

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

Canadiana.org has attempted to obtain the best copy available for scanning. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of scanning are checked below.

- Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la
marge intérieure.

- Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires: Continuous pagination.

Canadiana.org a numérisé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de numérisation sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / Pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary materials /
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Blank leaves added during restorations may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas
été numérisées.

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF
CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

NOT PARTY, BUT THE PEOPLE.

CONTENTS.

	Page.		Page.
THE DOMINION :		ENGLAND :	
The Change in the Pacific Rail- way Policy	403	The Premier and the Opposition	429
Messrs. Blake and Mackenzie at the National Club	405	The Irish Question	431
Emigration and the Colonies	406	The Bradlaugh Case	435
The Press on Commercial Union	408	The Game Laws	438
Orangeism and its <i>raison d'être</i>	411	Election Trials	438
The Working-men's Manifesto	412	Protection v. Free Trade	436
The Bennett Case	413	South African Confederation	440
The University Dinner	415	The Eastern Question	440
The Educational Imbroglia	416	FRANCE AND GERMANY :	
Quebec Affairs	420	The Expulsion of the Jesuits	442
UNITED STATES :		The Germans and the Jews	444
The Republican and Democratic Nominees	422	Dr. Byerson on the U. E. Legalists	445
The History of American Parties	423	Hon Mr. Morris on the Indian Treas- ties	452
The Greenbackers: Maine and Louisiana	428	National Games	454

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, WELLINGTON ST.

PUBLISHERS.

WHOLESALE AGENTS:

THE TORONTO NEWS COMPANY.

MONTREAL AGENTS:

THE MONTREAL NEWS COMPANY.

AGENTS IN SEVERAL PROVINCES: J. & A. MACMILLAN, 24, JOHN, N. B.

THE BYSTANDER:

A Monthly Review of Current Events, Canadian and General.

~~~~~  
**NOW READY!**

