

THE WEEK.

Ninth Year.
Vol. IX., No. 23.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MAY 6th, 1892.

\$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. stg.; half-year, 6s. stg. 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.
European Agents—SMITH, AINSLIE & Co., 25 Newcastle Street, Strand, London.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

CONTENTS OF CURRENT NUMBER.

TOPICS—	PAGE
The Toronto Election	355
A Commendable Tax	355
Medical Education in Ontario	355
The Redistribution Bill	355
Evidences of "Gerrymandering."	356
An Agent at Washington	356
The Quebec Legislature	356
Payment of Members	356
India and the Elective Principle	356
A Peaceful May-Day	357
OTTAWA LETTER	T. C. L. K. 357
WHY SHOULD WE READ GERMAN LITERATURE?	Thomas Cross. 357
CRAIGELLACHIE. (Poem)	Annie Rothwell. 358
TWO KNAPSACKS: A NOVEL OF CANADIAN SUMMER LIFE	J. Cawdor Bell. 358
SUN-GOLD. (Poem)	Helen M. Merrill. 361
ANE WHA KENNED WALTER SCOTT	Annie L. Jack. 361
THE CRITIC	361
IN MEMORIAM: James William Williams, Lord Bishop of Quebec.	Frederick George Scott. 361
CANADIAN LITTERATEURS AND THE UNIVERSITIES	Alchemist. 361
PARIS LETTER	Z. 361
TWO TRIOLETS	A. Melbourne Thompson. 362
CORRESPONDENCE—	
WAGNER and "The Critic."	J. W. F. Harrison. 362
ART NOTES	362
MUSIC AND THE DRAMA	362
OUR LIBRARY TABLE	363
LITERARY AND PERSONAL GOSSIP	364
SCIENTIFIC AND SANITARY	366
CHESS	367

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.

BOTH parties were no doubt genuinely surprised at the result of the Toronto election. A month ago the man who should have predicted that in a contest between Liberals and Conservatives in Toronto for the choice of a representative, even in the local Assembly, the former would be successful, would have been scouted by the political wisecracks of both parties. But the causes of the unexpected issue in this case are pretty well understood. The revolt of a large number of the more independent members of the party which is numerically the stronger in the city, against the operation of the "machine," was unmistakable and emphatic, and was probably the chief factor in the problem. That revolt was hopeful and should prove salutary. Yet it would perhaps be easy to attach more importance to it as an evidence of growing independence of spirit than it deserves, since it is altogether probable that had there been more at stake, in a party sense, the recalcitrants, or many of them, would scarcely have held out. Had the contest, for instance, been waged for the Dominion Commons by the same men and under the same circumstances, it is altogether likely that party loyalty would have triumphed over personal dissatisfaction. Another influential cause of the unlooked-for outcome was the disenfranchisement of numerous citizens through the failure of the proper officers to have entered their names upon the voters' lists. This is a matter which should be and no doubt will be closely enquired into. A third circumstance, which had evidently considerable effect in reducing the number of votes polled to unusually small dimensions, was the restriction of the right to vote to the district in which the voter resides. Thus the operation of the "one-man, one-vote" principle, excellent as that principle is in itself, was not without serious disadvantages. This local inconvenience will be less observed as electors become more used to the arrangement, yet there will always be a considerable number of voters who will be unable or unwilling to leave their places of business and return to their places of residence, often in a distant part of the city, for the purpose of voting. The question arises whether the difficulty might not be met by allowing each elector to choose whether he shall

be enrolled in the district in which he resides, or in that in which he does business. In pointing out these various influences which had to do with the result, we have no intention to disparage the merits of the successful candidate, nor have we any doubt that his personal popularity and the general conviction that he would, if returned, prove an able and useful representative, had also much to do in securing his election. Nor can we resist the hope that the result affords some faint indication of a growing tendency, however slight as yet, to pay more attention to the qualifications of candidates and less to the mandates of the party "bosses."

A GOOD deal of discussion has very naturally arisen from the fact that the Ontario Government and Legislature at the late session adopted the expedient, novel to Canadians, of a succession tax. Some of the other Provinces have, we believe, followed the example. To those who object on principle to every form of direct taxation, the exaction of a percentage from large estates as they pass by inheritance or bequest from the dead to the living will appear objectionable because it is direct in its nature. To most other persons such a mode of raising money for the public service will, we think, commend itself as one of the least objectionable that could be devised. The dead man has done with his possessions and cannot suffer loss. His having been able to accumulate a large amount of property may be accepted as evidence that he enjoyed in a large degree the protection of the laws and the advantages of good government. By some it may be held to prove that he was less mindful than he should have been of the claims of his fellow-citizens and of humanity. This need not, however, be pressed. The inheritor or inheritors have never been in possession of the property. In the majority of cases probably they have done nothing to earn it. In any case they cannot feel the loss of that which they have never had. The provision that the tribute shall be exacted only from the larger estates affords sufficient guarantee that no hardship or privation can ensue from the payment of the tax. In so far as the operation of the statute tends to discourage the accumulation of immense hoards in the hands of individuals and to encourage the distribution and circulation of the capital of the country it can be only beneficial to all concerned, the prospective heirs themselves not often excepted. It is pretty clear that, under the present Canadian constitution, the provinces will be compelled to resort more and more to direct taxation for revenue purposes, and they will be wise to make this taxation of a kind that will fall as lightly as possible upon the people and their industries. Without entering just now further into a question which affords much scope for controversy, it may, we think, be assumed that there is a growing conviction that the weight of dead men's hands has often in the past pressed too heavily upon the rights and interests of the living.

