

altar and be worshipped any longer. He is plainly stamped with the mark of Cobden and that brand will not take well in an American market. And the worshippers who fill the chairs at the foot of his altar, like himself, all free-traders, will have to go with him." The *Commercial* of the same city is scarcely less severe on the Yale College professors who, it says, "have contrived to bring that time-honoured institution of learning into disgrace." "Yale" it thinks, "would do well to give Professor Sumner his walking papers." It bodes ill, indeed, for the future of liberal culture if professors of the highest ability are to be excluded from institutions of learning because their views on abstract questions of economics do not coincide with the practical politics of the majority. It would perhaps be even more disastrous should the mouths of thinkers and investigators in the domain of political, or sociological science be gagged in the interests of partyism. There are no questions better worth the closest study in the schools of any country, especially one having democratic institutions, than those pertaining to political and social science. No man who will submit to have his freedom of research and discussion arbitrarily curtailed is fit to lead the investigations of students in such subjects. But if such views as those above quoted prevail, as they are too likely to do, one of two results must follow, either of which will be disastrous to the cause of higher education and to scientific research. Either the chairs in national institutions of learning will become the sport of party politics, to be emptied and refilled with the flux and reflux of the political tide, or, worse still, they will be occupied by men destitute of convictions, or strength of character, and prepared to avoid all difficult and dangerous ground, or else to mould their teachings to suit the views and prejudices of the party in power.

THERE is some reason to hope that the late Presidential election will afford another illustration of the manner in which good is often evolved from evil. It is not unlikely that a great blow has been given to the influence of the Irish vote in American politics. The fact that that vote failed to elect Cleveland, even though in cringing to it he not only went to the verge of personal humiliation, but incurred the charge of serious discourtesy to Canada and England, will probably help both parties amazingly to cast off the dread of the Irish faction in future elections. The unsuspected weakness now apparent of the element which has hitherto been made of so much account in the national politics may be due in part to the counteracting influence of other elements, particularly of the English vote, which is becoming a force to be reckoned with. So long as it is impossible to get rid of the influence of foreign factions in national affairs, it is manifestly better for the nation that those factions should hold various opinions, and be of such relative weight as to as nearly as possible counter-balance each other. In this particular instance it will also evidently be better for the nation's neighbours. If the statement, so often made, that there are now nearly one million Canadians residing more or less permanently in the United States, is near the truth, it is easy to see that a large field is opened up for the future influence of a possible Canadian vote. Why not? There is much to be said in support of the view that when once a citizen of any nation has permanently taken up his abode in a foreign country, it becomes his duty to the State in which he finds support and protection to qualify himself for the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in it. Should the Englishmen and Canadians now in the States adopt this view, the next Presidential contest might show us both parties as anxious to make themselves civil and agreeable to Great Britain and Canada, as they were a few weeks ago to pose in an attitude of unfriendliness and defiance.

THE New York *Independent* has been asking the opinion of some leading Republicans on the subject of Civil Service reform. In reply John James Ingalls, President of the United States Senate says, "If there will be more than forty thousand Democrats in office on the 4th of March next, about which I know nothing, they should all be removed before the going down of the sun on that day, and more than forty thousand Republicans appointed in their stead." Other leaders are, happily for the future of the Republic, not so stalwart. The Hon. Dorman B. Eaton, Ex-Member of the Civil Service Commission, argues forcibly and at length that no subordinate should be removed merely by reason of his political opinions, but holds reasonably enough from his point of view that the heads of departments and a few others "whose duties are in part an exercise of discretion in carrying out the political principles and policies of the new administration," should give place to new officers having confidence in those principles and policies. Mr. Eaton says that no President can wholly prevail against party pressure for removals in the present state of public opinion, however resolute his purpose to do his full duty. President Grant

yielded to the office-seekers, and abandoned a reform he had begun. He goes on to say:

"President Cleveland has made a more heroic and successful struggle, but has come out far short of his ideal in various ways. He has, however, fully preserved the examinations—constituting the specific reform—which were begun under President Arthur. That reform required a surrender of party patronage, and the selections of persons for appointment on the basis of non-partisan examinations of merit for about 15,000 places. It also prohibited the demand of political assessments by any one public officer of the United States of another, but not by private individuals. President Cleveland has faithfully upheld this specific reform, both as to assessments and as to examinations. He has also extended the examinations to seven additional post-offices, and various other offices, so that not far from 16,000 places are now covered by them. Fully half the clerical force of all the post-offices of the Union, as well as the clerical force of the customs offices where nearly ninety per cent. of the customs revenue of the country is collected are now covered by these examinations. These nearly 16,000 places are, therefore, practically taken out of party patronage and placed beyond the sphere of arbitrary removals, a reform by no means small to a beginning, and which is sure to grow."

THE speech of the Emperor of Germany, at the re-assembling of the Reichstag, was looked forward to with a good deal of interest and even anxiety as being likely to foreshadow to some extent the prospects of peace or war in Europe in the near future. The speech has been delivered, and leaves the world about as wise as it was before. That the Emperor should reiterate his desire for the peaceful progress of the nation was to be expected. Such an expression is one of the commonplaces of such formal addresses. The monarch or minister of a great power who should in these days hesitate to profess himself a lover of international peace would be regarded as a monster. There is, unhappily, as the semi-official journals have since pointed out, nothing in the references to the Emperor's round of royal visits to indicate that any sure basis of good understanding has been reached in the one quarter from which trouble is more likely to come than from any other, France not excepted. The Czar of Russia, who holds in his own hands the issues of peace and war more directly than any other monarch, continues mysterious and ominous as ever in his military manœuvres. The constant increase of armaments, and the raising of fresh military loans by each in turn of the great nations, is an index of danger, whose significance no general protestations of good intentions can do away with. The limits of borrowing power and of national endurance cannot be far off, but what shape the coming crisis may take not even the Emperors can tell. A European congress, a league of peace, a reduction of armaments all around, may be among the possibilities, though such a consummation would be little short of miraculous. Among the many influences that are tending powerfully in the opposite direction not the least dangerous is that arising from the presence in each nation of thousands of military and naval officers, whose numbers are being continually augmented, and whose professional interests and ambitions are all on the side of war.

THE new Austrian Military Bill is quite as stringent as the German system. The age of conscription is raised from twenty to twenty-one, and the duration of military service is fixed at ten years, three of them in barracks, and seven with the regular reserves. The actual force is increased by twenty-one thousand men, and the old exemption allowed to men who are the sole support of their families is abolished, they being drafted into the reserves. The new law is to operate for ten years, the experts declaring, as in Germany, that it takes that time to include a whole generation of the physically fit. Commenting on these provisions of the Austrian Bill the *Spectator* notes that the effect of such measures is that the Governments are placed in possession of irresistible physical force outside the control of the representatives. Parliamentary power on the Continent, so far from increasing, tends, the *Spectator* thinks, to decrease, the danger of invasion developing, as it has always done, practical dictatorship. The representatives retain, however, the power of the purse. The *Spectator* says "they cannot abolish the ordinary taxes, and though they can refuse loans, they would not do it if war seemed to be imminent." The force of the first remark is not apparent, so long as the parliaments have the control both of rates of taxation and of the disposal of the money when collected. Does not the *Spectator's* argument fail, also, to take into account two counteractive influences which are constantly at work? In the first place, as intimated in another note, the growth of armaments and of expenditures must be tending rapidly towards the maximum limit of national endurance, and so towards a coming period of reaction. And, in the second place, the increasing intelligence of the working classes and the extension of their political influence through the medium of labour unions,