

had already turned in the direction of the turret-room. Had he tidings to communicate? As if in answer, slow, heavy feet could be heard ascending the stair. Who were they? Surely there was but one step in all the world to which her heart would answer with that swift, instinctive leap; had her brain given way beneath its weight of trouble? There was still light enough in this upper chamber to see about her; her eyes fastened upon the door. The footsteps hesitated for a moment without, and then, without a knock the latch was lifted. Pale as death, and haggard as if with years of suffering, Henri La Roche stood before his wife.

Eglantine neither screamed nor fainted. Speech and motion were as impossible to her as to one in the grasp of a horrible nightmare. But the look of shrinking terror in her eyes held Henri's feet.

"Has my wife no welcome for me?"

The low, muffled voice broke the spell that was upon Eglantine. She rose to her feet, with her slender figure drawn to its full height.

(To be continued.)

## TO THE HEIGHTS

*Sic itur ad - ten*

As fair to the Hebrew leader  
O'er the desert pathway dun,  
The distant shadowy mountains  
Loomed—soft in the morning sun,

Although on their radiant summits  
His feet might never stand,  
And, but from the Mount of Vision,  
He might view the Promised Land!

So fair on our inner vision,  
As on through life we go,  
Loom the shadowy hills of promise.  
Soft in the morning glow:

How long is the way to reach them,  
But little we heed or care;  
How hard and weary the climbing  
To the summits so bright and rare!

Yet still they recede before us,  
And ever their promise sweet,  
Like a spell they have woven o'er us,  
Lures on our wandering feet:

And though we may reach them never,  
Till the cold dark stream is past,  
For us they shall keep their promise,  
And the heights shall be ours at last!

—Fidelis, in *The Week*.

## PROBLEMS OF GREATER BRITAIN.

The first and most important fact connected with Sir Charles Dilke's very able book is that it pricks the glittering bubble of Imperial Federation, and scatters to the winds the literary and political soapbuds of which it is compounded. That such a result is achieved will call up a feeling of devout thankfulness in the minds of all who are possessed by the wider rather than the narrower patriotism, and who are above all things anxious that the future of the whole English race shall be glorious and secure. Those who desire not to establish an *imperium* for these islands, but to see the English-speaking peoples bound together by the nobler and more lasting ties of a common kinship, had begun to fear lest some inopportune and ill-considered step might be taken on behalf of the Mother Country. They dreaded a rash experiment inspired by the desire of empire for a section of the race, rather than of brotherly union for the whole, which should end in blasting for all time the promise of a destiny more auspicious than has ever before been unfolded to any portion of mankind. Fortunately, the information carefully collected and set forth in "Problems of Greater Britain" shows that the public opinion of the Colonies, even if our own people were for a moment to lose sight of their true goal, and to pursue, instead, a will-o'-the-wisp, would sternly force us back into the right path. Australian and Canadian statesmen may be too friendly and too courteous to tell our politicians that they are in the wrong; but for all that, it is clear that the leaders of Greater Britain recognize "the authentic fire," and mean to follow it. But though we pick this out as the most significant result of Sir Charles Dilke's volumes, it must not be supposed that he draws any such direct conclusions. His attitude throughout is that of one who desires to place both sides of the question fairly before his readers. It is the irresistible logic of the facts stated in this book, rather than any attempt to argue against Imperial Federation, that hurls Lord Rosebery's idol from its pedestal.

The author of "Problems of Greater Britain" shows clearly by implication that there are only two alternatives as regards the future of the Empire,—Separation, and a system under which the Colonies shall practically stand to the mother country and to each other in the relation of autonomous States joined together by the bands of perpetual and unbreakable alliance. At first sight it may seem as if there was little or no distinction between these plans. In reality, there is a world of difference—at least for those who believe that the future belongs to the English. If in the coming ages civilized mankind is to

