

country every year and take up their residence in the United States. They forswear the old flag; they become citizens of a Republic; they live and die under political institutions which they once regarded as foreign. And why? Just because, they desire to be "richer in pocket."—*Montreal Herald*.

THE French have entered Confederation, but are not willing to assume their share of its responsibilities, and not until there is a man at the head of the Dominion Government with sufficient honesty and firmness to refuse to pander for their votes, and not until that man is supported by a large majority of the English-speaking members of the House, will the stick-in-the-mud Province of Quebec realize that Confederation carries with it duties as well as privileges.—*St. Thomas Journal*.

THE *Journal des Débats* is not misled by the apparent approximation of Germany to France. The Chancellor's real object, it thinks, is to establish, in spite, or rather by means, of his temporary ill-humour, more cordial relations with England. If that is indeed the case, and it may well be that the suspicious eyes of the French writer see most clearly in this matter, it would be the greatest folly on our part not to contribute actively to such a result. And that for the simplest of all reasons. It is not that we would buy the friendship of Germany, valuable as it is, by any sacrifice of our honour or surrender of our substantial interests; but, as it happens, the course most likely to regain us the esteem and support of Germany is the very one which our own honour and duty most imperatively dictate.—*Pall Mall Gazette*.

In the most densely-peopled districts of London there are but one hundred and seventy thousand persons to the square mile. New York has two hundred and ninety thousand. London has an average population of seven persons to each one house. New York has twenty-five. One block in the Eleventh Ward has forty-five occupants to each house. The slums of New York have nominally disappeared; but they exist nevertheless. They are internal, not external. The streets have been made decent; the outside of the sepulchre has been whitened; but within there is a horrible foulness—foulness due to a plethora of humanity. It is scarcely to be wondered at that, under such circumstances, the authorities of a city the most cosmopolitan in the New World should exercise the greatest care in preventing the increase of its already surplus population by fresh contingents of indigence from Europe.—*London (Eng.) Telegraph*.

It may be possible to do something toward the consolidation of the Colonial Empire by the more direct recognition of agents who might act as diplomatic representatives of the colonies, and who might perhaps form the nucleus of consultative councils, and ultimately of organizations which cannot be at present foreseen. Sagacious statesmen will cultivate the loyal sentiment which in ordinary times prevails in the English-speaking colonies; and they have learnt by frequent experience the prudence of avoiding all collision with their jealous regard for their own independence. Attachment to the Crown and the Empire, though it is perfectly genuine when it is not interrupted, seems to disappear in a moment if colonists suspect any interference with their cherished rights of responsible government. As no English Minister really entertains any design of encroachment, colonial susceptibilities may perhaps gradually abate.—*Saturday Review*.

CONSIDERING that Lord Randolph Churchill is accepted by the Conservative party as a responsible statesman, and perhaps even looks upon himself in that light, one is at a loss to reconcile such a speech as he delivered on the third reading of the Appropriation Bill with any other idea than that of a temporary aberration of sanity. Mr. Disraeli once said of Lord Salisbury that his invective "wanted finish," but Lord Salisbury, in his most violent moods, never descended to the coarse and vulgar abuse which once more proved that, whatever else the member for Woodstock may be, he is no gentleman. The Tory party may not have any deep trust in Lord Salisbury, and they certainly have a strong liking for Lord R. Churchill; but they have only to think for a moment on the immeasurable distance between the intellectual capacity of the two men to realize how impossible it will ever be for them to supersede the former, if they wanted to do so, in favour of the latter.—*Manchester Weekly Times*.

WE ought to care something of what they think of us in Europe, and we ought to care very much if we give them the right to think meanly of us over there. The Great Republic ought to be proud to stand well in the opinion of all peoples of civilization. Is it possible that we can do so during this Presidential contest? Is it not dreadful to show to the world that the United States cannot elect its President without all this filth throwing? We ought to be ashamed of ourselves, and very many of us are: indeed all, except the small number engaged in this nasty business. If this be the method of our election contests, we can not be surprised if older Powers thank the fates the same methods are not in order with them. Whatever may have been done in the past in the old countries of this nature and worse, excuses us not at all. The Great Republic was to teach the world better things in all ways.—*The Philadelphia Progress*.

