

It is highly significant of the nature of the Clan-na Gael that it has disbanded, in order to prevent any investigation of its affairs; but it strikes us that the police authorities might have been sharp enough to take possession of their premises, and if possible, secured their papers when suspicion first became tangible. American processes are sharp and arbitrary enough in some cases, but it strikes us there may perhaps be sufficient congenial element in the Chicago Police Force to delay prompt proceedings, or even to convey warning betimes.

We have always maintained in reference to Militia expenditure that it is but taking money out of one pocket to put it into another. Now that both uniforms and ammunition are supplied at home, there is additional force in this view. But it should also be borne in mind that the entire sum expended in annual camps goes into the pockets of our own people, and especially benefits the particular localities in which they are held. Alluding to the probability that the Sydney Field Battery and the 94th Battalion will go into camp there for a fortnight from the 1st July, a Cape Breton contemporary observes:—"The presence of a military camp in Sydney containing three or four hundred men will tend to enliven our town considerably this summer, while doubtless the disbursements will have a good pecuniary effect on trade." This is the sensible view to take.

We quote from the *Sydney Island Reporter* (which we thank for a courteous correction in the same issue as to a matter of fact on which our contemporary is doubtless well-informed) the following paragraph:—"A gentleman from Margaree informs us that the locality of the leprosy referred to in an Ottawa despatch in our last issue is at Lake O'Law, N. E. Margaree, that it is supposed to have been brought there from Newfoundland many years ago, and the worst case at present is that of a young lady who contracted the disease while waiting upon and reading to her uncle, who was a leper." Wherever this disease may be stated to have been imported from we were taken to task about a year and a half ago for asserting its existence in, as far as we remember, the same locality. Our informant, however, was a reliable gentleman who was quite conversant with the facts he gave us.

The beautiful verses by Mrs. Browning, which we give in our poetical column, are supposed to have been written on her death-bed by the lady beloved by the great Portuguese Poet. Luiz de Camoens was born in Lisbon in 1524, and died there in 1579. He was the son of a sea-captain, and studied at the University of Coimbra, which he left with a high reputation. But a passion which he conceived for Catarina de Atayde, a lady of the Court, blighted his prospects. His suit was discountenanced by the lady's family and by the King, who, indeed, was himself supposed to be enamoured of her. Catarina died broken-hearted, Camoens survived her 30 years, mostly spent in banishment; but he never married. His great poem, "The Lusiad," is a patriotic epic of high merit, reflecting the spirit of maritime adventure and discovery in which Portugal at that era stood almost without equal. The life of the poet was one of almost continual misfortune, and he died in absolute poverty, a pension granted him by the King for colonial services being withheld in his latter days.

The recent carpenters' strike is suggestive of some thoughts on questions of labor and capital. We confess to a good deal of sympathy with the operative in his desire for a little more time to himself, though he probably does not work nearly so hard as the employer, who has to arrange and estimate his contracts, and find the money to carry them out. But, letting that pass, some of the evils of Trades Unions (we are far from thinking there is no good in them) are brought to mind. One of the chief of these is the tendency to bring down the good workman to the level of the indifferent one, the logical, if not practical result being that it will become less worth a man's while to qualify himself as a first-rate hand. The only solution of such difficulties would seem to lie in a combination of the interests of labor and capital, and it is satisfactory to think that some steps in that direction have been taken in some recently recorded instances of the division of profits. The whole question is one to which intelligent capitalists should give their serious and broad-minded attention.

A serious issue affecting the liability of banks has been brought before the English courts in the case of *Vagliano Brothers v. the Bank of England*. It was first tried before Mr. Justice Charles, who decided that the bank is liable to pay upon forged bills, under the Bills of Exchange Act, notwithstanding the fact that the ostensible payees had nothing to do with the transaction, and that the money was fraudulently obtained by a clever swindler, and this decision has been sustained by the Court of Appeal. The condensed details are as follows:—A clerk with a salary of £150 a year in the office of Messrs. Vagliano, was able, by an ingenious system of fraud, to obtain the signature of his principals to bills amounting in the aggregate to more than £71,000, a sum squandered apparently in paying "differences" on unsuccessful Stock Exchange speculations. There was evidently laxity of system on the part of the plaintiffs, but, on the other hand, the bank, by cashing very large drafts over the counter within a few months, contrary to the usual practice, seems to have taken a share in the moral responsibility for the result. The decision of the Court of Appeals turned on the technical question whether the bills could be invalidated on the ground that the payees were, in the words of the Statute "fictitious or non-existing." It was contended that they must be treated as "fictitious and non-existing." This view, in opposition to that of Mr. Justice Charles in the court below, was taken by the Master of the Rolls, but the five other ordinary members of the Court of Appeal were agreed in rejecting it, and in throwing the responsibility upon the bank. The bank has the right of a further appeal to the highest tribunal, but we are not informed whether it will do so or not.

