

## 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 prepaid, on terms following:—One year, 12s. 6d.; half-year, 6s. 6d. 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. M. CLOUGHER, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto. C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

It is an indication of the curious state of society that when a man in any public position does his duty his intimates and *confrères*, not content with expressing their own surprised admiration at the feat, must also call upon all the world to admire. There can, of course, be no objection to their celebrating the virtues of their hero in any manner they please, provided it be done without too much noise and self-obtrusion; but it is rather an exaction to expect every other person in what may in any way be called a public position to join in the apotheosis. Such persons may entertain a genuine and warm regard for the memory of a dead hero, and yet be totally averse to this loud mode of showing it. Men are dying all around them daily, after leading often heroic, though humble and unblazoned, lives—stricken down on every hand while fighting manfully to the best of their ability the great battle of life; but being in a private walk, which is at any rate as respectable as a public one, no one dreams of raising memorials to them; and there is no more reason why it should be done in the case of any more famous person that may happen to meet his fate while engaged in the active duties of life. If every one that dies while going about his business deserves a memorial, let us be consistent and treat all alike. The organization of a Mutual Testimonial and Memorial Association would be the thing to serve this purpose. If founded on the broad and liberal basis of providing every member able to keep out of jail with an occasional testimonial, and of raising a memorial to every one deceased that escaped hanging, it will afford a consistent means of offering to each a mark of esteem and respect worthy of his merit as a man—and a tailor or soldier, a statesman or a butcher, as the case may be. The plan, too, would be comparatively inexpensive: instead of a perpetual and irregular tax, you pay your subscription, and you know your turn will come sooner or later, though you may be so unlucky as to die first; and if you don't choose to join the Association it will be clearly seen that you don't care for either *ante* or *post mortem* testimonials—a fact which, though it doubtless is often the case, cannot be known now.

It is perhaps hardly worth while at present to discuss the details of the Morrison Tariff Bill now before Congress; for the chances are that— if it pass at all, which is extremely doubtful—it will be so transformed from the one now about to undergo discussion at the hands of the Committee of Ways and Means as to be unrecognizable. As it now stands it is a conservative measure, representing probably as much tariff reform as the reformers deem it prudent just now to ask for. It places a number of articles on the free list, involving a loss of revenue of over five millions; nearly five millions more are lost by an adjustment of duties on other articles, and ten millions go with a reduction of twenty-five per cent. in the sugar tariff. This is the most important change of all, and was proposed apparently because it was found difficult otherwise to cut down the revenue to a sufficient extent without too much enlarging the free list—a thing to be avoided. But it is precisely this great reduction in the revenue on one article that will not pass; the tax is not felt as a burdensome one; the House of Representatives is clamorous for appropriations; and it is felt by disinterested public men that the sugar duty, as a fair and pretty sure source of revenue, upon which the Treasury is largely dependent, should be left untouched. And if left untouched, the only alternative being an enlargement of the free list, the Bill will probably fall.

THE Morrison Tariff will not receive the approval of the new school of American Protectionists; for it removes the taxes from a number of articles of raw material, instead of increasing them. "Protection to native industry" is now the dogma—a dogma that has lately received scientific statement in a lecture delivered by Prof. Thompson, of the University of Pennsylvania, to the students of Yale College; and which is summed up in the formula, "The Tariff is not for manufactures, but for industrial independence: we should increase the articles of raw material on the tariff list, instead of decreasing them." Protection to home manufactures and to home industry were once synonymous terms; but Labour has come to the conclusion that digging coal or iron ore is just as much industry as manufacturing by machinery, and it has been told so often that Protection is for

its benefit, and not for the benefit of Capital, that it has determined to get the whole of it, whether as to the production of raw materials or of finished products.

