

The extreme of folly in relation to the use of the razor was, however, exemplified, not in the clean shave with which we are familiar, but with the preposterous system of shaving the head. It is difficult to realize that for a very long period it was the universal custom in Europe for all persons, men and women alike, to shave their heads and adopt wigs in place of their own hair. How general this was may be gathered from allusions in contemporary authors, wherein we find it stated, as a special point in the description of a person now and then, that "he wore his own hair." The wig had its obvious origin in an attempt to conceal the ravages which Time was making in the appearance of great personages. Courtiers of the class who surrounded Queen Elizabeth and Louis XIV. would have deemed it high treason to have admitted that kings or queens could ever grow old, and they were all adopting little tricks to keep up the fiction of perpetual royal youth. Now, the great flowing wig was an admirable expedient in which Age could take refuge and masquerade as Youth to the last moment of life. When the great Ramilies wig had gone out as inconsistent with the simple form of dress, a resource was still found. The happy idea occurred to somebody—and what a courtier he must have been—that by the use of white wigs grey hair might become the *ton*. As these wigs were also becoming, they had a long reign. But consider what a nuisance the fashion must have been—what time must have been wasted over the perpetual shaving of the head, to say nothing of the unpleasantness of the operation! And the guys these people must have looked out of their wigs! They could not sleep in them—in fact, they did not wear them in undress about the house; so that bald valour must often have surprised bald beauty under circumstances not favourable to romance. No wonder their poetry was so artificial. What genuine love could be inspired by a beauty of the time of the second George, when we read that the famous *belles* of that time wore elaborate structures in the way of wigs, which they called "heads," and it was a customary thing for these heads not to be touched for six weeks at a time! Passing over the delicate flattery involved in wearing "patches" as a tribute to some pimply Princess, we come to the monstrous absurdity of the high neck-cloths adopted by our grandfathers in compliment to George IV. That monarch, having an affection of the neck, was compelled to hide it, and forthwith society rushed into the extravagant adulation of poulticed necks, high and bulgy, which eventually resolved itself into the tall stock and stick-up collar.

It would be easy to multiply examples of this kind of thing; but sufficient have been glanced at to calm the loyal mind—perturbed by the rumours as to the terrible calamity which had befallen the Royal Family. Depend on it, the resources of the courtiers would have been equal even to this demand upon them. We should have entered upon an era of tattooed noses. Had either of the young Princes come to the throne, poets would be found singing the praises of blue-nosed beauty, and philosophers would demonstrate to the satisfaction of an admiring country that the practice of tattooing is alike conducive to health and marks a very high stage in the progress of civilization. Everybody who is anybody would have been tattooed, or perhaps it would have been made a party question and the Blues would adopt this outward and visible sign of their principles; while those of the adverse fashion would go through life content with the severe simplicity of nature unadorned. So strong is the loyalty of some folk—or rather the vanity which prompts them to adopt means for being supposed to be in society—that should the young Princes fall among the Caribbees or other savages, and get tattooed all over, living copies of them would abound in every circle. In fact, to such lengths is a certain form of toadyism carried, that it only needs the Court to set the fashion for half the nation to revert to the original costume of the Native Britons, and to stain themselves with woad, as a light, elegant, and impressive summer attire.

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE IRISH LAND LEAGUE.

It may interest some to know that the Scottish courts of law have held that where the produce does not equal more than the cost of the seed and labour expended no rent is due. In Hunter's "Law of Landlord and Tenant" three or four cases are given showing this to be the case, and it further states, "Where the subject let is totally destroyed by causes not within the contemplation and beyond the control of the parties, the contract, and consequently the claim for rent ceases; and if there be a partial injury or diminution, there must be a corresponding reduction of rent." In the year 1829 "destruction by rabbits, kept by the landlord, was deemed sufficient for the abandonment of the contract, where the produce only defrayed the cost of production." (Earl of Kinnoul vs. Richmond, 27th May, 1829.) On the other hand, it is argued that a bargain is a bargain, and that a bad year is a contingency for which a tenant must be prepared. In nearly everything except agriculture this argument will apply, but in agriculture there are certain events, such as hail-storms, etc., which cannot possibly be provided against; therefore, when a succession of bad years occur, the landlord is called upon, in justice and in equity, to relinquish his claim for a certain amount of rent, the amount of reduction being proportionate to the tenant's loss. It has been often stated that if one tenant cannot pay the rent another can, and so a course of eviction is followed, with the lamentable results at present to be witnessed in Ireland; agrarian outrages

