

their homes on the Russian steppes. We have heard stories of their boiling them for soup in Manitoba, but for the truth of these we will not vouch. Many of the Mennonite strange ways are, however, the talk and wonder of the new Province, and it is probable they may introduce some new customs that may lead to permanent good. It is certain from the manner in which they have already commenced that they will create wealth, and in many senses their acquisition is a fact on which the Dominion may be congratulated.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

This important question is again vigorously discussed in English and American papers. Not long ago, Anthony TROLLOPE published a very elaborate argument upon it. He was followed by James PARTON in an equally exhaustive paper. The *Athenaeum* and *Appleton's Journal* are also agitating it. All these authorities insist on the salient point that it is unjust to deprive authors of the legitimate rewards due to their talent and labor, and allow publishers to pocket them instead. The whole argument is in this point. The present system is an injustice and a legal swindle, and we wonder that enlightened governments which have so many ties of community should countenance it. In language and literature, England and America are one—*matre pulcra filia pulcior*. English writers are read in the United States and Canada as much as, if not more than, in England. American writers, to a very great extent, are read in England. Why then should the English author be robbed of his gains in America, and the American, in England? Why, if we like a book particularly, can we not pay the money for it into the author's hands, as a slight tribute to him, instead of giving it to his speculating publisher? Why should such monopolists as the great firms of London, New York and Boston, make fortunes on the mere mechanical part of works, while the grand brain work is unrequited?

We can understand why England, for instance, seizes at her custom houses, for breach of copyright, the Lepsic editions of British works published by Tauchnitz and Trübner. This is a mere question of trade, where one nation tries every means to prevent its being undersold by another, in the matter of printing. For the same reason, France legislates with much severity against the surreptitious editions of French works printed at Brussels and Liege. But between England and America, the case is far different. There is a community of literary interests between them, as there is a rivalry of literary glory. No paltry considerations of trade, no absurd technicalities of international legislation, ought to prevent legitimate encouragement to literature.

It is really pitiful to learn how much authors have suffered by the present system of "protection." TROLLOPE mentions that when LONGFELLOW showed him with laudable pride the different English editions of his works in his library, he inquired of the poet how much he had received from their transatlantic reproduction. The reply was a shrug of the shoulders, and a smile of disappointment. PARTON adds, on the authority of McMILLAN, the London Publisher, that if there had been an international copyright between England and the United States, LONGFELLOW would have made fifty thousand pounds sterling on his poems, during the last twenty five years. DICKENS, in a letter to the *New York Tribune*, written shortly before his death, said that an international copyright would have given him a large fortune, whereas, as it was, he had accumulated only "moderate savings." The same may be said of the poet TUPPER whose works, worthless as they are, have sold in America by the hundred thousand.

To evade the law, as it stands to-day, writers are forced to have recourse to a rather shabby trick. English authors become American residents, and American authors British residents, while their works are being published in England or America, as the case may be. The first instance of

this evasion we had in OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, who came to Montreal, while his "Guardian Angel" was being printed in London. His example has been followed by HARRIET BEECHER STOWE, HOWELLS, PARKMAN and others. Being thus for the time British residents, these persons were able to have English copyrights for their London reprints.

We are aware that there are arguments against the international copyright, derived from the increased prices of books which would result therefrom. But these prices would soon equalize themselves and even if they did not, this consideration is as nothing compared to the losses which authors endure under the present system.

MYSTERIES SURROUNDING US.

