

apparently is applauded by his order for replying, that he will be happy to attend if the nation will only restore the Bread Tax and increase his rent-roll so that he may be able to keep up a house in town. That he should brave the hardships of a hotel or of lodgings for the purpose of doing his duty as a legislator does not strike him as a thing conceivable. There could scarcely be a better measure of the standard of duty which it is the inherent tendency of hereditary rank and wealth, without the corrective influence of labour, to form in their ordinary possessor. The Baron of the Middle Ages had to take up with much worse quarters than lodgings in Pall Mall, with the Carlton Club for a restaurant, if he wished to retain his lordship; as a King in the Middle Ages had to forego his whims and bear the allotted burden of Royalty if he meant to keep his Crown upon his head. Mr. Thomas Hughes, in the letter which we published last week, expressed the feeling of all but thorough-going reactionists when he said that the reform of the House of Lords was at hand, and that the only question was as to the exact shape which it would take. Regeneration without change is impossible, unless some means can be devised of making idleness and unearned rank produce on the characters of members of the House of Lords an effect the very opposite of that which they have always produced on other men. Economical causes will soon conspire with the political movement to hasten the change, since the aristocracy really depends for its ascendancy on its rent-rolls, without which it would be a thing of mediæval shreds and patches; and the rent-rolls, instead of being raised by the re-enactment of the Corn Laws, are evidently destined to be still further reduced, both by the continuance of agricultural depression and by the abolition of primogeniture and entail, which is now practically decreed, not only on revolutionary but on Conservative grounds; for there is no antidote to agrarianism but the free transfer and acquisition of land. Nobody doubts that there are good elements in the House of Lords; they will be able to act with far more effect when translated to a better sphere.

COSMOPOLITANISM is the order of the day. Yet it is difficult to understand on what principle Mr. Henry George is allowed to carry on an agrarian agitation in Great Britain. Is Great Britain, because her institutions differ from those of the United States, to be a happy hunting-ground on which any American who wishes to gratify his spleen or his vanity is to be at liberty to practise political incendiarism at his will? Suppose some English Anarchist were to invade the United States and try to get up a renewal of the Pittsburgh riots or of the outbreak at Cincinnati, would he not stand a chance of being lynched? Nobody wishes to interfere with the free progress of opinion or with its transit by fair means from one country to another. Perhaps it may be said that there is not much difference between sending over a book and advocating the same opinions in a speech or a lecture on the spot. Yet everyone must feel that there is a limit, and that it is overstepped when a foreigner takes part in stirring up agitation, which, like that in Skye, plainly points towards a resistance to the law with the accompanying possibility of civil bloodshed. Doubt with regard to the rule of international law on this point, or with regard to the ground taken by the British Government, is by no means free from danger when American propagandists are concerned. There are plenty of right-minded Americans, scornful of the mean Anglophobia which is part of the stock-in-trade of the demagogue, who see that to do by other countries as you wish and expect them to do by you is the only line of conduct consistent either with morality or with the honour of the Republic; but there are also political scoundrels, neither few nor destitute of influence, who may profess, with Mr. Blaine, to confine their protection to American citizens engaged in lawful callings, but to whom every calling appears lawful or better than lawful which inflicts injury or insult upon England.

THE principle of freedom of speech is stretched to a questionable length when people are allowed at public meetings to advocate wholesale murder, even though they may not, like the Irish Nationalists, take up subscriptions for the execution of their nefarious projects and mark out particular persons for assassination. It appears, from a report in the *Mail*, that Chicago has been the scene of a meeting of Socialists, usurping and sullyng the name of Labour, at which not only the most insane doctrines were preached, but the wholesale slaughter of Capitalists by dynamite was proclaimed as the method by which the Social Utopia was to be realized. A resolution of sympathy with men who had destroyed the property of their employers was also offered and apparently adopted. Chicago is now hardly an American city; it is becoming the lair of Invincibles, Anarchists, Dynamiters and Thugs of every variety and from all quarters of the earth. It may be said, and with truth, that the conspiracy which goes on in public is less dangerous than that which goes on in

