

THE WEEK.

Eighth Year.
Vol. VIII., No. 32.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JULY 10th, 1891.

\$3.00 per Annum.
Single Copies, 10 Cents.

THE WEEK:

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable in advance. 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. ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4.00 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. No advertisements 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 Tarte-McGroevy Investigation	507
Divorce in the Senate	507
Ministerial Patronage	507
The Irish Land Purchase Bill	507
The Workingman in Legislation	508
The Convict Labour Problem	508
Free Trade and the Zollverein	508
A Significant Visit	508
Children's Aid Society	508
Cheap Literature	508
The Physical Effects of Tobacco	509
NATIONAL EDUCATION	509
ADVICE. (Poem)	509
OTTAWA LETTER	509
PROMINENT CANADIANS	510
THE WEDDING OF CLAIRE DE L'ECHELLE: A STORY OF OLD QUEBEC.	511
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MODERN CRITICISM.	512
THE "SPECTATOR" ON AMERICAN AND CANADIAN POETS	513
THE RAMBLER	513
AT PARTING. (Sonnet)	514
CONFESSIONS—	
The Crimean War	514
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	514
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	515
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	516
PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED	516
READINGS FROM CURRENT LITERATURE	517
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY	518
CRISIS	518

All articles, contributions, and letters on matters pertaining to the editorial department should be addressed to the Editor, and not to any person who may be supposed to be connected with the paper.

A GOOD deal of interest is being excited by the cross-examination of Mr. O. E. Murphy, before the committee of privileges and elections. Mr. Murphy has been thus far the principal witness for the prosecution, and the one whose testimony has been, if credible, particularly damaging to the Minister of Public Works. The clever and merciless tests to which Mr. Murphy's testimony is being subjected by Mr. Osler have thus far resulted in inconsistencies, and some actual contradictions. It has moreover caused him to stand self-revealed as a man who is not only unscrupulous to the last degree, but as one who rather glories in the fact. But all this was pretty well known before, and the wonder is how such a man, self-confessed as a New York "boodler" and an absconding embezzler, could have been admitted into business relations with the department of Public Works. Unsupported, the testimony of such a witness is valueless, especially if any motive for prevarication can be shown. Where contradicted by that of a more credible person, it will at once fall to the ground. Its value or worthlessness for the purposes for which Mr. Tarte has called for it will, therefore, depend almost entirely upon the extent to which it is supported by documentary evidence. Whether the documents can be explained away remains to be seen. Meanwhile some of the incidents of the committee-room are not adapted to elevate our conceptions of the value of a Parliamentary committee as an agency for eliciting the truth in such an enquiry. The strength of party feeling and the absence of the judicial spirit are sometimes almost painfully apparent. As this feeling exists on both sides, it is likely that between the two the truth may be brought out and a virtually just conclusion reached. But it is surely an undesirable not to say unseemly way of reaching the truth. One can hardly help wishing that the investigation had been handed over to a court of justice.

THE current of opinion or feeling in the Senate set so strongly in opposition to Senator Macdonald's Bill for removing jurisdiction in divorce cases to the courts that the mover was constrained to withdraw his Bill at the request of the Premier. It is not easy to understand why the gentlemen of the Senate should be so desirous of retaining this troublesome bit of judicial business in their own hands. It surely cannot be that it is supposed to

add either to the dignity or to the *prestige* of the Upper Chamber. It may be that the details of the measure proposed by Senator Macdonald were open to criticism, but that would have been a valid reason for amending those details, not for refusing to endorse the principle. It seems passing strange that the Senators are unable to see how utterly illogical is the position they occupy in this matter, or, seeing it, are so little moved by the perception. A number of them are, no doubt, honestly averse to the principle of divorce, believing it to be objectionable in every case, on religious grounds. The only consistent position for such is one of uncompromising opposition to any and every legal provision for the dissolution of the marriage compact. But the holding of such views constitutes no reason why enquiries purely judicial in their character should be pursued in a House of Parliament, rather than in a court of justice. Those, on the other hand, who hold that relief from the marriage bond should be granted in certain cases, should surely admit that such relief should be obtainable by all classes of persons, as nearly as possible on equal terms. The theory that divorce should be a luxury to be had only by the wealthy would, we should have supposed, be found abhorrent to every notion of even-handed justice. And yet, strange as it may seem, Senator Powers, unless sadly misrepresented in the newspapers, openly contended for the present system on the ground that the cost of divorce operates as a coercive upon a large proportion of the population, and makes divorce a luxury for the rich. That such an argument was listened to with patience in the Upper House must go far to strengthen the popular conviction that the venerable legislators in that body either are not amenable to the laws of logic, or are not in harmony with the fundamental principles of modern, popular government. In either case reform of this injustice is evidently hopeless until either the *personelle* of the Senate shall have been changed in the slow course of time, or the business of divorce legislation taken vigorously in hand by the other House.

