

The Communisite schism is making headway in Scotland—but great efforts are being put forth to reunite the Free and the Established Churches. A code of regulations has been drawn up, of which here are two articles:—

"II. If the Free Church minister adhere to Disruption principles, his congregation are morally bound to adhere to him.

"III. If the Free Church minister forsake Disruption principles, great consideration and forbearance should at first be shown in dealing with him. If he consent to leave it an open question, then his congregation should still adhere to him; but should he persist in endeavouring to 'ripen and enlighten public opinion' in the cause of Disestablishment, then they are morally bound to separate from him, and join the Established Church."

But a still stranger thing in connection with that movement is this form of prayer which has been adopted:—

"O, Heavenly Father, who art a jealous and yet a merciful God, look down with compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our fellow-sinners in the Free Church, who, as leaders and followers, have broken their covenant with Thee as God over this nation, by forsaking the distinctive principles of the Disruption; who, since then, handed over to judicial blindness and hardness of heart, have supported those men that have been labouring to undermine the inspiration and supreme authority of Thy Holy Word; and who, like another backsliding church of old, are continually proclaiming to the world, 'We are rich, and increased in goods, and have need of nothing,' and know not 'that they are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.' Bring them to a thorough and sincere repentance, and mercifully heal their backslidings. Abundantly prosper and bless Thy servants in the Free Church who faithfully maintain, through good and through evil report, the true testimony for the Headship of Christ, not only over the Church, but over States and nations in their character as such; and grant that the day may speedily arrive when Ephraim shall no longer vex Judah, nor Judah Ephraim; when they that hate our national Zion shall be confounded and turned, and shall be as grass on the housetops; and when Thou shalt bring back the captivity of Thy people, so that Jacob shall rejoice and Israel shall be glad. Deliver us, O Lord, from our present blindness, and spiritual pride, and folly, as a nation; and grant unto us more light, more wisdom, and more humility, for Christ's sake. Amen."

Isn't that Scotch?

Said the great Earl of Beaconsfield: It is not correct to say that the Congress has made a partition of Turkey; and yet this is what has happened as a matter of fact. Greece, under the mild denomination of a rectification of the frontier, has received an extension of territory to the tune of not less than 5,500 square miles, comprising lands rich by reason of climate and soil. Roumania loses 2,500 square miles in Bessarabia, but she gets 7,000 square miles in the Dobrudja and Delta of the Danube, making a net profit of 4,500 miles. Servia receives 3,800 square miles; and Montenegro the small amount of 1,300. But Russia has received largely at the hands of the Congress, notwithstanding the firm and stern attitude of the British plenipotentiaries, securing 10,000 square miles in Asia, besides the 2,500 in Bessarabia which Roumania loses. So Turkey has lost 23,800 square miles, but has not suffered the humiliating process of partitioning. Verily, old words are changing, and the great mystery-man of England will have to write a new dictionary for the guidance of the people he has educated.

The Earl was equally happy and correct when he spoke of having helped to secure the interests of Britain and the peace of Europe. Peace, forsooth! It sounds well, and pleased even the British Jingo—*for they didn't want to fight—only to brag and bluster; but the state of affairs is little like giving a promise of lasting peace.* The Turks and the Bulgarians are regarding each other with a mutual hatred—and unless foreign troops are maintained—or at least foreign officers to command native troops—in all Bulgaria and Roumelia for years to come there will be worse anarchy, bloodshed and ruin than the world has ever seen in those provinces. Austria has to take by force of arms the position assigned to her in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In Italy the feeling with regard to the result of the Congress is one of deep and universal dissatisfaction. A Republican Congress has been held in the city of Rome giving expression to the popular feeling. Menotti Garibaldi—son of the famous General—presided, and the Italians cheered as they did in the years of their great struggle when a red flag was carried on to the stage, having on its field the word "*Unita*," and on the streamer attached the name of Maurizio Quadrio. The Plenipotentiaries at the Congress—the Austrian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina—Monarchical government, and that of Italy in particular, were denounced with violence. The mildest word applied to the Congress was "infamous." The General telegraphed to the meeting:—"Slaves have the right of rising; people of Trieste, take to your mountains." Things are no better in Russia. The Press there is gagged—but M. Aksakoff has dared to give utterance to the general sentiment—which is one of profound discontent. He accuses Russian diplomats of "rare stupidity, combined with excessive servility," adding, "The greatest enemy of Russia and the dynasty could have devised no scheme more prejudicial to the throne, the peace, and the quiet of the country." This, and more like it, the Earl

of Beaconsfield calls peace. Things are getting strangely named in these days. The word *peace*, like the word *partition*, has got a new meaning.

PROTECTION:—THE LUDICROUS SIDE OF IT.