become English, as seems at least possible, let us do our best to prevent the repetition of the evils arising from war, and from the existence of the international hatreds and jealousies of the old system. But if this is to be brought about, then everything should be done to prevent the scattered portions of the English kin from assuming a political configuration tending towards the growth of national antagonisms. Let the Colonies become as independent as they desire, or as the abolition of every restriction, real or nominal, can make them, but let us never commit the mistake of encouraging them to drift into an attitude towards each other, or towards the mother country, at all resembling that in which, unfortunately, the United States now stand to Great Britain. Let Australia, Canada, and the Cape become Republics, or reflections of our Constitutional Monarchy, exactly as pleases them best, but let us and the whole world feel that hostilities between us and them would be civil war, and no more to be contemplated than civil war. If this is made the ideal of those who feel themselves members of the English-speaking world first, and only secondly inhabitants of a particular portion of it, it is certain that what we now call the Empire may become a belt of land and sea stretching across the globe and dedicated to a common prosperity and peace. Who knows, when such an alliance has transformed the British Empire, that the United States also may not be willing to range herself beside it, and that then the sisters Powers, may not be able to impose upon the whole earth, civilized and uncivilized, not the "might and majesty" of universal dominion, but of the Pax Anglicana?

The following quotation is from his chapter on "Colonial Democracy":—

"The Conservative and resisting forces of strong Upper Houses, difficult, indeed, to create except upon the federal and provincial system, seem, however, to be little needed by our Colonies, for there is in them no such sign as is to be seen in the Mother country of the growth of extreme views hostile to the institution of property and obnoxious to the richer classes. Revolutionary Socialism, as contrasted with State Socialism, is far stronger in Europe than in our Colonies; and if it be true that the Australian Colonies, and in a less degree Canada and portions of South Africa, present us with a picture of what England will become, we shall find reason to suppose that the changes of the next few years will be much less rapid and much less sweeping than many hope and most believe. It is in Great Britain of all the countries of the world that Revolutionary Socialistic views appear to be the most generally entertained among thoughtful people at the present time. The practical programmes put forward by moderate European Socialists are indeed, mostly law in the Australian Colonies, but the larger proposals which lie behind appear to have less chance of being entertained there than they have in the Old World. The programme of the Young Democrats of the democratic republic of Switzerland contains a large number of items most of which are already the subject of legislation in Australia: the railways to be in the hands of the State, stringent labour legislation to be adopted, the separation of Church and State, and so forth. But while Swiss Social Democrats put last in their programme the item which looms largest—the nationalisation of commerce and industry, and equality of the profits of labour—they doubtless give to it the greater portion of their thought. Now, in Australia, such ideas have little weight. Revolutionary or democratic Socialism, in short, in Australia, in Canada, and in the United States, is not popular with workmen, who largely own their houses and possess land and shares, but, on the other hand, State Socialism advances rapidly in Australia. While in Canada, as in the United States, the great body of small agricultural proprietors seem disinclined to try many of the experiments of State Socialism, in Australia the householding town democracy has no such fears. The Australian Colonists feel that their Governments are Governments of the whole people, and that the people should make full use of the capacity of Government to do all that can be done.—*Spectator*.

## A GLIMPSE OF GEN. GORDON'S CHARACTER.

Some interesting matter on the subject of General Gordon appears in the *Contemporary Review*. The writer of the article, which is headed "A Voyage of General Gordon," has had access to the diary of a skipper who, in 1882, conveyed Gordon in a small trading schooner from Mauritius to the Cape. Gordon was very communicative on the voyage, when he was not prostrated with sea-sickness—which, by the way, he bore no better than Marius—and one evening he told his nautical host why he had resigned. He simply could not endure the manners and customs "of the high social circle in which he was expected to move. 'Dress for dinner, dress for evening parties, dress for balls, dress and decoration, decoration and dress! day after day. I could not,' said Gordon, 'stand the worry of it, and rather than do so I gave up the appointment.'" Gordon was firmly persuaded that the site of the Garden of Eden is one of the islands of the Seychelles, and that the *coco de mer* of that region is true Forbidden Tree. His reason for not marrying, as stated on the same occasion, was only less original than his reason for throwing up his appointment in India. "I never yet have met the woman who for my sake, and perhaps at a moment's notice, would be prepared to sacrifice the comforts of home and the sweet society of loved ones, and accompany me whithersoever the demand of duty might lead."