are common, and are the necessary outcome of such a course of action. The labourer is not called upon to give the result of his labour to the landlord, nor has the landlord the moral right to exact payment of the rent when the result of the labour is not even sufficient for the sustenance of the labourer. It is not a question of property-rights, nor a question of land-laws in such a crisis; these questions must be left out of sight altogether, and the distress looked at on the broad principles of humanity. It is useless and ungenerous for a landlord in such a state of affairs to proceed to harsh measures on account of the non-payment of rent, especially when, as is said to be the case, the landlords have for years past kept the rents at such a figure that the labourer has not been able to make more than enough to pay the rent, and therefore has not had it in his power to make provision for such a bad year as the past one. The landlords have, through the monopoly of land, had everything their own way, and have, without any doubt, abused their power and privileges. Even acknowledging their right to hold property in such vast estates (large parts of which are kept for purposes of mere pleasure), the moment that they show themselves incapable of holding it with benefit to themselves and to others, their right necessarily ceases; or, if it be found that by a sub-division of land the interests and well-being of the people at large would be further secured, the property-right at once ceases. Of course the landlord will have to be, in justice, remunerated for the cessation of this right, and the problem for politicians is, how to effect this, in an equitable manner. It is a simple and common solution of any trouble in Ireland for sentimental loyalists to lay the blame immediately upon the national character and temperament. So be it; but it will be found that these troubles are not of their own making. It is the fashion to say that an Irishman is always "agin the government." Small blame to him—in a great many cases. English Canadians will express their opinions in the most violent manner about the Irish Obstructionists in the House of Commons, and will then refuse to express an opinion on the Land Laws of Ireland—or, at any rate, on their effects. This is done through a toadying worship of British conservatism, and not through any respect for non-interference. They did not hesitate to sympathize with the Southern States, and openly to express their sympathy. Here lies the pleasant contrast for the majority of English Canadians,—endorsing and sympathizing with a corrupt cause in the United States on the one hand; refusing to condemn the evil monopoly of land in over-populated and over-taxed Ireland ('cause it's British) on the other hand. Beautiful contrast, and perfect consistency! They flatter themselves that this is an evidence of loyalty, and straightway indulge in podsnappery. This *loyalty* in not seeing anything wrong in British institutions is, as Dickens says, of the ostrich sort. The highest and most ennobling loyalty is the loyalty to the right, whether evidenced in Yankee dom, Cockney-dom, or Canuck-dom, and any loyalty which does not have this principle firmly fixed is sure to be attended with disaster. We Canadians were very much praised and belauded by Lord Dufferin, who won his way to our goodwill and esteem through our vanity by speaking of our loyalty. Canadian loyalty has been always entirely controlled by what Canadians judged to be the interests of Canada. The feeling of loyalty in Canada to England is liable to be rudely torn up at any moment. If Canada finds that her interests are better served by being independent, no one can dispute her right to carry out measures having that purpose in view. It is nothing, therefore, but maudlin sentimentality to deny or oppose the free discussion of Independence, Annexation, or any other subject having a bearing upon the interests of Canada. All these subjects come under the head of Political Economy, as commonly understood, and it shows the weakness of the opposition when people speak of "tearing the mask off," assuming that a Political Economy Club is a species of inquisitorial institution. Complaint is made in England that our system of Protection is prejudicial to her manufacturing interests, and Free Traders in Canada state that by this policy we are severing our connection and alienating her regard from us; this is merely proof that where Canadian interests are at stake, loyalty goes to the wall.

As the meaning of Political Economy has been disputed, it is pertinent that we should consider the subject. Defined absolutely, "it is the science which investigates the circumstances in relation to the acquisition of wealth and the laws governing its distribution amongst mankind." It may be defined more curtly as the science which treats of human functions, with this limitation, that "it is a non-moral science, and in no case can be allowed to pronounce a moral judgment," so that the "brotherly love" of Free Trade does not come within the province of Political Economy. Wherever human action is not in question there can be no political economy. The adaptability of a country, its climate, its resources, enter the economical science only to the degree that they are affected by human action. The crops produced by human industry, the yield from the mines by human hands, etc., enter into the science, because they represent forms of work produced by man.

The destruction of the crops by a storm, or of a people by an earthquake, is not a question of political economy; but the depopulation of a district by the owner by converting it into a game-desert is a question of political economy; therefore we have a right to discuss and question the justice of laws