

FORWARDED IS FOREARMED.

Several of the great nations have within the past year discovered weak spots in their armor, or flatness in their bow-strings. The utter rottenness of the American harbor-defence and naval system is the subject of much comment among the Americans themselves; a fact which must diminish their enthusiasm, when they sing the well-known line, "The American Navy, the best in the world!" Our own militia, though its bravery and training have been demonstrated by the recent occurrences in the North-West, has been found to be numerically much weaker than was generally believed. The weakness of the German coast defence has just been shown by a captain sailing his ship safely into a harbor, which was so studded with torpedoes that it was supposed to be ready to blow a hostile fleet into nothingness. England, too, has had her day of awakening during the past year. The navy has been submitted to a rigorous examination and criticism which have led to a general overhauling. Strong efforts are being made, chiefly owing to the representations of Sir Frederick Roberts, the hero of the last Afghan war, to place the British army on a more efficient footing. General Roberts, who has recently been appointed Commander-in-Chief of the forces in India, has directed his efforts mainly towards breaking down the short service system. After three years' active service, a soldier is now placed among the reserves. The result is, that the soldiers in active service are, for the most part, too young. The only good, reliable men, are those who have been engaged in operations abroad. Now, in countries where military service is compulsory, the evils of the short service system are less apparent, because the army is more numerous. In France, the term of actual service is five or six years; and there are no reserves. In Prussia, the men serve three years, and are placed on the reserves for a further period. But England, with her limited army, expects more from each man, in order that she may be able to cope with superior numbers. Like the Macedonians of Alexander the Great, the Tenth Legion of Julius Cæsar, or the Old Guard of Napoleon, the comparatively small British army must be a model of all that is valuable in war. The history of British arms is a series of almost unvarying successes, seldom gained through force of numbers, but generally through superior fighting. But other nations have arisen whose soldiers are physically equal to the British, and whose equipments are of the very best. It behooves England to increase the efficiency of her forces; and any nation may consider herself fortunate if her weakness is discovered, like the imperfection of the Servian commissariat department, before it has been demonstrated by disaster.

TAXATION IN INDIA.

The rapid increase in the debt of India is causing uneasiness among the more profound thinkers of England. Forty years ago, India's debt was but \$175,000,000; to-day, it stands at \$800,000,000. The people of India are taxed, not only for government and the construction of public works, but also for the wars carried on by Britain in Afghanistan and Burmah. It was taxation without representation that caused the American colonies to sever their connection with the British Empire, and it is now thought by many of the most far-seeing of British Statesmen that the same cause is operating against the continuance of British supremacy in India. An increase of \$625,000,000 in the debt of India during the past forty years, in a country in which the mass of the people are materially little better off than they were two score years since, is certainly a matter worthy the consideration of the Statesmen of to-day. Indian taxes have steadily increased, while the power of the people to pay them has remained stationary; and as these people are unrepresented in the British Parliament, there is little hope for them in the future. Britain fears the encroachments of aggressive Russia, but disaster from that source may be considered of little moment, as compared with the troubles which may follow a continuation of the present extravagant policy.

TERRITORIAL GREED.

Territorial greed is to-day the most noticeable characteristic among the more aggressive of the European nations, and it is this passion which causes the frequent disturbances in what is commonly supposed to be the most enlightened quarter of the globe. Eastern Roumelia, being peopled by Bulgarians, awakened the desire for territorial extension in the breast of Alexander, the Bulgarian Prince, and accordingly the country was annexed to Bulgaria without so much as saying "by your leave or license" to the Sovereign, of whose domain it formed a part. Serbia, jealous of the Bulgarian success and afflicted with a like land-hunger, declares war upon Prince Alexander, and moves her armies forward. Russia and Austria see in this conflict a timely excuse for their interference, and just as the Servian successes were turning into severe defeats, they lay their hands upon the belligerents, and cry, "hold, enough!" Looking beneath the surface, we find that both Russia and Austria have determined upon territorial extension, and that the formation of a strong and independent nationality, south and east of their frontiers, would frustrate their designs. Accordingly, Prince Alexander and King Milan suddenly find themselves controlled by the powers at St. Petersburg and Vienna. This nominal Sovereignty, assumed respectively by the Czar and Emperor, will, if we mistake not, soon be followed by actual occupation, and when this comes, Britain will have to face an Eastern question, compared with which all previous complications would appear trivial.