## THE BACILLUS OF INFLUENZA.

One of the most serious mistakes in science is haste. The world is now told that the bacillus of influenza has been discovered by Drs. Maximilian and Adolph Jolles, who have been at work on the subject for two months in the bacteriological laboratory of Professor Sacker, in Vienna. If they have really discovered the bacillus of epidemic influenza it may be said that their work is the most rapid of the kind on record, and if their discovery should finally turn out to be a substantial reality, it is as yet not proved. Robert Koch worked for some four years at the bacillus of tuberculosis before he convinced himself that he was right; his work on the bacillus anthracis was of almost equal duration, he worked for about two years on the comma bacillus of cholera before he made a public announcement, and when he finally gave the results of his experiments to the world there was not a stone wanting in the foundations and superstructures of his buildings. For at least six years the scientific world has waited for some one to find the microbe of epidemic influenza. Every one knew there must be such a microbe. In 1884, Seifert, of Wuerzburg, described in a German journal what he claimed was the bacillus of influenza. His description was unsatisfactory, however, because he did not prove his case; his announcement was thought to have been made upon insufficient evidence and experimentation. The mistakes of hasty bacteriologists fill a long and interesting chapter, and not the least interesting are those of the hasty workers that tried to upset Koch. That the hooded or Bishop bacillus of Jolles should be unlike the comma bacillus of cholera was to be expected. It has been many years since scientific men gave up all idea of any connection between influenza and cholera. A strong point in favour of the correctness of Jolles' discovery being real is the fact that the Bishop bacillus resembles the pneumonia coccus of Friedlaender, since there is certainly an analogy between epidemic influenza and pneumonia. Both pneumonia and Russian influenza are infectious, and one might almost say that influenza is pneumonia in miniature. The fact that the Bishop bacillus was found in well water brought to Vienna from a well a hundred miles away is, if anything, rather against the bacillus being that of influenza, since it is perfectly plain that water is not the vehicle of the infection in influenza. The germ of epidemic influenza is undoubtedly carried by the air; the cholera germ is carried in water for the most part. The rapidity with which epidemic influenza travels is positive proof that water is not its native element.—*Chicago Herald*.

*The Christian World*, London, Eng., says: The PRESBYTERIAN YEAR BOOK for Canada and Newfoundland for 1890 has reached us from the Presbyterian Publishing Company, Toronto. A glance at its pages shows that Presbyterianism has taken a firm root in the Dominion.

## COLD FEET.

AT LAST THE CAUSE OF THIS COMMON TROUBLE IS KNOWN.

"I am troubled with cold feet."

This was a remark recently made to one of the leading doctors of Ottawa, by the wife of a very wealthy gentleman. It is impossible to give the doctor's exact words in reply, but it was substantially this:

"Your feet and hands are cold because your blood does not circulate well. If you were to run or exercise, your feet and hands would soon be warm. When a stream stops running it becomes foul, and green scum gathers on the surface. When the blood stops flowing freely, it becomes foul and poisonous, and sickness is the result. Now the blood depends entirely for its circulating power upon the nervous system. If the nerves are strong, the blood circulates freely, healthily and there are no cold feet. If the nerves are weak or unstrung, the blood does not and cannot circulate. What then should we do? Keep the nerves in perfect condition and then the blood will flow freely, be kept pure and health will result. Many people try to purify the blood. It is sheer nonsense. What is the use of purifying the blood if it does not circulate freely and becomes poisonous the next day?

Blood that flows freely does not become impure, for the impurities are thrown off every time it flows through the body. The best way, therefore to stop cold feet and hands, is to strengthen the nerves so that the blood will circulate freely and hence become pure, keep the body warm and the health vigorous. I know of no way by which this can be so readily done, as by the use of that great discovery made by Professor Phelys, of Dartmouth College, known as Paine's Celery Compound. It is a food, a strengthener and a tonic for the nerves. It takes weak women, gives them health and hope and brings colour to their cheeks. It takes debilitated men and makes their constitutions strong, their muscles hard and their life vigorous. It takes puny children and converts them from sickness into rosy health. This is what I have found it to be and it is for this purpose that I cordially recommend it to you."

## BURLINGTON ROUTE.

TO KANSAS CITY.

The best line from Chicago, St. Louis or Peoria, to Kansas City, St. Joseph and Atchison. Vestibule trains, dining, sleeping and reclining chair cars, and direct connection for all points southwest. Tickets via the Burlington Route can be obtained of any ticket agent of its own or connecting lines.

*The Canada Citizen* says: In dealing with any question connected with Presbyterianism in Canada, there are hardly any facts that one will want to get at regarding this large and influential body that will not be found in the PRESBYTERIAN YEAR BOOK.