We notice from the English papers, by the last steamer, that Professor Tyndall has made yet another explanation in a lecture delivered at Manchester; and that the conflict of argument arising out of his utterances at Belfast continues to rage angrily. He is apparently stung by many of the remarks to which he has been subjected; and at Manchester we find him again apologetic. His statement at Belfast was "that he discerned in matter 'the promise and potency of every form 'and quality of life.'" A doctrine of this nature, thus nakedly stated, naturally drew forth the chorus of condemnation to which he found himself called upon to reply in an apologetic preface to his lecture, in which, in somewhat misty terms, he endeavoured to make the world believe that he was not a simple atheist. But he yet did not show what he did believe. We see by the *London Times* of October 31st that "Cardinal Cullen and the 27 Catholic Bishops and Archbishops of Ireland have issued a Pastoral addressed to their flocks," in which Professor Tyndall is again denounced for attempting to revive "the teachings of a 'school of Pagan philosophers who flourished six hundred years before Christ, 'and whose condemnation was pronounced 'by Plato and Aristotle.'" The Pastoral goes on to say: "These doctrines born of a corrupt paganism, spurned by the 'great heart of mankind in disgust, and 'angrily rejected as absurd by the flower 'of human intelligence, reprobated by the 'Holy Spirit as unpardonable sins, have 'been haughtily proclaimed in assemblies 'gathered for the advancement of science, 'as a sovereign truth in the splendour of 'which the Christian religion must stand 'convicted as an imposture. If man be 'but an unconscious automaton, a machine 'constructed of organized matter; if the 'soul be but a function of the nervous 'system, the act of volition must be governed by laws similar to those which 'govern the phenomena of matter. To 'what havoc in individual souls, to what 'ruin in society, to what universal unchaining of all the worst passions, rav- enous for satisfaction, these doctrines inevitably point, is there a man so blind 'as not to see?" Professor Tyndall as we have said, has once again in effect, exclaimed, in answer to attacks of this kind, "I am not an atheist." At Manchester he was lecturing on "Crystalline and Molecular Forces;" and after showing an experiment which he described as "astonishing," said: "We are surrounded 'by wonders and mysteries everywhere. 'I have sometimes—not sometimes, but 'often—in the springtime watched the 'advance of the sprouting leaves, and of 'the grass, and of the flowers, and ob- served the general joy of opening life 'in nature, and I have asked myself this 'question: 'Can it be that there is no 'being or thing in nature that knows more 'about these things than I do? Do I in 'my ignorance represent the highest 'knowledge of these things existing in 'this universe?' Ladies and gentlemen, 'the man who puts that question fairly to 'himself, if he be not a shallow man, if 'he be a man capable of being penetrated 'by profound thought, will never answer 'the question by professing that creed of 'atheism which has been so lightly at-

tributed to me." This is well, as far as it goes, and it is both pathetically and practically said, but we must observe that the doctrine, that "matter contains within itself, the promise and potency of every form and quality of life," does not coincide with the declaration that there is an intelligent "being or thing in nature that 'knows more about these things than I 'do." The question that Professor Tyndall has put is not original with him. It has been before met by several of his brother scientists and philosophers of modern times, who have affected to sneer at the teachings of revelation. But they stop there. They seem to be as powerless to construct an intelligent faith, as they are to discover aught in nature, beyond a very few phenomena lying, as it were, on the very surface of things. The reason why the simplest of the facts they discover does exist, is one of the impenetrable mysteries surrounding them; and it can be no more defined and described by them, than the illimitable expanse of the universe can be measured. The really narrow limits of our intellectual scope, should teach us all humility.

ICELANDIC SETTLEMENT.

The question of an Icelandic settlement has been before discussed in the *ILLUSTRATED NEWS*, and we are now happy to be able to inform its readers that we have information on this subject from Ontario of a very favourable character. We should, however, first explain that there is every reason to believe an exodus of the whole of the people of Iceland will take place, if circumstances favour. The total number of the population is about 60,000; and it is composed of a class likely to make the very best settlers in Canada. The people are for the most part fair-haired and fair-skinned, and they are hardy and industrious. An immigration from among them to this country has been already commenced, by the energy of the Dominion agents, and the government of the Province of Ontario has taken it in charge to foster the infant settlement. Some three or four hundred Icelanders have already arrived, men, women, and children. They are temporarily settled during the winter on the line of the Victoria Railway, in the construction of which work is provided for them, and the Government of Ontario has erected for them temporary sheds to live in while engaged in this work. They express themselves, through their interpreter, Mr. JONASSEN, to be very well satisfied, as well with their position as the treatment they have so far received. In fact they are astonished at the profusion into which they have fallen, and some of them have actually made themselves sick with the quantity of fresh beef they have eaten. Eating fresh beef appears to be a new sensation for an Icelander. And the same remark may be made of several other kinds of provisions which they have been able to obtain. A number of their children, we are sorry to learn, have died of dysentery. In the spring, the Ontario Government will locate them on the free grants, and, we understand, will make them advances to build shanties and clear a few acres to start with; but these advances will have to be repaid, and they will remain a lien on their farms until they are paid. Mr. HENRY TAYLOR, the Secretary of the Agricultural Labourers' Union of England, who came out to this country with a party of English agricultural labourers, asks why as much is not done for them as for the Icelanders? The answer is very easily given: the Icelanders form a nucleus of an entirely new and it may be important immigration, which it is of the greatest interest to nurse. The same cannot be wholly said of the English labourers; but we are not prepared to argue that it would not be desirable to make some such exertions in their case. We understand that this has been tried in New Brunswick, and that with measurable success. The question is especially interesting for the Province of Quebec, which has large tracts of good lands to settle; and it is greatly important for its welfare to get them settled.

