

tinental watering-places. Indeed, it would not be surprising if greater simplicity of manners, and less exclusive notions of their own dignity, should come to prevail among our landed gentry, leading to a revival of that free and kindly social intercourse which made rural neighbourhoods what they were in olden times. The peculiar agricultural system of England would remain intact, with its three-fold division of labour between the landlord charged with the public duties attaching to property, the farmer contributing most of the capital and all the skill, and the labourer relieved by the assurance of continuous wages from all risks except that of illness. But the landlords would be a larger body, containing fewer grandees and more practical agriculturists, living at their country homes all the year round, and putting their savings into land, instead of wasting them in the social competition of the metropolis. The majority of them would still be eldest sons, many of whom, however, would have learned to work hard till middle life for the support of their families; and besides these there would be not a few younger sons who had retired to pass the evening of their days on little properties near the place of their birth, either left them by will or bought out of their own acquisitions. With these would be mingled other elements in far larger measure and greater variety than at present—wealthy capitalists eager to enter the ranks of the landed gentry, merchants, traders and professional men content with a country villa and a hundred freehold acres round it; yeomen-farmers and even labourers of rare intelligence, who had seized favourable chances of investing in land. Under such conditions it is not too much to expect that some links, now missing, between rich and poor, gentle and simple, might be supplied in country districts, and that 'plain living and high thinking' might again find a home in some of our ancient manor houses; that with less of dependence and subordination to a dominant will there would be more of true neighbourly feeling and even of clanship; and that posterity, reaping the beneficent fruits of greater social equality, would marvel, and not without cause, how the main obstacle to greater social equality—the law and custom of primogeniture—escaped revision for more than two centuries after the final abolition of feudal tenures." This may seem to be a rather sanguine view; but there is nothing in it chimerical, much less is there anything savouring of communism or even of social revolution. Mr. Brodrick's essay has won great, and we think well-deserved, praise, even from opponents, by its ability and by the spirit in which it is written.

The essay of Mr. Rogers on the Colonial question is marked by his usual force and vigour. It is written from the "Manchester" point of view, of course, but no Colonist will be offended in it by anything anti-colonial, if by that term is meant a want of right and kindly feeling towards the Colonies. It is absurd to suppose that we can close a discussion which has been going on among the greatest and most revered masters of economical science for a century, merely by imputing to people sordid motives, and calling them hard names. Every man is a patriot who, whether on the right road or not, is sincerely seeking the good of his country. In this very volume M. De Laveleye protests strongly against the policy of retaining Algeria, that possession which France cherishes so passionately, and on which she has wasted so much money and so much

blood without even a shadow of return, for even as a military training-place, it has proved the mere destroyer of her strategy. "I would suggest," says M. De Laveleye, "that France had a means of making Prussia pay dearly for the conquest of Alsatia; it was to give up at the same time Algeria, as a cause of weakness and ruin. Oh! Frenchmen, borrow compulsory education from the Germans, and give them Algiers in exchange, and you will be avenged." A total severance of the Colonies from the old country, Mr. Rogers holds, would be a misfortune. "The invitation to secede, so freely tendered to the colonists is, in my opinion, inexpedient as well as uncivil. It would be much wiser to tell them that we do wish to keep them not only in amity but in alliance, but that in treating on the terms of the alliance, we and they must act with equal independence." The least agreeable part of Mr. Rogers' essay, to many colonists, will be the discouraging terms in which he speaks of proposals for extensive emigration.

We believe we may say that all the essays in this volume, without exception, will be found instructive to the economist and politician, whether he agrees with them or not. Perhaps some day a Derby club may be instituted for the propagation of the principles of Lord Derby, and we may then have volumes of philosophic essays on the other side.

The presence of no less than four foreigners (though one of them is of English birth) among the nine essayists, is significant not only of the cosmopolitan character of political and economical science, but of the growth of European sympathies, and of the more European character which is being gradually assumed by political and economical as well as by religious and intellectual movements.

A SURVEY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.—By John Macdonell, M. A. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

This work is based on a series of articles contributed to the *Scotsman* newspaper. We have read it with interest and profit. It is a comprehensive, sensible and well written account of the chief topics and problems of Political Economy, and is marked throughout by openness of mind and a desire to do justice to the different writers and schools whose theories are passed in review. Mr. Macdonell's candour is particularly shown in his treatment of the land question, which in England is one of such exceeding bitterness, not only on economical but on political grounds. While he repudiates, as might have been expected, Mr. Mills' extreme plans of exceptional dealing with rents, and vindicates private property in land; he combats with equal fairness the extravagances of the opposite school, enforces the special duties and restrictions which attach to the ownership of land, and condemns primogeniture and entails. He even goes so far as to look forward to a time "when the landlord shall be regarded as a public functionary or trustee entrusted with the care of certain portions of the soil of the State, and bound to use it to the common advantage, and when the last and greatest of sinecures shall be reformed." We confess that he does not make it clear to our mind why in this, which is the commercial, not the feudal era, investments in land should be treated so differ-