~~~~~  
First Half-yearly Volume, 340 pages. 12mo. Price 50 Cents.
~~~~~

At the end of the first half-year of its existence, THE BYSTANDER finds its circulation treble of that on which its founders calculated, and still increasing. We do not take this as a proof of agreement with our opinions, but we hope we may take it as a proof that independent journalism is in favour, and that THE BYSTANDER is believed to be independent.

## PRESS NOTICES.

---

"The attention of intelligent observers will be drawn to Canada afresh by the promise of a modest little periodical, the first No. of which has just been issued at Toronto, and which is felicitously called *The Bystander*. It is devoted to comments upon 'Current Events, Canadian and General,' and shows *The Bystander* to be a singularly sagacious and well-informed observer, watching events with a thoroughly trained eye, and recording his comments with a firm, vigorous, and practical hand. Indeed, *The Bystander* contains some of the maturest and most admirable political criticism that the English press, daily or weekly, offers."—*Harper's Weekly*.

"The impartial opinion of one who looks upon our affairs with the disinterested yet kindly eye of a well-wisher who is outside of our circle, and personally unaffected by our successes or our failures, our vices or our virtues, ought to be of value. . . . A free-lance in politics can do useful work . . . whether *Bystander* talks of home or foreign affairs; whether he fights against party or advocates independence, or slashes at the Tory Government of Britain; whether he mildly hints at Sir John's "equivocating and disquieting language" on the Pacific Scandal, or slaps at Austria as "the Tory turnkey in the jail of oppressed and struggling nationalities," or pictures the showily-attired politician whose loud-patterned vests and gaudy jewellery of a generation ago have been translated in the Jingo policy of Great Britain that dazzles weak intellects; in whatever department of criticism the *Bystander's* remarks are worth reading, and often worth heeding."—*London Advertiser*.

"An examination of the contents of the first numbers shows that the magazine is edited with a vigour, ability, research, and extended information, that promise to make *The Bystander* an important auxiliary in diffusing an improved tone and sentiment in regard to the more important topics of the day."—*Detroit Free Press*.

"We like the idea of the publication of *The Bystander*, as the exponent of the independent views of one who has the power and the leisure to think out public questions, and the faculty of clothing his reflections in attractive language."

"The March No. of *The Bystander* is the raciest of the series thus far, and full of interest and practical thought. The Editor hits right out from the shoulder when addressing himself to questions affecting the Dominion, no matter which party gets hurt; and this is the kind of independence we admire."

"Turning from the miserable wrangle and slavish commendations of the party press, the new candidate for public favour (*The Bystander*) is an encouraging sign of the times, with its broad views and refreshing independence."—*Irish Canadian*.

✉ Subscriptions and Advertisements may be sent to MR. G. MERCER ADAM, Equity Chambers, Toronto, or to the Publishers,

MESSRS. HUNTER, ROSE & CO.,

25 Wellington Street West, Toronto.

TORONTO, June, 1880.

✉ Those to whom the first numbers, as specimen copies, may come, will, if they desire the publication, enclose the subscription with their address, either to Mr. Adam, as above, or to the Publishers, Messrs. Hunter, Rose & Co.

NOT PARTY, BUT THE PEOPLE.

# THE BYSTANDER.

---

---

AUGUST, 1880.

---

---

THE voice of the country has been heard, and the Prime Minister has gone to England, taking the Minister of Railways with him, to transfer the Pacific Road to a private Company. This is decisive. After the admission implied in such a step, it will be impossible ever to throw back the burden and danger on the country. Here is the end of the Pacific Railway as a Government enterprise. Are there a hundred people in the Dominion, saving contractors and contract-mongers, who do not in their hearts rejoice ?

Our deliverance from Government contracts and their pestilent influence is almost as great a cause of rejoicing as our deliverance from the mad undertaking itself. We may say so without casting an aspersion on any particular Government. No Government, however honest, can control the powers of mischief which are called into activity by contracting on a large scale. The army and navy contracts in England, at the time of the war with France, were sources of jobbing and corruption as prolific as the contracts of the same description in the United States, or Railway contracts here. Look at Mr. Sandford Fleming's letter declining the Chief Engineership of the Intercolonial. He says he would have to investigate unsettled claims amounting to several millions. What an opening for corruption is here ! When the scene of operations is distant, and not under the eye of the Government, the danger cannot fail to be increased. The very names of some of the men who are active

•

in connection with the North-West are enough to prove that corruption is abroad. There must be a carcass, and a pretty putrid one, where such birds are gathered together. Even to us materials for creating a sensation on the subject of contracts have come ; but there is no use in creating a sensation ; what we want is to see the source of the evil extinguished. Of the dangers which threaten free institutions on this continent, there is hardly one greater than the corruption which waits on public works.

There are two things of which the country will wish to be assured—that it is entirely rid of the whole undertaking, of the running as well as of the construction ; and that the company is completely and finally severed from the Government, so that there may be no playing of the two into each other's hands, and we may not be ruled by a colossal Lobby. Sir John Macdonald, no doubt, hopes to reserve land enough to indemnify the nation for past expenditure. It will, of course, be borne in mind that a single railroad only opens up the line of country through which it passes, and that land reserved at a distance from it, without branch lines, is of little value.

Manitoba, as we learn from trustworthy informants on the spot, is not filling at the rate which sanguine calculators expected. The Opposition will throw the blame on the Land Regulations. But the illimitable wilderness, with its great attractions, has also disadvantages—remoteness, present scarcity of fuel, and a climate which may be exhilarating to the robust, the well-fed and the well-clothed, but stops industry during the greater part of the year.

Whatever is to be done for us by negotiation, the address of Sir John Macdonald will do. He is more worthily employed in this than in sitting umpire over a sordid chaos of conflicting claims for small places. There is no one who can cast a stone at him for not sacrificing the interest, nay the solvency, of the country to the obstinacy which folly calls consistency. We are all in the same boat, and alike ready to bury the past, if we can be rid of the national incubus for the future. ) With

•

commercial enterprise nobody would think of interfering, though it were to project a railway to the North Pole.

—It was hardly reasonable to expect that Mr. Blake and Mr. Mackenzie would say anything important about politics at the dinner of the National Club. In the first place, they might by so doing, have “waked with war-cry the wassail hour;” the club containing members of all shades of opinion, to some of whom any sentiment strongly expressed would have been offensive. In the second place, it was not likely either that Mr. Mackenzie could unbosom himself before Mr. Blake, or that Mr. Blake would unbosom himself before Mr. Mackenzie. A more delicate operation could not be imagined than a public interchange of ideas on the policy of the Opposition between the old and the new leader. Each just indicated his position. Through the speech of Mr. Mackenzie there ran an undertone of sorrow over the inability of the old shrivelled wine-skin of Gritism to hold the new wine of Liberal opinion. Mr. Blake intimated his sympathy with bolder councils, though under the usual form of advocating Imperial Federation. A surrender of self-government, in return for an almost nominal representation, which would be rendered still more ineffective by the influence of London Society on the representatives of the Colonies; acceptance of a share in the burden of Imperial taxation for the maintenance of the Federal armaments; full and direct participation in wars made for objects utterly remote from Canadian interests, by a diplomacy over which Canada would have no control—such, all must see, would be the certain consequences to us of Imperial Federation. Is Mr. Blake prepared for them? We cannot believe that he is, or that he means anything more than that the present situation cannot last, and that he is ready for a change. But the Admiral must not make false signals. Besides, Mr. Blake may be entrapped. Had Lord Beaconsfield remained in office and carried his schemes into effect, he would have been sure to quote

in a paper proposing Imperial Federation the language of a colonial statesman so distinguished as Mr. Blake.

The Liberal party has plenty of life and hope in it. Two things prevent it from marching—a leader who does not thoroughly know his own mind, and an organ in the hands of very narrow and rancorous Tories, whose general tendencies are not altered though they may be forced to pay tribute to Liberalism on particular questions such as that of the reform of the Senate.

—We have been taken to task for repeating the statement that the Government was about to advance the passage money of a large body of navvies to work on the Pacific Railway. The statement was part of the Cable news, and it seemed to us to be confirmed rather than contradicted by the explanations of some of the Government journals. Nobody can suppose that we wish to do injustice to the Government. We only wish that it should go right and not wrong. Once more we register the admission that its Anti-Continental policy has been in accordance with established tradition and general sentiment, and that the policy which we have ourselves supported has been at variance with both, though with general sentiment we believe it is at variance no longer.

The Cable is again to blame, if we are mistaken in supposing that conferences have been held between our High Commissioner and the representatives of the Australian Colonies, with a view to some change in the relation of the Colonies to the Mother Country. Something in the nature both of an Imperial Zollverein and of an Imperial Emigration League seems to be still afloat; the special object of the Emigration League being to divert the stream of emigration from the United States to British Dependencies. We are sick, and we believe everybody is sick, of debating these questions in the abstract. We cannot conceive a tariff in which all the Colonies, with their great diversity of industrial interests and

trade relations, would acquiesce, and for the sake of which they would be content to resign for ever their powers of commercial legislation. As to the other question, we believe that the High Commissioner is about as likely to succeed in diverting the migration of birds, and inducing the feathered wanderers to confine themselves to countries under the British flag, as he is to succeed in inducing the English, still more the Irish, peasant to abstain, on political grounds, from going to the country where he thinks he can earn most bread. The question will also arise, how the emigration is to be distributed among Colonies which have hitherto been carrying on a competition, and in the case of New Zealand, cut-throat competition with each other. But it is needless to discuss projects which have never assumed a definite form. Let the plan be framed, and we shall see whether it is likely to work. In the meantime, can anything be imagined more absurd than a scheme for promoting and subsidizing emigration from England to Canada, while Canada is losing her own people by tens of thousands? The emigration policy wanted, so far as we are concerned, is one which will keep Canadians at home.

Among the Australians with whom Sir A. Galt confers, no doubt, is Sir Julius Vogel, lately Prime Minister of New Zealand, now High Commissioner (we believe that is his title) for the Colony, and the paragon of highflying Imperialism of all kinds. But the brilliant reputation of Sir Julius is at this moment obscured by a passing cloud. From New Zealand comes a cry of distress. Sir Julius has piled up a public debt amounting, according to a correspondent of the *London Times*, to \$150,000,000, for a population, according to the last census (1879), of 414,412 whites, including Chinese, half-castes and persons on ship-board\*; while in the last budget the deficit was nearly \$5,000,000. Of course, while the money was being spent, there were fine times, and Sir Julius Vogel was a heaven-born statesman; he is now regarded as "too sanguine

---

\*See *Stateman's Year Book*, p. 739.



and ambitious." It is evidently a case of incurring liabilities on the strength of latent resources. Resources which are latent are, for financial purposes, non-existent; they can be called forth from their latent condition only by the influx of settlers, and settlers will not flow into a country where they have to shoulder an enormous debt. Mortgaging for improvements pays of course within limits; but not when carried to the extent of actual embarrassment.

—There can scarcely be any doubt as to the growth of a feeling in favour of Commercial Union or the removal, under whatever name may be preferred, of the Customs' line between us and the rest of the Continent. Mr. Perrault addresses large and enthusiastic meetings in Quebec where the attempt to create a division in favour of partial Reciprocity is as ineffectual as the attempt to put down discussion by the use of foul language here. Were this a political movement the issue might be uncertain; unless the grievance is very great, political movements often reach a certain point and then die away. But economical movements which concern the bread of the people, if there is real reason for them, very seldom die away. Commercial Union will come. There will be fluctuations of opinion, as there always are, when a great change is in view. Adverse forces, political, commercial and sentimental, will develop themselves when the political crisis approaches. The wave will recede, and its retreat will be taken by superficial observers for the ebb of the tide. But the tide will not ebb. It is highly probable that the decisive protest against the continuance of the Customs' line will come from that very North-West, the incorporation of which was to give new life and substance to the Anti-Continental system. The *London Advertiser*, which is now practically the leading journal of the Liberal party, is favourable to Commercial Union. The *Hamilton Times* is against it, evidently fearing that it would injure the Canadian manufacturer, who, as we believe, would, on the contrary, gain by

