

imposition of a small special tax laid on the membership for the purpose of inaugurating and maintaining coöperative enterprises, indicate, not the disintegration of the order, but rather its continued vitality under sounder conditions. Several features of its organisation and constitution are dangerous or objectionable. The order is so large, so heterogeneous, that some system of local government must be adopted if it is to last; and then greater play must be given to individual effort, in the local branches and in the membership. The movement is in that direction, we hope, and if so, the order may yet be evolved into a most useful institution, and a conspicuous proof of the sound judgment and honest purpose of the mass of our workingmen.

WE find that we did a great injustice to Dr. McGlynn in a note in our issue of August 4, where, commenting on his article in the *North American Review* for August, declaring against the policy of Separatism in national education adopted by the Roman Catholic Church on this continent, we said:—"But this was as true before Dr. McGlynn was excommunicated as it is to-day; yet he had not a word to say against the system till he had a personal quarrel with the Church." On reference again to the article, at the instance of a correspondent, to whom we are much obliged for the correction, we find that Dr. McGlynn concludes his observations by guarding himself against the very error on the part of "not well informed readers" into which we inadvertently fell. As he points out, he had, so early as April 30, 1870, published in the *New York Sun* a series of suggestions (which he reproduces), looking towards "an act (or amendment to the Constitution) to guard against the union of Church and State, and to protect liberty of conscience;" which practically cover the ground taken in the *North American Review* article.

A NEW phase of the Behring Sea Fisheries case is the seizure of two American schooners engaged in sealing in those waters, the pretext being that the United States Government is bound to defend the interests of its tenant, The Alaska Commercial Company, against all comers. When Alaska belonged to Russia, the United States contested the pretension that Behring Sea was a land-locked domain subject only to Russian jurisdiction, and Russia was compelled, in 1824, to formally recognise the right of both United States and British subjects to fish within the sea, outside the three-mile limit; but now, when the shores are owned by two different Powers, the right of any other than these Powers to enter what is, and always has been, an international highway from the Pacific to the Arctic, is denied. It is impossible to regard this new attitude as anything else than a diplomatic manoeuvre. The claim is probably set up in part as an act of retaliation for the enforcement by Canada of the treaty of 1818; in part it is an attempt to create a privilege which may be surrendered as an offset when the Atlantic Fishery Question shall be settled. The secret history of American diplomacy might be instructive reading for those who are urging us to entrust the making of the Canadian tariff to politicians at Washington. The public history—which may be read on the surface—is enough for everybody else.

THE Irish question truly seems to have turned everybody's head in England. Under the alarming title of "Parnellism and Crime" *The Times* publishes a letter from a loyal gentleman who complains that he met another gentleman in a public coffee-room, who informed him that he was Mr. Pinkerton, the Parnellite M. P. for Galway City. Whereupon the writer of the letter, rather impertinently as it appears to us, expressed his strong abhorrence of the crimes which had followed the footsteps of the League in Ireland, and instanced cases of persons he knew who had been shot at; to which this dreadful M. P. replied that he saw no reason why there should be a "close time" for landlords in Ireland. This incident the aggrieved loyalist informed the public of through *The Times*, thinking it might "serve to show that, however much the Parnellite leaders may try to dim the real feelings that actuate the Parnellite party, the rank and file of this party have not changed their views since the worst days of the Land League murders and assassinations." But, in a subsequent letter, Mr. Pinkerton, after explaining that he was introduced to the gentlemen complaining, gives this account of what passed. In answer to the question put by his interlocutor—What right had any Government to interfere in a contract between landlord and tenant?—"I replied I regarded this question from the tenants' point of view, and possibly if I was a landlord I might think different. He said, 'I am not a landlord myself,' and in order to show the distinguished position he occupied, told me he was related—I forget in what degree—to the Governor of one of Her Majesty's colonies, and was also cousin to a landlord who had been shot at three times. I laughed, and said I did not doubt it; at that time there was no close season for landlord more than tenant." Evidently the Parnellite M. P. had the

best of it, and one cannot but feel glad that he came out of the affair so creditably, for the grievous gentleman is apparently not over-truthful. But what a state of society, where two men cannot engage in conversation in an hotel without furnishing *The Times* with a text, however far-fetched, in proof of the connection between Parnellism and crime.