The avowed desire of Russia to occupy Constantinople, and that of Austria to find an outlet at Salomca on the Ægean Sea, are not as empty and meaningless as some politicians would lead us to believe; moreover, as the action of Austria and Russia appears to have the sanction of the

Emperor of Germany, we may naturally infer that the triple alliance between these three great States, which was whispered to have taken place, has more of fact than fancy about it. The Eastern question is one of great moment in Europe, and one which at any time may involve Britain in the most desperate struggle in which she has ever been engaged.

TAXATION IN ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CITIES.

The taxation in the Cities of the United States is well known to be excessive, but its proportions were not fully understood by the Americans until Mr. Lothrop compiled the interesting statistics which we give below. By these, it will be seen that the average tax per head, in fourteen cities in the United States, is four times as great as the average in a corresponding number of English cities, while the rate per head of the Municipal debts is twice as great in the former as in the latter:—

ENGLAND—MUNICIPAL DEBT.

Name of Town.	Population in 1881.	Consolidated Debt. Dollars.	Debt per head of Population. Dollars.
Liverpool	552,425	12,979,671	22.81
Birmingham.....	400,757	14,499,086	34.74
Manchester.....	341,508	12,938,651	37.59
Leeds	309,126	7,651,318	23.61
Sheffield	384,410	3,068,381	10.31
Bristol.....	206,503	2,879,364	13.47
Nottingham.....	186,656	4,272,538	21.77
Bradford.....	183,032	4,879,450	25.39
Hull.....	154,250	2,821,823	15.66
Brighton.....	128,425	1,316,963	9.87
Leicester.....	122,351	428,475	3.29
Sunderland.....	116,282	1,477,940	12.15
Oldham	111,343	1,299,625	10.91
Cardiff.....	85,378	1,214,572	13.55
	3,182,426	71,722,857	21.56

UNITED STATES—MUNICIPAL DEBT.

New York	1,206,299	92,960,316	72.02
Philadelphia	847,170	27,427,387	30.12
Brooklyn	566,663	21,477,629	34.18
Chicago	503,185	8,797,000	15.89
Boston.....	362,839	14,991,016	37.96
Baltimore.....	332,313	5,582,652	15.72
Cincinnati.....	255,139	22,315,308	84.25
San Francisco	233,959	2,104,657	8.11
New Orleans	216,090	16,152,825	75.28
Pittsburg	159,389	8,885,407	51.08
Newark	136,508	4,771,643	32.34
Louisville.....	123,758	2,102,739	16.38
Milwaukee	115,587	786,500	6.38
Providence	104,857	2,851,058	24.46
	5,163,756	231,156,137	41.56

ENGLAND—MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURE AND TAXATION.

Name of Town.	Annual Expenditure. Dollars.	Annual Taxation. Dollars.	Rate of Taxation per head. Dollars.
Liverpool.....	3,149,717	2,987,714	5.25
Birmingham	2,135,294	1,461,495	3.50
Manchester.....	2,142,788	1,603,600	4.69
Leeds.....	1,890,700	1,279,890	3.95
Sheffield.....	1,084,630	899,231	3.02
Bristol.....	1,043,280	733,612	3.44
Nottingham.....	1,178,865	687,150	3.50
Bradford.....	828,392	549,710	2.36
Hull	676,823	428,129	2.36
Brighton.....	584,148	443,552	3.32
Leicester	704,150	418,475	3.22
Sunderland	385,855	215,314	1.71
Oldham	371,216	323,102	2.71
Cardiff.....	315,025	229,294	2.55
	16,490,582	12,260,868	3.69

UNITED STATES—MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURE AND TAXATION.

New York	30,926,555	29,240,778	22.12
Philadelphia	11,274,453	10,386,872	11.66
Brooklyn.....	8,682,712	6,875,251	10.94
Chicago.....	5,444,895	3,990,333	7.20
Boston	12,266,361	9,268,122	23.47
Baltimore.....	4,256,755	3,878,804	10.92
Cincinnati	3,160,552	2,504,791	9.45
San Francisco	3,703,762	3,544,827	18.45
New Orleans	2,545,663	2,292,576	10.09
Pittsburgh.....	2,508,522	2,409,493	13.85
Newark	1,217,234	1,219,439	8.26
Louisville	1,149,941	1,399,275	10.80
Milwaukee	1,149,941	1,192,537	9.10
Providence	1,651,565	1,725,500	14.8
	88,788,970	78,928,589	14.18