admission to the larger market more than he would lose by the competition. But in the press, as among the people, the movement appears decidedly to advance. The *Globe*, of course, continues to prove in one column that Free Trade is the only road to wealth, and in the next that Free Trade with our neighbours would be the road to ruin. When the commercial union of Scotland with England was proposed, the great Scotch orator of the day, Lord Belhaven, described with apocalyptic eloquence the woe which was sure to come—the Scotch artizan “drinking water instead of ale, and eating his saltless porridge,” the Scotch ploughman “seeing his grain spoil upon his lands, cursing the day of his birth, and dreading the expense of his burial.” The orator even asked the leave of the House to pause in his speech while he dropped a tear over his ruined country. It is a pity the tear could not be preserved, as a memorial of political foresight, at Glasgow or Dundee.

Public attention continues to be attracted to these subjects by the exodus to the States. This, according to some writers, arises purely from the action of a mysterious tide of population, swayed by the influence of some commercial moon. The tide of population, however, unlike the ocean tide, appears to ebb without flowing; at least, we have not recently heard of people rushing by tens of thousands from the United States into Canada. Besides, what power causes the waters to observe so closely a certain political line, which corresponds with no commercial boundary, for Sir Leonard Tilley finds it necessary to impose a protective coal tax, in order to create an artificial privity of interest between the Maritime Provinces and Ontario. To say that the N. P. has driven all the people out of the country, is preposterous: the N. P., a mere adjustment of new taxes in themselves unavoidable, cannot have produced a very great effect one way or other, and perfectly trustworthy judges are of opinion that on the whole the effect has been good. The cause is the atrophy which would be produced if a tenth part of England or France were cut off by a Customs' line from the rest; and this Commerce and the people are beginning to see, though

the politicians may as yet think it expedient to shut their eyes.

That people talk about these matters more and with greater freedom in private than in public is very true. The *Journal of Commerce* is astonished at our thinking that opinion in Canada has not been free; we are astonished at our able contemporary's astonishment. Tyranny may be exercised over reputation as well as over person or property: it has been exercised over reputation by powerful journals in this country to an extreme degree, as well as with the utmost unscrupulousness, and only with difficulty put down. Men to whom no interested motive could be imputed, who were advocating in a perfectly legitimate way what they believed to be good for the people, have been treated by those who had got the control of opinion as malefactors and traitors, held up not only to political but to social odium, and hunted down almost like noxious beasts. The tyranny was not only fatal to the openness of national councils, on questions that concerned the nation most deeply but injurious to national character. Perhaps at Montreal, where the *Journal of Commerce* is published, there has been more of liberality and tolerance than under the Calvinistic dictatorship in Ontario. Another thing that has interfered, and still interferes, if not with freedom of opinion, with the free profession of opinion by the people in the elections—is the rigidity of party organization. The *Journal of Commerce* challenges the adherents of Commercial Union to appeal to the people under the Ballot. But how are they to get nominations? The nominations are completely controlled by the managers of the two organized parties, and an independent candidate attempting to appeal to the people in favour of a new principle, would, as the *Journal of Commerce* must know, expose his principle to defeat by agencies irrespective not only of its truth, but of the sentiment of the people. In the United States, an immense majority of the citizens may be safely said to be in favour of Administrative Reform, which the two "Machines" are practically in collusion with each other to prevent; but no

independent candidate would dream of running as a champion of Administrative Reform. This in fact is a weak point in all elective institutions to which political architects will have to look carefully in the future. Opinion works its way nevertheless; and those who do not want seats in Parliament, or anything else that it is in the power of politicians to give or withhold, may be well content patiently to watch, and as far as they can, help its progress. At the last general election, thousands of the people went across the party lines to vote for the N. P.; we shall see whether, at the next general election, they will do anything of the same kind.

—By the recurrence of the Glorious Twelfth everybody is once more set asking what is Orangeism? and still no answer is found. What Orangeism was in Ireland at the time of the Battle of the Boyne is clear enough. But what is it in Canada, a land of perfect religious equality, at the present day? Against whom and what are the Orangemen banded together? Hardly against their old enemies the Roman Catholics; for here Roman Catholic and Orangeman often vote together on the Tory side. Fenianism and the Fenian raids may perhaps have revived for a moment the original reason for association; but nobody, we suppose, in Canada is afraid of Fenianism now. Antagonism to the United States, again, can scarcely be the explanation, because in the United States there are Orange Lodges, the members of which are, of course, good citizens of the country to which they belong. Probably the solution is to be found in the broader tendencies of human nature, in the love of combination and secrecy for their own sake, in fondness for titles, costume, and parade. The love of combination is apt to be particularly strong where, as in these democracies of the New World, the general texture of society is somewhat loose. Essentially, perhaps, Orangeism may be classed with Freemasonry and Odd-fellowship. Unluckily while Freemasonry and Odd-fellowship are purely social and benevolent, Orangeism is poli-

tical and antagonistic, vague and shadowy as the antagonism may be: it lends itself to the purposes of faction, and interferes with the independence and the broad duties of the citizen. It is particularly objectionable in this country on account of its local adjunct of Young Britonism, which is likely enough some day to be the source of serious trouble. To trepan boys, before they have had a chance of fairly forming their opinions, into a political club, and to cultivate in them a spirit of estrangement from their fellow citizens, is wrong, and it is a pity that the practice cannot be prohibited by law. There are two Lodges, to one of which all of us, to the other most of us, belong—the State and the Church—which between them would seem to afford full scope for the social tendencies and energies of every one, however gregarious he may be. If a man wants any closer bond, or a bond that brings with it more banners, insignia, and supporters, let it be like that of the Freemasons and the Odd-fellows, a bond of good fellowship and good will.

— A spirited manifesto has been put forth by the Workingmen's Liberal Conservative Union of Toronto, complaining that the workingmen have been "the dupes of professional wirepullers and party tricksters, to be used at pleasure on certain occasions and afterwards thrown aside." Nothing is more certain; and it may be added that a "Working-men's Liberal Conservative Union" is precisely the same kind of thing in England that it is here. Why should the working-man allow himself to be penned into any sheepfold by any shepherd? Industrially, he must have his trade-unions, or other associations, for the promotion of his special interests; but politically he is a member of the community, and on election days he ought to be that and that alone. Let him preserve his individual independence, make up his own mind, and cast a patriotic vote, in his own interest and that of his family, for the policy which he believes to be best for the country; resting assured, as he may, that the policy which is best for the country is best for every man, wo-

man and child in it. If he will not do this, he will be bought and sold; bought with lying flattery, or worse, with appeals to social envy and malignity, then sold behind his back for what he will fetch in place and pelf. The men who try to keep him apart from the rest of the community, and pretend to lead him for special objects of his own, if they are not wire-pullers of the common kind, are vote-jobbers: they get the working-man's vote into their pockets, and then they run over to a Minister and ask him how much he will give them for it. Their vaunted independence is a way of keeping up their price. Let the working-man bid them go and, like himself, ply honest trades. If he wants leaders on any special occasion, let him at least take those whose objects are above suspicion. After what he has seen, his credulity is astonishing. Independence of party is excellent; and the artisan may become a power of inestimable value in our politics if he will steadfastly support those statesmen, and those only, who, without regard to U. E. fancies, or any other fancies, do to the best of their ability what will secure to labour its fair reward, and bring wealth, happiness and the virtue which goes along with them into his home and those of the Canadian people. His freedom from the fetters of tradition and convention is likely also to make him a specially fearless champion of that liberty of discussion which we are glad to see our new contemporary, the *Commonwealth*, make a vital article of its creed. But a class which severs its interest from that of the community at large is an amputated limb; and if the amputation is bad for the body for the limb it is much worse. Independent candidatures, though they may be forlorn hopes, we shall hail with pleasure, but we trust they will be independent of class and special interests as well as of party.

—Bennett has paid the penalty of a life of low dissipation. His homicidal and suicidal reveries, committed to writing in the maddest form and carried about on his person, are conclu-

sive proof that, at the time of committing the act for which he was condemned, he was a proper inmate for an asylum. He most likely entered Mr. Brown's room with a demoniacal impulse in his shattered mind, but without any fixed purpose; and had Mr. Brown only been aware of the mental state of his visitor, it is possible that by studious calmness and gentleness he might have conjured the fiend for the moment, and his life might have been saved. But insanity, brought on by bad habits, was criminal; as perhaps is not a little of that which fills our asylums. Bennett went into the dock with the rope round his neck; for writers, not meaning to do anything wrong, yet, as we think, rather forgetting what is due to a prisoner awaiting his trial, had been all along calling him the murderer and the assassin. Little weight could be attached to any of his maudering, even when he was speaking in the presence of death; but there was nothing incredible in his statement that his pistol would have been drawn only in irresolute menace, had not his hand been seized and a scuffle ensued. The wound evidently was not in itself mortal. With regard to this part of his defence, the prisoner seems to have suffered from his destitute condition, which prevented his commanding all the medical evidence that his Counsel would have desired. An application to the Government for pecuniary assistance was refused; no doubt unavoidably: yet it seems hardly consistent with the interests of justice that any accused person, especially one on trial for his life, should be left without the means of producing all that is requisite in his defence. There was nothing redeeming in Bennett's case; nor was there anything touching, except, perhaps, that he was so complete a type of the castaway. Nothing linked him to society or society to him. To the question whether life is worth living, he replied, so far as he was concerned, by begging that the day of his execution might be hastened. Not the faintest sign of sympathy attended his tragic exit from the scene. It appears that as a child he was thrown on the world an orphan, and we can easily imagine what the world was to him. Circumstance is not all, but it often makes the difference between the

castaway who comes to the gallows and the highly respectable rogue who comes to reward and honour. Once more we may say, "There, but for the Grace of God—but for a good home, happy surroundings, and the influence of affection—goes Richard Baxter."

—It was just after going to press with our last number that we were favoured with a copy of a religious newspaper containing a solemn editorial on the Toronto University dinner, at which, because there was wine, it was charitably assumed by the writer that there must have been intemperance. The writer deprecated the title of "Maw worm," which he seemed to think some persons might be so misguided as to apply to his moral zeal. Social crusades, such as the temperance movement, have done much good, and are most hopeful signs of moral life in a community; but they are apt to produce a one-sided morality. A man, who has been all his life committing breaches of charity and poisoning the social atmosphere around him, may fancy himself, and be fancied by others, to be a saint because he can scent debauch where there is nothing but good-fellowship. It is strange that these censors, who assume that it is impossible to touch wine without running into excess, should forget that in England, where it is the regular habit of the gentry to take a glass or two of wine every day at dinner, you may pass your life in good society without ever seeing a man the worse for liquor. Perhaps we should be better without wine: that is a question between us and our medical advisers. If you say that the use of wine, however moderate, must be morally criminal, because the beverage, if taken in excess, would intoxicate, you will have, if you are a Christian, to expurgate your Bible, striking out, among other passages, the narrative of the Marriage Feast at Cana, and to abolish the Lord's Supper. The theory that the wine of Scripture was the unfermented juice of the grape, is the most desperate of exegetical subterfuges. When people are guilty of excess and make themselves



offensive to their neighbours, they are proper subjects for interference; otherwise they are not; and the community will be none the better for a reign of malignant suspicion, which places character at the mercy of self-constituted detectives.

