

ised band of robbers under King Theebaw's brother, a youth of seventeen years of age. He numbered some of the most influential ex-officials of King Theebaw's government among his supporters.

Brigands in every part of the district professed to be fighting in his interests, and covered their crimes with his name. The military power of the British soon ejected him from his stronghold; he and his band were driven from post to post, until at last they had to take refuge with the Sawbawa of a small Shan state offered them as an asylum. Here the young prince remained until his death in August, 1886.

The district from Toungoo to Mandalay is now fairly pacified, and the construction of the railway has been commenced, and will afford employment for the inhabitants, less exciting but more safe and remunerative than gang robbery.

Let us now turn to that division of Upper Burmah which lies north of Mandalay. At the period of the British invasion seven English gentlemen, in the service of the Bombay-Burmah Trading Corporation, had been made prisoners by the Burmese officials in that district; of these three were barbarously murdered, and the rest rescued and sent to Mandalay by the Woon of Mingin, a large town upon the Chindwin River. At Kendat, a town still further up the river, other Europeans were held captive, and were delivered by Col. Johnstone, Political Agent at Manipur, who came over the border with fifty Sepoys and a Manipur contingent, and marched upon Kendat. The district was also scourged by a brigand chief, Hla-oo, and by cousins of King Theebaw, who had fled from Mandalay. The British cause was supported by some of the local Woons; local police were organised; and the troops with the aid of these, and the loyal villagers, operated with vigour against the bands of robbers, and constantly marched to the protection of villages threatened with attack. The power of Hla-oo has been finally and thoroughly broken, the brigand leaders and their followers in every quarter have given in their submission and surrendered their arms.

Strange to say the most remote district of Burmah, that of Bhamo, in the extreme north, near the Chinese frontier, has been the least disturbed. It was occupied without opposition in December, 1885, and an efficient civil administration at once provided.

The vast tract of imperfectly explored country to the north-west of Bhamo abounds in mines of jade and amber, and in forests producing india-rubber. The people of this region have received the troops and civil officers with professions of loyalty, and their acts, so far, have been consistent with their words. At some distance from the east bank of the Irrawaddy River, between Mandalay and Bhamo, lie the famous ruby mines of Burmah. A military expedition was sent at the end of the year 1886 to occupy these mines, and enforce the power of British authority, and it met with no opposition. In the town of Mandalay itself no serious difficulty occurred; but one insurrection took place, and that was quickly suppressed. From this short summary it will be seen that the pacification of Burmah has been a work of tedious and desultory fighting in every part of the empire. The task has been carried out by regimental officers and small detachments of men, under circumstances of great hardship and danger, with little prospects of glory and renown. The duty has been performed in a way that reflects the highest credit upon Sir Frederick Roberts, by whom the plan of campaign was arranged and executed. Although the task of pacification appears complete there may be further struggles when the rainy season renders the jungles impassable; some portion of the work will have to be done over again each successive season until the habits of the people are altered, and their taste for brigandage is eradicated. Soldiers will be gradually replaced by military police, and the labour in future years will become less dangerous and less costly. As the rich fertile country is opened out by railways and roads, it may be expected that the population will settle down to industrial pursuits, and that Burmah will become a source of strength instead of weakness to England's Indian Empire.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PARNELL LETTER.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Strong evidence has been borne by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. George to the vehemence of the language in which Mr. Parnell deplored and denounced the Phoenix Park murders. We need not doubt their testimony; though whether Mr. Parnell deplored the crime as deeply as the blunder, may be questioned, when we see that he evidently draws a distinction between the murder of Mr. Burke, who was his enemy, and that of Lord Frederick Cavendish, who was not, and when we remember that more than a hundred murders have been committed by the agrarian agitators of his party in Ireland, without his making a single strenuous effort to prevent them. But this in no way proves, or tends to prove, that he did not find it necessary secretly to reinstate himself in the good graces of those extreme men whom he openly denounced, but who were the best subscribers to his fund, as well as his staunchest partisans.

The *Times* challenges inquiry; it has distinctly formulated its charge so as to furnish ground for a libel suit. It is said on Mr. Parnell's part that the impartiality of a London jury could not be trusted. The facts, at all events, would be elicited under oath, and if they were in his favour public opinion would revise the verdict. But he or his friends might move for a committee of inquiry in the House of Commons. They do nothing of the kind, nor is *The Times* challenged to produce the document or to explain its history. Mr. Parnell takes his departure for Ireland, and we are now informed that he is detained there by a cold.

