

"LORD LANDSDOWNE spoke sensibly when he told the Canadians that he hoped they never would be 'a military nation in the sense in which some of the great European powers are military nations.' No greater curse could come upon Canada or any other as yet free country than to be saddled with the crushing burden of militarism. Canada, however, is in no danger of that, and will doubtless go quietly on her way until her people conclude that manifest destiny calls for consolidation with the United States." So says the *Tribune*, and so far as the first sentences of the excerpt are concerned it reëchoes the sentiments of truly patriotic Canadians. But the concluding words will find no response.

PROFESSOR E. RAY LANKESTER is more distinguished for his scientific knowledge than for his urbanity; but a New York contemporary has shown that his erudition is not infallible. Mr. Lankester dubbed the over-rated "white" elephant "Toung," and the "priests" attending him, "impudent frauds—American inventions." He further runs a-muck of spiritualists, thought-readers, quack-doctors, and queens of comedy—all of which, he says, are also American inventions. The New York *Tribune*, after denying the soft impeachment, says: "If his reference to us be not all we could wish, it is flattery itself compared to what he says of others. The Burmese imported by Mr. Barnum may not be priests, but would Professor Lankester, who is a zoölogist and has studied ethnology, tell us when and how the people of Burmah became 'niggers'? When he has done that he will perhaps find leisure to spread before the London public further details of that 'conspiracy' into which, as he alleges, the London press and the Zoölogical Society have entered to delude the British public. 'Absolute nonsense,' 'conspiracy' and 'mendacity' are surely less innocent and better deserve exposure than the mere 'inventions,' which he imputes to America. That we should be accused of nothing worse than inventiveness cannot be attributed to any poverty in Professor Lankester's vocabulary of vituperation. In the course of his short communication we find the words 'conspiracy,' 'delude,' 'impudent,' 'showman's frauds,' 'gulled,' 'absolute nonsense,' 'mendacity,' 'humbug,' 'niggers,' 'showman's invention,' 'wanton mendacity,' 'credulity' and 'impudent fraud'—a fair assortment for a dozen lines or so."

THE fact that all the eleven bridesmaids who were present at the wedding of the Marquis of Leinster and Lady Hermione Duncombe, the beautiful daughter of Lord Feversham, were brunettes, is considered indicative that the reign of the blonde is over in England, and that her dark-haired sisters have come once more to the front. There seems to be no fixity of idea in the human mind as to what constitutes beauty. It is within the recollection of many that the shades of hair disparagingly called "red" were considered abominable, and dark hair-dyes were in great demand. Then came the pre-Raphaelite craze, during which the once-despised shades were the highest beauty. And now the ever-revolving wheel has brought round the taste for raven tresses once more, and with it weeping and wailing amongst foolish devotees of fashion who have half ruined naturally black hair in their endeavour to make it auburn.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN's language with regard to the forthcoming English Reform Bill is much more moderate than his opponents expected. So far from being grateful to him for this, however, the more truculent Tories, feeling the ground has been cut from under their feet, continue to assail him with most venomous invective. Speaking to his constituents, the junior member for Birmingham said: "We are going to interfere as little as possible with existing arrangements. We are going to proceed, as my right honourable friend here (Mr. Bright) has advised us to do, on the old lines of the Constitution, and we are going to disturb as little as we possibly can existing rights and existing privileges. We shall have to put a stop to faggot-voting, by which persons with no interest either of property or responsibility in the constituencies are brought in on the day of election to swamp the votes and nullify the action of the real electors of the place. But even the Tories do not defend this particular abuse. Why then should they oppose our modest little Bill?" The *Spectator* considers the very "modesty" of the Bill its greatest drawback, since its want of thoroughness will necessitate the early re-opening of the question. It is objected that there would be no necessity for this continual tinkering if an element of finality were introduced into the contemplated Reform. In this connection the *Spectator* would prefer the scheme of Mr. Forster who practically is at one with Mr. Morley in advocating "one man, one vote." This would involve the splitting large constituencies into sections, each returning one member. "Why," asks our contemporary, "should an elector in one constituency have twice the voting power of an elector in another constituency" because the former resides in a town large enough to have two members and the latter in one for which one is thought sufficient?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN has also provoked the enmity of Mr. W. T. Marriott, M.P. for Brighton, a gentleman professing to be a Liberal, and who recently delivered a furious attack upon the Government on their Egyptian policy. Mr. Marriott is a member of the local bar in the pleasant but somewhat shoddy watering-place he represents, and is said to be the proprietor of a pink social paper published there. He has caused his friends considerable anxiety by his extraordinary conduct since entering the House, and one of his latest eccentricities is the publication of a pamphlet indicting Radicals in general and Mr. Chamberlain in particular with conspiring to send the country to the dogs. But though Mr. Marriott falls into the error of blaming Mr. Chamberlain for becoming more moderate with age and office—greater than he have been guilty of that—he scores a point in the following:

