

she is. With him she now passes as much time daily as the prison authorities at Clairvaux will permit. She is not allowed, it seems, to enter the prison, but sits with him in the garden or elsewhere, with a sentry walking up and down, and keeping an eye on them all the time. The rest of the day this brave little woman remains in solitude in the little inn of the place where she is the only guest, the village consisting of only some dozen houses.

Of the industry of the Prince, of his kindness to his fellow-prisoners who, although only workmen, are stimulated by his encouragement and example, and study languages or something else, much has been written, as well as of his cat, who shares his room day and night, and even his meals. Many stories are told of the intelligence of this cat, but space forbids my relating any of them here.

#### ELISEE RECLUS,

the greatest of French geographers, is a distinguished socialist, who resides in a villa at Clarens, the garden of which extends to the very shore of Lake Lemman. He is short of stature and slightly built. His forehead is high and broad, and over it falls a mass of hair once brown, but now considerably mixed with gray. His eyes are blue, and his face indicates power and high intelligence. There is nothing about his appearance to lead one to suspect him to be a revolutionist or upsetter of all forms of government. He has rather the air of a man of letters than a man of action. Those who know him well say that his knowledge is encyclopædic. His linguistic powers are also great. He learned the Russian language, difficult though it be, in order that he might the better write the article on Russia for his great work, "Universal Geography." He, too, like his friend Prince Krapotkin, is a hard worker, scarcely ever leaving his library. Still he is as much of an Anarchist as his friend, and has also the courage of his opinions.

He did not take a prominent part in the Communist rebellion in Paris either as an officer or leader, but contented himself with fighting in the ranks as a private. Still he was afterward imprisoned for a time. He is said to be of Huguenot descent, and as persistent in pursuit of what he regards duty as were his forefathers. When questioned as to his views on the division of property, he replied: "We don't intend to bring it about at all. We are not so *bete* as to suppose that it is either desirable or possible to make an equal division of property. We look upon all property as the common possession of humanity, and we consider it should be enjoyed in common. There is enough for all, and all should work and all enjoy the fruits of their labour. But this can never be attained by governments or through irresponsible deputies; we propose, therefore, to put an end to both." But the destruction of authority would imply the abolition of tribunals, police and soldiers? "The man who commits a crime," he adds in reply, "interferes with my freedom, impedes my liberty of action. He would be brought before one of the groups into which society would spontaneously resolve itself, and—I do not say punished—restrained, but we should not require courts and policeman for that."

The point, it seems, on which he most dwells, and to which he always returns, is that this mother earth of ours produces enough of everything to make all her children happy, and that poverty and all its woes arose not from the nature of things, but from bad laws and selfishness in high places. "We want to shake off these fetters—these vicious old institutions—that render the poor poorer, the rich richer. This is the object of Anarchism. Every movement, every speech that helps the redemption of the disinherited, and the freedom of the socially oppressed—that also is Anarchy."

Speaking of the condition of France, he says the nation now believes in nothing—neither in the power of the Church to make them happy in another world, nor in the power of governments to make them prosperous in this. On the other hand, faith in the solidarity of the human race, in individual effort, as opposed to administrative interference, in self help and the principle of fraternity, is increasing. The end, he holds, will be Communism. The peasantry, he thinks, are convinced that they have more to hope than to fear from the nationalization of the land, which will be one of the greatest achievements of the social evolution.

#### DR. PAUL BROUSSE

is a native of Montpellier, in the South of France, and a remarkable as well as highly-cultured man. He

studied medicine at the University of Paris, but the authorities of the University, finding out that he was connected with the "International," refused him his degree, and he had to leave France to avoid arrest. He went to Spain, and appeared as the representative of the "Internationals" of that country at the congress which met at Geneva in 1873. He then resumed his studies at Berne, took his degree of M.D., and was made an assistant of the professor of chemistry in the same university. He next lived at Vevey on the Lake of Geneva for a time, and in private life is said to be an amiable man, and kind to those whom he attends professionally. But it is not an unusual thing, it seems, to find kind and generous sentiments associated with a fierce political creed.

He next appeared at Chaux-de-Fonds in the Canton of Neuchâtel as editor of the *Avant-Garde*, the organ of the Anarchists. When Hoedel and Nobiling failed in their attempts on the life of the German Emperor, Dr. Brousse deplored the result, and attributed the failure to the imperfect weapons employed, recommending the use of cold steel in future. When the poniard of Passanante missed its aim in the case of King Humbert, the *Avant-Garde* suggested that in future "avengers of the people" should disperse the *entourage* by bombshells before attacking the monarch himself.

But monarchs were not the only objects of the Doctor's ire. He was quite impartial in his selection of persons for assassination. On one occasion he pointed the moral of his teaching by placing at the top of a leading article in his paper a picture of the severed heads of Marshal MacMahon and his rival Gambetta.

Employers of labour being regarded as enemies of the human race, the *Avant-Garde* advocated the murder of masters by their workmen, and the "slave of the mine" and the "helot of the field" were told this means of achieving emancipation. Dr. Brousse was prosecuted by the Federal Council. He was not directly accused of inciting to murder, but of having by his writings violated a clause of the Criminal Code, which makes penal acts "contrary to the rights of man," and which is so construed as to include breaches of the duty that we owe to each other. By approving of the murder of rulers he broke this law, and was sentenced to two months' imprisonment, and ten years' banishment, in addition to the pecuniary loss involved in the suppression of his paper, and the costs of the prosecution.

