

FROM an English correspondent we learn that the Custom House is overdoing the dynamite precautions. Magnificent boxes have been forced open, jewel cases of the costliest kind have been wrenched in twain, dressing cases worth pounds have been greatly damaged. A "poor player" who had gone over with an ingenious apparatus for an electric ballet was pursued for hours until he had proved that his machines were not infernal; and people have been actually stopped when they were in a hurry on railway platforms, to turn out their bags. One night all the Duke of Norfolk's trunks were forced; and an official who let the servants of one of the Rothschilds carry away his trunks without examination—the master having the key—was censured. All this zeal will end in an outcry, and then a reasonable examination will become impossible, or will be very perfunctorily performed. Surely the Duke of Norfolk is not to be suspected of being a dynamitard.

THE latest growth of journalism—the *Dynamite Monthly*, the organ of the dynamite party, has caused a thrill of horror amongst civilized communities. The frank avowal of murderous intent which characterizes its every page, the cowardly admonitions to its readers to take advantage of "scientific" means to destroy English life and property, and the fiendish glee with which a "black list" of persons to be butchered is dwelt upon, are calculated to make all men thank heaven they are not "Irish Nationalists!" In concluding a summary of persons who have been murdered by "zealous" patriots, the editor gives a list of victims who must be "removed" at an early date, and concludes:—"In mentioning obnoxious persons, we should not forget Judge Lawson and the infamous Clifford Lloyd, and William E. Forster, who escaped for a time the judgment passed on him. Even that 'grand old man' Gladstone may be included." A little further on in the paper Lord Lansdowne is singled out for a special attack. The passage runs:—

"The hatred of the Irish people goes forth to such monsters as Lawson, Clifford Lloyd, O'Brien and Denman. These men must be guarded by constabulary and detectives while dealing out their mockery of justice. The lives of informers are no longer safe from the indignation of an outraged people. . . . But while these things give us pleasure, we remember regretfully that a scoundrel, differing from these only in being a greater scoundrel, sits with impunity under our very noses, and over the noses of thousands of Irishmen in Canada—the Right Honorable the Earl of Lansdowne. . . . If Clifford Lloyd or Buckshot Forster had been appointed Governor-General it could not have been a greater insult to its Irish population. The insult was felt at the time, and threats were made, but as yet justice has not been measured out to one beside whom even Careys may be considered virtuous."

There can be no doubt what this list means, or what "justice" it is to which the writer is referring. Every man in the list is marked out for murder, and the 22,000 persons to whom copies of the *Dynamite Monthly* have been sent are appealed to for help in carrying out the diabolical plan. A correspondent of the London *Times*, commenting on the precious publication, says:—

Now everybody knows, of course, what all this wicked nonsense means. It is an appeal for dollars or fractions of dollars, with murders and outrages promised as the reward if only the dollars are forthcoming. The men who make the appeal will keep their promise, for in no other way could the desired contributions be kept up. There must be outrages now and then, as proof that the money subscribed has not been wasted, and these are to be accepted as an earnest of the larger operations which are to follow. There have been very natural doubts raised as to the financial honesty with which the Emergency Fund has been managed, and a letter from Mr. Patrick Egan, late treasurer of the National Land League, is quoted as evidence for the defence. This gives a new turn to a very old saw. It is an instance of the pot bearing its unbiassed testimony to the absolute whiteness of the kettle.

I need only add that these dynamite meetings and lectures are openly advertised and are held regularly at known times and places, and that the *Dynamite Monthly*, the organ of the scientific war, has its offices in New York and its assigned box for letters at the New York Post-Office.

Would the New York *Nation* consider this an "overt act"?

"LOTHAIR" has given up his youthful idea of cathedral building. Instead of erecting a shrine at Westminster to rival the famous Abbey, he has translated the Breviary, and thrown considerable doubts on the very existence of some of the saints whom he is bound by his faith to invoke. But as a sort of concession to his early enthusiasm, he has commissioned Miss Edmonia A. Edward, the negro sculptress, to "do" him a Virgin for one of his chapels. Miss Edward is the first Ethiopian in, very recent times who seems to be on the way to win her place among the great sculptors of the day. Lord Bute's patronage of her is creditable to him.

MR. RUSKIN, in his latest *For*s, contends that "the three R's" should be taught, not at school, but at home. "I do not care," he adds, "that St. George's children were not taught either reading or writing, because there are few people in this world who get any good by either." These sentiments would not ill-become a noisy declaimer against the School Board, but they come with a smack of ungraciousness from a great art critic, and a man who has often boasted over his University Education.

