

equal importance to the last, has not to such a degree the never ending cry of cost to be said against it. Reference is made to the almost universal practice of building one house against another without any attention being given to manipulate the heights of the principal horizontal lines, which in ordinary house frontages are the intermediate cornices placed to mark the levels of each floor, then the main cornice, being that feature above which the roof commences, then the sky-line of the roof itself. The heights of the window and door openings might also be included, but to the general observer the variation of those necessities is not so offensive as the first mentioned items. It matters little how pleasing the design of each separate façade may be, as in many cases they are all to be desired, this want of unity mars the whole.

If, in the majority of cases, there was really cause for the display of this craving to be different from one's neighbour, the observer could have no plea, but when there appears no palpable reason, the conclusion to be arrived at is, that this disjointed mode of building is the outcome of individual conceit.

In England, a method is adopted specially devised to guard against the over-fondness for variety. When a new street is laid out upon which a continuous row of houses is to be erected, there is a general elevation supplied by the proprietor of the land, plain or ornate as suited to the locality. The only restrictions which are placed on intending builders or purchasers of the ground, are that the materials to be used externally, and the heights of the principal features shown on the original design are to be adhered to, latitude being given to alter matters of architectural detail. Thus a more satisfactory result combining variety without incongruity is obtained, than if on the same street every one had been allowed to follow his own peculiar fancy.

Perhaps such a method would not find much favour in Montreal, owing no doubt to local custom. At the same time when the principles involved are taken into consideration, affecting as they do the appearance of our streets, it should surely be the endeavour, if not the duty, to apply what in those matters, is the only remedy, and that is, good taste. *Langrout.*

FLOGGING.

Last week an article appeared in the CANADIAN SPECTATOR entitled "Prison Discipline, Curative or Destructive," in which the writer, influenced doubtless by charitable motives, raised a warning cry against the flogging system of punishment. That he should feel called upon to characterise flogging as brutal will be regretted by many, as the brutality can only be deemed such when we allow that flogging is entirely unnecessary. If necessary, it can hardly be thought brutal except that it is used as a preventive of brutal crimes. In some cases, through the fault of incompetent guards, prison doctors, etc. the flogging may become thoroughly brutal—this is to be considered beside the question, as in many cases besides flogging, mistakes are made, and it appears to me that if a man commits a brutal crime, a brutal flogging will be about the best thing for him and will be most likely to correct him. The writer of the previous article in the SPECTATOR makes the statement that "true philanthropists who advocate their reintroduction into England find the crop of victims increase in exact ratio to the number of punishments." This I take to be a grievous misstatement and one which requires proof; within two weeks I have read an item in a reliable newspaper giving a judge's opinion that for certain crimes flogging was absolutely necessary, and it is a commonly received opinion that the crime of garrotting was stopped by flogging.

I am not prepared, nor have I the wish, to enter into a psychological or metaphysical discussion of the question; but when he states that there is such a thing as "this hunger of society for personal violence as a punishment for crime," I deny *in toto* his right to assume that there is a "hunger" for "personal violence" (whatever that may mean), and would reply that experience, in my opinion, has shown us that the "cat-o'-nine-tails" is in many cases the only radical cure for certain crimes. It is rather a peculiar question to study out, whether the flogging raises in the mind of the criminal a desire of revenge, and if so, against what? Society in general. Well, let him know that his crime of revenge will be punished as well as the first crime. And the mere fact that the flogging aggravates the criminal, shows that he feels disgraced, and if so, why should he not thus feel? I hold that society is not moved by a feeling of revenge, but by one of self-protection; and, further, I hold that a man when he commits a crime should be punished in accordance with the baseness of the crime, and not that the theoretical questions of "philanthropy" should be considered, nor should men jump to the conclusion that, because severe punishments are inflicted, they are inflicted in a revengeful spirit.

You correspondent "F" says: "Can such a course of discipline be carried out by men brutalized by familiarity with the use of the lash. Does it need our best men or our worst?" This is not argument nor can I see its bearing unless "F" means to infer that the frequent use of the "cat" will familiarize keepers or guards to its use and why should this not be the case? If the principle is correct, that flogging is a corrective, the more honestly it is administered, the better, and I for one am glad to hear of the flogging of "brutes" who have assaulted defenceless women. *Sappho.*

THE IRISH EVIL.

