

barbaric and a civilized State is marked in nothing more than in this, that in the barbaric State every man is his own protector and his own avenger, while in the civilized State he goes unarmed, and the community undertakes the duty of protecting his rights and avenging his wrongs."

RECENT despatches from England and Europe fall far short of corroborating Mr. Chauncey M. Depew's somewhat bombastic statement that the people of all classes in the trans-Atlantic nations are in mortal terror of the McKinley Bill. That the operation of that middle-age measure will cause a good deal of inconvenience and loss for a time, while commerce is adjusting itself to the new conditions, is very probable. But it requires no great prescience to foresee that it will lead to a speedy development of British and European trade with Africa and Asia, the extent of which may prove practically unlimited. Selfishness and isolation are no more likely to prove good policy on the part of a nation than on that of an individual. That the new and unique course upon which the United States is about to enter will be bitterly regretted at a future day may be regarded as certain, because recoil as the effect of sudden and violent disturbance of established order is the law of nature, in commerce as in every other sphere. With the adoption of the McKinley Bill our neighbours must abandon any hope they may have cherished of being able to regain gradually their lost ocean commerce, to say nothing of competing in the race for the prizes Africa and other Eastern lands have to offer. There seems little reason to fear that the rapidly developing resources of her own colonies and of India, Africa and other Eastern lands will prove ample in the near future to meet all the demands which Great Britain may make upon them, and render her less and less dependent upon the United States. On the other hand, the dread with which, the *Standard* says, many English merchants and manufacturers have looked forward to the possible adoption by America of a trade policy which would enable her to compete on equal terms in the markets of the world, was, no doubt, well founded. We have only to imagine that instead of resorting to a policy of "protection run mad," the American Congress were just now about passing a measure looking in the direction of universal free trade, to be enabled to get some conception of the cause for British apprehension. There can be no doubt that the United States has a wealth of resources of various kinds, and her people an inventiveness and energy which would give her, other things being equal, an advantage over any European nation. With the vast merchant fleets she might have sailing every sea, freighted with the rich products of her boundless fields and her skilful industry, or bearing back the treasures of foreign lands to her shores, what was to prevent her from becoming, in a single decade, England's most formidable rival on the high seas and in foreign markets? We are not sure that we should be going too far in saying that the danger England's manufacturers thus escape may fully counterbalance any loss they may temporarily suffer from the operation of the McKinley Bill.

IN a recent number of the *London Times* it is said that "a new form of electrical generator and motor has been invented by Mr. J. Vaughan-Sherrin, by means of which the propulsion of boats, tricycles and Bath chairs is effected without accumulators." If this be so, and it becomes thereby possible to get rid of the weight of accumulators, a new revolution, so far at least as light vehicles are concerned, is at our doors, and we may expect to see spider-wheeled carriages of various kinds flying over the roads with the speed of bicycles, but without the demand for skill and muscular effort on the part of the riders which those imply. There is, we are told, an entire absence of danger to those working the new machine, and no chance of even a shock being received. Characteristically enough, an Act of Parliament is said to stand in the way of the use of these new vehicles on English roads, and legislation must be had before they can be employed. If, however, the invention proves successful it will be of too great value to admit of its being long hampered by any artificial obstacles.

FROM the accounts given in papers now to hand of the use of smokeless powder at recent manoeuvres of French and Austrian troops, it is evident that the term "smokeless" as applied to these new explosives is not, as we have half-suspected, a hyperbole or a misnomer. The *London Times'* correspondent, telegraphing from Vienna, says that in a certain sham fight in Hungary there were 77 battalions of infantry, 36 squadrons of cavalry, and 128 pieces of artillery engaged, and that, although heavy firing

