

"anarchy may in the end bring more good than evil to the nation if the proper moral be drawn."

We commend the above to the attention of Principal Grant of Kingston, who advises all, over whom he exercises influence, to be guided by Professor Goldwin Smith, but who himself rather suggested that, although party government was quite proper in England, it was fraught with evil in Canada. It is not very easy to form any reliable opinion as to what our Canadian philosopher really wishes. It is to be inferred that neither he himself nor Mr. Cobden had any leaning in favor of household, much less universal, suffrage. Cobden dreaded "an appeal to the ignorance and vice of the country against the opinions of the teetotallers, nonconformists and rational radicals, who would constitute nine tenths of our phalanx of forty shilling freeholders." Professor Goldwin Smith has taken many opportunities to denounce the last extension of the franchise in Great Britain, but he has not, so far as we can recollect, stated what sort of franchise he would himself deem eligible.

We are tolerably familiar with the kind of government which he would like to establish in his model republic, but we have never seen any statement of the mode of electing the governing body. Cobden was, we are assured, a great enemy to Imperialism, so far as desiring to get rid of India, Canada, Gibraltar, and of course for the same reasons, the Australian and South African Colonies, but he "had no sympathy with repeal," any more than the learned Professor has with what he terms "murderous anarchy." The Irish question is the other difficulty pressing on the nation. It is described as "an economical difficulty peculiar to Ireland, and consisting mainly in the multiplication of an unprosperous tenantry on an unproductive country, under the influence of a church, which does not teach prudence, and in its own interest discourages emigration." The poor Irish are not favorites with Dr. Goldwin Smith. He tells his readers that people have seen "on the other side of the Atlantic the Irish unanimously supporting slavery, and forming under the vile leaders, whom they invariably choose, the regular rank and file of American corruption." We hope that the foregoing character of Irish leaders cannot be strained to mean Senators Smith, O'Donohoe and the Hon. Mr. Costigan. Canada, however, is on the "other side of the Atlantic," and the Irish emigrants are of much the same class. At all events, Cobden's opinion of Irishmen, which was not

favorable, is quoted approvingly. The quality of the men sent to represent it in the House of Commons is said to be most discouraging, and they are only too ready, in Mr. Cobden's opinion, to sacrifice all worthier objects to such jobs as the celebrated Galway Steamer subsidy.

It would be difficult for Dr. Goldwin Smith to refrain from giving a stab to the late Lord Beaconsfield. He could hardly have hit on a more unjustifiable ground of attack than the controversy which took place in the Corn Law debate between Lord George Bentinck and Sir Robert Peel on the subject of the alleged bad treatment of Mr. Canning by the latter. The charge was made professedly from the recollection of Lord George Bentinck, who had been Mr. Canning's private secretary. It was denied by Sir Robert Peel, and the authorized version of his speech did not contain the words imputed. Nevertheless they were in the *Mirror of Parliament*, and in the *Times*, and, what is more singular, there was a reply to the statement from another member. The whole matter, never of any importance, is raked up after an interval of nearly forty years, in order to insinuate that the charge was made by Lord George Bentinck at the instigation of Mr. Disraeli. He then identifies him with a character in one of his own novels, Vivian Grey, charges him with approaching Peel with "fulsome flattery," and then expresses his belief that when Peel's papers are published, it will be found that he was only prevented from giving office to Disraeli by the opposition of Lord Derby.

Dr. Goldwin Smith seems to be of the opinion that the advocates of free trade in England were wholly actuated by selfish motives. Their object "was simply the repeal of a noxious impost which specially pressed on their own industry." They were not universal philanthropists, "they were hardly even free traders in the full sense of the term. Their subscriptions to the League fund were what Cobden himself called them, investments which they expected to be repaid to them, and which were in fact repaid to them a hundred fold. Had the same men been landowners, they would probably have been protectionists." There may be some truth in the foregoing description, but it is calculated to lead to the conviction that the politics of all classes are governed very much by their personal interests. Dr. Goldwin Smith repeats a statement frequently made by him before, that England is not a free trade country, because she raises twenty millions by import duties. Of

course those who claim that England is free trade, mean simply that there are no duties imposed to obstruct or fetter trade. Large revenues are obtained from articles not produced in Great Britain, such as tea, tobacco and wine, which are admitted on the same terms from all foreign countries. The duty on spirits is countervailed by an excise duty on the home-made article. It is hardly correct, under such circumstances, to designate such duties as "interferences with the freedom of trade," and to insinuate that the British tariff is of the same character as the tariffs of other countries. As a matter of course, each country must be allowed to frame its own, and nothing could be more visionary than the idea of Cobden and his free trade friends, that the world could be looked on, as to trade, as a single community. We have endeavored to convey some idea of Dr. Goldwin Smith's last contribution. His *bêtes noires* are the French Emperor Louis Napoleon, Lord Beaconsfield, and the Irish. He blames Cobden for lack of suspicion of the Emperor's designs, which he himself thinks might have led to an attack on England by the conspirators of the *coup d'état*, from which "they would no more have shrunk than they shrank from the perfidies and massacres by which they raised themselves to power." Lord Beaconsfield was "an unscrupulous adventurer,"—"a man whose motives were purely personal." As to the Irish, Mr. Morley is told that he has hardly taken in the fact that among the Irish "on both sides of the Atlantic political incendiarism is a trade." It is not often that we find such a sweeping denunciation of a nation. If "political incendiarism" be a trade, we venture to hazard the assertion that no Irishman on this continent has devoted himself so perseveringly to it as the author of the calumny that we have cited. We shall be interested in watching whether our Irish contemporaries will be as complimentary to the learned Doctor in the future as they have been in the past.

POINT IN ENGLISH TAILORING LAW.—On Tuesday morning, in the county court, a tailor, formerly in the employ of Messrs. Henochsberg & Ellis, sued that firm for the amount he alleged to be due for making a coat which he, however, had only commenced. It appears that the coat was required by a certain time, and the tailor having wasted it and sent it to be tried on, failed for two days to call to receive it back and finish it. In the meantime, the coat being wanted, defendant's foreman gave it to another tailor to finish, whereupon the plaintiff sued for the price of the coat as though he had made it, urging that by the custom of the trade he was entitled to the full amount. It was proved in evidence that Messrs. Henochsberg & Ellis actually cut another coat, which was sent to the tailor in lieu of the disputed one. The judge gave a verdict for Messrs. Henochsberg & Ellis, with costs against the tailor.—*Liverpool Courier*.