In his speech to the jury the Doctor sought to justify tyrannicide by the example of Tell, the "hero of Switzerland," and Charlotte Corday, the "angel of assassination," and by quotations from Shakespeare and Disraeli, both of whom had styled Brutus the "most virtuous of Romans." But the jury failed to see that he and Brutus stood on the same level, and found him guilty.

#### WENDELL PHILLIPS

theoretically was strong in favour of Nihilism as any of the above, as appears from the following extract from an address he made at Harvard College, in which he glorified the French Revolution with all its crimes as an unspeakable blessing to liberty and humanity, and then pronounced the following words upon Russian Nihilism, which may be new to many of your readers as they were to me:

Nihilism is the righteous and honourable resistance of a people crushed under an iron rule. Nihilism is evidence of life. When "order reigns in Warsaw," it is spiritual death. Nihilism is the last weapon of victims choked and manacled beyond all other resistance. It is crushed humanity's only means of making the oppressor tremble. God means that unjust power shall be insecure; and every move of the giant, prostrate in chains, whether it be to lift a single dagger or stir a city's revolt, is a lesson in justice. One might well tremble for the future of the race if such a despotism could exist without provoking the bloodiest resistance.

I honour Nihilism; since it redeems human nature from the suspicion of being utterly vile, made up only of heartless oppressors and contented slaves. Every line in our history, every interest of civilization, bids us rejoice when the tyrant grows pale and the slave rebellious. We cannot but pity the suffering of any human being, however richly deserved; but such pity must not confuse our moral sense. Humanity gains. Chatham rejoiced when our fathers rebelled. For every single reason they alleged Russia counts a hundred, each one ten times bitterer than any Hancock or Adams could give. Sam Johnson's standing toast in Oxford port was: "Success to the first insurrection of slaves in Jamaica," a sentiment Southey echoed. "Eschew cant," said that old moralist. But of all the cants that are cant in this canting world, though the cant of piety may be the worst, the cant of Americans bewailing Russian Nihilism is the most disgusting.

Switzerland, December, 1885.

T. H.

### IS RELIGIOUS EQUALITY A FACT OR A FICTION IN ONTARIO?

MR. EDITOR, When that useful institution, the Reformatory for Boys, was established upward of twenty-five years ago at Penetanguishene, the Government of the day very properly decided to give prominence to the religious element, and, therefore, resolved to appoint two chaplains—the one a Roman Catholic, and the other a Protestant. They appointed the former official on the recommendation of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto, and have ever since continued this arrangement.

With this mode of selection we, as Protestants, have no right or desire to interfere, as this official only attends to the religious wants of the Roman Catholic boys, and also represents the whole people of this Church in Ontario.

The appointment of a Protestant chaplain was beset with some difficulty, on account of the outward divisions of the Protestant Church.

In selecting this official, three principles should have been kept pure and intact, viz. The principles of religious equality, of disestablishment, and of a fair and full representation of the Protestant Churches of Ontario.

The census of 1851 showed that there were three leading denominations in the Province:—1. The Church of England represented a population of 223,000, the Methodists, 213,000, and the Presbyterians, 204,000. 2. The first two of these Churches had resident ministers in Penetanguishene; but the third had none. The most just and fair way of carrying out the three principles enumerated above would have been the appointment of ministers of the Methodist and Anglican Churches, as joint chaplains, for this reason, that the salary of \$400 was too small and had to be supplemented by other ministerial work.

The Government, however, of that day, in flagrant violation of the above-named plain principles, applied to the Episcopal Bishop alone, and on his recommendation appointed, as sole Protestant Chaplain, the Rev. Mr. Hallen. Nothing could be said against the character of Mr. Hallen; but his extreme ritualistic views unfitted him for being the representative of the Ontario Churches. He, for example, conscientiously believed and publicly taught that there is no salvation for any Protestant outside of the Church of England, that his was the only true Church, and that the ministers of other Evangelical Churches were no ministers at all, because they were not ordained by a Bishop.

Holding these and kindred views, as well as teaching them, he represented but a small section of Ontario Protestants. For upward of twenty years this sectional chaplain continued to represent the Evangelical Church of Ontario. During this period important religious changes had taken place in the Province. By the census of 1861 the Methodist Church became the largest Protestant Church of Ontario, while the Anglican and Presbyterian were nearly equal in number. By that of 1871 the Methodist Church still held the pre-eminence, the Presbyterians standing second, and the Anglican third. In 1881 the religious census was as follows: Methodists, 590,000; Presbyterians, 417,000. and Episcopalians, 366,000.

When Mr. Hallen was superannuated, the Episcopal Church had become third in point of numbers, and the Presbyterians were now represented in Penetanguishene. It was, therefore, plainly the duty of the Mowat Government to appoint as joint chaplains Methodist, Presbyterian and Anglican ministers, and to divide the small salary among them. But with amazing fatuity they again, concealing the vacancy from the other denominations, applied to the Episcopal Bishop of Toronto, who appointed the Rev. G. Anderson. Mr. Anderson's former experience as an Indian missionary, along with certain peculiar traits of character, unfitted him for the position. After a few years' trial of the post he found himself uncomfortable, and returned last year to his Indian mission.

As soon as the vacancy became known the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches requested the Government not to make any appointment without consulting them, as well as the Church of England. The suggestion was also made that the three resident ministers of the respective Churches should act as joint chaplains, and thus have the Protestants of Ontario represented at the Reformatory as fully as is possible under the circumstances of the case. Verbal pledges to this