THE English newspaper is inferior in many respects to the American journal, but it is superior in the fact that even amid times of political excitement it tries to give the news. The facts it presents can be relied upon. They have not been tortured into doing service for this political party or that political party. It, in short, tries to recognize that its functions as a newspaper are best served by trying to please the public at large and not a section of it. May I appeal to some of my contemporaries to give the public some consideration? Surely a newspaper ought to give news in such a manner that it can be accepted as a true picture of what is passing on the stage of the world's affairs. When news is garbled to subserve

a political idea, the public are defrauded. They are not getting news, but are being dosed with ideas which may or may not be offensive, but which are certainly not news in the true sense of the word. We raise this humble appeal against political prostitutes for the honour of American journalism. We hope it will at least contribute toward the mitigation of an evil which many people are recognizing very acutely.—*Chicago Rambler*.

A VERY safe test of England's relative position [as a naval power] has just been given by Sir Thomas Brassey. In these matters account is generally taken of ironclads only, though it is not a sufficient basis of comparative strength. Of ironclads, however, the aggregate tonnages are—England, 329,520; France, 201,789; Germany, 74,007; Austria, 62,110; Russia, 83,621; and Italy, 59,905. The above figures prove that, if we leave Russia aside, we have an armoured tonnage substantially equalling the combined tonnage of France, Germany, Austria and Italy. Can the most exacting ask for more, unless they are in a position to demonstrate that Sir Thomas Brassey has been grossly deceived? Moreover, our superiority to France is being more than sustained. Our voted expenditure for ironclads for 1885 is £1,232,000 as against £1,025,360 in France. As to the quality of the vessels there is nothing to choose: the French give more armour to the water-line, and we give more protection to the men. Only a naval campaign could decide which system is the more advantageous. The most the Government can be expected to do is to maintain a leading position and this, Sir Thomas Brassey assures us, the Department is successfully doing at present.—*Liverpool Mercury*.

BOOK NOTICES.

HISTORY OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR. By Anton Gindeley. Translated by Andrew Ten Brook. Complete in two volumes. With twenty-eight illustrations and two maps. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Toronto: Wm. Briggs.

Owing to the fact that in his larger work Professor Gindeley only brings down the history of the Thirty Years' War to the year 1623, and that it has taken him fifteen years to produce the four volumes covering the period treated, he some time ago consented to be diverted from the more exhaustive history to produce a popular one. That he was wise will hardly be disputed in view of the fact that he has attained his fifty-fifth year. The professor is acknowledged to be the foremost authority on the period of the Thirty Years' War, and the beautiful edition in which he gives to the world a summarized result of his exhaustive labours in that field is one of great value to those interested in the history of Europe. Though Professor Gindeley has not the pen of a Macaulay, but turns out his periods with the colder quill of a philosophic historian, his work is by no means wanting in interest. The book is divided into three parts. The first describes those events which gave immediate occasion to the outbreak of the war, and proceeds thence to relate the history of the Bohemian insurrection, the judicial proceedings which followed and the consequent reactionary measures of religious reformation. The work is prefaced by an introductory chapter from the pen of the translator, in which, as he truly says, he lays "before the readers some preliminary information which a certain class of them will need, while others will not." He has also added a concluding explanatory chapter, which will be of service to students. It is pleasant to be able to say that this edition has been prepared with the full sanction of the author.

A DICTIONARY OF MIRACLES, Realistic and Dogmatic. With illustrations. By the Rev. E. Cobham Brewer, LL.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company.

The author takes an early opportunity to inform his readers that he has written several other books, most of which have attained large circulations; but, though his "Dictionary of Miracles" may be of service by attracting attention to the subject, it is very doubtful whether it will not rather detract from his reputation, rather than add to it. In a preliminary notice it will be sufficient to say that though Mr. Brewer has collated a vast number of "miracles," he has left untouched many which would have been more to the point in his analysis of the belief in supernatural manifestations. Moreover there are a number of historical inaccuracies in his work, for which it is difficult to attribute any cause but carelessness. All the same the book contains in handy form matter not easily to be found elsewhere, and when purged of its blemishes—as it no doubt will be in future editions—it may possibly attain a success not unworthy of a writer, some of whose works have reached "enormous circulations."

IRVING CLASSICS.

ELZEVIR CLASSICS. Vol. IV. New York: John B. Alden.

These books are both reprints, the one of "essays and sketches by celebrated authors from the 'Irving Library,'" the other of "choice selections from the 'Elzevir Library.'" The first-named is a nicely-got-up volume containing excerpts from the works of Charles Lamb, Macaulay, Irving, Dr. John Brown, Andrew Dickson White, Thomas de Quincey, Nathaniel Hawthorne, George Rawlinson, Dr. Legge, Carlyle, Matthew Arnold, Froude, and Philip Gilbert Hamerton. In the latter book are papers by Herbert Spencer, Matthew Arnold, George William Curtis, Wendell Phillips, Robert Griffen, Huxley, Tyndall, and Edward Orton, LL.D.