

bring to bear for the purification of national politics, the improvement of international relations, and the doing away with such iniquities as the African slave-trade, the British opium traffic, the crying injustice of the anti-Chinese laws, the selling of firearms and fire-water to uncivilized tribes, etc. Two distinct ways suggest themselves in which these ends could be promoted: First, by the concurrent representations of the various Parliaments of the respective denominations, embodied in such resolutions as some of those which were passed by the Pan-Presbyterian Council during its recent session. No Legislature in any nation with representative institutions could disregard the consentient opinions of these great representative bodies, if pressed upon their notice unambiguously and in downright earnest. The second means by which the power of the combined churches could make itself irresistibly felt would be through the aggregate of the action and influence of their individual members using their rights of citizenship. If the statement of one of the American delegates, to the effect that of every two adult citizens of the United States, one is a member of a Christian church, be even approximately correct, it is obvious that the legislation of the great Republic, and by parity of reasoning, that of Great Britain, Canada, and other so-called Christian nations, is really in the hands of the members of its churches. But if so, surely it is time that preachers and other good men should cease to cry out against the wickedness of the politicians and recognize the fact that the politicians are just such as the members of the Christian churches, either actively or passively, approve. Along these two lines lies the legitimate union of Church and State, but it throws a tremendous responsibility upon the churches!

REPLYING to an unambiguous allusion in an address recently made to him by a body of ardent Liberals at Carnarvon, in Wales, Mr. Gladstone used some very significant words. Although he endeavoured, he said, and it was his duty everywhere so far as he could, to recommend a spirit of sobriety as to the amount of their expectations, yet he would venture to say that, whatever the pressure of Irish demands or of any other question may be, "even one session of Parliament will not be allowed to pass without our being able to give some earnest to the people of Wales of our desire to deal with and, as far as we can, to promote and push forward the realization of their just demand." From a blunter statesman even these words might seem somewhat roundabout. From Mr. Gladstone's mouth they can be regarded as having only one meaning. Hence they seem to have been accepted as satisfactory by the crowds who listened breathlessly and who cheered this most important promise to the echo. And truly "a just demand" the demand of the Welsh people for disestablishment most certainly is, on any principle that denies the right of a small minority to impose their religious institutions upon the great majority of their fellow-citizens. That the Welsh are intensely in earnest in the matter was amply demonstrated at the general election, nor do we see how, in view of the facts, any unprejudiced person can find grounds for impugning the motives of the people in demanding that this crying injustice, done in the name of religion, be removed. Yet it pleases the *Spectator* to say that "the wave of anti-ecclesiastical feeling which swept over Wales at the general election was probably due to a composition of causes—class feeling, a hope of spoliation, excited by the revenues of the Church and the vague promptings of unsatisfied and aggressive racial sentiment."

QUOTING the *Spectator's* words in reference to the results of the election in Wales, we are reminded of an argument which is wrought out in the same article in which the above words occur, and which is so novel and curious that those of our readers who do not read the great unionist journal will probably be interested in it. The gist of this argument, so far as we can express it in a few words, is somewhat as follows: The demand for disestablishment was, in one of its aspects, the outcome of the "old or political radicalism, of which the chief characteristic was jealousy of all activity of government and all exercise of authority." To this has now succeeded the new or social type of radicalism, "to which the State is a *deus ex machina*, to be evoked in every emergency." Under this new system the duties of government are increasing and the province of the State extending. The whole position is therefore reversed, and

the presumption is now rather in favour of a State Church rather than against it. "Education, on its secular side, has already been recognized by all parties as a subject for the corporate action of the whole community. Why not, then, that which is the highest education of all?" It is not easy to conceive a mode of thinking or reasoning which more completely fails to apprehend the true basis of the most persistent and determined opposition to a State Church. Of course the fact that any such church, whether it be that of a minority or a majority, fails, and in the very nature of the case must fail, to become representative of the whole people, affords an incidental and easily understood objection to any existing establishment, and is, therefore, sure to be urged as such. But the root objection to all interference with religious matters by the State, whether in the way of patronage or of proscription, is, we take it, entirely distinct from any question either of majorities and minorities, or of radicalism, political or social. The most strenuous opponents of State-Churchism in every form are of two classes, who, setting out from positions diametrically opposite, religiously, reach a common conclusion. The deeply devout among those who are opposed to the establishment on the one hand, and the indifferent, the agnostic and the infidel, on the other, are agreed that in its very nature the matter of religious belief or unbelief is one which belongs so exclusively to the realm of the individual conscience that any interference by an external authority is an usurpation and an impertinence. The subject of religion belongs to a plane entirely distinct from, and, in view of the believer at least, immeasurably above, all those mundane concerns which constitute the proper province of municipal and State authorities. Hence it is evident that the most pronounced radicalism, or the most extreme socialism, as a political faith, may be held quite consistently with the strongest disapproval of everything savouring in any way of Church and State connection. The fabric so ingeniously built up on the foundation of a political creed falls to the ground because that foundation is utterly unfitted to sustain a structure which belongs to quite another sphere of thought and action.