A LONDON "society" paper is responsible for the following statements: Thirty-one families of the titled aristocracy govern England. They are

the Houses of Percy, Grey of Howick, Lowther, Vane, Stanley, Grosvenor, FitzWilliam, Cavendish-Bentinck, Clinton, Stanhope, Talbot, Leveson-Gower, Paget, Manners, Montagu, Osborne, Fitzroy, Spencer, Grenville, Russell, Cecil, Villiers, Baring, Petty, Fitzmaurice, Herbert, Somerset, Berkeley, Seymour, Lennox, and Howard. It has been claimed that these families alone supply on an average to every House of Commons three members of their own surname, to say nothing of seats in the Lords. Including the Irish and Scotch aristocrats "sixty families supply, and for generations have supplied, one-third of the ultimate governing power for an empire which includes (with India) one-fourth of the human race." But all is not fair sailing ahead for English monarchy and aristocracy. The law of primogeniture is threatened and the blue-blood legislators know that if that is abrogated and the division of real estate among the younger sons and the daughters of a noble house is made equally with the eldest son, then "good-bye" to noble privileges and the House of Lords; for that is how the death-blow came to aristocracy in France and Holland.

No controversy excites more amusement in the minds of men who have a sense of proportion than that over the unmarried sister-in-law. It raises an interesting question of social expediency. But while the English bishops say that if it passes there will be an end to Christianity, other people devote their lives to proving, what is sufficiently obvious, that a Judaic regulation has no application to England in 1884. Mr. T. Paynter Allen has published a volume of opinions of Hebrew and Greek professors of the European universities, of Bible revisers, and of other eminent scholars, on "the scriptural aspect of the question." The book shows that the weight of learned opinion is against the readings which the English bishops make. The American Episcopalians give a uniformly favourable answer in support of the Biblical legality of such marriages. Only prelates and high ecclesiastical dignitaries are against them, or professors in the Presbyterian Free Church. Mr. T. K. Cheyne is now probably the prince of Hebraists, and he is a clergyman and a reviser. He "cannot find any Biblical passage which can be proved to bear upon the question." Dr. Ginsburg, the leading reviser, and the compiler of the Massorah, is of the same opinion. Professor W. Henry Green was of the same opinion. So is Dr. Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge. Professor Stanley Leathes is against the marriage, but not because of any distortion of Scripture. Cardinal Newman, who was asked to be a reviser, says that the law ought to stand as it is if the educated classes are the objects of legislation, and to be repealed if the interest is to be consulted of the lower classes." Dean Perowne gives up the Scriptural argument. So does Dr. Robertson Smith, the chief Hebraist of Scotland. In short, the whole of the argument from this point of view is destroyed, and has become a positive weakness to the case of those who still hold that such marriages are inexpedient.

THE office of speaker of the House of Commons is no sinecure, and the man who fills it is probably the hardest worked member of the House of Legislature. The position is deservedly a lucrative one, and a peerage is invariably offered on retirement. Custom has undergone no change in the case of Sir Henry Brand, who recently vacated the chair he has so ably filled with both dignity to himself as well as to the House, and he has been raised to the honour of a peer by the title of Viscount Hampden. That the late speaker was fully worthy of the highest dignity that could be bestowed upon him none will attempt to deny, though many must feel surprised that he, as heir to the presumptive and time honoured title of Baron Dacre, should have been content to have allowed a title, which is interwoven so much with English history, to lapse—as it will have to do—into a new creation. Twenty-third Baron Dacre, as in the course of a few years, should he have lived, he must have become, surely takes the precedence of the first Viscount Hampden. Sir Henry Brand, doubtless, is the nearest lineal descendant of the illustrious man whose name he has honoured in the present title, and he may wish to record that fact and re-gild an immortal name. Yet it is not a title, which the name of the Great Commoner calls up, but a man whose distinction is not that he was of ancient lineage, or one of the largest proprietors in the kingdom—though he was both—but that being one of the greatest gentlemen in England, he fought for the people against the crown. The title of Viscount is a superior one to that of Baron; but to the English mind it must always have a new and foreign sound. Still it must be supposed from the eager way in which Peers, whose present rank is associated with much that is historical in the annals of England, seek for a step up the social ladder, that even amongst the titled members of the "Upper Ten," there is the same desire for a superior rank as there is amongst the vulgar herd for a knighthood or baronetcy. That a Baron might desire the title of Earl