Before proceeding to more important points, we quote, without the detail of giving instances, Delitzsch's general remarks on the numberless derivative verbal analogies between Assyrian and Hebrew which he has established:—"I hold strongly," he says, to the principle that Assyrian must above all be explained by its own literature, and especially by the invaluable help of the original vocabularies and lists of synonyms of the old Assyrians. Adopting this natural course I was surprised to find the Assyrian and Hebrew dictionaries in complete harmony. Indeed, the latter receives far more real and solid illustration from Assyrian than from Arabic, the peculiar, sometimes late, meanings of which have been forced upon the much older Hebrew sister, often in a manner which is at variance with common sense and the claims of scientific research. While cheerfully acknowledging that the editors of Gesenius' dictionary have not entirely ignored Assyrian research, and have added a good many improvements in matters of detail, I maintain that they could have avoided the extraordinary abuse of Arabic." This is the key note to verbal analogy, but there are analogies in cult of far larger and broader importance, some of which we will briefly sketch at future opportunities.

A kindly and esteemed subscriber to *THE CRITIC*, in sending us his subscription with a highly appreciative comment, continues to deplore the view we take of the "deceased wife's sister bill," which he considers "now happily (to my mind) thrown out." We would, however, remind our friend that if, as it would seem, he imagines the bill to be permanently dealt with, he is reckoning with ut his host. It will continue to be introduced until it is passed, and the law of Great Britain assimilated to the common-sense views which have prevailed in the great Colonies. Meantime, we present our subscriber, for his consolation, the comment of an American Statesman travelling abroad, which, if facetious, perhaps accords better than our own with those of our correspondent:—"The desire of the Englishman to marry his deceased wife's sister is one of the most curious phenomena of the times. The deceased wife's sister bill may be said to be his steady occupation. In all his breathing spells from emergencies he turns to that. When he is not being massacred by the South Africans or slaying Soudanese or fighting Afghans or pacifying the Irish, he is looking after the deceased wife's sister bill. He comes back to it out of all victories and defeats with unwavering pertinacity and courage. Seeing how attractive such an alliance seems in England, I cannot but inquire why the Englishman does not marry the wife's sister in the first place. Why does he go on marrying the wrong one and then wait for death and the law to help him?"

It has been sometimes suggested that there may be good as well as harm in some sorts of combines. The fresh-meat trade of England is largely in the hands of one great firm, John Ball & Sons, which owns large refrigerating establishments in London, Liverpool and Glasgow, and upwards of 300 retail places in all the populous centres of the country. It is claimed that, while realizing large profits to themselves, the operations of this great English corporation (which has also joined interests with a large New York exporting house) benefits the general consumer by selling at lower rates than if the meat had passed through the hands of a middleman. Commenting on this situation, a New Brunswick contemporary adds:—"The meat trade of America is year by year centering more largely in the hands of one or two corporations. The Armour's of Chicago now send their canned meats to all parts of the globe, and their refrigerator beef is sold in all the principal towns and cities, not only of the United States, but of Canada. The facts contain a lesson for Canadian farmers, who cannot hope for a better market for their beef as a result of reciprocity, when the great combinations of the United States not only control the home market, but are seeking to control the English market, and have already obtained a foothold in Canada in spite of the duty imposed." The inference drawn by the *Moncton Times* is that our farmers and some of our manufacturers want more protection. That which occurs to us is, that it ought to pay the investment of Canadian capital to establish a great meat-canning establishment of our own.

Some remarks on the Jesuit Bill agitation which appeared in a recent issue of the *Amherst Record* appear to us to be so thoroughly sensible that we are induced, with some abbreviation, to reproduce them:—"We are frank enough to admit that we do not approve of the incorporation of the suppressed Jesuits in Quebec, or the granting of this money to them in lieu of escheated estates. As Protestants, we cannot assent to this policy. Still, we fully believe its accomplishment is within the powers of Catholic Quebec. Parliament is all powerful within its province. The bill passed the Quebec legislature without opposition, and the Protestant members of the government and house were satisfied with the justice of the Act when \$300,000 was given to them. There is little reason or sense, we think, in this anti-Jesuit agitation. Quebec has a right to do as she likes with her money. To abridge this right would be striking at provincial autonomy. It will be time enough to talk plainly to Quebec when after the wanton waste of her moneys she goes begging to the Dominion treasury for funds to replenish her treasury which her Jesuits estates' act depleted. On constitutional principles there is not a Protestant in Quebec who can find ground of complaint against the Dominion Government for not vetoing this bill. They saw the bill incorporating the Jesuits passing into law. This was the entering of the wedge. They saw the bill granting the \$300,000 to the once suppressed order receiving the sanction of parliament, and not one Protestant vote against it. Then was the time for vigorous action—the time for the Anti-Jesuit fire-eaters of to-day to have brought political pressure on the Provincial Government. Too many of the anti-Jesuits' agitator exhibit far more anxiety to make political capital out of this question than a record of consistency for themselves."