We have seen other criticisms on the University dinner in which there was more truth. Visitors have complained that they found in it nothing particularly characteristic of a literary body. They would not expect or desire that the speeches should be pedagogic or pedantic; but they would wish that University subjects should prevail and that the tone should be Attic, not Bœotian. The repast was laudably Attic; it was light and soon dispatched; but it must be admitted that the praise could hardly be extended to the intellectual fare. The speeches made, in response to the toast of the Honour Men of the year, were not only light, as was proper, but, so far as we caught their purport, too much resembled those which are heard at boating suppers, in a choking atmosphere of smoke. It is true, that in this case, as in those of most public dinners, a conventional programme was mainly to blame. Why all those irrelevant subjects? At a University dinner, why should we be condemned to hear people discanting on the merits of the British Monarchy, the Heir-Apparent, the Lieutenant-Governor, the Senate, the House of Commons, the Bench, the Bar, the Army and the Volunteers, while the hand of the clock is creeping towards midnight, and the audience is being spoiled for the proper toasts of the evening? Let the formal toasts be formally disposed of: let the whole of the evening be given to the appropriate toasts and the speakers to whom they belong; let the speeches seldom exceed five, or at most, ten minutes; and let us rise from table fresh and get to bed betimes, instead of going home jaded at two o'clock in the morning, and being unfitted for work next day.

—The Minister of Education for Ontario seems to be in trouble, though not, we will venture to say, from any want of desire on his part to do conscientiously all the duties of his

office. His culture and University standing rendered the choice of him for his post entirely natural and creditable to those who made it: but he was set rather late in his public life to deal with a subject which requires not only experience but almost a lifelong familiarity. Perhaps he is not, in all instances, fortunate in his subordinates, though it would be difficult for him to change without positive ground. The Department as a whole appears to be stricken with a fatal malady—want of confidence. A political Minister can hardly be expected to decide upon the comparative merits of text-books, to settle the subjects of examinations, and the method of conducting them; or, indeed, to undertake anything beyond the general administration of the office. The rest must fall into the hands of the officers, who, let their personal merits be what they will, can hardly help forming a sort of bureaucratic clique; are pretty sure, if they have a chance, to over-centralize, and are apt to over-rate the importance of their department, and to overstep the limits of practicability and the measure of expense. There is evidently a growing suspicion in the Province that these tendencies prevail. We are, perhaps, partly suffering from want of circumspection in the change made six years ago. Mr. Mowat's intentions are excellent, and if he were acting in a vacuum he would always go right. But acting in a medium full of influences, he sometimes yields to them like other politicians, and it was perhaps not in his calmest or most courageous mood that he pulled down, with a somewhat unreflecting haste, the Council of Public Instruction, which he had himself reorganized only a year before. The substitution of a Minister of Education, responsible to the Legislature, for the Superintendent, was no doubt right, and the Council, unpaid, and meeting only for a few days, at considerable intervals, was obviously unfit for the purposes of current administration. But was it not a good body for the regulation of the text-books and of the subjects of instruction? As reorganized, it comprised the heads of education in the Province, with representatives of the Public Schools and High-

School teachers. Its members were thoroughly familiar with the subject, they were not connected with each other enough to form a clique, and they were pretty well above the suspicion of influence, commercial, political, or of any other kind. It was, in fact, in braving special influences, by throwing off discreditable text-books, and overhauling that superannuated nuisance, the Book Depository, that the Council met its doom. It is well that the people should feel that, at the centre of the system, and as a court of ultimate reference, there is something which commands the same sort of respect in its way which is commanded in a more important sphere by the Judiciary. If we had a Provincial University, a committee of its Senate, with representatives of the teachers, would be an obvious expedient: but a Provincial University is a vision which grows more shadowy every day.

What we have said as to the general conscientiousness of the Minister of Education may be extended, we are sure, to his action in the special case of the University appointments, which have caused so great an effusion of ink. But in this case he has not been happy in his defenders. We feel confident that a certain editorial on the "Know-nothing yell of the cultured youth of Canada," was not pleasant reading to so well-bred a gentleman as Mr. Crooks. This is the mere brutality of a bludgeon which has lost its force. The extraordinary liberality with which the Manager of the *Globe* has welcomed intellectual merit from every quarter to a partnership in the honours and emoluments of his own sphere, lends special weight to the censure visited by his highly educated pen on those whom he styles, with fine irony, "the cultured youth of Canada." Apart from "Know-nothingism," and even from the pride, not altogether criminal, which a Canadian may feel in seeing Canadians promoted to dignity, there is a plain reason of policy for making the higher appointments within the existing staff, provided any member of it is competent, because you otherwise take away the incentives to exertion. But the exception, on this occasion, was taken to an arrange-

ment which was, in itself, open to exception if ever an arrangement was; we mean the creation of a Vice-Presidency, with a distinction of salary, specially for the purpose of putting the youngest professor over the heads of the rest, and at the same time investing him with a prospective title to the Presidency which would have been extremely invidious and would have probably given birth to a great deal of jealousy and cabal. It is impossible, indeed, to believe that such a proposal could have commended itself to a man of sense, except as a mode of escape from a dilemma, which it almost certainly was. Mr. Warren's ability and scholarship are unquestionable; we have no doubt that he would be a very valuable addition in every respect to the staff of the University: but he would himself have been the greatest sufferer by the strange *tour de force* which was projected in his favour.

A special respect for classical studies, and a belief that a representative of them ought to be at the head of the University, seem to have been Mr. Crooks' leading motives, and to furnish the clue to this *imbroglio*. We heartily sympathize with his taste. But there is no use in striving to secure to the classics for ever the pre-eminence which they enjoyed when they were the only literature worth reading. They dethroned the School Philosophy, not without a desperate resistance on the part of its devotees; and the time has now come for them in turn to resign a portion of their realm. Not that they are going to drop into the graves of the School Philosophy. They remain the best educators of taste, the highest of all intellectual pleasures, the most perfect manual of humanity, while comment and illustration are daily adding to their value. But they are no longer the only literature, and Literature as a whole has now to share the domain of education with Science. To some extent the necessity of studying the originals is being superseded by good translations, though in the translations the beauty of form is lost. Perhaps Classics are more suited for a leisure class, such as the young gentlemen of England, than for the youth of a more hard-working community.

Even in England they begin to talk of ceasing to require Greek, of which few learn enough to repay their trouble, while the toilsome and barren acquisition of beggarly elements cannot fail to breed distaste for learning. Not that either Greek or Latin need be taught as both have been hitherto, but as no other language is, with a long preliminary course of weary gerund grinding. However, the Classics must be left to find their own level in the scale of studies; no propping and craning can keep them above it. The President of a University ought to be a man of pretty general culture, able to hold the balance between rival studies, and to sympathize at any rate with all his Professors. He ought to be a good specimen of the intellectual character, that the students may feel pride in him, and at the same time enough of a man of the world to deal wisely with practical questions, and represent the University worthily on all occasions. We trust there is no very grievous illiberality in adding, that familiarity with the character and ways of the youths whom he is to govern will make his task easier. Youth in all countries has its peculiarities, as a Canadian would quickly learn if he were suddenly promoted to the Headship of a College at Oxford or Cambridge, and set to govern a number of the young squires of England.

—The Quebec Scandal has passed off, we are happy to say, without leaving anything that can be called a stain on the character of the head of the Government, though he seems to have tried to make use of people with whom he had better have had nothing to do. He appears to be safe in possession of power. By way of forcing a little prosperity, the Quebecers are going to encourage, by bonuses, the production of Beet Sugar: we fear they are destined once more to prove by experience how little bonus-fed industries are worth.

In Commercial circles, at Montreal, general sympathy is expressed with Sir Francis Hincks on the total loss of his temper.

Nothing is so trying to the temper as the Currency Question, except theology and chess.

From New Brunswick comes a report of dull times, prices raised, factories closed, while their managers go to work on salaries in the United States, of a heavy fall in the value of real estate, of general discontent, which breaks out against the N. P., though it might perhaps find more reasonable objects of denunciation. A furniture firm, which finding itself unable to import in the face of 35 per cent. duty, has taken to manufacturing at home, is about the brightest spot in the picture as presented to us. Our private correspondence confirms, as far as New Brunswick is concerned, the statements which have appeared as to the growth of political disquietude. He finds a tendency towards separation from the Dominion, and even towards annexation to the United States, in quarters where it might least have been expected. The old Anti-Confederate party of 1866-'7 appears to him almost a unit in the expression of these views, while it is joined by some who were enthusiastic Unionists in the early days. A Nova Scotian writing to the *Globe* a few weeks ago said: "There are more Repealers and Anti-Confederates in Nova Scotia to-day than there were in 1867. It only wants an able, popular and eloquent leader, one in whom the people could repose confidence, to lead off in a repeal agitation, when our people would rally round him with a unanimity which would surprise the people of the West. That leader may come to the front sooner than we expect; and when the repeal agitation is inaugurated, it will not be confined to Nova Scotia, but will have for its theatre Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and unless the politicians of the Western Provinces can succeed in buying up our leaders, as they did in 1868 and 1869, the result cannot be doubtful—the Maritime Provinces will go out of the Union." This writer mentions, among the leading causes of discontent, the Railway expenditure in the West, and the lavish pampering of British Columbia. Our own correspondent mentions, also, the extravagance of the

Administration generally, and especially the waste of money on the Department of Militia. Meanwhile, amidst the festive influences of Wimbledon, the Colonial Secretary, lapped in the blissful ignorance which is the appanage of his office, drinks to the increase of our military expenditure and of the railway undertakings of the Government. Nobody is so uncourtly as to whisper to him that the debt is straining the bonds of Confederation, and if disruption were to come the securities of our English creditors would not stand quite so high as they do now.

It is time to consider what is to be said in answer to these anti-Confederationists. How are they to be convinced that they made a mistake in 1867, and that they are making a mistake now? Confederation has produced a vast development of faction, demagogism, corruption, and extravagant expenditure. It has produced a public debt heavier, in proportion to the resources of the country, than that of the United States, though Canada has had no civil war. It has committed us to enterprises in the way of politico-military railways which are simply mad, and which, if we cannot get out of them, will be our ruin. So much is certain; and to counterbalance all this, what practical good has Confederation so far done? It was unfortunately not the deliberate work of statesmen, but the shift of politicians, who, in their faction-fight, had brought affairs to a deadlock. Had it been the deliberate work of statesmen, it would perhaps have been kept geographically within practicable limits, carried forward to completion by a legislative union, and finally crowned with self-government.

—We said that General Hancock, the Democratic nominee, was a respectable soldier. We ought to have spoken more strongly. General Hancock, as a soldier, is not only respectable, but highly distinguished, though he never held supreme command, while his general character appears to be stainless and to do honour to West Point. Still he is a mere soldier. It is true that as military Governor of Texas, at the time of the

schism between President Johnson and the Republican party, he showed a leaning towards Johnson's policy, which is now his special title to the Democratic nomination. But nobody pretends that he has studied political questions, or that he is in any sense a statesman. He would therefore be at the mercy of his Machinists. It is just to Grant to remember that, after his first election, he made an effort to emancipate himself by bringing into his government independent men, such as Stewart, of New York, and Borie, of Philadelphia; but his ignorance, both of men and questions, was fatal to his undertaking, and he soon fell helpless into the hands of his managers. The military character of the nomination, while it will flatter the army and perhaps bring over the votes of a good many soldiers, will probably repel an equal number of those who are justly jealous of approaches to military rule, and determined to keep a civilian government. Those men, who have succeeded in defeating the Third Term, will ask themselves, whether Hancock is anything but a Democratic Grant. It would not be a bad thing if the Constitution could be amended so as to preclude officers of the regular army, and judges at the same time, from being candidates for political office. The electioneering restlessness of Chief-Justice Chase, when he was at the head of the Supreme Court, gave just umbrage to those who were jealous of the honour of the judiciary; and political neutrality is hardly less essential in the case of an officer of the regular army than in that of a judge.