THE fact that in some respects the Morrison Tariff might benefit Canada will not help its passage just now: the chief reason assignable for the rejection of the President's Fisheries Recommendation appears to be because Canada has always profited most by past treaties. The placing of corn on the free list, if followed by a similar change in the Canadian tariff, would no doubt enable Canadian growers of pease to sell them abroad and for feeding purposes replace this pulse by American corn; the removal of the coal duties on each side would at once open, on the one hand, the New England States and California to the coal supply of Nova Scotia and British Columbia, and, on the other hand, Ontario and Quebec to Pennsylvania. But would Canada, with the new ideas of her statesmen as to what is legitimate Protection, follow suit in abolishing duties? Upon the coal duties depends the flour duty, upon this the duty on grain, and upon this the submission of Ontario farmers to the duty on cotton, woollen goods, and agricultural implements. The removal of the duties on salt and iron ore would distinctly increase the trade of Canada; and so with lumber and wood in the rough. The reservation excluding from the free list these last-named, when coming from countries that impose an export duty on them, need not be a permanent drawback to Canadian trade, because the export duty could be abolished without almost any loss of revenue, and it is said to be the most difficult of all duties to collect. But whether this freedom of lumber is at all intended for the benefit of Canada may reasonably be questioned. The Buffalo Courier, in jibing the other day at the Philadelphia Press's opposition to the Morrison Bill, makes a naïve admission when it says: "The Press's idea of lofty statesmanship is doubtless expressed in the present plan of keeping foreign lumber out of the country by means of a high tariff, and at the same time bewailing the destruction of our forests and offering bounties to persons who will cultivate new ones." It is the preservation of the American forests at the expense of the Canadian that is aimed at in this provision for free lumber.

MR. JUSTICE BUTT, the judge who tried the Dilke case, seems to be as deficient in taste as he is in judgment. In a case heard before him, in the Probate and Divorce Court, a week or two earlier, on the question of costs counsel stated that "all who had appeared and were represented by counsel could have their costs, there being 'plenty of money'" [the case involved property to the amount of £100,000]. Whereupon Mr. Justice Butt had the ill-taste to say that there was "nothing like having a good *corpus*"—a levity as little calculated to maintain respect for the Bench as his subsequent judgment in the Dilke case. That judgment may well puzzle and divide laymen and lawyers alike. "To say," he himself began by remarking, "that Mrs. Crawford has been guilty of adultery with Sir Charles Dilke, and at the same time dismiss the case as against him, is to state things which, at first sight, do not look quite reasonable. But, when it comes to be considered, there is nothing unsound in it." And he then proceeded: "I see no reason at all for doubting the truth of Mr. Crawford's evidence. That being so, I am compelled to come to the conclusion that the adultery was committed, and to grant the decree for relief which he craves. With regard to Sir Charles Dilke, my decision is that there is no evidence worthy of the name as against him. It would be unjust if any gentleman in the position in which he finds himself in this court should be assailed and condemned on charges of this nature, on the statement of a person, not upon oath, and the truth of whose story he has no opportunity of testing by cross-examination. In common fairness these admissions, as they stand, ought not for one moment to be weighed against Sir Charles Dilke." To a plain man, with a mind moderately free from cobwebs, it would seem that if Mrs. Crawford was guilty of misconduct with Sir Charles Dilke, as the Judge says she was, Sir Charles must have been guilty of misconduct with her. But this the Judge says he was not; and though a strong suspicion must obtain that the judgment was the outcome of some special arrangement, no good Liberal can connect such a judicial scandal with the name of a nominee of a Gladstone Government, as Mr. Justice Butt is. Accordingly the Chelsea Three-Hundred have met, and 294 of them have expressed undiminished confidence in Sir Charles Dilke. So all the world, save such as have not yet reached the moral level of the Chelsea Liberals, are expected to rest satisfied.

THE Boston Globe, after reciting that Great Britain paid twenty millions sterling for emancipating the West India slaves, forty-one millions for the Crimean War, four millions for its stock in the Suez Canal, six millions in 1878 for the purpose of propping Turkey, and eleven millions in 1885 for