

central authority to recognize it and govern itself accordingly. There is evidently no power within or without the Dominion that can constrain the Provinces, against their inclinations and convictions.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND and United States Representatives and Senators have advertised Canada into a prominence in English journals which she had not before attained. The results cannot be wholly gratifying to the self-esteem of those of us who have been accustomed to think of the Dominion as a cherished if not indispensable arm of the British Empire, whose possible severance would not be thought of without dismay in the mother country. To such it must be a source of some chagrin as well as surprise, to find powerful English journals like the *Spectator* coolly wondering that Canada has not, before this, yielded to the attractions of the mighty State by her side, pointing out the unique greatness of the nation that would result from such a union and calmly balancing the probabilities of our ultimate choice between annexation and independence. The *Spectator* is right in concluding that Canada is not shut up to the alternatives of continuing British connection and falling into the outstretched arms of the great Republic. She will, when occasion arises, be pretty sure to choose the "third alternative," and "try to become a nation." For the present, Canadians "can wait" and can afford to wait, but should the question of setting up for themselves become one day a living and practical question, any natural reluctance that might arise at the thought of severing the old ties will be lessened by the reflection, which can hardly be considered as other than a fair inference from the tone of such articles as that of the *Spectator*, that the mother country has discounted the bereavement, so to speak, and is prepared to bear it with equanimity. The *Spectator's* view is eminently philosophical and rational, but what a change must have come over the old national spirit when the British Empire can contemplate the prospective loss of her most powerful colony with such disinterested complacency!

In a paper which was read a few weeks since before the Association of Sanitary Inspectors at Brighton, Mr. Edwin Chadwick, a veteran leader of sanitary reform in England, gives some astonishing facts in regard to the saving of life which has been achieved through the agency of the partial and imperfect sanitary reforms which have been from time to time adopted, largely through his influence. A few figures are all that can be given in a paragraph, but even these tell a wonderful tale. It is not long since the death-rate in London was 24 in 1000; it is now but fourteen or fifteen. A quarter of a century ago the death-rate in the Guards was 20 per 1000; it is now $6\frac{1}{2}$ per 1000. In the home army it has been reduced from 17 to 8. Germany, however, shows still better results, her army death-rate being but from 5 to 6 in 1000. In the large district schools of the Poor Law Unions, the chief diseases of children, measles, whooping-cough, typhus, scarlatina, diphtheria, are "practically abolished." The death-rate of those children who come in without developed disease upon them is now less than 3 in 1000, a result which may well be called "extraordinary," seeing that the death-rate among children of the general population is more than three times as high. The process by which this result has been reached, even with children of the lowest type, bears unequivocal testimony to the wonderful efficacy of scientific sanitation. In one institution in which the old death-rate was "the common outside one of twelve in the 1000;" thorough drainage first reduced it to eight; thorough washing from head to foot in tepid water brought it down considerably lower and better ventilation in the rooms and separate bedding arrangements in good beds completed the process of reduction to three. But Mr. Chadwick is far from satisfied with what has already been accomplished. He boldly maintains that had the sanitary reforms been carried out in London according to the plans prepared, the death-rate might now have been reduced to 12 in 1000, and that the delay of the Metropolitan Board of Works has cost a yearly loss of between 35,000 and 36,000 lives. Such arguments and statistics, in addition to other effects, set in a striking light the terrible responsibilities devolving upon the municipal authorities in all our towns and cities. The lives of the people are evidently in their hands to an extent not hitherto realised.