—The question between Hancock as a representative of the military element, and Garfield as a representative of the civilian element, to which he essentially belongs, may be said to form a special issue in this election: otherwise the contest will be simply a struggle for power and patronage between the Republican and the Democratic party. What are the Republican and the Democratic parties? is a question often asked by the enquiring stranger, and one which his American friend



sometimes has difficulty in answering, the more so as the names themselves fail to throw any light upon the matter, being, in fact, merely Latin and Greek for the same thing. The connection between Democracy and an institution so much the reverse of Democratic as slavery, is particularly hard to understand. The solution, however, is simple; and the history of American parties, apparently so complex and bewildering, may, so far as its main current is concerned, be told in very few words. At the outset there were two parties—an English and Conservative party, headed by Adams and Hamilton, which wanted a strong central government, as nearly after the English model as might be without readmitting the hereditary principle; and a Revolutionary party, closely allied in sentiment to the Revolutionary party in France, and headed by Jefferson, which wished that there should be as little of central government as possible, and that public affairs should be carried on as far as it was practicable by the immediate action of the people. The first was the party of Federation, the second was that of State Rights, a doctrine in those days really democratic. Slavery had at that time not assumed the terrible importance which it assumed after the invention of the cotton gin; it appeared as the remnant of a system of bond-service destined in the course of nature to expire. But when slavery became the great interest of the South, and was threatened by the Abolitionism of the North, it found its bulwark in the doctrine of State Rights, which forbade Federal interference with the democratic affairs and institutions of any State. Thus the Southern oligarchy became a self-styled leader of Democracy, and the Revolutionary creed of Jefferson, the philanthropist and the friend of equality, was transmuted into a doctrine of slave-owners. To make up his party, however, the slave-owner had allies at the North of two kinds: plutocrats like himself and would-be aristocrats on the one hand; on the other the Irish, a large proportion of the Germans, and other retainers, who were democratic with a vengeance, and to whom the Union was politically given up to plunder as the wages of their service in the army of slavery.

Such a coalition between the extremes of society, an oligarchy and a populace, is a political phenomenon not peculiar to the United States, nor is that the only country in which the practical bonds of alliance between the two elements have been a priesthood and the tavern. By this pseudo-democratic combination were wrought the worst of those misdeeds of which genuine democracy has borne the reproach, such as the introduction of the elective judiciary, which never was adopted by Massachusetts, and the reign of unpunished crime and public plunder in New York. Opposed to the slave-owner and his Northern confederates, as a rule, were the worth, the intelligence, the morality, the honest industry, the legality, the rational religion, the political loyalty of the Republic; not, however, without an alloy of fanaticism, which, as it manifestly tended to hurry the controversy to a violent crisis, alarmed a good many moderate men, and threw them into the Democratic party. No one needs to be told how the mine was fired at length, as any mine that there may be issure to be fired, by a Presidential Election; how the slave-owner threw down the gauntlet; how he fell, involving the Northern wing of his party in his ruin. Such is the backbone of the history. There have been special movements, such as the Know-Nothing movement, and there have been schisms and new departures of a sectional kind under strange names, in which ambition and other personal influences have played a considerable part. The most important of the subordinate issues has been that between Free Trade and Protection. This was not unconnected with the main issue, because the Slave States, as they were incapable of manufacturing anything, were necessarily for Free Trade, while in the Free States manufactures were growing: but the lines of division were not identical, the Pennsylvanian manufacturer having been at once a Democrat and a Protectionist. The work of Mr. Spence, which had a great run in England at the outbreak of the American Civil War, and in which the main issue was represented as being not between Slavery and Free Labour, but between Free Trade and Protection, was a skilful attempt to

enlist the commercial sympathies of England on the side of the South, and to reconcile English morality to alliance with the slave-owner. It contained merely that grain of truth which is necessary to give vogue to falsehood.

To the errors and scandals of General Grant's two terms, and especially to his mal-administration of the South, the Democratic party principally owes it that it has been able to lift its head again; to re-organize its shattered forces; to recall many of those who had temporarily seceded from it, under the name of War Democrats, to its ranks; to bury its disgrace, and invest itself with a new title to allegiance, as the champion of reform against abuse, and of self-government against tyrannical centralization; to cast at least an equal vote for the Presidency at the last election; and to gain, what it now possesses, a majority in both Houses of Congress. The coming struggle will be between two great organizations, contending for power and the spoils, rather than between any two definite and paramount principles, such as Free Labour and Slavery. Slavery is dead; and though White Ascendancy survives, it has been made so complete, and the negro vote has been so entirely suppressed, under the present regime, that the South can have little left to desire in that way. State Right is a principle perfectly separate from Slavery, to the development of which, as we have said, it was antecedent; but it is not one, we apprehend, on which there is practically any very marked difference between the two parties. Railroads, canals, and commercial connections of all kinds, have so interlocked the States, that the old-fashioned theory of State Rights, founded on the idea that these communities were entirely separate, is out of date; nor do we believe that the Democracy, if the government were once in its hands, would be less jealous of its prerogative, or less inclined to extend its jurisdiction than its rival. Jackson, the typical Democrat, was certainly not disposed to increase local power at the expense of his own. With the anxious onlooker, the main question will be, what elements of the community does each party represent, and what practical influences for good or evil is it likely to

bring with it to the exercise of supreme power. On each side there is a host of mere office-seekers, machinists, and wirepullers; both hosts alike are scourges of the Commonwealth; and if the Republican party appears at present in this respect worse than its rival, it is merely because it has been for some time in place. But setting aside these professional politicians, we find that the core of the Democratic party is still the South; and apart from all questions of morality connected with Slavery or White Ascendency, it cannot be doubted that the South is inferior to the rest of the Union in civilization, so that the influence imported by it into the government would be one of comparative barbarism. Highly educated Southerners, of course, there are, but we speak of the South as a whole; and if any one thinks our judgment harsh, we refer him to "Olmsted's Cotton Kingdom," in which, we believe, he will find a faithful picture of Southern society, as it was just before the war, and as, in all essential respects, it is still. After the South come the Irish whose lack of constitutional training is their misfortune, not their fault, but is not the less fatal to their power of acting as good and intelligent citizens of a Republic, while their religion makes them the tools of the priesthood, which, whatever may be its ecclesiastical virtues, is antagonistic, politically and socially, to the organic principles of modern civilization. To suppose that the Irish, in attaching themselves to the Democratic party, are actuated by a love of self-government, or administrative reform, would be preposterous; their tendencies are adverse to both: they are addicted to the blind following of chiefs, and to claiming, with jealous importunity, their national share of the spoils. In adhering to the Democracy, they follow at best a name and a sort of clan tradition, wholly unconnected with principle. To the Irish may still be added a large section of the Germans, and the Germans of the beer-gardens rather than those of the Prussian public school, who are also caught, probably, by the name. The liquor interest is naturally, as a rule, on the same side, and it is no inconsiderable power. Among the wealthy leaders of the Democratic party, it may

be surmised that there are not a few who, in their hearts, are but little attached to Republican institutions; who regarded Slavery with positive favour, as an aristocratic system; who use the passions of the populace to combat a Government of the people; and whose antagonism is the surest indication that the genuine spirit of Republicanism is on the side to which they are opposed. Of the presence of very good and patriotic men in the Democratic ranks, the name of Senator Bayard is a sufficient proof; and to such men, no doubt, the party presents itself as the means of guarding the Constitution, and repelling centralizing aggression. But when we look at the party as a whole, it is impossible not to feel the strongest misgivings as to the results of its return to power; nor are these misgivings in any way diminished by its conduct in Congress during the session which has just closed.

—In the Democratic platform there is a plank in favour of honest money, not excluding, however, that particular form of financial folly and roguery which consists in debasing the currency and defrauding public and private creditors, by the enactment of laws ordaining that silver (and perhaps some day brass or nickel) shall pass for gold. But there is a suspicious affinity between the Democrats and the Greenbackers, who together made an attempt on the constitutional life of the State, under the name of Fusionists, in Maine. This may be merely the natural attraction of opposition for all malcontents which makes the party out of power a cave of Adullam: we fear, however, that it is something more.

It does not seem probable that the appeal against the "Fraud" will be very effective, though the Democrats of course lift their hands to avenging Heaven. The issue is somewhat stale, and Mr. Hayes is not a candidate. Moreover, it was always pretty hollow: that there was Republican fraud, and of a most infamous kind, in Louisiana, cannot be doubted: but it is equally unquestionable that there was throughout the South,

and is going to be again, a lawless suppression, by Democratic fraud or violence, of the negro vote. That the negro is unfit to be trusted with a vote is very likely; so is a white, whose political character has been formed by slave-driving; but both have the vote by law, and the objection to cheating or intimidation is in both cases the same. Maine, too, is a full set-off against Louisiana. Unhappily, though the memory of "the greatest Crime of the century" is not likely to tell much on the election, it is too likely to tell in the counting. Should the result be again open to question (a contingency far from improbable), and should the decision fall to a Congress in which the Democrats have a majority, the temptation to redress an alleged wrong by committing another wrong would be great, and there is nothing to assure us that it would be resisted. By the hasty re-incorporation of the South, a fatal spirit of lawlessness has been imported into the Union; and the Republic, even if it escapes the present danger, will have for some time to come reason to rue the unreflecting good nature which admitted a plague-stricken ship without salutary quarantine. The renunciation of vengeance was admirable, and put the traducers of democracy to shame: but in the interest of the South, as well as that of the North, statesmanship ought to have secured to American civilization the objects for which enormous sacrifices had been made.

—It is difficult to see from a distance what is really going on in England. An hour on the spot would tell us more than all the cablegrams and correspondence, which, we must once more remind our readers, come from London, where the feeling, both political and social, is intensely hostile to Mr. Gladstone. Newspaper correspondents tell us that the Premier is growing testy; if badgering can make a man testy he may well be so; but the accounts which we receive from private correspondents are favourable to the tact and judgment of his leadership though the writers are far from being his devoted adherents

or indisposed to criticize his strategy. Assuredly, whatever powers of leadership he has, he needs them now. The Opposition, breathing the atmosphere of London drawing-rooms in which "the people's William" is hated far more bitterly than a more orthodox object of hatred; encouraged by the recovery of one or two seats which were lost in the rush of the popular uprising against the late Government; touched as a body of landowners in the most vital and sensitive point by the Compensation Bill, the Opposition is manifestly furious. Its nominal leader, a man of moderate temper, is evidently swept along at the head of an assaulting column which he cannot control. The Tories are practically combining with the Fenians for the obstruction of legislation. In truth, the state of the House of Commons is apparently becoming serious. Parliamentary Government can go on only if the minority, after fully stating its case, will yield to the majority, and all parties will concur in expediting the business. It is not unlikely that the British Parliament in the coming years may display, in a very significant manner, the weak points of these institutions. The scenes in the House of Commons are most violent, and mark the ominous transition from questions which are merely political, to those which affect property and class. As we write, appearances betoken a collision between the Lords and the Commons with which another "irrepressible conflict" may commence.

