

will best proceed. The appeal to the ratepayers to do their duty in the elections ought therefore not to be made in vain. Unfortunately it is far from being needless, since some, even of our wealthiest men, though they have the largest stake in the city, do not always give themselves the trouble to vote. A full vote is generally a good vote: it swamps the personal influence of the ward politicians. Nor is it less necessary to adjure the citizens, if they want a good police, good paving, drainage and water, and do not want confiscation of their property, for once to lay party politics aside and cast their votes in the interest of the city. What has Toryism or Gritism to do with our water supply? If Toronto will act with spirit, she may help to solve for other cities as well as for herself the grand problem of city government. The ideas of Reformers seem to point to a charter. A charter was framed during the mayoralty and under the auspices of Mr. Beaty; but the Government refused to entertain the scheme on the plea that what was good for one city must be good for all, and that it would, therefore, be wrong to legislate exclusively for Toronto. This was hardly a sufficient ground for refusing to try in one case an experiment which, if successful, would have furnished a safe basis for general legislation. But perhaps a better course may be suggested. Power might be given to every city to amend, from time to time, its own municipal constitution by means of by-laws or ordinances proposed by the council and submitted to the popular vote, subject to the authority of the Local Legislature, before which the by-law or ordinance would be laid at the Session next ensuing for approval or disallowance. This would give liberty of experiment within safe limits, and one city would benefit by the results of experiment in another. It is probable that a lengthening of the terms for which members of the council are elected, with overlapping, so as to increase the continuity of government and its power of systematic action, in the manner proposed by Mr. Beaty's charter, would be one of the first reforms introduced under the power.

LIKE the rest of the world, the Secularists have been holding their convention, and they have presented to Canadian Society a series of demands constituting, as it were, their Bill of Rights. All public recognition of the existence of a God is to cease. We are no longer to have chaplains or prayers in Parliament or in any public institution; the Bible is to be no more used, even as a text-book, in public schools; the appointment of religious festivals or fasts by national authority is to be discontinued; judicial oaths are to be abolished; enactments compelling the observance of the Sabbath are to be repealed; purely civil marriage is to be legalized; the enforcement of "Christian" morality is to be henceforth unknown to the law; the political system is to rest on a purely secular basis, no advantage being conceded to Christianity or any other religion. The framers of this manifesto, if they are philosophers, especially if they are evolutionary philosophers, ought to be aware that social progress in any case must be gradual, and that a community, the morality of which, public as well as private, has hitherto been bound up with its religion, can hardly be expected at once to change its fundamental character and virtually declare itself Atheist upon the peremptory summons of a small minority whose discoveries are new and not very well settled even in the minds of the discoverers. That which may be rightly demanded, and which no Christian who has in him the true spirit of his religion will ever hesitate to concede, is the utmost possible measure of individual liberty, together with a perfectly equal measure of all civil rights or advantages. That no political privilege should be granted nor any political disability imposed on the ground of religious belief or disbelief is the dictate alike of natural justice and of the religion of Him who taught His disciples that His kingdom was not of this world. Judicial oaths, in the case of those who believe in a God and feel no scruple about invoking Him on a solemn occasion, are a practical security for the integrity of jurymen and the veracity of witnesses with which we can hardly afford to dispense, at least till Scientific Ethics shall have more definitely replaced religious Ethics in the popular mind; but a conscientious Atheist, as well as a conscientious Quaker, ought undoubtedly to be allowed to affirm. Nor has the community the slightest interest in requiring the profanation of the religious ceremony of marriage by those who have discarded religion; it neither needs nor is justified in exacting anything beyond the authoritative ratification of the legal tie. Before we assent to the abrogation of all laws enforcing "Christian" morality prudence bids us inquire what "Christian" morality includes. This demand comes in somewhat suspicious connection with a demand for divorce courts. The institution of a regular and trustworthy tribunal in place of the irregular and by no means trustworthy jurisdiction of the Senate is a most reasonable proposal, and the reform cannot be long delayed. But a community, the overwhelming majority of whose members believe that the family is the essential basis of civil life,

and that the sanctity of marriage is indispensable to the integrity of the family, has a right to conserve the vital principle of its organization. It has as clearly a right to do this as it has to maintain monogamy itself. To refuse a lax divorce law is not persecution and intolerance, though the indissolubility of marriage is in its origin undoubtedly Christian.

