

man is in fact the key of their whole position; they would reduce to a minimum the differences between man and woman as thinking and working beings. They hold, further, that the tendency of education, civilization, and progress generally, is to cause woman to become more like man than she was in bygone times—more fitted to assume many tasks formerly allotted to men only.

Now it may be worth while to examine how this theory of woman's becoming more like to man in our days harmonizes with Spencer's theory. In the progress of civilization, does woman really tend that way? Or, on the other hand, is exactly the reverse the case, and does she tend to become more unlike instead? At the first blush it seems as if the two theories must be irreconcilably opposed to each other. One affirms increasing diversification to be of the very essence of progress; the other affirms that in at least one most important instance, progress tends towards increasing similarity. The "woman's rights" theory is on the face of it in flat contradiction to the modern doctrine and practice of the division of labour, which latter, again, agrees with and is included in the Spencerian theory. Let us now make one comparison of a certain sort, which may perhaps indicate to us in which of these two directions the progress of the human race really tends.

Examine the physiognomies of savage or half-civilized peoples. One of the first things to strike us is the similarity between male and female faces—the lack of distinctively feminine character in the latter. In Catlin's portraits of North American Indians, the women's faces look so much like the men's that we have to refer to the printed description to distinguish one from the other. Photographs and sketches of savages from all quarters of the globe, copied in the illustrated papers, tell the same story. The story is that of a certain condition of existence—a degraded condition of existence, be it remarked—in which woman loses her distinctive facial expression, and takes on something of the masculine expression instead. Now, compare this with the striking difference between male and female faces which we see among the highly-civilized races, and which is so pronounced a characteristic in portraits of the most cultivated classes—of those who are people of mark at the world's centres of art and literature, of politics and society. If the portrait of "George Eliot" be cited in opposition, the case can easily be disposed of as an apparent exception only, which really helps to prove the rule. Go back to the Greek statues, which ought to be a crucial test, and we find the face of Venus a long remove in its expression from that of either Jove or Apollo; while even Minerva is not made to look like Mars, though both are cut out for war. But, given the faces only of a Hottentot Venus and a Hottentot Apollo, who but an anatomist could tell one from the other?

Now, what is here pointed out is no accidental circumstance of only trifling import, no mere coincidence without meaning. If a fact it really be, then, most assuredly, there lies behind it a mass of cognate facts, all of profound and permanent significance, with regard to the bearing which civilization and progress have upon the aptitudes, the occupations and the general destiny of woman in future ages. When these facts have been coordinated, and the riddle of their meaning solved, they will point to something very different from what the woman's advocates are looking forward to. Already we may divine beforehand that, instead of tending to assimilate the work of the woman to that of the man, the world's progress will on the contrary bring us to still further division of labour between the two, and will mark still more deeply the distinctive characteristics of each.

JOHN MACLEAN.

OTTAWA NOTES.

SIR LEONARD TILLEY made his Budget Speech to-day, just six weeks and one day after the opening of the House. It was a disappointment to both sides. Sir Leonard had to talk about depression, falling revenue, decreasing surpluses, maturing debts, and other subjects of a like unpleasant nature. He is not accustomed to the task, and as he went on with his speech he evidently did not relish it. Personally he is ten years an older man than he was this time last year. His explanations were feeble; his attack on the Opposition for want of patriotism was but a crack-voiced echo of Sir Charles Tupper's ringing denunciation of a few weeks before, and his muddled sentences were more hopelessly incomprehensible than ever. Even his own followers seemed to yield to the depressing influences of the occasion, for the Government benches were almost empty while the speech was in progress. On the other hand, it had been expected that Sir Richard Cartwright would riddle the Finance Minister and the Government with hot shot. But Sir Richard was not "up to his old form." His strong points looked a good deal like exaggerations, and his weak ones were palpably so. He made a good speech, but not so good as the men on

his side had looked for. This is one of the grand opportunities of the session, of the Liberals. The N. P. has been glorified for years and they have had to bide their time. Now the time has come. The most effective argument in favour of the policy—its success—is gone. If the Liberals are an active, aggressive party, as they pretend to be, now is the time for them to show their strength.