was going on for more than four hours, not the slightest trace of smoke was visible. "Commanding officers were no longer able to judge the position, movements and strength of opposing forces by the density of the smoke, and it took considerable time to fix the position of firing batteries, while infantry well under cover could hardly be discovered. There was the usual roaring of cannon and musketry, although somewhat subdued, but the landscape as far as the eye could reach remained serene and motionless." The *Spectator* suggests that amongst other results of this momentous change, it is possible that the effects on men's nerve may be very great. "Death that comes from no one can tell where, and is accompanied only by a dull, indeterminate roar, might become terrifying beyond human endurance." We do not see, however, why the nerves may not as easily be schooled to withstand that, as the certainly not lesser terrors of the roar of cannon, the crash of musketry, and the death-dealing messengers coming unseen out of dense clouds of smoke. There is one consolation in connection with all these improvements in the means of destruction. It is pretty evident that each great nation's hesitation to engage in war with its neighbours may be due, in no small measure, to the fear that that neighbour may have some more potent implement of war than its own. Such an implement, as has been more than once demonstrated, may decide the issue of a great campaign.

BIGOTRY.

THE *Canada Educational Monthly* is presumed to be written for the benefit chiefly of those who are interested in educational work; in other words, of an exceptionally intelligent class of readers. If its readers are as intelligent as might fairly be expected, a majority of them will certainly repudiate the intolerant remarks that appear in the September number on the subject of the new High School Reader. The statement is editorially made that, in the volume in question, "there are no less than eight authors represented who are distinctly atheistic, or agnostic, or materialistic, or whatever else they may choose to be called"; and a desire is expressed to see "a new table of contents made out in which the names of these writers shall not be seen." I have looked over the list of authors represented to see who the eight are to whom the editor of the *Educational Monthly* refers, and I find some difficulty in making out the number with certainty. The following seven are probably included:—Arnold (Matthew), Darwin, George Eliot, Hume, Huxley, Shelley and Swinburne; but who is the eighth? Is it Carlyle, or Clough, or Emerson, or Froude, or Dante Rossetti? It may be any one of them, or any one of half a dozen others whose names appear. Now, had passages been chosen from the above writers that expressed agnostic opinions, it might not unfairly have been objected that questions unsuited to the age of High School pupils were being unnecessarily brought forward. But when we find George Eliot represented by a most innocent description from the "Mill on the Floss" of a summer morning spent by Tom and Maggie in fishing; Matthew Arnold by his fine poem "Rugby Chapel"; Darwin by a page or two from his universally admired book on the "Formation of Vegetable Mould"; Hume by an account of the first Crusade; Huxley by his splendid delineation of "A Liberal Education"; and Shelley by his "Cloud," the simple intolerance of the objection raised to the appearance of these names becomes obvious. As regards Swinburne's "Forsaken Garden," I am disposed to agree with the editor of the *Monthly* that it is not a good selection; there is nothing in it of a specially agnostic character, but it is dreary and unsuited to youth—quite as dreary as a good deal of the Book of Ecclesiastes. The extraordinary thing is, however, that a professed advocate of education should wish to keep the intelligent pupils of our High Schools in ignorance of the broad fact that there are such writers in the world as Huxley, Darwin, Matthew Arnold and George Eliot—should advocate the policy of excluding the very names of such writers from a selection of readings that claims to be representative of modern literature and modern thought. Are such writers excluded from our public libraries? Do the most orthodox of booksellers exclude the novels of George Eliot or the works of Darwin from their shelves and counters? It would really be interesting to know in whose behalf the *Educational Monthly* speaks when it recommends so obscurantist a policy. We know there are feeble-minded men and women in the community who dread the very name of modern thought, and look upon science itself as almost a spirit of evil. Here and there we discover a degree of mental darkness that would find a fitter environment in Equatorial Africa than in the progressive cities of the Western Continent; but an educational journal is not supposed to appeal to, or take its inspiration from, the most backward portion of the community. Where, then, are the intelligent men and women, persons themselves educated, thoughtful and competent, and known to be such, who will come out over their names and support the *Educational Monthly* in objecting to the insertion in a High School Reader of any selections whatever—even the most instructive and the least controversial in tone—from such writers as are named above? If there are such persons,

let them speak so that we may know what kind of a community we are living in.