We have said before that a separation of the Whigs from the Liberals must come, and would probably come as soon as any serious question should arise about the land. The Whigs are a section of the land-owning aristocracy. We have traced their pedigree before. They represent the new nobility, formed under the Tudors out of the grantees of monastery lands, who, by the origin of their property were bound to Protestantism and to the politics with which it was connected. Having led the nation to victory over the Papists and Absolutists in 1688, they afterwards formed a powerful oligarchy, which held in tutelage the Kings of the House of Brunswick, whom they had set, and whom they kept, upon the throne. By George III., whom

the extinction of the Stuarts had secured against rivals, the oligarchy of Whig houses was overturned and plunged into opposition, from which it emerged, at the head of the Reform movement, after the close of the French War. But since that time it has been gradually yielding to the bias of its class affinities. The heads of the great houses are nailed to their place by leadership and history, though the head of the great house of Seymour has virtually seceded. But the Whigs of the lesser houses are fast going over to their own place. Their own place the Conservative camp is, if they obey the most natural impulses of rank and interest. A member of an aristocracy who should see into the situation, understand that the only use of his hereditary rank in the present day was to make the past slide gently into the future, and act on that principle by steadfastly casting in his lot with Progress, would show himself to be not only a man of remarkable perspicacity but moulded of the very finest clay of humanity.

—Desperate difficulties surround the Irish Question, especially when it has to be dealt with in the midst of a raging faction fight. For our own part we are not agrarians. We cannot see why a man's land should be more liable to confiscation by the State than his ship or his goods. If it is said that land is the gift of nature, we answer that raw land is the gift of nature, but that tilled land is the work of industry. In every work of industry there must be raw material and natural forces: there are in a ship, in a piece of cloth, in your hat, which a sovereign assembly may legislate off your head if it thinks fit. Everything must be liable to confiscation or nothing; and if everything were liable to confiscation nothing would be produced; land would not be tilled, nor would ships, cloth, or hats be made. Indeed, what the Irish want is not common ownership, such as the Communists desire, or anything of the kind. What each of them wants is to have the land which he occupies as his own, without payment of rent. That everybody has



a natural right to live on the land is another aphorism which is continually repeated as though it were self-evident ; but if an Irishman has a two-acre lot and twelve children, where is the use of saying that all his children have a right to live on the land ? They cannot all live on their father's lot, and if they are to have other lots assigned them, somebody must be ousted to make room for them. The law owes, it seems to us, as a rule, the same protection to landed property as to any other kind of property, and on the same grounds both of justice and of expediency. But Ireland is practically an exceptional case. The ownership of land in that country is itself the heritage of confiscation, and of confiscation which has never been forgotten. This struggle is, in fact, the last stage of a long civil war, waged between the conquered race and an intrusive proprietary which was closely identified with the political ascendancy of the foreigner and the religious ascendancy of an alien creed. If the war has been waged on the part of the natives more by conspiracy than by open fighting, it has not been the less murderous, nor has the enmity which it has created between classes been the less deadly. Respect for the property of the landowner has, in truth, never had a chance of taking root in the Irish mind. Absenteeism, the almost inevitable consequence of the repulsiveness and danger of residence in Ireland, has increased estrangement. The peasantry has multiplied for centuries in misery without its natural civilizers and guides. Now, as in 1846, comes famine and adds to agrarianism despair. It is impossible to evict a nation. The Government must arbitrate between the parties as best it can, and require of the landlord such temporary concessions as are necessary to prevent the total overthrow of his rights. With this object, it cannot be doubted, the Compensation Bill has been framed, and its framer, Mr. Foster, is about the most Conservative member of the Cabinet. Mr. Parnell, in his violent and ill-conditioned way, assails everything reasonable and especially that which is most in his own favour. If he could succeed in overturning the Government, the Tories would ride back into power with renewed

force, and with a few regiments would soon settle the Irish agitation. No Englishman can see without anguish the un-failing flow of this fountain of calamity, the bitter waters of which are now streaming, in the form of a vast Irish immigration, over England as well as over Ireland itself. The apostles of Force, such as Mr. Froude, think it a perfectly sufficient reason for conquering and enslaving the Irish that they were weak: weak in arms they may be, but they have proved strong enough in their misery and its hideous consequences to shake the pillars of the Empire; and the end of these disasters is not yet.

—Out of the Bradlaugh affair, at all events, Mr. Gladstone appears to have come well, while his enemies, as the reward of their hypocritical attempt to connect him with hostility to religion, have covered themselves with ridicule. Who would have thought it possible that 280 men of the world could have made such old women of themselves as to shut a man up in the Clock Tower for not believing in the Deity? The people were not taken in: to the confusion of the legislators, they saw plainly enough that the religious question had nothing to do with the question of political right. Mr. Plimsoll spoke for the masses when he wrote to Mr. Bradlaugh that, as a firm believer in Christianity, he was on the side of justice. Bradlaugh, of course, has gained immensely in influence: he showed that he that he was no Kenealy by making a powerful and impressive speech in perfectly good taste. Among the foremost of his assailants, it seems, was a Jew, himself just emancipated from religious disabilities, who no doubt regards the Supreme Being as a very useful guardian of shekels. The matter has now sunk into the hands of informers who are now suing Bradlaugh for legal penalties. England and Christianity will be dishonoured if the rogues recover a cent.

—The Game Laws will not go this Session; but they will go. That they should have lived so long proves the strength of the

land-owning element in the Liberal party, for they have always been manifestly condemned by Liberal principles and by the public good. There are some on the democratic side of the Atlantic whom it is necessary to remind that the English game laws are not like our laws for the conservation of game, but laws practically confining the liberty of killing game to a privileged class. Poaching is in England no small item in the rural calendar of crime, and not unfrequently it is the first step in the downward course of the peasant: he begins by breaking an arbitrary law, gets a bad name, becomes a social outcast, and in the end a felon. Justice, under the present system of county government, is administered by a Bench of Game Preservers. The existence of these laws is in itself enough to show the element of feudal character which English society has retained, though no Conqueror now lays waste a wide district, destroying the church as well as the hamlet and the grange, to make a New Forest. To the Norman king or lord, full of fierce animal vigour, and living during the intervals of war in a lonely castle, without anything to occupy his coarse, illiterate mind, the chase was at once a physical and mental necessity. Hence the extraordinary tenacity with which the whole race battled for its forest privileges, and the almost insane cruelty with which it enforced forest law. Perhaps we may go back even further, and trace in the tastes of Squire Western a lingering relic of the hunter state of man. The modern English landowner is scarcely less full of animal vigour than the Norman, and not very much better provided with indoor recreations. He therefore clings with a tight grasp to his game and the laws which protect it; in a sequestered and squire-ridden parish, the reign of awe over man and dog which prevails, while the pheasants and partridges are sitting, would not have seemed discredit to the Conqueror. Shooting, however, as well as fox-hunting, has become extremely artificial, and has almost lost the character of wild sport. A battue is dull and senseless carnage, which might as well be enacted in a barn-yard as in a wood. Pheasants are actually bred, like domestic fowls, in

hutches. There could be no sharper satire on the system than the fact that the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, an Oriental domiciled in England, eclipsed all the English game preservers in the enormity of his "bag" of game. Economy will now combine with Liberalism to put an end to game-preserving on English farms, which can no longer hold their own against hares in the wheat, added to American competition. These changes, however, tend to break up English country life, and the political regime of which that life is the basis. Without the fox-hunt and the battue, the modern manor-house is almost as dull an abode for an inmate who reads nothing but the newspaper as a Norman castle. The landowner will live less in his country place, more in the pleasure cities; his social, and with it his political, influence will decline. It will be so at least unless he turns farmer in good earnest, as he may possibly be obliged to do by the diminution of his rents, which in that case would be a blessing in disguise.

—When it was first proposed to hand over the Election Petitions from the House of Commons to the Judges, Chief Justice Cockburn strongly protested on the ground that the ermine would be in danger of being stained by political trials. His prophecy of evil seemed to have been totally falsified by the event: but the account of the Election Trial at Plymouth shows that his fears were not wholly groundless. Mr. Justice Lush, it seems, found himself compelled to unseat Sir Edward Bates for bribery through his agent, but in doing so his Lordship, who has evidently great respect and sympathy for the political character of Sir Edward, thought fit to remark: "The petitioners, actuated, as I think and believe, by party spirit, have succeeded in depriving not only the poor and needy of all creeds and denominations, religious and political, in Plymouth, but also the people at large, of a kind friend and generous benefactor, and the majority of the constituency of a member of whom they had good reason to be proud." It was evidently a case of

“nursing a borough.” Nursing a borough is a refined practice which, since the passing of the new Bribery Act, has taken the place of the old-fashioned system of coarse bribery. You buy the constituency, not by bribes at the election time, but by giving doles to the poorer electors every year and all the year round. You ask no questions about the vote which any one has given or intends to give; if you did you would come within the grasp of the law; but you let it be understood that the doles will be forthcoming so long as you are the member and no longer. We say that Plymouth was evidently a case of this kind, not only because it is generally stated to have been so, but because Mr. Justice Lush himself distinctly implies that Sir Edward Bates will discontinue his doles when he ceases to be the member for Plymouth. No doubt this systematic corruption formed the real ground of the petition, though the technical ground was the act of bribery by an agent at the time of the election. The Judge denounces the petitioners for being actuated by party spirit, as though election petitions generally emanated from a speculative love of public purity and virtue. No Canadian judge, we are happy to say, has ever so far exceeded his functions as this representative of the renowned judiciary of England. But the case may serve as a warning of the special delicacy of the duties which a judge trying an election petition is called on to perform, and of the absolute necessity of his confining himself to the law and the facts, and resisting any temptation, however strong, to launch into gratuitous comments. Let one or two of our judges give vent to their feelings as Mr. Justice Lush appears to have done and the authority of the judges in election trials will be gravely shaken; nor will the bad effects end there.

—Acute observers of commercial opinion in England say that there will be a return to Protection, and that the movement will commence in the very quarter which gave birth to Free Trade. There is a good deal to produce this impression;

we know that even in those sanctuaries of Free Trade sentiment, the Northern Chambers of Commerce, the cry for Reciprocity has been heard; and we can well believe that if interest appeared to demand a change of policy, cosmopolitan philanthropy would soon go to the wall. Nevertheless, we do not think that England will return to Protection. The farmer will not allow the manufacturer to raise, by protective duties, the price of clothes and tools; still less will the manufacturer allow the farmer to raise the price of food. Reciprocity treaties, which the pure Free Trader repudiates as a form of Protection, may come into favour as the means of opening foreign ports to English goods, though their fatal instability and the consequent uncertainty of the trade based upon them has been too clearly proved: more we do not anticipate.

Certain it is, however, that a change has been coming over the political economy of Europe in connection with the growth of continental manufactures and with the fiscal necessities simultaneously imposed by the military system. Recent writers, instead of being cosmopolitan, are national. By the cosmopolitan and philanthropic Free Trader it is assumed that mankind is one community, and that the same rule which holds good between the different members of the same nation must hold good between the different members of humanity. But this at present is not the fact; at present mankind is divided into nations, with distinct interests and national tariffs which they cannot be prevented from regulating each in the way that suits it best. England is a nation subsisting by the exportation of manufactures, and she will naturally regulate her policy accordingly, and be inclined to see everything from that point of view. But, as we have said before, she is not really a Free Trade nation: she raises a large portion of her revenue by import duties, though she takes care not to tax the raw materials of her industries, while her power of cheap production has till recently been an effectual protection against the importation of rival goods. Examine her system, and you find it national, not cosmopolitan, though the members of humanity to whose goods

