

writers, and in whose heart unkind feeling towards England is now almost extinct. One mistake, perhaps, Mr. Arnold made. He had better not have chosen Emerson as the subject of a lecture in the United States. The worship of Emerson, we have been frankly told is national; certainly it is not universal, for it would be very hard to find a trace of his influence, not very easy to find a reference to his opinions, in any great French or German writer. If you do not thoroughly believe in the Siamese elephant, discretion forbids you to lecture on him in Siam, and all the more if you have reason to believe that the natives themselves are vexed with a suspicion that his divine whiteness is partly paint. Mr. Arnold has probably said at least as much in praise of Emerson as he thinks, and he has said a good deal more than any ordinary intelligence can follow. A BYSTANDER.

HERE AND THERE.

AN extraordinary story is being told in Court circles, and is being retailed by the Spiritualists, as to the reasons which induced the Queen, at the last moment, to alter the arrangements for Prince Leopold's funeral. It is said that a short time before his death, dancing with an intimate friend, a lady of Danish birth, of great personal beauty, and the wife of an English peer, he was rallied by her upon his unwonted abstraction. His answer was that his sister Alice had come to him in the night, warned him of an approaching calamity, and told him not to trouble, for all would soon be well. The royal duke, like his mother, the Queen, seems to have accepted supernatural visitations as real, and he told the lady he would prefer, if anything happened to him, to have a military funeral. Her ladyship, the recipient of these confidences, wrote a letter to a high Court official telling him the story, and he laid her communication before Her Majesty. At once the Queen ordered her dead son's desires, expressed in life, to be fulfilled. Hence that change at the last moment which led to so much perplexity and inconvenience.

"THE Duchess of Albany is the daughter of a petty German prince, whose dominions are not more extensive than the cabbage garden on an English nobleman's estate." So states a writer in an English Journal. Her father made his consent to the marriage conditional upon a settlement of \$30,000 per annum being made in case his daughter became a widow. The royal duke was in receipt of \$125,000 a year from the date of his marriage. It is remarkable how tenaciously these pensioners hang on to dear life. For instance, the Duchess of Cambridge is between eighty and ninety years of age, and for thirty-four years has been in receipt of \$30,000 a year from the public funds. She is furthermore lodged at St. James' Palace, has a residence at Kew, near London, and her children are educated at the expense of the long-suffering tax-payer. The following salaries are now being annually paid from the same patient source:—Crown Princess of Prussia, \$40,000; Princess Christian, \$30,000; Princess Louise, \$30,000; Duchess of Cambridge, \$30,000; Duchess of Mecklenburg, \$15,000; Duchess of Teck, \$30,000; Princess of Wales, \$50,000; Duchess of Albany, \$30,000.

A well-known Toronto divine at a recent dinner stated that Her Majesty's allowance was only half a million of dollars annually. There was considerable astonishment amongst his hearers at the rev. gentleman's ignorance. It may be a fitting time to point out that the exact yearly amount voted by Parliament for her privy purse was \$1,925,000. In addition to this the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster bring her in some \$200,000 a year more, besides which it is more than supposed the Queen is in receipt of a large income out of investments made of money saved from her allowance.

AMONGST the matter-of-fact signs of the times may be noticed the number of peers of the realm who are now actively engaged in commercial pursuits. The sign is surely one of good omen, for till recently, members of our titled aristocracy were wont not only to be regarded, but also to regard themselves, as mere ornamental puppets. A few like the recently deceased Duke of Buccleuch, or the present Duke of Bedford, became practical agriculturists; but in other respects, to hold a title was a sufficiently powerful social bar to all commercial enterprise. At present the Earl of Shrewsbury—premier Earl of England—is a large cab proprietor, and the recent procession of his thirty well-appointed "Forders"—an improved style of "Hansom"—was watched with keen interest during its course through the fashionable streets of the west end of London, in which aristocratic neighbourhood his Lordship's cabs ply for hire. The Marquis of Salisbury, by nature more cut out for a country gentleman than a political leader, is proprietor of a large jam factory, the fruit being grown on the home farm. The Marquis of Lorne's brothers were the first of title to

