

complaint is that this cry is kept up by class or trade interests, and employed as an *ad captandum* appeal by politicians, when it has no justification. This position is fortified by an elaborate array of statistics. "We are," he says, "the richest nation on the earth, and yet we submit to be told by our orators in Parliament that we are not rich enough to discharge our duties, or to mend our social evils, or avert our coming perils. We find ourselves with millions of surplus revenue when our annual budget is unveiled to us—last year it was six millions—yet our constant question is not 'What best can we do with it?' but 'To what clamorous interest or class shall we give it away?' Mr. Greg contends that the national prosperity now enjoyed by England will not, at any rate, may not, be lasting, and that, therefore, instead of following Mr. Gladstone's system of flinging away surpluses when the country can afford to spend them, and when it is their duty to spend them, they should be utilized now while we have them. There are six objects of expenditure which Mr. Greg regards as of immediate and pressing importance—the Army, the Administration of Justice, Irish National Education, the Reduction of the National Debt, Sanitary Measures, and the Relief of Local Taxation. He contends that if Parliament refuses to apply its revenue to these purposes now when the country is wealthy and prosperous, and taxation light, it will bitterly rue its so-called economy in the day of peril.

Dr. Carpenter's paper on "Ocean Circulation" is exceedingly instructive, as well as interesting, although, from its length, it is impossible to give an adequate idea of its contents here. The writer sums up the results of exploration in H. M. S. *Challenger*, and the U. S. steamer *Tuscarora*, with a view to substantiating the theory of deep-sea current from the poles towards the equator, and a return current in the reverse direction. By this means a never-ceasing circulation of the great seas is kept up and life rendered possible at all depths. It is noticeable that the old notion of the Gulf Stream as a modifier of climate in Western Europe is exploded without ceremony. The climatic influence of the main currents of ocean, both in the Atlantic and Pacific, is traced with great care. Professor Huxley meets another antagonist in the person of Lord Blachford, better known, perhaps, as Sir Frederick Rogers. The writer has very little confidence in the physiological method as applied to psychology. Preferring to rest entirely on what we, or more properly each *Ego*, know by consciousness or experience, he endeavours to follow in the path marked out by Descartes. The method need not be followed out here in detail. It may suffice to say that his lordship arrives at this just conclusion:—"In all this I seem to myself to have shown that the evidence of the sensitiveness of human beings is as conclusive as any-

thing can well be, and that, with unimportant difference of degree, the evidence for the sensitiveness of animals is the same as the evidence for the sensitiveness of men other than ourselves." He denies, therefore, that a "dog is only a better kind of *marionette*," and demands the proof, if any, that he is. Then follows a rather slashing criticism of Professor Huxley, of which we must content ourselves with an example. Quoting a passage in the Professor's *quasi*-demonstration, in which follow successively the phrases—"it is a highly probable conclusion," "it is further highly probable," and as an inference from these premises, "We may assume, then," Lord Blachford parallels the argument thus:—"Remove from a piquet pack the diamonds and draw a card, 1. It is highly probable (in fact 2 to 1) that it will be a black card. 2. It is also highly probable (in fact 5 to 3) that it will not be a picture card. Mr. Huxley's conclusion would be 'we may assume' that it will be a non-picture card of spades or clubs—the fact being that the odds are 15 to 9 against its being so." Mr. Walter Edwards has a plea against the English Poor Law, and in favour of its early repeal. We observe that he is not aware that there are alms-houses supported by the State in New England, and that a system of out-door relief has been instituted, which places them in the same category with the English workhouse.

Three essays, or rather skeletons of essays, are published under the title of a discussion "On the Scientific Basis of Morals." Professor Clifford's part is, as he describes it, very "crude," indeed, we scarcely see how a thinker of his acuteness could have penned it, if he had thoroughly thought out his subject. His theory of the "Tribal Self" is a sort of fancy patchwork, for which Hobbes and Rousseau are mainly answerable, supplemented by touches from Darwin, Spencer, and Tylor. Bentham he repudiates altogether, and his derivation of Conscience, Right, and Responsibility are marvellous examples of imaginative skill. "P. C. W." replies, starting with a denial of the supernatural, of any essential difference between men and animals, and of any creator, and then he wants to know how the possible systems of ethics on this basis should treat a woman suffering with an incurable cancer. Should they nurse her, &c., for the remainder of her days? Should they leave her alone? Or should they terminate her existence? He then examines these questions by the light of these three theories:—the Mechanical or Automatic (Huxley's), the Utilitarian (Mill's), and the Perfectionist (Clifford's). His conclusion is that none of them can give a satisfactory answer, and that no answer is possible without a belief in the existence of an intelligent Creator, and in the spiritual part of man. Mr. Frederic Harrison, in the third part, is not at his best. He agrees with P. C. W. in the main, but