

In regard to the Geneva Award, Great Britain has rebuked the United States. In the case of Burnand against Rhodocanachi in the Court of Common Pleas, London, Lord Coleridge gave a decision that the defendant, a merchant who had obtained the net sum of \$2,804 as a compensation for tobacco destroyed by the "Alabama," must pay it back to the plaintiff, an underwriter with whom the tobacco had been insured, and who had paid upon it as a total loss. Lord Coleridge remarked that the defendant, being in possession of money to which the plaintiff by English law was entitled, was obliged to give it to the plaintiff, notwithstanding the Act of the Congress of the United States excluding the claims of underwriters.

Sir Garnet Wolseley is to be sent to Afghanistan to extricate the British army from the fastnesses where it took shelter after the reverse of Candahar. The presence of Sir Garnet will undoubtedly have a wholesome effect on the population of India, which has been in a troubled state, if we may believe Indian authorities. It is somewhat peculiar that all warlike undertakings should be entrusted to a single General, and it is also curious that in the British army, whose *war strength* does not exceed 400,000 men, there should be on the active list 215 Generals, 159 Lieutenant-Generals, and 242 Major-Generals,—a total of 626 Generals, or more than *four* times the number in the Prussian army, which has 600,000 men *constantly* under arms.

It is at a most inopportune moment that Premier Gladstone is ill, as there are troubles both in the colonies and at home. The terrible disaster in Afghanistan has brought grief to many circles, and is not likely to be settled without further bloodshed. The Turkish affairs are also in a disjointed condition and exact from England watchful care, but that Turkey should be troubled is not unusual. The recall of Sir Bartle Frere is also a vexing matter and complicates still further the African difficulty, especially as the Basutos are causing trouble on account of the severe conditions imposed by the Cape Government. In home affairs things have been going badly, the perverseness of Home Rulers, the opposition of Conservatives, and the backsliding of Liberals, disarranging the scheme mapped out by the Premier. It is extremely likely that he will take no more part in government affairs during this session, and his place will be hard to fill.

There is also another very serious source of trouble—the end of which is yet to come. We refer to the fact that the landed aristocracy are owners of too large a portion of the soil. The gap is beginning to widen between the Peers and Commons, and there will ere long be a serious conflict. The Peers will have to accept a new condition of affairs, as regards landed property, or else be prepared to meet the opposition of the people; liberal concessions from land-owners may avert trouble—nothing else will. It would appear that there is to be modern ideas against baronical rights and forms and landed tenure.

The adage that, "there is no fool like an old fool" is brought to our mind in hearing the renewed announcement that Baroness Burdett-Coutts is about to be married to a young person named Bartlett. He is an American by birth but has lived the greater part of his time at Torquay; through some fortuitous circumstances he secured the position of private secretary to the Baroness and was deputed as her almoner in the East after the Russo-Turkish war and since then in Ireland, and is now, so Dame Rumour says, to be married to her. We also read, that Her Majesty and Lord Beaconsfield have endeavoured to dissuade the Baroness from entering into this marriage—but, without effect—and a rather officious proceeding we should think. It is rather curious that the Duchess of St. Albans, from whom the Baroness inherited the greater part of her fortune, married, when quite old, the Duke of St. Albans, then 26 years of age, and the Baroness, now somewhat older than the Duchess was, is about to follow her strange example.

*Truth* has the following:—

I wonder if the following good story, which reaches me from Rangoon, is really true. If not, more's the pity. A gentleman of the civil service recently applied for leave on urgent private affairs, and the government granted the

leave on his explaining that he wished to marry. On the expiration of his leave he returned, still unmarried, and the Secretary wrote, asking for an explanation of such conduct on the part of the gentleman. The reply was as follows: "Sir—I have the honour to inform you, in answer to your No. B. 23 of the 21st April last, that on taking leave I fully intended to marry, but on my arrival in England, I found the lady in question entertained frivolous objections to my personal appearance. I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant."

We have received "Ingersoll in Canada," a reply by Allen Pringle to several critics. Without taking up the cudgels in defence of opinions not advanced by us, there are several statements made by Mr. Pringle, which, while willing to hear all arguments, we believe to be faulty. The first one, against the Christian conception of God, runs thus:—"Intelligence presupposes a greater intelligence; God has intelligence, therefore there must be an intelligence greater than God." This argument of Mr. Pringle's we candidly admit, but do not stop here, we must continue; there must be an intelligence greater than "the intelligence greater than God," and so on *ad infinitum*, which is the Infinite Intelligence in which we believe. Take another of Mr. Pringle's logical deductions:—"Whatever manifests design must have had a designer; God in His alleged personality and attributes manifests design, therefore God must have had a designer." Well, continue, the designer of God must have had a designer also, and so on *ad infinitum*, which gives us an Infinite God or Designer. Mr. Pringle believes that there is but "*one existence, the Universe*, and that it is eternal—without beginning or end—that the matter of the Universe never could have been created, for *ex nihilo nihil fit* (from nothing nothing can come) and that it contains within itself the potency adequate to the production of all phenomena." This potency, of course, came of itself to produce all these phenomena, and as the matter of the *Universe* has never been created, it does not exist; therefore all of us, together with Mr. Pringle, are nonentities. Further, our writer says, that he considers the above theory to be more conceivable and intelligent than the Christian theory that there are two existences—God and the Universe—and that there was a time when there was but one existence, God, and that after an indefinite period of quiescence and "masterly inactivity," He finally created a Universe either out of Himself or out of nothing, either of which propositions is philosophically absurd, and, in either case, to say "that God would be infinite, would be equally absurd;"—but, of course, it is not absurd for Mr. Pringle to say that the *Universe* is eternal, and it is not absurd for him to say that the Universe is without beginning or end, while it is absurd, of course, for the Christian to say that God is without beginning or end. In another place Mr. Pringle says that "scholars now generally agree that whether Jesus of Nazareth lived or not, *we have no authentic account of Him.*" This will be news to many, ourselves included. He also informs us that the Bible represents man as being *without any good in him*—another piece of interesting news; of course Mr. Pringle does not think that "suffer little children to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of Heaven," is any evidence of there being any good in man. We have the Puranàs and Vedas, etc., thrust into our faces by Mr. Pringle, and we are astonished that his common-sense did not show him that the time for bringing these into opposition with Christianity has gone by, and we need only refer to the text, "By their fruits ye shall know them." We doubt very much if Mr. Pringle has ever even *seen* a translation of these works of which he talks so glibly, and he must have very little acquaintance with them, when he says no parallel can be found in them of the Christian (?) doctrine of everlasting punishment. In conclusion, we would state that we have carefully avoided taking up arguments advanced by Mr. Pringle in opposition to his opponents, designated upon the first page; we have merely touched upon some inconsistencies which we have noticed, and would say that we do not see how Mr. Pringle can be an Atheist, when he says, "we fully admit the existence of a great and mysterious power or force in the universe which we cannot understand or comprehend; we do not deny there may be a God." How this belief can be reconciled with an atheistic belief, is more than we can understand, unless Mr. Pringle has a peculiar definition of his own as to Atheism. We would also ask in reference to the atheistic champion, Ingersoll:—"What salutary reforms has he suggested, in what manner and to what extent has he contributed to the general welfare or happiness of his fellow-citizens?"