

declined to take their cue from the Congressional actors in the matter of international discourtesy. As the press and the people, so, eventually, will the politicians be.

SHOULD Senator Sherman's proposal be adopted and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations be charged with an exhaustive enquiry into the relations between Great Britain and the United States, it is to be hoped that they will not forget to ascertain in what manner the pledges made on behalf of their Republic in the Washington Treaty, in reference to the New York State canals, have been redeemed by the successive Washington administrations. The Committee should particularly inquire whether it is a fact, as is now stated, on the alleged authority of the Deputy State Engineer, that the canals of New York State have always been closed against Canadian vessels, and that the State authorities have not even been asked by the National Government to throw them open. If such is ascertained to be the fact, the Committee will, of course, satisfy itself whether the stipulations of the Treaty of Washington have, in this particular, been observed by the United States, and report accordingly to the Senate and the people.

THE attitude of the Independents, or "Mugwumps," of New York State towards Governor Hill, who has been nominated by the Democrats for another term, is just now causing a good deal of discussion in the Empire State. A large body of these Independents, who are significantly called by the New York *Star* "the Protestants of politics," occupy the seemingly anomalous position of warm supporters of Mr. Cleveland for the Presidency, and equally warm opponents of Mr. Hill for the Governorship. There is, it is true, no necessary connection between the two offices, and no good reason why the local politics should blindly follow the lead of the national, yet the spectacle of a large body of the most influential citizens, represented by several powerful journals, the *Times* included, working at the same time for the National Democratic and the State Republican candidate, is a new and, to the manipulators of the machine, somewhat startling departure. The Independents are, however, true to their record, and their action will be approved by the best sentiments of the country. The entrance of this new and influential factor into American politics four years ago marked an era in the national history. Its revolt against the tyranny of the machine turned the scale in favour of Cleveland and the Civil Service reform of which he was for a time the loyal representative. His election, however the later years of his administration may have failed to fulfil the promise of the earlier, signalized the ascendancy of the moral over the conscienceless element in political affairs. It was the rising star of hope to the lovers of electoral and administrative purity. The reappearance of this force at the present juncture in New York State happily disappoints the predictions of those who confidently hoped that the moral reaction had spent its force, and that the recalcitrant voters would be re-absorbed in the party ranks. The action of the New York "Mugwumps" seems fully justified in their high principle, that of putting morality before expediency, and personal character above party fealty. Governor Hill is, in the expressive slang of the stump, a "low down" politician. He represents, to use the words of the *Christian Union*, "all the worst elements in the State—jobbery and corruption in public affairs, machine methods in party administration, the gambling fraternity and the saloon." That the revolt of the Democrats who love morality better than party will avail to defeat him, the *Christian Union* does not believe, on the ground that "when all the evil elements in a community are combined to defend their interests, and the moral elements in a community are divided and uncertain," the victory of the former is assured. Nevertheless the action of the Independents will have its effect as a brave and influential protest, and will bear fruit hereafter.

ALL Germany seems to be profoundly stirred by the fragments of the late Emperor's diary, which have just been published. The liberal and generous sentiments of Emperor Frederick, as thus revealed, can scarcely create surprise. They are in strict harmony with the noble features of his character as brought out in the history of his too brief reign. The publication of the extracts at this particular juncture will hardly increase the scant admiration of the people for his son and successor. The contrast between his spirit and ideals, as thus far exhibited, and those of his father, must be positively painful to the better sentiments of the nation. The alleged indiscreetness of certain of the revelations is a matter of opinion. It is certainly a surprise, to find that the deceased Emperor rather than Prince Bismarck was the real father of the German Empire, and the sagacious promoter of German unity. The discovery that France narrowly escaped disruption cannot greatly increase the wholesome dread entertained

by the French people of the results of another German conquest, while Bismarck is at the helm. Every thoughtful Frenchman must know that in any case another contest with Germany will be emphatically a struggle for national existence. The publication of these extracts will probably intensify to a painful degree the dislike and distrust of the Empress already entertained by those high in office in the Prussian capital.

### THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE: SOCIALISM.

THE subject of Socialism has been dealt with in a very thorough manner by the bishops at Lambeth. The paragraph in the Encyclical and the resolutions of the Conference simply refer to the Report of the Committee, a very strong one, presided over by the able Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Moorhouse. To this report therefore we must go, if we would know what the Right Reverend Fathers would have us to believe and do in regard to Socialism. We are convinced that reasonable persons will not be disappointed in this document.

The bishops seem to be quite sensible of the gravity of the subject and of its urgent importance at the present moment. We are accustomed to speak of the progress of civilization in such an optimistic spirit that only those who look beneath the surface are aware of the shady side of modern life. No one can deny the enormous strides which have been made, especially during the present century, in the improvement of all the surroundings of our social life. But it is still a question whether the poorest classes are better off than they were a century ago. An English clergyman of some note has just contributed an article to one of the magazines, in which he professes to prove that the condition of the poor is much worse than it used to be, and this to such an extent, that England is no longer "merry England."

Without attempting to compare or contrast the present with the past—an undertaking which is always difficult, often hopeless—there can be no question of the gravity of the present state of things. While wealth is increasing in the hands of the few, fortunes of unheard of magnitude being amassed on both sides of the Atlantic, millions are living—if it can be called living—around the dwellings and the warehouses of the millionaires, on the very borders of starvation.

And let it be carefully noted that these contrasts are found not merely in old countries where privilege is rampant, but no less in that great Republic where all men are supposed to be free and equal, and where privileges are supposed to be unknown. Democratic institutions have not put an end to poverty or want, they have not gone any considerable way towards the prevention of the miseries which were supposed to be fostered by the aristocratic institutions of Europe; and it cannot be a matter of surprise that many should begin to ask whether something else should not be done to ameliorate the condition of the poor, and to do away, in part at least, with the frightful inequality which exists between class and class.

The time has gone by when this problem could be safely ignored by the teaching and governing classes. If the rulers in Church and State will not take the matter in hand it will soon be taken out of their hands, and that in a manner which will be as unpleasant as to many it will be unexpected. It is a terrible thing to conceive of the masses of poverty and vice which are crowded together in cities like London, or Paris, or New York; for, indeed, the great city of the new world is, in this respect, hardly behind those of the old. It is frightful to imagine the consequences of a popular rising in any of these great centres. We know something of these outbreaks in the past, in Paris; let us figure to ourselves a similar rising in the London of the present!

But it is not a mere outbreak that is chiefly to be feared. Quite as serious, and much more permanently mischievous results may be brought about by quite regular and constitutional legislation. Let us remember that the voting power is now, to all intents, in the hand of the working classes. The labouring men, as distinguished from the capitalists, have now the making of the laws; and we have no reason to doubt that they will make such laws as, they believe, will be for their own advantage. And in doing so they will act in precisely the same manner as their "betters."

Now, the most thorough believer in the wisdom and goodness of the working classes will hardly pretend that they are infallible, or that they are not in some considerable danger of being misled by demagogues and the somewhat large and growing class of men who live by agitation. Even if they were better educated than they are, they could hardly help listening to "the voice of the charmer, charm he never so" unwisely, when he tells them of diminished labour and increased gains, of the benefits resulting to their class from schemes for the destruction of large private possessions and fortunes. And this belief may easily be engendered in one class even when it is quite distinctly visible to every other class that the revolutionists are