

sional leaders, their 'Dukes'.' We do not see how to parody this proposal.

Finally, there are the rich to be dealt with. How can we make it impossible, or at least a very serious matter, for any man to be rich? We must demand "a much higher degree of efficiency" in the property holder than in the common citizen: the heir to a great property "should possess a satisfactory knowledge of social and economic science, and should have studied with a view to his great responsibilities:" he must not be allowed to come of age till long after twenty-one, "and to specify a superannuation age would be a wise and justifiable measure": he must be subject to a code by which "deposition" would follow his conviction for habitual drunkenness, assaults of various kinds and other offences: for bribery, forming corners in the necessities of life, or being found in a condition of malignancy or ruthlessness, the penalty will be confiscation.

Under a system of this kind, says Mr. Wells in conclusion, the British Babe, the developing citizen, "will have a fair chance to grow up neither a smart and hustling cheat—for the American at his worst is no more and no less than that—nor a sluggish disingenuous snob—as the Briton too often becomes." Filled as we are with the same anxieties and hopes as the preacher, we come away empty and disappointed: we have merely known one more leader of revolt.

What came we out to hear? We do not know, but we have a humble preference for fresh ideas, new methods, for something a little more recent than the French Revolution. We look round among those who have (no doubt) formed the congregation, and we see many who have thought over these questions longer and more deeply than their latest instructor appears to have done: his ingenuous confidence reminds us uncomfortably of the young man at the musical party who had never played the violin, but did not mind trying. Mr. Wells has never heard that you cannot make men moral by Act of Parliament: still less does he realise that you cannot "make