In closing his series of letters on the condition of Ireland M. de Molinari, of the *Journal des Débats*, says:—"Ireland undoubtedly suffers. She labours under one of the worst forms of poverty—agrarian pauperism. Of the 580,000 occupiers who till her soil there are about 230,000, representing 1,000,000 individuals—a fifth of her population—who have scarcely the means of living in good years, and whose miserable balance sheet is made up with a deficit. When a bad year comes upon them this million of poor people find themselves on the verge of starvation. The poor rate and the public works loans are insufficient to support them. As Mr. Davitt, the apostle of the Land League, said at the meeting at Chicago, Ireland is then obliged to hold out her wooden bowl to the givers of charity all over the world. But the social malady of which I speak is not peculiar to Ireland, though it is there exceptionally violent, and it has, at least of late years, been aggravated by the doctors. I allude to the social doctors—a race of men who were unhappily unknown to Molière, and whose special vocation it is, as every one knows, to cure all the ills of society. If they do not wear the long robe and the sugarloaf hat of the doctors of Molière, they resemble them at least in the essential particular of believing religiously in the infallibility of their systems and the virtue of their elixirs. Poor Ireland, with her open wounds, which she is falsely accused of parading in order to excite pity, but which the inveterate use of whiskey poultices may have contributed to inflame, has attracted doctors just in the same way as the sheep's heads in the shops of Dublin butchers in the neighbourhood of the Cathedral of St. Patrick attract flies. From all quarters have gathered together doctors, political, socialistic, philanthropic, revolutionary and parliamentary, wildly disputing and seeking to try upon the country the virtue of their several panaceas. I look in vain for a real remedy for her disease in their heterogenous prescriptions. The cause of the economic evil from which Ireland is suffering—and this evil is the root of all the others—is the existence of from 200,000 to 300,000 tenants, representing 1,000,000 individuals who work with old-fashioned tools, and whom the slightest failure in the crops reduces to the verge of famine.

A glance at the statistics of Ireland will show that Nature herself is endeavouring to effect a cure, and that if she is but left alone small holdings will before another quarter of a century has elapsed have disappeared from Ireland. In 1841 there existed 310,436 farms of from one to five acres, and 252,799 farms from five to fifteen acres apiece. In 1878 those numbers had been reduced to 66,359 and 163,062. On the other hand the number of farms of fifteen or thirty acres had increased during the same interval from 79,342 to 137,493, and above thirty acres from 48,625 to 161,264. Since the Land Act established a special system of protection for small holdings the rate of progress in this direction has naturally tended to fall off. Progress, however, continues nevertheless, and Ireland in due time will be cured of her sore of pauperized holdings, in spite of the doctors. But what will become of the small tenants? Some will emigrate to America, others will become mere agricultural labourers. All that is required, therefore, to bring about an evolution which the force of circumstances necessitates is that Nature should be allowed to take her course. The only way, perhaps, in which she may be usefully assisted would be to lighten the labour market in England and America, and to advance to those whom the gradual suppressing of small holdings left for the time being without work and penniless, money to enable them to move to a distance or to emigrate. The Canadian Government has shown itself disposed to favour this system under proper guarantees for the recovery of the sums of money advanced. Let the Land League transform itself into a simple employment and emigration agency for the benefit of the small tenants who are evicted by the march of events, like the handloom weavers, and the change, which is indispensable, will be effected with a minimum of suffering. Need it be said, however, that this modest *role* of assisting Nature, and as often as not letting her take her own course, does not suit the political doctors, socialists and others whom the Irish people have chosen to consult, attracted by their fine promises and their loud pretensions? Ireland—and this is the final conclusion at which I have arrived—suffers not only from her maladies, but also from her doctors."

ARE AMERICANS A RACE?

Anglo-Saxon is the collective name usually applied by historians to the different Teutonic tribes which settled in England during the fifth century and established the Heptarchy. These were mainly Angles, Saxons, and Jutes; the commonly received opinion being that the invaders made their first appearance in 449, under the leadership of Hengest and Horsa, recently resolved into mythical personages. There is good reason to believe that German settlements were made in Britain long before, and that, of the three tribes mentioned, the Jutes were the earliest intruders. The Saxons were, in all probability, a part of the nation or confederation of peoples whose territories lay along the Baltic, in what are now the Duchy of Holstein, the north of Hanover, and the west of Mecklenburg. The third tribe, the Angles, whose name and nationality overcame the others, did not arrive till some time after. They were, like the