It is a favourite idea, as I have had many occasions to notice, of the ultra-orthodox that dissentients from orthodoxy have no rights which they (the ultra-orthodox) are bound to respect. It may be presumed that people who themselves buy the works of Darwin, Huxley, Arnold, Spencer (somehow or other Spencer's name does not appear in the Reader, though he has written many a page suitable for selection) and other literary and scientific leaders of our time, would not prevent their children from reading such portions of the works of these writers as might be suited to their comprehension. Are such people so few in number that their very existence as an element in the community may not only safely but justly be ignored? Ask the booksellers whether in the class that chiefly sends pupils to the High Schools and Collegiate Institutes, the purchasers of the works of modern "liberal" thinkers are a really negligible element. If they are, how is it that such books are *always* kept in stock in the bookstores? No one can read the great English reviews without being brought into the most intimate contact with the most advanced thought of the time. These reviews are in every reading-room and on every bookseller's counter. Have the people who read them no rights? Have their children no rights? "No rights that I am bound to respect" virtually replies the editor of the *Educational Monthly*, "for if I had my way I should not let any writer of the Matthew Arnold or George Eliot or Charles Darwin type so much as show his or her face in a School Reader. I, and those who think with me, are in the majority, and I should have no hesitation in excluding all names that did not belong to our household of faith."

Well, yes, the editor of the *Monthly* and his friends are the majority; how is it, then, that they do not have their way as completely as they could wish? Mainly because what they wish is both unjust and absurd. The moral and intellectual forces, which they would gladly over-ride if they could by the brute force of numbers, are too strong for them. The reason on which the unthinking multitude would trample, if they could, makes itself heard in the councils of ministers, and wherever two or three intelligent men are gathered together. The heathen of reaction may rage and imagine any number of vain things, but their power for mischief will never equal their disposition. They lay about them with a stupid arm of flesh; but the spirit has been beforehand with its pervasive work, and what the spirit has done the flesh cannot undo. So, although there is no agnosticism—that I can discern—in the new High School Reader, there is a fair sprinkling of the names of those who have cast off the "winter weeds outworn" of ancient dogma, and whose free and untrammelled ways of looking at things furnish both guidance and inspiration to intelligent youth. For this let us be thankful, and let the children of light take courage.

W. D. LESUEUR.

Ottawa, Sept. 19, '90.

PARIS LETTER.

BEYOND doubt, Paris may fairly claim to have possessed the first "casual ward" on record. This was in the thirteenth century. An hospice-hospital was established by royal charter in the Rue St. Denis, not far from the present tower—an affectionate ruin of Jacques sans Peur. The establishment had for its primary object, to shelter during three days and three nights all women, widows, and girls who arrived in Paris to seek a situation to pursue some business, or to prosecute some law-suit. The females generally came to the city on foot, having exhausted all their resources to meet the expenses of their journey.

The sheltered, while inmates of the institution, were prohibited from begging. They were known as "Catherinines," because the establishment was placed under St. Catherine, the patroness of girls. The hospice-hospital was conducted by nuns; they enjoyed certain privileges, thus they had a separate quarter in the Cemetery of The Innocents for interment. But they were bound in return to take charge of all the corpses picked up on the streets of Paris, or found in the river Seine, and see that they had Christian burial in the common grave. They declined to receive the bodies of suicides, and were not bound to do so. They were allowed ten sous for each corpse buried by them. As perquisites, they had the right to all the clothing and property belonging to a deceased. This could not have been much, as the city guards searched and stripped each "find" before bringing it to St. Catherine's, and depositing it wrapped in an old mantle, or rolled up in rushes. A free-thinking captain, on one occasion, lost his situation for bringing to the hospice a suicide, with the rope by which the unfortunate hanged himself round the neck, and ordering the nuns to inter the remains.

The "shelter" was exclusively for females. However, a prisoner who had escaped from his guards, was brought to the convent and placed in a bed in the infirmary, among the sick women. The guards forced their way in and carried off their prisoner; a clerk, charged with theft. The nuns protested: the judges ordered the two guards to pay an indemnity of forty francs, then a heavy penalty, and to bring back the prisoner. The latter had died *en route*, so the nuns had to bury him. The matter came again before the judges, who decided that the guards were to have an effigy made in wax of the prisoner, to present that to the nuns, to express in presence of the inmates, an apology for their misconduct, and to announce that they had been dismissed from the service.