THE satisfaction expressed by the local branch of the Irish National League at the "suicidal action of the Salisbury Government" in proclaiming the League, is very likely to turn to disappointment. Not that the Government may not be shaken by carrying out the Proclamation—but if so, this will be only to give place, immediately or remotely, to a better, a stronger, a more truly Unionist Government, representing the conservative forces of the country; before which, and as a result of whose firm yet conciliatory policy, the National League will dwindle into powerless insignificance.

IN spite of the predictions and extravagant hopes of the Gladstonites and Parnellites, Government has been sustained in the Proclamation of the National League by a majority that shows little if any diminution. Mr. Chamberlain voted with the minority, but Lord Hartington supported the Government, refusing to "interfere needlessly and prematurely with their exercise of the authority which Parliament had entrusted to them and intended that they should use." It would have been strange if the House of Commons, having given Government the powers it asked for to repress crime, had refused to allow them to use those powers. The League will be suppressed wherever it ventures on anti-social action; its political action, however, so long as that is constitutional, will not be interfered with. Mr. Gladstone's confusion of these two things is most perverse. It is insulting to the working classes to confound their Trade Unions with the criminal combinations of the League. And as to the absence of crime on which Mr. Gladstone relies for argument, he ought to know that the small volume of crime apparent in Ireland is due to the ascendancy of an organisation that has won its position through crime and maintains it by criminal intimidation. The question before the country is whether the League shall be allowed to retain this predominance in Ireland or whether the Queen's Government shall be restored. It may be that for the moment the League, for its own purposes, maintains order in Ireland; but is that a reason why the legal Government should abdicate its functions? The moment is a critical one; the Government must in fact, now that it has the power, crush the League, or at least stop its illegal action. It has been entrusted by Parliament with power to do this; and if it fail in its duty, fail to use every force at its command, the League remaining master of the position, there will be practically an end to the British government of Ireland.

THAT was a most interesting Jubilee gift presented to the Queen by Mr. Drury Fortnum, a well-known antiquary and connoisseur. It was known from the record in the Public Record office that an engraved signet ring had been made for the unfortunate queen of Charles I. "His Majesty under warrant dated January 16, 1628, orders the payment of £267 to one Francis Walwyn, for the cutting and finishing of the arms of England upon a diamond with the initials of the Queen on either side," Mr. Fortnum found this ring in the collection of the late Duke of Brunswick, and having bought it, he presented it a few weeks ago to Queen Victoria, and it is now included in the royal collection at Windsor, where it lies side by side with the steel and gold signet of King Charles. Curious, and not without pathos, that the hand of Henrietta Maria should again be joined with her husband's, though only by association, in this material fashion, after the lapse of near two centuries and a half.

THE recent attempt made by some French aeronauts to reach a great height above the earth, says the *Spectator*, has not been productive of any particular scientific results. The balloon in which the ascent was made reached an altitude of over 20,000 feet without the occupants of the car experiencing any ill effects, except a tendency to faintness on the part of one of them. When about twelve years ago a similar attempt was made, and the height of 25,000 feet was reached, it was with fatal results to three out of the four aeronauts. The success of the present experiment is explained by the allegation that the difficulties due to the rarefaction of the atmosphere only begin at an altitude of 23,000 or 24,000 feet. This view seems supported by the fact that in the Himalayas and the Andes, heights of about 20,000 feet have been on several occasions reached without any inconvenience. In such cases, however, the ascent has always been gradual. The ill-effects experienced in balloons are possibly due to the suddenness of the change.