"Time was, that when the brains were out, a thing would die,"—not so with the bugbear of Protection, we have its ghost "revisiting the glimpses of the moon" in all its emptiness. The most manifest absurdities while remaining in fashion receive the greatest respect; for it is not till Time affords a retrospect that the full force of the absurdity is revealed.

Such a retrospect England is able to realize on this question, and we may venture to assert that no sane man in England would dream of a re-enactment of Protection; nevertheless it was amongst the most prominent superstitions in which our forefathers believed, as a commercial principle and rule of legislation, and apparently in Canada we have scarcely sufficiently awakened to perceive its absurdities, it may therefore be worth our while to glance at a few of them as revealed to us in that voluminous legacy bequeathed to the present generation,—the English Statute Book.

Before, however, we open some of its most comical pages, let us premise that the question of Protection proper is not a political one. Of the precise force and meaning of the term, there is a large class of "constant readers" who have no definite idea. The word Protection calls up in their minds a sort of phantasmagoria composed chiefly of tedious debates in Parliament, Custom-houses, excisemen, smugglers, "preventive-men," and mounted "coast-guards." They know it has to do with imports, exports, drawbacks, the balance of trade, and being searched when they step ashore from a foreign steamer. Floating over this indefinite construction of the term, they have a general opinion that Protection must be a good thing; for they also associate it most intimately with the guardianship of the law, which protects them from the swindler, and with the policeman who protects them from the thief. That powerful and patriotic sentiment—"Protection to Native Industry"—must, they think, be nearly the same sort of thing, except that it means protection from the tricks of foreigners, instead of from those of compatriots. They confess that, believing the whole matter to be a complicated branch of politics, they have neither time nor patience to "go into it."

There is another phase of the question, which may be regarded as the workingman's view of it, and this seems always to travel as a side-show to the main exhibition; and as the advocates of Protection, from time immemorial, have called it by euphonious nicknames to serve the occasion (taking care, as Petroleum Nasby has it, not to deliver the Massachusetts speech in Ohio), so the arch-protectionist agitator Kearney now speaks of "*pooling the issues*," which (whatever it may mean) may well be applied to Protectionist arguments the whole continent over.

In supposing the question of Free Trade or Protection to be a political one, they are, as we have before hinted, in error. It has no more to do with politics than their own transactions with the butcher and the grocer; for it treats of the best mode of carrying on a nation's, instead of an individual's, dealings with foreign customers. Connected, as everybody knows, with what is protected, there must be two parties,—A., in whose *favour* it is protected; and B., *against* whom it is protected. Legitimate and wholesome protection preserves the property we wish to guard against our enemies; impolitic and unwholesome protection too securely preserves property to us which we are anxious to get rid of—by sale or barter—against our best friends, our customers.

These elementary explanations are absolutely essential for the thorough enjoyment of the comedy, which here and there lightens up that great publication,—the Statutes at Large.

When the laws had protected English manufacturers and producers from foreign produce and skill, they, by a natural sequence of blundering, set about protecting the manufacturing population one against another, and the jest of the German wig-makers, who petitioned their Crown Prince "to make it felony for any gentleman to wear his own hair," is almost realised. In the palmy days of Protection, a British bookbinder could not use paste, nor a British dandy hair-powder, because the British farmer had been so tightly protected against foreign corn that the British public could not get enough of it to make bread to eat.

These were perhaps the most expensive absurdities into which John Bull was driven by his mania for protection, but they were by no means the most ludicrous. Among his other dainty devices for promoting the woollen manufacture, was the law which compelled all dead bodies to be buried in woollen-cloth. There may not be many who can sympathise with the agony of Pope's dying coquette:—

"Odious! In woollen! 'Twould a saint provoke;
Were the last words that poor Narcissa spoke."

But every one must be astounded at the folly of bribing men to invest ingenuity and industry to bury that which above ground was the most useful and saleable of all possible articles. The intention was to discourage the use of cotton, which has since been proved one of the greatest sources of wealth ever brought into the country.

The strangest and most practical protest of national common sense, against laws enacting protective duties, was the impossibility of compelling people to obey them. To those laws the country has been indebted for the expensive custom-houses and custom-house officers, who cannot, after all, prevent smuggling. The disproportionate penalties threatened by protective laws, show how difficult it was to ensure obedience. In 1765, so invincible was the desire of the ladies to do justice to their neat ankles, that a law was passed, decreeing that "if any foreign manufactured silk stockings be imported into any part of the British Dominions, they shall be forfeited, and the importers, retailers, or vendors of the same, shall be subject, for every such offence, to a fine of £200, with costs of suit." The wise legislators did not dare to extend the penalty to the fair-wearers, who found means to make it worth the while of the vendors to brave and evade the law.

The complicated and contradictory legislation into which the *ignis fatuus*