become members of the Stock Exchange, and now Lord Scarsdale, like Lord Verulam, has started a huge dairy and butter factory.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, the cock-a-hoop member of the British Parliament who causes his leader so much trouble, is to visit the United States after the close of the session. This is the young gentleman whose attempts to "bluff" Mr. Gladstone have brought upon him such condign castigation as would have effectually and permanently suppressed anyone less pachydermatous. But the leader of the "fourth party" has nominated himself the successor of Benjamin Disraeli—and "all the world wondered." He married a daughter of Leonard W. Jerome, of New York, and will no doubt have "a good time" on this side the Atlantic.

THE Arnold-Chicago episode, hoax though it was, continues to exercise the minds of our American cousins. The *Springfield Republican*—generally a moderate, and always a well-written, journal—professes to derive great amusement from Mr. Arnold's visit, his sayings and doings. "Of all that he said here the only memory that remains is that he found Emerson no poet, from lack of form, and no philosopher, from lack of system. Mr. Arnold diminished his standing in a degree that none of our English visitors for a generation has lost. He had become a realist and a philistine, and given the lie to his own message. When he failed to recognize the work of Emerson in exalting the thought of America, he revealed his own hopeless limitations." Our contemporary opines that whereas Mr. Arnold addresses culture, Mr. Emerson appeals to humanity—not to a privileged aristocracy, but to an educated people. Mr. Arnold's surface impressions are true enough, "but they are all he gained from his visit." He has "a slow and narrow habit of mind." There was "little in the substance of the hoax that was not based upon things he said whilst here." He showed a disposition to "sweep the characteristics of the country under a few preconceived ideas, like an agent for a museum of civilization." The great critic's critic rejects Mr. Arnold's anticipation of America's future—when refinement, succeeding commerce, will bring a grand and beneficent civilization—and says if that ideal is prophetic, their whole democracy is a failure and their Government but a temporary expedient.

It is rather too much to find the American press gravely lecturing the press of England because it complains of the United States Government for allowing the murder of English people to be openly plotted in their midst. The New York papers, in telling Englishmen to mind their own business, simply add insult to injury. We know what a howl of rage would go up from New York if Londoners were to allow a paper to be published there periodically advocating the destruction of the city by dynamite. The American Government, in refusing to put a stop to the proceedings of O'Donovan Rossa and miscreants of that stamp, simply declines to fulfil one of the first duties of civilized life, and the disgrace is none the less because their conduct is beyond all question simply to be attributed to a desire not to lose the vote of the lowest class of Irish who live in the States.

AMERICAN economists are seriously discussing the future of the United States wheat industry. From recently-collated statistics it appears that agriculturists number about seventy per cent. of the total population. This must eventuate in a production which will touch the limit of demand, and that time is being hastened by the opening out of wheat fields in other parts of the world. India and Australia are entering into competition with this continent, and its position as the world's granary is not long assured. America must look for new markets for her vast surplus produce—for the grain which, it is held, the farmer must sell at any price—for the dry goods which protected manufacturers have produced until they are overwhelmed with stocks in excess of the wants of the people. "But," say the *Manchester Examiner*, commenting on this, "when the United States begin seriously to look for new markets, the fact will be forcibly brought home to the national mind that purchasers of its overplus will require America to take their products in return, and that an exchange of commodities is prohibited by a Protective tariff."

STILL another centenary: this time the hundredth anniversary of American Methodism. The general conference—a quadrennial gathering—met this year at Philadelphia, and had important business to transact. It is the "privy council" of the Methodist church, controlling the polity and government of near two million members and some twenty-five thousand ministers. A leading topic of discussion was the limitation of church membership, and the abolition of the itinerant system. New bishops are to be elected, and the Temperance question was considered.