Mr. Chamberlain endeavours to turn the mind of the public away from the miseries of the poor to the iniquities of landlords. "The expense of making towns habitable for the toilers who dwell in them must be thrown on the land which their toil makes valuable." This proposition sounds very simple, but why is not the wealth which their toil creates to share the expense? Charity begins at home, and Mr. Chamberlain's connection with Birmingham is sufficient to induce him to consider the condition of his poorer neighbours there. An eminent American, Judge Kelley, the father of the House of Representatives at Washington, has recently been travelling in England and taking notes of the condition of its people. Speaking of the midland capital he says: "At Birmingham and its environs there are three principal industries in which women are largely employed, that is to say, chain-making, brick-making, and the galvanizing of iron. The last trade is one which ruins the health of workwomen more than any trade I know of, and yet it is the one which they for the most part prefer, because they can gain one shilling a week more than they can at brick-making, the wages of the galvanized-iron workers being seven shillings a week." Amidst these hard-worked and underpaid poor women, and probably by their very aid, Mr. Chamberlain made the enormous fortune which he now enjoys. No one wishes to say that he is to blame for the condition of these unfortunate women. Causes which neither men nor laws can affect are probably at the bottom of it. But he is quite as much responsible for it as is the landlord for the condition of the labourer or for that of the poor of London. Were Mr. Chamberlain himself an anchorite, or a monk living on plain fare and wearing mean apparel, and distributing his goods to the poor, nobody would condemn the jeremiads he preaches against wealth and the wealthy, however useless they might consider them. But for one who is clothed in purple and fine linen, and who fares sumptuously every day, to denounce purple, fine linen, and sumptuous fare strikes people as somewhat incongruous. Yet as he himself has a princely income, for which "he toils not, neither does he spin," as he lives in a stately mansion, which he has recently built at a cost that would supply a hundred artisan families with model dwellings; and as that mansion is furnished and appointed with a luxuriousness and sumptuousness infinitely greater and more costly than that of the houses of nine-tenths of the landlords of this country, he must not be surprised if the working classes, when they realize these facts, as they will do, look upon his declarations as nothing more than examples of glaring hypocrisy.

UNDISMAYED by the grave disaster met by Baker Pasha in Egypt, with which the tribes whom General Gordon has undertaken to pacify must be acquainted, English journals still hope that brave soldier will escape the perils surrounding his mission. No man of the day is the centre of so much interest, and everyone has confidence in his judgment, in his resource, and above all in his extraordinary power over other minds. These great qualities may enable him to overcome obstacles which would baffle any man of less genius.

THE expected visit of M. Clemenceau to England with the object of studying the constitution and working of trades' unions, and other social subjects, is creating considerable interest amongst the leaders of unionism in the metropolis, and it is probable, if the time at the disposal of M. Clemenceau will permit, the London trades will, in some public form—either by deputation, reception, or banquet—give expression to their sympathy with the efforts of the French deputy to ameliorate the social condition of their fellow-workmen across the Channel.

THE most enthusiastic admirers of the British Constitution will not deny that the machinery of government is complex, in many respects anomalous, and is very little understood outside the charmed circle. For instance, in spite of its political importance, the Cabinet is not recognized by any court of law in the Kingdom, and no record is kept of its decisions. It is informally summoned by a card calling "Her Majesty's servants to meet to-day." Its deliberations are also purely informal, no votes are taken, and the greatest secrecy is observed as to whatever transpires. No Masonic secret is more religiously kept than the result of a meeting of the Cabinet, it being a strict point of honour with its members not to reveal its proceedings. This is absolutely necessary, as it is imperative for it to present an appearance of solidarity to Parliament. It was originally a meeting of the most trusted members of the Privy Council who assembled in the King's "Cabinet" or private room. Since the time of the early Hanoverian kings, who did not attend because of their ignorance of the English language, it has not been customary for the reigning monarch to be present. *Vanity Fair* thus writes:—

A Cabinet Council may meet when, where and how it pleases, yet, as a matter of convenience, its meetings are commonly held in what is called the Council Chamber of the house in Downing Street used as a private residence by the First Lord of the Treasury. The Prime Minister and the Secretary for Foreign Affairs really rule the Cabinet; these two alone know everything; these two alone get all the important despatches, though each Minister is supreme in his own department. Tradition assigns the members their seats. The Premier sits at the centre of