

lieved, fully committed. If Lord Salisbury and his colleagues share the views of the defunct Cabinet in this regard, which views are evidently those of the great majority of the British people, it would scarcely be safe for the new Government to act less promptly and decidedly. In almost any other case of which we can conceive, involving the nation in danger of a great war, a very influential body of the people would be pretty certain to disapprove, and to voice their disapproval in no uncertain terms. But one of the peculiarities of the situation is that in this matter, the principle involved is of such a nature that those very persons who would ordinarily be most anxious to avoid warlike complications are in this case among the strongest supporters of stern measures, believing it a sacred duty not only to fulfil to the letter the pledges of the nation, but to give the protection of Britain's mighty hand to save an oppressed Christian people which has already suffered the most horrible barbarities, from further oppression at the hand of the "unspeakable" and pitiless Turk.

The Cromwell Monument.

It is generally conceded, we believe, that the Cromwell incident had considerable effect in bringing about the defeat of the Rosebery Administration so unexpectedly. Of course that defeat was but a question of time, but it seems pretty evident that the withdrawal, in deference to Irish feeling, of Government aid from the proposed statue to Cromwell, so far injured the *morale* of a part of the Government's following as to facilitate its defeat, on the first opportunity. Much contempt has been heaped upon the Irish representatives for what is deemed their narrow sectionalism in remembering and perpetuating the racial animosity against Cromwell. But is it so wonderful, after all, that he should be remembered by them as the relentless conqueror of Ireland, rather than as the deliverer of England and the founder of the Commonwealth? It sometimes seems as if there were an unconscious tendency in many minds to measure Irish feeling and aspiration by some other standard than that which would be applied to another people in their stead. Probably this is due, in large measure, to the peculiar characteristics and methods of the people themselves. But irrespective of these, it is surely not surprising, under the circumstances, that they should remember the man whom the nation was about to honour, rather by his relations to their own country and ancestors, than by the services which he rendered the nation, of which he made them, or rather a part of them, an unwilling appendage. No other race, such as the Poles or Hungarians, would be expected to vote very cheerfully for the appropriation of a sum from their own taxes to perpetuate the memory of their subjugator. The incident seems well adapted to cast doubt upon the propriety of national celebrations, of any kind, in honour of those whose deeds of heroism are fraught with memories of humiliation for a part of the nation. It is meet that the British nation should do honour to the memory of Oliver Cromwell, but it is most fitting that this should be done, as it is now being done, by the voluntary offerings of those who appreciate his character and achievements.

A Chicago Memorial.

A commemoration of a different kind was the dedication of a monument in Chicago, on Memorial Day, erected to the memory of the Confederate soldiers who died in the prison camp in that city, during the war. This is the first monument which has been raised in the North to the memory of Confederate soldiers. The event naturally evoked wide differences of opinion. Congressman Boutelle appealed to the Mayor of

Chicago to prevent the "desecration of the day solemnly devoted to the memories of the preservers of the Union." A few influential newspapers sympathized with that view and uttered strong protests against the "desecration," on the ground assigned by the *Iowa State Register*, that "*treason should be made odious.*" But the great majority of the representatives, both of the people and of the press, seem to have joined heartily in approving and promoting the celebration. The Chicago press, without exception, gave it sympathy and support. "The monument was dedicated," says *The Literary Digest*, "with much pomp and enthusiasm. General Wade Hampton, of South Carolina, was the chief orator, and the Illinois National Guard and the Chicago Hussars furnished the military escort. Northerners as well as Southerners took part in the ceremonies, and there was a general interchange of cordial greetings between the Southern and Northern representatives." The North could well afford to be magnanimous in such a matter. Moreover, as a matter of policy and patriotism the course they took was eminently wise and will do not a little to strengthen the sentiment of unity the statue is supposed to betoken. But, for obvious reasons, such a tribute to the memory of dead Northern soldiers in the South would be another matter. We shall hardly hear of that in our day.

The Labour Problem.

In a late number of the *International Journal of Ethics*, Mr. William R. Salter, the Lecturer of the Philadelphia Society for Ethical Culture, puts some familiar aspects of the Labour Problem in an interesting and suggestive, if not exactly new, light. The first thing to be done is, to his thinking, to get men to feel that there is a labour problem. By this he means, if we understand him, than an essential pre-requisite to any permanent settlement of the struggle of the representatives of labour for better terms is the general recognition of the fact that the question of the proper division of the products of industry between the capitalist and the labourers is essentially an ethical as well as an economic, if not an ethical rather than an economic question. It is not merely a matter to be adjusted by competition, or by what we call the laws of political economy, but one which can be permanently settled only on the basis of righteousness; in other words, by the eternal laws of right and wrong, interpreted by active and enlightened consciences. "We can only speak of a labour problem, in the real sense of the word, if the labourer not merely fails to get what he would like, but if he fails to get what, according to some standard of right, we think he is entitled to." "No one in his senses can imagine that there is any natural law which obliges a railroad president to take \$25,000 or \$50,000 a year as his salary." Granting this, and assuming that there may be, on the other hand, a moral law which, rightly interpreted, forbids him to take more than say \$8,000 or \$10,000 a year, it is evident that the recognition and hearty acceptance of such a law, leaving the difference to go to increase the wages of the labourer, would go a good way toward making a solution of the labour problem possible, on the basis of justice or righteousness. The same reasoning might be applied to the claims of capital. It can hardly be thought that there is any natural law which demands that capital invested in any given industry should return an interest of twelve or fifteen, or even of six or eight per cent. But should it ever come to pass that three or four per cent., or even less, should be considered its just share, the moral consideration would again have done more than many strikes or lock-outs toward settling the labour problem on the basis of justice. As things are at present, under the operation of what is called the economic