EXTRAVAGANCES OF FASHION.

A paragraph has lately been going the rounds of the press, in which high praise is accorded to a young lady of fashion who appeared at an evening party or ball, in a magnificent dress which she herself had made. "I am so glad you like it," said she to an admirer, "for I made it all myself, and it costs only seven dollars." We might indulge in a little humour over this incident, but we shall not, for when we come to think of it, the young lady in question did a wonderful thing and has some reason to be proud of it. The little fact, insignificant as it may seem, points a double moral, for which reason we presume, it has been so generally circulated in the papers. The young woman actually made her own dress—a modish evening costume—and that dress cost only seven dollars! The announcement may possibly cause the cynical bachelor to leer quizzically and utter some caustic epigram, but it may well open the eyes of *paterfamilias* to the prevailing style of home education to which his daughters are being trained. In the days of our grandmothers—or even within the recollection of our boyhood—the use of the needle was frequent in our highest family circles. To say nothing of elderly or married ladies, our young girls were early taught to sew, made up their own clothes, knitted and quilted, never going near the milliner, except occasionally to get a new pattern, or on some special occasion, such as a wedding, to order a stylish dress. By this means they were innocently and profitably employed at home, and spared enormous expense to their parents. But the manners of fifteen years ago have been amazingly revolutionized. The extravagance of toilet now-days is something positively alarming. To appreciate it, one has only to move about a little, at public entertainments, not only in high life, but among the middle and lower classes. If he has any acquaintance with the ruling prices of dry goods, he can count up a little bill on the back of each figurant, which will surprise even himself. In old times patrons used to push their clerks and clients to matrimony as likely to make them more steady and economical; now, in Montreal, and others of our large cities, they are rather inclined to get rid of their young employees as soon as ever they get married. The reason is that the usual salaries are not sufficient to maintain man and wife, and patrons will not take the responsibility of supporting both. Preachers and moralists complain of the growing evils of celibacy, but what is the reason given by bachelors against matrimony? It is that they find a wife too costly. As fashions go to-day, many men of letters, beginners in a profession or a trade, cannot find the means of toileting a wife according to the requirements of what she fancies her station in society. And, indeed, it is enough to startle them, when they read in the papers that a certain young lady lately appeared in a dress worth ten thousand dollars.

We do not mean to make merry on this subject, although we might easily work it up into a humorous article. The social and religious aspects of the question predominate in our mind over every other consideration. Can money—earned with so much toil and anxious care—be put to no better use than the purchase of plumes, ribbons, flowers, and other gewgaws? Are the grace and glory of womanhood to be set in velvets, silks and satins? Is the female no more than a fair animal bedecked and bedizzened, to be gazed at by every idler, and ogled by every Don Juan? To her husband is the wife to be only a doll, to be shown to every visitor? Has woman no other pride than the beauty of her face or the ornaments of her person? Why, she should be the first to discern and resent the shallowness—we might say, the insolence—of an admiration founded only on exterior and often fictitious charms. Intellect and heart are what distinguish a true woman, as they do a true man. With these she may easily set aside the appliances of fashion.