

Field Battery, and two Field Batteries from the Reserve Artillery. The whole of this force to wear green leaves or leather in their head dress.

3RD DIVISION—THE ENEMY.—Major-General Sir Charles Staveley, K. C. B., commanding. Cavalry—Major-General Sir T. McMahon, C. B., commanding. 1st Brigade, Colonel Seymour, commanding—2nd Dragoon Guards, 3rd Dragoon Guards, 7th Dragoon Guards; 2nd Brigade, Colonel the Hon. I. Finnes, commanding—7th Hussars, 9th Lancers, and one Battery of Royal Horse Artillery Infantry—Major Brownrigg's Brigade, with one Field Battery; Colonel Stephenson's Brigade, with one Field Battery; Colonel Smith's Brigade, with one Field Battery, and one Battery of Horse Artillery, and two Field Batteries from the Reserve Artillery.

These arrangements will be carried out on Thursday morning, the troops moving at such hours as the general officers commanding the divisions which they are to join may direct.

"The baggage will return direct to Aldershot to-morrow morning—From Chobham, by Pirbright; from Bisley, by Brookwood; from Southhurst by Frimley.

"By Command,
C. R. EBERTON.

"Major General, Deputy-Adjutant General."

Also the following continuation of "General Sketch of Manœuvres"—

"Thursday, 21st.—The defending force (1st Division) having yesterday maintained its position, has been reinforced and will to-day advance.

"The enemy (3rd Division) will endeavour to check the advance and cover Aldershot.

"There will be no limits to the area of the operations except those laid down by the 'Military Manœuvres Act,' and such lands as have been interdicted by the Commissioners.

"Each corps will move at such hour as will bring it into the position selected by the general officer commanding, from which to commence his operations by nine a. m.

"The baggage of both forces is to be considered neutral to-morrow.

By Command,
C. R. EBERTON.

"Major General, Deputy-Adjutant General."

BRITISH ROYALTY VS. BRITISH REPUBLICANISM.

If, as Mr. Gladstone asserts, the British working man has a deep seated respect for the aristocracy, it seems tolerably clear that his reverence for the Throne is considerably on the wane. When an ambitious politician wants to ingratiate himself with the English masses, the easiest method he can select to win applause is to proceed to inveigh against the expensive and ornamental appendages of the Monarchy. Perfect candor and fairness would be rather fatal than otherwise to his complete success. He has simply to make a little capital out of the medieval ornaments which still cling to an ancient institution, a few innuendoes about the relaxed habits of the present occupant of the throne may be added; and a general suggestion of how many poor families could be kept in comfort on the allowance of a single prince, will make his triumph over the sympathies of his audience complete. As for any frank exposition of how far Parliament and the nation are responsible for the anomalies of the Royal Household, and how comparatively little the Reigning Family have to do with them, that is not to be ex-

pected from the new type of British trading politician. Still less can we look in this connection, for a comparison of the expenses of British royalty with that in any other country, and any statement of the advantages of the institution in point of avoiding chronic political excitement and a general surrender of the good of the country to the temptations of high office is altogether out of the question.

The latest aspirant for political fame who has been distinguishing himself in this direction is Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke M. P. This gentleman, who though too young for a statesman, seems to consider himself old enough to reconstruct the British Empire, is chiefly known for having made the tour of the world in an incredibly short space of time and for having summed up the results of his scamper of observation in a book entitled "Greater Britain." In a lecture at Newcastle-on-Tyne on Monday, Nov. 6th, Sir Charles favored an audience, chiefly composed of working men, of his views upon the excessive cost and general want of utility of the British Court. He makes out the annual amount of the Civil List, i. e., the Royal allowances, with sundry fanciful additions, to be £707,000—rather less, it will be observed, than Tweed and his confederates stole in the course of half an hour's session. Thereupon follow some strictures, in the main well deserved, upon the very useless character of the cavalry regiments known as Life Guards and Horse Guards, and an enumeration not particularly appropriate in such a discussion, of the officers—ordinary and extraordinary—of the Royal Household. After a good deal more to the same purpose, the speaker is reported as having said, "I confess freely, that I doubt whether, if the charges to which I have to-night alluded are well founded, the monarchy should not set its house in order.

