

manner which is at first amusing and then offensive. Here is the *Globe* day after day and week after week crowding its columns with nauseating notices of the new Managing Director. If I could express tender, sacred thoughts and purposes of manly conduct which came to me at my brother's open grave, I am sure I should not care to see them reproduced and commented upon over and over again in the columns of my own paper. And I am sure that I would not have a dead brother snubbed in order that I might be exalted. What else are some of these notices? E. g. "Mr. Gordon Brown has been for many years the guiding mind of *The Globe*, and to his ability and carefulness the great journal owes much of its success." "We rather look to see it (*The Globe*) develop greater influence than ever." "Very much of the success of the journal in times past has been due to his industry and ability, and now that he will be less hampered than formerly by considerations of a personal kind, his views with regard to independent journalism are likely to have effect." "He put more hard work and anxious care, more mental toil and real life blood into the columns of the *Globe* than any other man—living or dead." This and very much more of the same kind is copied into *The Globe*. "Le Roi est mort, vive le Roi," is good enough, but the Browns are not Kings, and Mr. Gordon, great man as he is, and exalted above all newspaper men in Canada, should remember that society admires decency just as much as it admires a capable managing director.

Whoever read the letter of Mr. Hugh Niven in the last issue of this journal—a letter which got in by one of those accidents which will occur in the very best conducted papers—should read the answer by the Rev. Mr. Mackie to be found in another column. Why Mr. Niven should have undertaken to bring a serious charge against a man when there was not the slightest ground for the charge, and when, through the courtesy of the *Montreal Star* he had been informed of his error, I cannot tell. I have seen the letters which passed between the different parties, and have had the whole story from other lips than Mr. Mackie's, and am prepared to say that Mr. Niven had no ground whatever for his charge, or insinuation; and I think Mr. Mackie just as incapable of collecting money under false pretences as Mr. Niven appears to be of rightly judging a Presbyterian minister.

When Bradlaugh at first quietly, but firmly entered his protest against being compelled to take the oath of allegiance in the name of God, because he believed neither in the English Constitution nor in the God of England, one could not help feeling a sense of respect for the man. At any rate, he was true to his convictions, and made a show of putting his manhood before all other considerations. But when the select committee had decided against him, and he declared that he was prepared to go through "the solemn mockery," the feeling was changed for one of profound contempt. Another question was at once brought before the House, and very properly: since this man has declared that he has no belief in the existence of a God, and therefore that an oath has no meaning for him, shall he be allowed to swear in the House to maintain what, in private and public, he has given his pledge he will do his best to overthrow?

For be it remembered that a member of Parliament is required to take an oath that he will sustain the English Constitution, and against that Bradlaugh is doing war. So that the question is not merely religious, it is political and religious. Would a judge be appointed to administer law who had for years declared that those laws were an iniquity and should be violated on every possible occasion? Would a man be allowed to serve in a responsible position in the army who had declared against fighting under all circumstances? Would Guy Faux have been allowed to sit in Parliament when it was known that he had been sent there to find ways and means for blowing legislators into atoms? This man enters an assembly which he will use his best endeavours to destroy; he offers to take an oath which he declares will not be binding, and treats the most sacred sentiment of a nation with ill-bred scoffing. I, for one, hope that the select committee, appointed to decide whether Bradlaugh shall be allowed to take the

oath, will decide against him. For his oath can have no more significance than his affirmation, and the English nation should pronounce against hypocrisy of this insolent type.

Mr. Forster is nominally the Secretary for Ireland, but in fact he is appointed by Mr. Gladstone to rearrange and readjust, and if possible balance Irish affairs. It will be no easy task, but if any man can do it Mr. Forster will succeed,—patient, plodding, and able withal, he may be depended upon for a thorough investigation of the many grievances of Lord Beaconsfield's "brilliant brethren." This will surely cut the ground from under the feet of Mr. Parnell, for the Irish are a generous people, and already their sympathies are aroused for a government which has so readily and earnestly taken up the question of their supposed wrongs. Mr. Parnell deserves only distrust and anger from his compatriots, for he came very near to wrecking the famine fund, and I should not be surprised to see, in a short time, the main body of the Home Rulers leaving their ambitious, but incapable leader to take their seats among the Liberals, who upon assuming office set their hands to the work of redressing Ireland's wrongs.

Mr. Fawcett was undoubtedly wrong in charging the late Government with knowingly passing over an item of four millions for the Afghan war in the Indian Budget, but the mistake can very well be accounted for. How could any one suppose that such a blunder was possible? And, as it turns out, there was a most important, because a most significant, telegram lying on the desk at the office of the Secretary for India, which, if explained, would have brought out the full information needed. The facts of the case point unmistakably, not to withholding information, but to staving off enquiry. The general elections were at hand, and the Government felt, probably, that in the interest of the party the discussion of the enormous deficit should be postponed; There was not much in the Afghan war of which Lord Beaconsfield's Cabinet could be proud; there was no glory obtained for the British army; "the scientific frontier" had remained a mere phrase; Russia had been in no way checkmated, and to have brought forward the fact that four millions sterling remained to be paid for this piece of unaccountable folly would have been most damaging.

Probably they reasoned soundly from their point of view, but the misfortune is that postponing enquiry did not annihilate the difficulty. There it is, a debt of four millions. And ugly enough it is. India cannot pay it, for her resources are straightened and strained to the utmost. The masses of the country are absolutely impoverished, and can suffer no more in the way of increased taxation. Then only one thing remains to be done; India is a colony of England, and England must pay the debt. This may appear to press unduly upon the British taxpayer, and many will ask, probably, are we to be held as finally responsible for debts incurred by the Provinces which they may not be able to pay? But the answer is simple enough. The Afghan war was not an Indian war, was not instigated or initiated by the people of India, but was a war promoted by the Government of Great Britain. Lord Lytton went out to the Viceroyalty with a distinct mission of fire and sword against an unoffending people who desired merely the right of governing themselves without interference. So Britain has to pay the whole, or a large portion of this debt, as one of the expenses attendant upon the luxury of a Beaconsfield policy of "Imperium et Libertas."

If the succumbing of the Reading Companies results in the breaking up of the coal monopoly in the United States, the good effects will far outweigh the present losses to a few coal kings.

In the United States General Grant is again in the ascendant for the Presidency. A few weeks ago his chances appeared few and small, and the quiet intelligence of the country was waking up to the fact that Mr. Hayes had done enough since taking office to entitle him to renomination. But that has subsided, and the Grant boom thunders through the land. To say that in statesmanship there is a good reason for this would be to talk nonsense; it is purely a party move, and done in the interests of party, and it may end well, but the thing is doubtful.