THE *tu quoque*, though logically one of the weakest of arguments, is often practically one of the most effective. An illustration in point was given in the House of Commons the other day when Sir Richard Cartwright took occasion to call attention to the length of time during which the office of Collector of Customs in Quebec and in Toronto had been kept open for political, or rather for party, reasons. Minister Bowell, with refreshing frankness, pleaded guilty to the impeachment, but said that this was a practice which had prevailed in the past and he had no doubt would continue to prevail in the future. The practice was not, however, confined to the Dominion Government. Registrarships and other offices were sometimes kept open in Ontario. The retort was natural and effective, in so far as the so-called Liberal party can be considered as one and the same in Dominion and in Provincial politics. Probably Sir John Macdonald himself was scarcely more skilful than Mr. Mowat in turning such opportunities for patronage to the best account. It was observable, too, that no one of the Opposition speakers who followed Sir Richard ventured to say that the act was equally reprehensible in the Ontario Premier and in the Dominion Minister of Customs. It might, however, be well if those who foot the bills should reflect a little more seriously upon the meaning of this system of patronage. Mr. Bowell excused his delay on the ground that money was saved to the public by it. A significant admission truly. If the other employees in the Custom House, or the Registration Office, are able to do the work and save the public money for three or six months, why not for a year or ten years? A post-mastership becomes vacant. In all probability, if the office is a moderately large one, there is a head clerk who has been for years in the office, understands its duties thoroughly, has performed them satisfactorily, it may be, for months, while the Minister has been balancing the conflicting claims of political applicants. One day, however, a decision is reached, and the successful politician installed at a salary several times larger than that of the faithful clerk, though the latter may, very likely, still manage the whole business. Is this just? Is it economical? Is it even business-like?

THE stages by which the Land Purchase Bill made its way through the British House of Commons were so slow and separated by intervals so wide that the nation seems even yet hardly to recognize the length and significance of the stride it has taken in the matter of Irish legislation. The *Spectator* of the 20th ult., in an article on the broad effect of the Bill, enumerates a very formidable list of obstacles which it had to encounter at different points in its steady onward march. The dread aroused in the mind of the British taxpayer, the jealousy of the Gladstonians who regarded it as a stolen bit of their own programme, the lukewarmness of the Tories to whom it foreboded the downfall of the country-gentleman organization of society, and the dislike of some of the hotter of the Irish Home-Rulers, who feared that it would blunt or break their chief weapon in the struggle for an independent Irish Executive and a Parliament on College Green—all these influences combined to clog the measure in its passage through the House. In fact the Bill had, as the *Spectator* points out, no enthusiastic party promoters. "There was from first to last," says the *Spectator*, "no really grand speech delivered in favour of the Bill," and throughout its history no public meeting was called in Great Britain or even in Ireland specially to facilitate its progress. Yet, notwithstanding all, the majorities in its favour steadily increased until they at the last reached much more than two to one. Probably it augurs well for its success that it has thus been put on the statute book with the reluctant assent of the leaders of both parties, and of men of all classes, many of whom dared not oppose a measure which they at heart disliked, rather than as the result of a violent party struggle and by a strictly party majority. The leading aim of the Bill is, of course, to change the system of landlordism for one of tenant proprietorship by giving every thrifty tenant within certain limits the power either to become himself a freeholder, or to transmit a freehold to his children. Its effect, if it prove successful in its operation, will be to create a large class of peasant proprietors in place of the needy and restive tenants who have been struggling so long and so violently against the payment of rents, which were in too many cases unfair and exorbitant. What effect the Bill will have on Irish discontent and the Home-Rule movement remains to be seen. The scheme is identical in principle with that which Mr. Gladstone annexed to his Home-Rule project, and it was no doubt one of the chief causes of his overthrow. But the world has moved since then, carrying even the British Parliament with it. Whether the operation of the Land Purchase Bill will tend to sap the strength of the Home-Rule agitation, as many of its supporters no doubt anticipate, or will simply mark another vantage-ground gained in the progress towards the Home-Rule goal, is not yet apparent. On the whole the latter result seems at least quite as probable as the former.

AMONG the many forces which are uniting, or conflicting, as the case may be, to shape the course of modern legislation, that of organized labour is becoming one of the most potent. The days of class legislation are rapidly passing away, and the democracy is making its power felt to such an extent that in almost every civilized nation—Russia only excepted, if indeed it belongs in that category—the new laws and the new modifications of old laws that are being made from year to year are in the main the resultant of a variety of opinions and interests, converging from almost every point of the social horizon. We are not of the number of those who deplore this state of things, or regard it with gloomy forebodings, especially in countries like those of the English-speaking world, in which the average of education and intelligence is continually rising. An indirect effect of the trades-unions and the important part they are coming to play in the evolution of the modern state,—an effect, too, of great value to society, is that these organizations are naturally and of necessity becoming schools of a most effective kind, for the political education of the industrial classes. The defeat of the British Government the other day, on the motion to raise the minimum age at which children may be employed in factories, from ten years to eleven—a motion which the Government, in strange