CARDINAL MANNING'S contribution to the Gladstone-Ingersoll Controversy—in the September number of the *North American Review* is an interesting study, if not a convincing argument. To the man who is already an adherent of the Catholic, apostolic, infallible church, the chain of reasoning so elaborately woven will seem absolutely unbreakable. To the non-Catholic Christian it will appear a subtle though unconscious intermingling of the true and the false, a combination of irrefragable logic with glaring sophism. To the sceptic and the agnostic it will present itself

as a chapter of fallacies. In maintaining that the imperishable existence and persistence of Christianity, "the vast and undeniable revolution it has wrought in men and in nations, in the moral elevation of manhood and womanhood, and in the domestic, social and political life of the Christian world," cannot be accounted for by any natural causes, any forces within the limits of what is possible to man, Cardinal Manning undoubtedly adduces that which is, next to the self-evidencing power of the Christian system as related to the human reason and conscience, the strongest proof of the truth and divine origin of Christianity. In tacitly claiming all these grand results of the Christian religion in its broadest influence and freest development as the fruits of the tree of Romish Catholicism, he, unwittingly no doubt, falls into an error so transparent, and perpetrates an injustice so gross, that the whole force of his argument is more than counteracted. Again, in dwelling on the fact that the Catholic Church has always claimed infallibility, and has always enforced unity of belief, as evidence of its supernatural authority and divine inspiration, Cardinal Manning's logical armour exposes so many vulnerable spots that one wonders how his keen and powerful intellect could have satisfied itself with so specious an argument. The contention, for instance, that unity of creed, in an organization which makes submission to authority and surrender of private judgement prime conditions of membership, and which excommunicates and anathematizes all heretics, is proof of the divine indwelling, so manifestly completes a sophistical circle that it is hard to conceive of it as having weight with any careful reader. Cardinal Manning's article will probably convert the duel into a triangular contest, and draw a portion of the fire of both the previous combatants, but it can scarcely do much for the cause it is intended to serve.

THE various appeals that are being made to the humane and freedom-loving instincts of Englishmen, in behalf of the victims of the slave-trade in Central Africa, are producing their effects. Various persons of influence in England are calling on their countrymen to aid in the work of putting down the abominable traffic by private enterprise, and efforts, which will no doubt sooner or later be successful, are being put forth to form an organization for this special purpose. The words of Lord Salisbury, who declared in the House of Lords that this great enterprise "must be, and will be, carried through by individual Englishmen," sound very like an invitation to the people to engage freely in it. On three different occasions already, it appears, small expeditions of Englishmen have come into conflict with the Arab slave-dealers, and suffered repulse at their hands. Towards the end of last year there was a general muster of Englishmen to ward off from Nyassaland an incursion of slave-trading Arabs. Twenty-six Englishmen, it is said, assembled, and with the aid of native volunteers, not only held the Arabs in check, but even attacked them, though without much success, in their strongholds. The difficulties of the philanthropic movement which is being inaugurated will, no doubt, be greatly increased by the fact that the slavery appeals strongly to certain commercial interests, as Mr. Oswald Crawford points out in the *Nineteenth Century*: "Slavery and slave carriage are at present necessary incidents of trade. An elephant may be killed a thousand miles from the coast, and each tusk is the burden of a slave to the nearest seaport, while it will have taken three or four negroes to carry the calico for payment of the elephant-hunter." The demand for this forced labour is, no doubt, one of the strongest influences upholding the unholy business of slave-catching. The fact that the recent murder of Major Barttelot seems to have resulted from the reluctance of the native carriers to march with their forty-five pound loads, is suggestive in this connection. It is not easy to see why the civilized powers might not conjointly put a speedy end to the whole horror and wickedness. But failing that, there is every likelihood that the task may be undertaken and carried through by individual Englishmen, as Lord Salisbury suggests. Efficient help could surely be had from the oppressed natives, under proper training and encouragement. Nor would it be at all wonderful if the upshot should be the opening up, under British auspices, of that part of the Dark Continent lying between the Congo Free State and the Zambesi, which is the seat of the traffic, the country, namely, of the great lakes, Victoria Nyanza, Langonyika, and Nyassa.

THE Chinese question is another of those matters of popular agitation in regard to which a more exhaustive and dispassionate inquiry is needed than has as yet been had, so far as we are aware, in any country. Is it true that the Chinese, as a rule, work for less than Europeans or Americans? Is it true that their morals are, on the whole, so far below the general average in the countries which are tabooing them? May it not be that much of the testimony given to the public in regard to them is preju-