Nobody will dispute Sir Charles Dilke's perfect liberty to make any comparison he may think proper between the respective advantages of a Republic and a limited Monarchy. In a free State the question of what is a form of government is one eminently proper to be made at all times, except perhaps in times of great public danger. But in discussing changes so grave, it is incumbent on any man who has the slightest concern for his own reputation, to see that he should "naught extenuate or set down aught in malice." As a member of the British Parliament, Sir Charles Dilke could hardly be ignorant of the fact that the present Civil list of the British Royal Family is the result of a bargain between the Crown and the people which ought to be equally binding upon both. Queen Victoria and her family are not, in the current phrase of demagogues, "Royal beggars." They possess certain estates by a title rather clearer than that by which most of the land in the United Kingdom is held. At the beginning of the present reign, the representatives of the nation in Parliament undertook to manage these estates on behalf of the Queen and to give her a certain sum in exchange for their annual rental, in addition to other sums necessary to sustain the dignity of her position. Within thirty years, the revenues of the Royal manors have increased immensely. So also from the birth of princes and princesses, has the national expenditure upon the Royal Family. But even now after matrimonial and other grants have rather wearied public patience and greatly exasperated the imperfectly informed British masses, it is conceded by all impartial inquirers into the matter, that the difference between the revenues of which the Royal Family cannot be deprived without confisca-

tion and those which they hold by parliamentary grant is not great enough to make the British Court anything but the cheapest in Europe.

A man who systematically evades the recognition of facts like these in passing judgment upon the Royal Family of Great Britain is guilty of unfairness which would be contemptible in dealing with a private adversary. Considering that the only object to be gained is a little cheap popularity, Sir Charles W. Dilke, M. P. must be set down in the front rank of unscrupulous demagogues. The thoughtful friends of Republicanism in England perceive pretty clearly that such a line of attack, however popular with the masses, is entirely unworthy of so momentous a controversy. British fair play has not become so much of an exploded fallacy, that any cause can be furthered by such overstatements as that of which Sir Charles Dilke's speech affords the latest example.

Later Cable advices give details of renewed personal attacks upon Queen Victoria in England. A temperance orator called Gribble has publicly accused her of habits of intoxication and Sir Charles Dilke has repeated at Bristol his tirades which so tickled the democracy of Newcastle. Gribble will, it is said receive a somewhat needless notoriety by being prosecuted by the local authorities of Brixton, a London district where his speech was delivered. The speech of the Republican M. P., was greeted at Bristol by a good deal of uproar and fighting, a band in attendance was prevented from playing the National Anthem. All this may be a little exciting, but it represents a very contemptible style of warfare. If the British Monarchy is to be overthrown at all surely noble means will be found to effect such a purpose. If not, then so much the worse for the form of government which is to succeed it.—*Acadian Recorder*.

THE GREAT MISSION OF WOMEN.

Great indeed is the task assigned to woman! Who can elevate its dignity? Not to make laws, not to lead armies, not to govern empires; but to form those by whom laws are made, armies are led, and empires governed; to guard against the slightest taint of bodily infirmity, the frail, yet spotless creature, whose moral, no less than physical being, must be derived from her; to inspire those principles, to inculcate those doctrines, to animate those sentiments, which generations yet unborn and nations yet uncivilized will learn to bless; to soften firmness into mercy, and chasten honor into refinement, to exalt generosity into virtue, with a soothing care; to allay the anguish of the mind; by her tenderness to disarm passion by her purity in triumph over sense; to cheer the scholar sinking under his toil; to console the statesman for the ingratitude of a mistaken people; to be compensation for friends that are perfidious—for happiness that has passed away. Such is her vocation. The couch of the tortured sufferer, the prison of the deserted friend, the cross of the rejected Saviour—these are theaters on which her greatest triumphs have been achieved. Such is her destiny; to visit the forsaken, to tend to the neglected when monarchs abandon, when counsellors betray; when justice prosecutes, when brethren and disciples flee, to remain unshaken and unchanged, and to exhibit to this lower world a type of that love, constant, pure, and ineffable which in another we are taught to believe the test of virtue.—*Blackwood's Magazine*.