In the meantime the signature in fac-simile is before the world, and no

expert has yet been found to declare against its genuineness, though the correspondent of a Parnellite journal in New York announced his intention of consulting six experts of the highest eminence. It is preposterous to deny that this is *prima facie* evidence, or to allege that it can be rebutted by the mere disclaimer of the person whose character is at stake, especially as he has already shown himself capable of playing fast and loose with facts in a matter far less vital to him than the present.

The fac-simile presents some indications of genuineness. Two or three words are crossed out, though they are legible beneath the erasure. The word which, from the sense, should evidently be "regret," is miswritten "regard." This does not look like the work of a forger, who is pretty sure to be careful.

Reason and justice bid us, as I said before, suspend our judgment till the case has undergone a thorough investigation. We have no more right to rush prematurely to the conclusion that the editor of *The Times* has been guilty of malicious forgery than we have to rush to the conclusion that Mr. Parnell has been guilty of conniving at a assassination. Nor will anyone but a violent Nationalist partisan treat Mr. Parnell as though he had been proved innocent, and pay homage to him by addresses or resolutions while such an accusation, supported by *prima facie* evidence, is hanging over his head.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

DIVINITY DEGREES.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—Will you permit me a few remarks on your article of last week on this subject?

The general plan of the proposed clause in the University Federation Act seems to have been entirely misunderstood by those who have so far taken part in this discussion in the daily press. In saying that "For the general principle of connecting divinity degrees with the theological schools there is a good deal to be said," THE WEEK has fallen into the right line of the discussion.

The proposed action of the Government was somewhat as follows: There are now in affiliation with the University of Toronto, Knox, Wycliffe, St. Michael's, and the Baptist theological colleges. Victoria, which is coming into the federation, has also a theological course. If these affiliated colleges took advantage of the proposed scheme, there would then be, in effect, one standard of scholarship for degrees in theology in the case of all these theological colleges. The first requisite was the degree of B.A., and since the Arts degree of the University of Toronto is the best in Canada, and one of the best on this continent, this in itself would ensure sound scholarship as a pre-requisite for the degree in Theology.

How can a comprehensive scheme like this be called interference on the part of the Government with the internal affairs of a free religious society? Your article states that it would be a strange thing "to find the Legislature dictating the terms on which religious distinctions should be distributed in the various Christian churches in the Province." But must not any "religious society" obtain from the Legislature the power to confer degrees? If so, has not the Legislature the right to impose certain conditions on that degree-conferring power? In this case they made the standard as high as it was possible for them to make it, and there can be no complaint on that score.

The only case where it was even objected that such interference was felt, is that of Wycliffe College, and the result of the protest of the Bishops is that Wycliffe College is debarred from the enjoyment of the privileges of this clause of the Act. There is no doubt that the opposition in the Legislature was not to the principle of the clause, but to the participation of Wycliffe College in the benefits of the clause. The Government amended the clause so as to exclude Wycliffe, and Mr. Meredith expressed himself as quite satisfied with the amendment. I am not concerned with this particular phase of the case; I merely wish to draw attention to what I consider the benefits accruing to theological learning from the operation of such a unifying principle. You will agree with me that there ought to be a high standard in Arts as a pre-requisite to a degree in Theology. This is the main condition imposed by the Government. Unless the opposers of the measure contend that the Legislature has not the right to grant the power to confer degrees, then their only objection to the principle of the measure falls to the ground; because the three incorporated colleges of the Church of England in Canada which possess the power to confer degrees, confer degrees in Theology without requiring any degree in Arts at all.

M.

[We do not, for a moment, deny that the degree-conferring power must emanate from the Government of the country, or that the Government may "impose certain conditions on that degree-conferring power." What we insist upon is that such powers should be given on the petition of the churches concerned, or in concert with their representatives.—Ed. THE WEEK.]

THE editor regrets that in the report of Will Carleton's lecture published in THE WEEK, April 21, the latter words of a phrase which should have read: The assembly was, it must be admitted, not a fashionable one, and was largely composed of dissimilar elements of the city,—was printed "'dissenting' elements of the city." The writer had no intention to associate attendance at a lecture with the profession of any form of religious belief, nor to reflect in the slightest degree on the social status of dissenters; and writer and editor alike beg to apologise for a regrettable oversight that may permit such a misconstruction.