she refuses free admission are the producers of tea, coffee, wine, spirits and tobacco. German writers have broached the idea that a special system of economy, as well as a special set of political institutions, is a necessary adjunct of the peculiar character of each nation: this seems to us fantastic; but we believe that there will be national tariffs so long as there is need of import duties on a large scale; and there will be need of import duties on a large scale so long at least as there are international rivalries and wars. If righteousness and peace could reign, the tariff question would hardly trouble us any more. Free Trade enthusiasts tell us that commerce is the great missionary of righteousness and peace; but to this history, unhappily, can only give a very qualified assent. It was commerce that made the Opium Wars and the Treaty of Tien-tsin.

Again, political economy shows a tendency to return to the path traced for it by its illustrious founder, Adam Smith, which, in our humble opinion, it ought never to have left. Adam Smith treated the subject historically, and by way of observation, garnering the fruits of experience as he went along, but not turning rules of general expediency into adamant laws. He admits, for example, exceptions to the principle of Free Trade, suggested by the same experience on which the principle rests. The very title of his book, "The Wealth of Nations," indicates his point of view. But after him came writers who turned political economy into a deductive science, establishing, as they thought, universal principles, and deriving all the rules of action from them. Some of these, as though the subject had attained mathematical precision, even went the length of clothing economic laws in algebraic formulæ. Nominally, they admitted that, in order to constitute their science, they had been obliged to eliminate all human motives, except the desire of wealth, and that this elimination must be hypothetical only: practically, they treated it as not merely hypothetical but actual, requiring us to be ruled by the desire of wealth, and by that alone. But political, social, military motives, as well as economical, must sometimes prevail. It is folly, no doubt, in the vast majority of

cases to reject the advantages of Free Trade and open competition; and so it is folly in the vast majority of cases to ravage your own country or to burn down your own capital; yet you may wisely do either of these things for the purpose of dislodging an invader; and it may be equally consistent with wisdom to put up with some loss or inconvenience in the way of trade for the sake of national objects of a higher kind. Clearly, also, it may be the plainest dictate of prudence sometimes to sacrifice present interest to the larger interests of the future; and if a new country is really the gainer in the end by protecting its infant manufactures, no science of wealth can possibly lay its ban upon that policy. That there are principles, and very valuable principles, in Political Economy, is certain; but, as we believe, they never can be applied without considering the circumstances of the particular case. If Sir Richard Cartwright had known this, he might still be Minister of Finance.

Another consequence of the ultra-scientific view of Political Economy, as we venture to think, is a tendency to barren metaphysics. This is seen in the disquisitions on the nature of rent, which are really not more fruitful than the verbal definitions of the schoolmen. Rent is the hire paid for land, houses, and real estate generally; that we do not use the word hire in this sense as in the case of a carriage or any other chattel, is a mere accident of language, and denotes no essential difference. In other languages, the same word is used for all the cases alike. A great practical truth was supposed to be discovered, or re-discovered, by Ricardo, when he announced that rent was the excess of the produce of land beyond what would be returned to the same capital if employed on the worst land in cultivation. But rent often bears no relation to the fertility of the soil: you may pay a high rent for proximity to a city, for the privilege of working minerals, or for a fine view. A farmer will not take a farm unless he can make something by it above the rent; no more will a hackman hire a carriage and horses from the stable-keeper unless by his fares he can make some-



thing above the hire : we believe there is no more in the renowned law, and no metaphysician is needed to tell us this.

—If the inconsistency and unpopularity of keeping Sir Bartle Frere in command were encountered for the sake of South African Confederation, the investment was not a good one : for South African Confederation is dead. The Cape Legislature refuses, apparently, even to take it into consideration. Perhaps the members have an inkling of the fact that Canadian Confederation, which has been held up to them as an example by Downing Street, is not, financially at least, an assured success : at all events they must know that the cases are not parallel, the Provinces of South Africa in which the native or the Dutch element prevails, and which form the chief difficulty there, having no counterpart here. Yet, to prepare the ground for this magnificent structure, blood has been lavishly shed, money squandered by millions, the rights of humanity have been trampled under foot, disgrace has been brought upon the nation, and the seeds of future troubles have been widely sown. Lord Carnarvon, the Colonial Secretary, who conceived the scheme, and is responsible for all that has been done, is one of the best of men : in point of benevolence he was perfectly well qualified to be a Providence to all the Colonies : he lacked nothing but omnipresence and omniscience.

—The Eastern Question marches once more rapidly to a crisis, and we see that English Liberals, if they looked at the matter from a merely party point of view, might not have been anxious for the immediate accession of their friends to power. The Tory policy was based on the stability of the Turkish empire : the Turkish empire was nodding to its fall ; and it might perhaps have been better for the Liberals that it should fall while the Tories were in power. Mr. Gladstone, however, appears prepared to deal vigorously with the matter, and people who fancy that Liberalism is Quakerism will be sur-

prised on learning that the word has been passed to have the forces of England in readiness. To all demands for the fulfilment of reform pledges Turkey responds with the sad *non possumus* of the dying. But, whatever coarse and fanatical virtues may be possessed by the Provincial Turk, the Turk of Constantinople is a corrupt and plundering debauchee, who only wants to empty the till to the last sequin before the end comes. That he is secretly holding out his hands to Russia to save him from reform is perfectly credible; he has no patriotism or sense of honour to prevent him. The suspicion generally felt of his manœuvres in that direction, is enough to show how trustworthy a guardian he is of the interests of Europe against Russian ambition. The time for packing his "bag and baggage" is come, and he will have to go farther than to Brusa. No real line severs Asia from Europe. The Ægean Sea, with its coasts and islands, is the Greece of the past, and is likely to be the Greece of the future. Over that area, the race which speaks the Hellenic tongue has continued, though dethroned, depressed and broken, to be the staple of the population. But it can hardly be doubted that the Ottoman Empire as a whole will cease to exist, and leave a vacuum into which, or some parts of which, it is not unlikely that emigration from the West may flow. Attention is already being turned to the natural resources of Asiatic Turkey. In the earliest times, the most genial and fruitful regions of the earth became the seats of the great empires; the weaker or less-favoured tribes were driven away to the inclement North; but there they renewed their vigour, underwent a severe process of natural selection, and became the conquering nations of later times. In the meantime, the decay of the East has left in the Valley of the Euphrates and elsewhere voids into which the tide of population may now flow again. Wholly apart from those questions of the balance of power with which diplomacy concerns itself, the opening of the vast territories which Turkish despotism has long closed against industry and civilization will be an event of the highest importance to humanity.

—When the Jesuits were expelled, a crowd of sympathizers gathered round them. But of whom did the crowd consist? Of the poor to whom the Fathers had preached the Gospel? No, it consisted of the wealthy and aristocratic enemies of the Republic. It was a mob of the Faubourg St. Germain, which after all, in passion and selfishness, is much the same as a mob of the Faubourg St. Antoine. Jesuitism is the bond and the propaganda of the party of social and political reaction. It is a great conspiracy, under a foreign head, against the liberties, civil and intellectual, of every nation in which it plants itself, even though it may sometimes choose, among other disguises, to put on the cap of liberty. It preaches, confesses, and educates, but all for an ulterior purpose, the reëstablishment of political and spiritual despotism on the ruins of free institutions and of the Reformation. In France, Jesuitism seeks the life of the Republic. In expelling it, the Republic may be acting wisely or unwisely, rightly or wrongly; but it is not committing a mere act of religious persecution. Our forefathers were not committing a mere act of religious persecution when they expelled the Jesuits who had been the instigators and councillors of James II. But the Jesuits themselves have practised religious persecution in the most cruel way, whenever they could get the powers of the world to lend them the use of the temporal sword. The land from which they are now being driven was that in which they persuaded Louis XIV., through a bigoted woman, to recall the Edict of Nantes, in which they perpetrated, by the hand of the tyrant, the Dragonnades and the butchery of the Protestants in the Cevennes. To-morrow, if they could gain the power, they would quench religious liberty in blood. Supported, as they are, by a powerful party, the expulsion of them is a perilous measure; it is one to which, let it be remembered, the Government was driven by the resistance of the Conservatives in the Senate to the Ferry Education law; but the amount of popular sympathy with the exiles seems to be very small; while the party of aristocratic and plutocratic reaction will be weakened by their departure, and it cannot be made more hostile to the Republic than it is.

It is evident that the National Festival, in commemoration of the taking of the Bastille, was heartily celebrated by the people throughout France ; though in the midst of the general rejoicing and illumination, the Faubourg St. Germain remained sad and dark. No event in history more distinctly marks an era than the fate of the most renowned fortress and dungeon of Feudal Monarchy. Widely different has been the course of things from that to which the captors of the Bastille, in their newborn enthusiasm, looked forward : far distant yet is the millenium of social perfection and brotherhood of the immediate advent of which they dreamed. Since their day, and in no small measure, through the wreck of their visions, mankind has learned to mistrust the Ideal. Yet those who would restore the Bastille are few, and almost confined to that unilluminated Faubourg St. Germain. Pessimism reminds us that there was joyous dancing on the site of the Bastille when it fell, that there was in those same days the Feast of Federation in the Champ de Mars, with almost delirious outpourings of joy ; and that all this proved but the gay rainbow that overarches the waters just as they are about to plunge into the abyss. But the omen is false. There is little more in the analogy than would hold good with regard to any picture of mortal hopes. In 1790, France was absolutely untrained in self-government ; she had no statesmen, but only a chaotic assembly of chimeras, resentments, and ambitions ; her people were destitute of political information, even as to passing events ; not one in twenty of them could read ; there was no newspaper press ; famine and misery stalked through the land ; public bankruptcy was at the door ; monarchical Europe was looking on with jealous eyes and preparing to take arms against the Revolution. All this is changed now, and France has had a century of terrible but fruitful experience. The Revolution is, economically, a wonderful success : it has even carried the lavish expenditure, the enormous corruptions, and the disastrous wars of the Second Empire. If the people are not enthusiastic about the Republic ; if they do not expect of it immediate and universal felicity ; it is evident

that they accept it with a reasonable loyalty which, as matters stand, seems likely to be lasting.

Not that danger is by any means at an end. Rochefort, the shallow and hot-headed, renews his appeal to anarchy, and not without success, if the circulation of his journal is a test. On the other hand, reaction is still strong, and it has in France as elsewhere, the compactness of a party of class interest, while its antagonist betrays the looseness and the internal divergences of a party of opinion. France has no longer an aristocracy of political privilege; she has no longer a legal aristocracy at all; but she has an aristocracy of hereditary title and social grade which leads, animates, consolidates, and, to servile minds, dignifies resistance to the Republic. The wealth of the aristocratic houses, lost in the first Revolution, has now been to a great extent restored, and is increased by marriages with the heiresses of rich plebeians desirous of a patrician connection. Shrewd observers of French society have depicted the powerful though contemptible influence of titular nobility, and the manner in which flunkeyism pays tribute to it, and woos its patronage, by the adoption or affectation of reactionary sentiment. With aristocracy, as with Jesuitism, a mortal conflict will some day come.

—In Germany they seem at present to be less occupied with anything political or diplomatic than with the dangers which they imagine threaten their own land from the progress of the Jews. There is hardly in history a more curious instance of the unexpected than the turn which this question has suddenly taken and the dimensions which it has assumed. It is not one of religion: all the declamations against bigotry are out of place: at Berlin no umbrage would be taken at your worshipping Ashtá-roth or your meerschaum. History in fact shows, that, of all European nations the Germans have been the most free from the vice of persecution. This is a struggle of the natives against the progress of an intrusive race, which, is believed by its patient