THE *Canada Lancet* published, as a supplement to its April number, a letter from Dr. Geikie, Dean of the Faculty of Trinity Medical College, in reply to the Report of Sir Daniel Wilson, which was laid before the Legislature at its recent session. That Report, it will be remembered, was written at the request of Premier Mowat, as an answer to a previous remonstrance made by Dr. Geikie against the alleged expenditure of a considerable sum from the resources of the Provincial University for the advantage of the Medical Department of that institution. In so far as the matters treated of in these papers relate to the general principle involved in the question touching the use of Provincial funds for purposes of medical education proper, it is one which ought to be discussed, in the interests of the University and the public, as well as in justice to the self-supporting medical colleges. As we have before intimated, we have no hesitation in endorsing the general principle laid down by Dr. Geikie, viz., "That it is not the duty of the State to use public funds of any kind in educating students for a special profession, such as medicine or law, any more than for any other calling by which people earn their living," as demonstrably sound. This principle has long been acted on by the Government and people of the Province, and few, we think, will now attempt to controvert it. The real question at

issue, so far as the great majority of the disinterested public are concerned, is the question of fact. Is it true, or is it not, that under the present arrangement between the University of Toronto and its newly-created Medical Department, a larger or smaller portion of the funds of the University, which are of course the funds of the Province, have been diverted from their proper channels, and used for the behoof of that department? The question becomes somewhat complicated by reason of the difficulty in distinguishing accurately between the scientific instruction which is essential to a liberal education and that which pertains specifically to the study of medicine. On this point the evidence adduced by Dr. Geikie appears certainly to be conclusive, especially as he is able to quote from official publications of the University Medical Faculty announcements which seem susceptible of no other interpretation than that which he gives them. Dr. Geikie also points out the impropriety, obvious on other grounds, of permitting rooms in the Biological building of the University to be used for anatomical purposes. Even the non-professional mind can well understand how undesirable it must be to have the class-rooms, which should be devoted to general scientific uses, pervaded by the unpleasant associations, to say nothing of the smells of the dissecting room. We cannot, however, take space in these columns to summarize the evidence brought forward to show that, as a matter of fact, large expense has been incurred by the authorities of the Provincial University, in building and otherwise, which could have had no other object than to increase its facilities for medical education proper. We have on former occasions expressed our sympathy with the self-supporting medical colleges, under the injustice done them when they are brought into competition with a college aided from the funds of the Province which has chartered them. Their very existence, in a high state of efficiency, proves that the aid of the public treasury is wholly unnecessary in the interests of medical science, while the abundant supply of medical practitioners makes it equally clear that the profession is sufficiently attractive to leave no cause for fear that the supply will not always be quite equal to the demand. The subject demands and the Legislature should insist on fuller investigation.

IS it a fair and honest redistribution, or is it a "gerrymander"? That is the question which now is, or presently will be, in hot dispute between the Government and the Opposition at Ottawa. It is a question which should receive the dispassionate consideration of every intelligent elector in the Dominion. The framing of a Bill to effect the rearrangement of constituencies made necessary by the results of the census was a matter in which the good faith of the Government was involved in an especial manner. If, in a transaction between two gentlemen in private life, or between the heads of two business firms of high standing, it should so happen that, by some concurrence of events, the one was placed in a position in which he held to a certain extent the interests of the other in his hands; if, for instance, the one was called on to act as arbiter in a case in which the rival interests of the two were involved, we can readily conceive how sensitive the individual thus placed would be on the point of honour. How careful he would be to pronounce a decision, or adopt a course of action, which would give him no unfair advantage over his neighbour. And how unworthy it would be deemed on the part of the other to suspect his neighbour to be capable of taking an unfair advantage of his position. Is it not a sad comment upon the condition of affairs in Canadian politics, that when the leaders of one party, by reason of their position, are placed in circumstances in which they have, in a large measure, the fate of the other in their hands, such is the mutual lack of confidence in each other's honour, that the "honourable" gentlemen at the head of the Opposition are ready to believe those at the head of the Administration so destitute of any high sense of honour, as to be not above taking advantage of their position of trust in order to perpetrate a disgraceful and dishonest trick for their own advantage and for the disadvantage of their political rivals? But, bad as is such a state of affairs, it becomes vastly worse if the event shows that these suspicions, at variance as they are with all traditions of manly honour, are to a greater or less extent