OF the literary merits of Mr. Parkman's "Montcalm and Wolfe," enough, though not too much, has been said. All must allow that it unites in the highest degree skill in narration and brilliancy of description with the fruits of conscientious research. To its somewhat florid style and elaborate cultivation of the picturesque only a severe critic would object: the taste of our age demands them; that of the next age will perhaps revert to something more terse, compressed and classical: to something more compressed indeed it will be absolutely necessary to revert unless life is to be spent in reading histories. But Mr. Parkman's book forms a moral epoch in American literature. His work is not like those of too many of his predecessors, a Fourth of July oration in a narrative form, but a judicial history; and he even dares to be just to England. He dares to award praise, where it is due, to British valour, wisdom, justice and humanity. By so doing he has, of course, given some scandal; and it was not surprising to find a writer in a New York journal exhorting his readers to stick to Longfellow's version of the Acadian affair, as being, if not truth, something more akin than truth to "humanity": that is, more congenial to malignant hatred of England. That Americans were Englishmen in those days is a fact against which the American Anglophobe manages steadfastly to close his mind. Mr. Parkman's work will hardly commend itself at once to a public taste vitiated by a century of falsehood and taught to identify calumny with patriotism; but in time it is likely to do real service as a literary instrument of reconciliation. The conquest of Quebec was our common enterprise. Chatham and Wolfe were common heroes of our still united race. Into the heart of the American, as he reads Mr. Parkman's glowing and stirring narrative, can scarcely fail to steal the consciousness that he had ancestors, and ancestors of whom he has some reason to feel proud. To the comparative neglect among Americans of all historical studies except that of Elijah Pogram's history of the American Revolution, is due in no small measure the strange and ignoble delight which one nation alone among the nations of the earth has hitherto taken in dishonouring its own blood, traducing the grandeur of its origin, and defiling the ashes of its fathers. Mr. Parkman's subject is so much a part of their own annals that it cannot fail to attract American readers, and their Anglophobia must be inveterate and keen indeed if it can separate the British soldier from his Colonial brother-in-arms. At the close of his book Mr. Parkman exhorts his fellow-citizens to "prate less about the enemies of the past and strive more against the enemies of the present." His own historical writings will indirectly, and therefore perhaps most effectually, help to stop the prating about the enemies of the past.

THE result of the Conquest of Quebec is however a lesson to conquerors. That the event would remove a curb from the spirit of independence betrayed by the New England colonies and thus jeopardize British Empire in America, was perceived by some clear-sighted men at the time, though the prophetic letter of Montcalm is not less certainly a fabrication than the prophetic letter of Napoleon respecting the consequences of a rising in Spain. But nobody then divined, or could possibly have anticipated, the effect which an enterprise directed against the power of France was destined to have in preserving and developing a French nationality on this continent. Suppose New France, the population of which at the time of the Conquest was barely a quarter of the present population of Rhode Island, while its development was fatally impeded by subjection to a distant and corrupt despotism, had been left to its own destinies, what would have been the result? The colony would almost certainly have been severed from Old France by the Revolution, and like the French element in Louisiana, or the Dutch and other foreign elements in the Central States, would have been gradually absorbed and assimilated; perhaps it would have been rather roughly ground down into conformity by the growing force of American Englishry; for in those days New England still abhorred Popery, and indeed made the toleration of it by the British Government in Quebec a count in her Revolutionary indictment against England. French nationality with its tutelary Church has been preserved by its subjection to a scrupulous conqueror, in whom philanthropy was somewhat incongruously wedded to ambition, and who felt himself bound by his Liberal professions to protect the conquered in the enjoyment of all their rights and privileges, including that of constitutional opposition to his own rule. Thus we have a