secret; on the other hand the open propagandism of crime can hardly fail to demoralize a community. It is notable that some of the most atrocious things appear to have been said by women. Mrs. Parsons asserted her ability to throw dynamite as well as her husband, and recommended that those who were in want should be taught to trust in dynamite instead of trusting in God. So it is everywhere; woman, when she engages in agitation, puts off her better nature; she is more excitable than the man, she feels less responsibility than he does, and she outruns him in violence. We are not likely to gain much by flinging female character into the political caldron. The time must soon come when our senseless party divisions will cease; and the tocsin which summons all the enemies of civilization to unite in its destruction will be heard by its friends as the signal for common effort in its defence.

THERE are people in the United States who would be glad to see a violent rupture of the obligations incurred by the Republic in the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. If the American Government desires to be released from those obligations its object should be to find the means of withdrawing without dishonour; and to do so, it must get the consent of the other party to the agreement. If it were shown that there has been a great change in the circumstances of the case since the treaty was made, and that there are valid reasons why the United States should be released from the obligations of that instrument, the present English Government would, of all others perhaps, be the most likely to listen to reason, and to grant the request. It is to be regretted that neither Mr. Blaine nor Mr. Frelinghuysen treated the question with the frankness and singleness of purpose with which it ought to have been entered on. Their treatment of it raises the suspicion that they are not unwilling to pander to the class which is anxious to find in it a source of embarrassment to Britain. Mr. Blaine wished to increase his stock of political capital till it should become large enough to ensure him the Presidency. Although he could not have gained greatly by playing this card, there are others who are ready to follow his example. The United States entered into a treaty which was not limited by time or eventuality, which in form was perpetual, and Mr. Frelinghuysen said in effect that nations did not make treaties which contain the elements of perpetuity, and he claimed for one of the parties to it the right to terminate the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty without the consent of the other. We all know what happens when in private life a man chooses to repudiate his engagements; and the honour of a nation may be tarnished as well as that of an individual. Among other things an ante-Clayton-Bulwer contract has been pleaded. In 1846 the United States entered into a treaty with the Republic of New Grenada, now the United States of Columbia, by which the former guaranteed the neutrality of the isthmus and of any inter-oceanic communications that may be constructed over it. But the existence of this treaty cannot absolve the United States from its obligations under the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, or furnish a reason for its arbitrary annulment by one of the parties to it without the consent of the other. And if proper means had been taken to obtain that consent there is no reason to believe that, good reasons being shown, it would have been refused.

THOSE who wish to abolish residence at the universities and to grant the degree on examination alone have been accustomed to cite the University of London as a model. That institution was the offspring rather of necessity than of choice; it was founded to grant degrees to Nonconformists when they were excluded by religious tests from matriculation at one of the old universities and from graduation at both. Having no Professors it is not properly speaking a university at all, but merely an examining board. Now, however, a movement is on foot to obtain a teaching university for London. This shows that mere examination is felt to be unsatisfactory. The feeling is perfectly well founded; for that which an ordinary student can take into an examination-room is but a small part even of the knowledge, much more of the mental training, which he acquires in the class-room under an able teacher and amidst intelligent classmates. The social advantages of the university, the friendships which are formed in it, and the *esprit de corps* which it produces are of course totally sacrificed by the non-resident system. But there is not much fear of a serious movement in that line, especially as we have the happy assurance that the labours of the Confederation Conference have reached a favourable issue and that a scheme will soon be before us.

The vigorous words of the Bishop of Oxford on vivisection which we give in another column point to one among many instances of the error into which those fall who think that the departure of religion need make no practical difference in our actions or our rule of life. Among the Agnostics there are men of unquestionable intellect and virtue; they are