RECENT despatches indicate that the rumoured evacuation of Uganda by the East Africa Company will, within a few months, have become a fact accomplished. If the departure of the Company means the withdrawal of British influence and the virtual abandonment of the regions about Lake Victoria Nyanza and the head waters of the Nile, to Mohammedanism and the untold horrors of the slave trade, the fact is to be deplored. If the event should prove it to mean that Lord Roseberry and his colleagues, while disapproving of the "Sovereign Company" system, intend to take other measures to prevent the contraction of the sphere of British influence in Eastern Africa, the change will, no doubt, be a salutary one. At the time of the formation of this and the other great African companies a few years ago we expressed our wonder that the British Government and people should, at this stage in the national history, sanction a mode of colonization so completely out of harmony with the spirit and institutions which have made her rule over the many barbarous tribes who have come under her sway so beneficent, comparatively speaking. It is not unlikely that the present British Administration is entirely opposed, on principle, to the bestowment of powers so extensive as have been given to the African companies, upon any private corporation. There seems, however, too much reason to fear that in this case it may carry a sound principle to an injurious extreme, by abandoning the wretched tribes of the interior to the tender mercies of the Arab slave traders. We say nothing of the loss to the nation of what has been called "one of the best pieces of Africa," and of what is likely, in the not distant future, to become the key to a large part of the interior of the "Dark Continent," including the Soudan, for, so far as we are able to judge, there is really little danger that any other nation will succeed in doing what a British trading company with an Imperial charter has failed to accomplish. Neither Germany nor France has made such a success of African colonization as would warrant the addition of this difficult task to what the one or the other has already undertaken, especially in view of the fact that Great Britain holds the sea coast and is not in the least likely to surrender that coign of vantage. It is to be hoped that the Company may see its way clear to accept Lord Roseberry's alternative offer, to bear the expenses of occupation until next March, thus enabling the Company to postpone evacu-

ation until that date. This would give Parliament an opportunity to express itself in regard to the matter and might possibly lead to the adoption of some such plan as that favoured by the *Spectator*, of separating the administrative and military operations of the Company from the commercial, and assuming the former, leaving only the latter to the Company. In so saying we are as far as possible from desiring to see anything in the nature of a Jingo policy adopted by the Mother Country. But if ever there was a case in which the enforcement of civilized rule in a barbarian land was justified on grounds of humanity, the deliverance of the wretched African tribes from the cruelties of the slave trade would be thus justifiable.

WERE Russian diplomacy straightforward and Russian statesmen reliable, the reported withdrawal of the Russian troops from the Pamirs and the Czar's reported disapproval of the conduct of Colonel Yanoff, the invading general, might be accepted as the end of the Pamir trouble. A better assurance is perhaps that given by the frank statement of the *Novosti Vremya* of St. Petersburg, to the effect that there can be no war between Great Britain and Russia on account of the Pamirs, because Russia does not want more uncultivated territory, having already too much of it, but is seeking "an outlet on the Indian Ocean," in order that she may thus have free access to the general waterway of the world. It is impossible not to sympathize to a certain extent with this ambition, which is no doubt the true cause of Russia's restiveness on the Indian border. There are said to be but two ways in which it would be possible for her to obtain such an outlet, viz., either direct through Persia from the Caspian Sea to the Persian Gulf, or from Herat through Afghanistan and Beloochistan to the Arabian Sea. The *Spectator* thinks that the latter route would be intolerable to India, as no doubt it would, but does not see any reason why Great Britain should dread Russia on the Persian Gulf, though it doubts whether Englishmen in general would take that view. It is scarcely a matter of doubt, as it is pretty clear that if Great Britain would have permitted, the route would have been taken long since. The determination of the English rulers of India not to permit the great Northern Bear to get access to the coasts of that vast Empire, to be a source of perpetual harassment, compelling the maintenance of an immense army for protection, can be easily understood. Nevertheless it is conceivable that a Government may some day come into power which will regard the presence of Russian fleets in the Indian Ocean as a lesser evil and danger than those resulting from the present situation. The prospect of having to exercise eternal vigilance in order to keep a mighty and unfriendly nation hemmed inland and cut off from the ocean on every side, is certainly not a pleasant one. If there were any probability that generous treatment in the matter would satisfy Russia and win her lasting friendship and good-will, thus bringing to an end the constant strain of the present situation, it might be a stroke of statesmanship as well as of generosity to let her find her outlet by the shortest possible route, provided it could be done without setting the whole region ablaze.

TOUCHING the Chinese question, on which we commented last week, it is interesting to note the characteristic way in which the Chinese in the United States are preparing to meet the outrageous Geary exclusion Act. A Chinese Civil Rights League has lately been formed for the purpose of securing the civil rights of Chinamen in the United States. At a recent meeting, which is said to have been well attended by Chinamen and others, a resolution was adopted declaring this Act to be unconstitutional and inhuman, and pledging the meeting to support the protest against it. But, notwithstanding this declaration, the Chinese themselves, instead of making a struggle in the courts against the Act, are contenting themselves with a policy of passive resistance by simply refusing to register. Not a single Chinaman has yet come forward, it is said, to be photographed, in spite of the efforts of the collector to secure registration through the influence of Americanized Chinamen. By a somewhat similar course of passive resistance the Chinese have hitherto successfully resisted all the attempts of Russia to retain possession of portions of their territory. In fact it is said that the only instance in which Russia has ever really retreated from an advance position once occupied in the East, was her evacuation of a portion of Chinese territory which she