So, Hon. David Mills and Mr. John J. Hawkins have changed places at last. The Supreme Court has declared that Mr. Mills is the member for Bothwell, and as such he is now sitting and voting. Whatever may be the private views entertained as to the merits of the question at issue in the late suit, we are bound to accept the judgment of the court of highest jurisdiction as just. That being so, all may be glad of the result. Mr. Hawkins is not so able a man as Mr. Mills by a very great deal; Mr. Hawkins was not necessary to make the Government strong, but Mr. Mills was badly needed by the Opposition. A strong Opposition is just as necessary as a strong Government, and this tends to equalize the parties. The arrival of Mr. Mills at this juncture, it was feared, would lengthen the session very materially. But writing editorials seems to have taught Mr. Mills to condense what he has to say; for speaking on a point of constitutional law—and that is his pet subject—on the first day since his return, he occupied only about ten minutes. If it becomes generally known that this is the effect of journalistic training, newspaper men should rank high as candidates for Parliamentary honours.

The subject of Mr. Mills' first speech was the right of Sir Charles Tupper to occupy a seat in the House. The question was broached by Mr. Blake, who contends that having accepted the office of High Commissioner to England, an office to which a salary is attached, Sir Charles has violated the independence of Parliament. The fact that Sir Charles has not voted this session seems to indicate that even he admits he has no right to be in Parliament. The idea that a man may be legally a member of Parliament to sit, but not to vote, seems on the face of it rather absurd. The difficulty is said by Government supporters to be only a technical one affecting only the vote, and a bill was introduced to indemnify the Minister of Railways for any penalty he may have incurred. The question has been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. That, like all the other Committees, has a majority of ministerial supporters, and though the Opposition all vote against Sir Charles—and they undoubtedly will—he will be confirmed in his seat. Of course a certain form of investigation will have to be gone through first.

The first state ball given by Lord and Lady Lansdowne came off, as all the world knows, on Monday, 25th inst. Since then, there have been heartburnings. Somebody on the new Governor's suite undertook to limit the invitations. He did it by leaving out many M.P.'s and their wives and daughters, as well as other female relatives enumerated by Mr. Gilbert. He left out also many other people of almost equal importance with the people's representatives, to say nothing of dozens of excellent, but less prominent people who have hitherto swelled the crowd at the state ball. But worse than that, this gentleman of the suite made up a list divided into three heads, "special," "military," "general." Ye Gods! Imagine the feelings of a man of importance, imagine the feeling of the better half of that man of importance, when they find their names in the "general" list. But worse than all this, at the ball a shorthand writer and an A. D. C. were stationed at the door to register the names of those entering the hall. Whether the idea was to keep out dynamiters, or whether such a check was thought necessary to make the ball select, is not announced.

For the last two days the snow blockade has kept trains from entering the city. The interference with traffic and with public business will naturally be very great.

Next week, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday will be occupied with the debate on the Budget. The other two days will be devoted to the consideration of various items of business to be brought forward by private members.

ED. RUTHVEN.

Ottawa, March 1st., 1884.

MR. JOSEPH HATTON is already "well on" with his book on the Irving tour. Mr. Hatton "interviews" Mr. Irving everywhere *en route*, and accompanies him in all his travels. It is understood that the book will be entirely in dialogue, and that its chapters will be verbatim reports of the conversational utterances of actor and author. Mr. Hatton will endeavour to draw Mr. Irving out, and Mr. Irving will freely criticise America and Americans in replying to Mr. Hatton. The work will be eagerly read when it does appear, but the author of "Clytie" is not likely to have the field all to himself. There are other "chiefs" in Mr. Irving's company who are "takin' notes," and other bookmakers are reported to be hard at work.