the winning ship's stokers. The S. S. *City of Paris* carries sixty firemen, who feed the flaming maws of fifty-four furnaces that create steam in nine steel boilers. Fifty coal passers are employed shoveling the fuel from the bunkers to the furnace doors. Nearly all the stokers upon this steamer and upon the *City of New York* are young men between 20 and 30 years of age, and receive \$20 a month wages and their board. The leading stoker is paid better and does less work, and is usually older than the crew he directs. The coal passers, or trimmers as they are called, whose ambition is to become firemen, receive \$17 50 a month. Service in the fire-room is divided into six watches of four hours each. After the first day from port two out of every six furnaces are raked out to the bare bars during the first hour of each watch. The ship usually takes about 3,000 tons of coal at Liverpool, burns 340 tons per day, and has between 500 and 800 tons left upon her arrival at New York. The engineers' department is entirely distinct from the firemen's. On the *City of Paris* there are twenty-six engineers, including hydraulic and electrical. The machine shops on shore contribute a certain number of them to the sea-going profession every year.

"The Immigration Bill which was enacted by Congress in the closing days of the session," says the *Boston Journal*, "materially strengthens the provisions of existing law for the exclusion of undesirable immigrants, at the same time that it does away with the absurdity under which college professors and clergymen have been treated as contract laborers." The new law excludes from admission into the United States all idiots, insane persons, persons likely to become a public charge, persons suffering from loathsome or dangerous contagious diseases, persons convicted of felony or other infamous crime involving moral turpitude, polygamists, and any person whose passage is paid for by the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively shown that such person does not belong to one of the just enumerated classes or to the class of contract laborers. It is, however, specially provided that persons in the United States may assist friends or relatives who are not of any of the excluded classes. The removal of the provision excluding ministers and professors of colleges and seminaries, and members of recognized professions is a tardy act of justice. The idea of treating them as contract laborers was absurd. The provisions whereby persons becoming public charges within a year after their arrival in the United States, from causes which existed prior to their landing, can be sent back at the expense of the owners of the ship from which they were landed, as well as the fine of \$1,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, for taking or aiding aliens to the United States in violation of the law, and the sending of all such persons back at the expense of the ship owners, ought to have the effect of making steamship transportation companies very wary as to the class of passengers they accept. Such stringent laws, if enforced, would keep out all undesirable characters.

As the woman question continues to agitate the public mind apparently just as much as ever, and most women take a deep and lively interest in what so nearly concerns themselves, we cannot do better than quote from the Editor's Table in the *March Popular Science Monthly* part of an article dealing with a profession for women. This new old profession, as it happens, has never been neglected, and while it is sure never to fail of candidates, it is rather disregarded by some because there is "no money in it"; and once having found out that she can make a comfortable living for herself, a woman does not feel like entering this "profession" just for the amount of credit it will bestow upon her. However, here is the extract:—"There is a class of women to whom the counsel in this article will be very distasteful. The career of a wife and mother has little appreciation in their eyes. It is not enough appreciated by a large share of both sexes. But the remedy for this is in the women's own hands. If they would have an honorable profession, they have only to do a quality of work that is worthy of honor. Surgery was once a branch of the barber's trade, and certainly no more honored than house-work is to-day; but men have made a study of it, have given it a broad, scientific basis, invented instruments and processes to increase its efficiency, and arranged a systematic mode of learning its practice, with the result that the surgeon of to-day has one of the most honorable of professions. In a similar way dressmaking—which is a trade in the hands of women—has been made a profession in the hands of one man. The ordinary dressmaker gets little respect; Mr. Worth is held in high esteem, and the difference is that he does work which compels esteem. The ordinary housewife and mother takes little pains to learn her business; she follows rule-of-thumb methods handed down from her great-grandmother, introducing no improved processes or appliances, and feeling no shame if her home is ill managed or her children ill trained. If women doubt that competent administration in the home would win the same esteem that is paid to the competent surgeon, or lawyer, or merchant, or college professor, they should recall the Roman matron, Cornelia, whose fame has already lasted for nearly a score of centuries. With her spirit the modern woman should say of her home, 'This is my diploma;' and of her children, 'These are my degrees.'"