Oriental craft, to be getting into its hands not only the money of the nation but the newspaper press and other organs of influence, while it is said to avoid manual labour, seldom to produce or even to organize production, to decline as much as possible public burdens, to retain its exclusive nationality, and to belittle more attached to the particular country in which it happens to sojourn than is the caterpillar to the particular leaf on which it feeds. That the Jew retains an exclusive nationality (it should rather be called tribalism) the hierophants of the Jewish mystery themselves admit. Germany has had Jews, by race at least, with whom she has got on very well and of whom she is proud, who gave her Neander and Mendelssohn. But it seems that there has of late been a great irruption from Poland of Jews of a peculiarly hard-shell kind. The Germans are in great alarm: they fancy that by the steady and united persistence of the Hebrews they will be reduced to the condition of Gibeonites in their own Fatherland, and they even invoke the assistance of the Slav to save them from the Jew. We may feel pretty sure that their fears are exaggerated, and that German intellect will in the end hold its own, even on the Bourse. Still their feeling is not unintelligible, nor a proof of disgraceful narrowness of mind. A high degree of liberality and self abnegation must be reached before a nation can see with pleasure an alien race climbing, by superior subtlety and acquisitiveness, over its head in the land which the sweat of its own brow has made fruitful and for which it has poured out its own blood. Moreover the German may say that if he is to have masters, he wishes at all events that their morality should be high, and that whether it has been the fault of the Jews themselves, or that of the nations on which they thrust themselves, they have for twenty centuries undergone, in the practice of clandestine usury and cognate pursuits, a training which, however favourable to sharpness of wit could hardly be favourable to high morality. The purely financial instinct is not that which is most easily transmuted into a noble leadership of humanity. No religious tolerance can enjoin us to-

disguise the fact that the Oriental character, in its leading features, is inferior to the European, and that the ascendancy of an Oriental over a European race, whether effected by money-power or any other power, would consequently be a great calamity. A community so thoroughly sound as Scotland seems to repel Jewish settlement, while Jews swarm in diseased communities such as Poland. If a local nationality, with its ties, influences and aspirations is good for other people, the want of it must be bad for the Jews. Mr. Lawrence Oliphant is reported to be negotiating with the Porte for the cession of Palestine to its former possessors; let him and those whom he represents put money in their purse, and they will scarcely fail while their success is much to be desired.

—Dr. Ryerson has brought out two volumes entitled “The Loyalists of America and their Times,” in the preface of which he says “As no Indian pen has ever traced the history of the aborigines of America, or recorded the deeds of their chieftains, their ‘prowess and their wrongs’—their enemies and spoilers being their historians; so the history of the Loyalists of America has never been written except by their enemies and spoilers, and those English historians who have not troubled themselves with examining original authorities, but have adopted the authorities, and in some instances imbibed the spirit, of American historians, who have never tired in (*sic*) eulogizing Americans and everything American, and deprecating (*sic*) everything English, and all who have loyally adhered to the unity of the British Empire.” This opening sentence indicates the writer’s point of view as well as his style. The well-known work of Mr. Lorenzo Sabine on the “Loyalists of the American Revolution,” is not only a monument of exhaustive industry, but written in the most friendly spirit possible. Its whole tenor confirms its author’s assertion that he and his publishers “found their principal reward in the belief that they had done something for the cause of human brotherhood, by lessening the ran-

cour—even the hate—which long existed between the children of the winners and the children of the expatriated losers, in the civil war which dismembered the British Empire.” Not long since the New York Historical Society brought out, in two portly volumes, with copious notes and illustrations, the contemporary history of New York during the Revolution, by the Royalist Judge Thomas Jones, which had remained in manuscript up to that time. This book does not seem to have fallen under Dr. Ryerson’s notice, though it is the most important source of information on the special subject of his own work. Jones was a thorough-going Royalist, and he abuses the leaders of the Revolution as handsomely as anyone can desire ; but he was clear-sighted and critical ; from him we learn plainly enough why the Royal armies failed. The spirit of the notes and illustrations is not less friendly and liberal towards the Loyalists than is that of the work of Mr. Sabine.

Are we to be dragged again through the history of this old quarrel, with all its heeltaps and afterclaps ? Are these smouldering ashes of hatred to be raked anew ? A century has passed since the Revolutionary war ; half a century since the last of those who could have taken any active part in it went down to their graves ; twenty years since, in token of final reconciliation between the two countries principally concerned, the heir of George III. became the guest of the American Republic. The question between the adherents of the Crown and those of the Revolution has been discussed to the dregs, and little difference of opinion, we should think, can remain among well-informed and right-minded men. Few, we imagine, would contend that the Stamp Act and the Tea Duty were in themselves sufficient reasons for taking arms against a Government in other respects good, or for severing a connection in other respects beneficial. The Stamp Act had been repealed, though with a foolish and sinister saving of the right to do what it was admitted at the same time could not rightfully be done, which showed that the practical statesmen could be as completely fooled by abstractions as any closeteer. It was at least possible that the repeal



of the Tea Duty might also be obtained by peaceful means; and no candid man can maintain that the imposition of the tax, however reprehensible, was clearly beyond the legal competence of Parliament, though Chatham chose to draw a super-subtle distinction between the power of regulating trade and that of regulating the fiscal system. But behind the Stamp Act and the Tea Duty lay that general system of commercial restriction which tyrannically repressed colonial industry in the supposed interest of the Mother Country, and under which the Colonies could no longer live. Behind that again lay the danger, which had been growing since the revival of Toryism and Prerogative under George III., of the destruction, by the intrusion of Vice-royalty, aristocracy, and an Anglican Establishment, of the practical self-government which the Colonies had enjoyed, and of the religious system to which they were dedicated. The Puritan Colonies had been sent out by that Republican England, which, its aspirations being then premature for the nation as a whole, had succumbed to the Royalist England at the Reformation; and a conflict was the certain result of an attempt made by the representatives of the Stuarts and Laud to reduce under their dominion, and recast in their political and ecclesiastical mould, settlements in which the ruling spirits were the representatives of Pym, Hampden, Vane, and Cromwell. In any case, the political severance of the New World from the Old was an event sure to come. It was necessary not only to the free growth of American civilization, but to the progress of humanity. A few clear-sighted men saw this at the time: all but idiots and courtiers see it now. Perhaps more persons saw it at the time, in the Colonies at least, than ventured to avow their conviction. If this was the case, it is a strong warning against resigning ourselves to the tyranny of conventional opinion. Free discussion, had it been possible, might have opened the eyes of statesmen to the real nature of the situation, calmed the temper of men, as well as given a better direction to their thoughts, and thus have averted one of the great calamities of history. For on that black list we must

place a war which inflicted heavy loss and deep disgrace on England; which, by completing the financial ruin of France, brought on that most terrible and destructive of all social cataclysms, the French Revolution; which fatally baptized the American Republic in demagogism and political violence; which set one part of the English race on this continent against the other, and has to this hour dedicated Canada to the perpetuation of an ancient feud, in which the substantial interests of her own people have been too much forgotten.

Civil wars are always cruel, because in them political and personal are added to military passions. The American Civil War was no exception to this rule; and while the atrocities committed on both sides were many, not the fewest nor the least, assuredly, were committed by the king's party. The leaders of that party were for the most part persons of the higher class; officials, territorial magnates of the Colonies in which the feudal system of land-owning prevailed, commercial men interested in the system, clergymen of the Established Church; but, as commonly happens, the two extremes of society were united, and the Royal cause was disgraced by the acts not only of wild Highlanders drawn into the field by personal influence, but of mere plunderers and cut-throats. Nobody, we presume, wishes now to trace his pedigree to the perpetrators of the Wyoming massacre, or to Bloody Bill Cunningham and his gang, any more than to the worst of the Green Mountain Boys. These outrages, as well as those perpetrated by the Indians, wickedly and insanely taken into the King's pay, and the brutal excesses of the Hessians, as the war went on, threw a large number of waverers, and of even those who at the outset were Royalists, into the arms of the Revolutionary party. We learn from Judge Jones what was the effect produced by the march of the Royal army through New Jersey. These outrages excused but could not justify, much less reconcile with a sound policy, the banishment of the vanquished Loyalists and the confiscation of their estates at the close of the war; measures against which the best of the Revolutionary states-

men, and notably Hamilton, entered a protest at the time, and which, we believe, all reasonable Americans now condemn. A magnanimous amnesty would soon have brought reconciliation and oblivion: vengeance led to the foundation on the borders of the United States of a hostile settlement which thirty years afterwards renewed the conflict in the field under the banner of the British monarchy, and has been a thorn in the side of the Republic ever since.

Those who wish to clear their perceptions and calm their feelings upon this subject will do well to study the cases of the waverers or the reluctant combatants whose pangs and oscillations show that, in the opinion of good and sensible men, there was some right, or at all events some wrong, on both sides. The English Civil War divided from each other two friends, Sir Ralph Hopton and Sir William Waller. Sir William Waller, wrote to Sir Ralph Hopton: "My affections to you are so unchangeable that hostility itself cannot violate my friendship to your person; but I must be true to the cause wherein I serve. The great God who is the searcher of my heart knows with what reluctance I go upon this service, and with what perfect hatred I look upon a war without an enemy. The God of peace in his good time send us peace, and in the meantime fit us to receive it. We are both on the stage, and we must act the parts that are assigned us in this tragedy. Let us do it in a way of honour and without personal animosities." Mr. Sabine says of Mr. Beverley Robinson, the head of a great U. E. Loyalist family, "When the Revolutionary controversy commenced, he was living upon that portion of Phillips' estate which had been given to his wife, and there he desired to remain, in the quiet enjoyment of country life and in the management of his large domain. That such was his inclination was asserted by the late President Dwight, and is fully confirmed by circumstances and by his descendants. He was opposed to the measures of the Ministry, gave up the use of imported merchandise, and clothed himself and his family in fabrics of domestic manufacture. But he was also opposed to the separation of the Colonies from the

Mother Country. Still he wished to take no part in the conflict of arms. The importunity of friends overruled his own judgment, and he entered the military service of the Crown." If this man was severed from Washington and Hamilton, it was evidently rather by difference of circumstances and connections than by a gulf of principle. On the commercial question, about which the English thought most, he was evidently in favour of Colonial liberty and against the Imperial system.

A special defence of the Puritans would here be hardly in place. Virginia rose as well as New England. The Puritans were the soldiers of Protestantism in its mortal struggle with the Catholic reaction. They saved England, they and Gustavus Adolphus together saved Europe, from being dragged back into the condition of Italy, France, Austria, and Spain. Their character could not fail to contract narrowness and sometimes fierceness from that deadly conflict, though the notion that they lacked culture and that their adversaries were eminent for it is an exploded fiction, and the greatest and most typical of them all, combined with resistless force and fervid intensity of conviction, the largest liberality of mind, the most magnanimous clemency, and the tenderest affection. Dr. Ryerson may depend upon it that his charity and courtesy would have been occasionally disturbed, and he would have been sometimes betrayed into the use of unseemly and unchristian language to opponents, had he been a Protestant living at the time of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Storming of Magdeburg. Intolerance was the vice of the age; and though the ecclesiastical polity of England, as settled by Cromwell, fell far short of our standard of justice, it was at the time the greatest instance of liberality and comprehensiveness which the Christian world had seen. If we are shocked by the intolerance of the Puritans in New England, we must remember that they had planted those settlements in the wilderness at their own cost, and through much suffering, for the purpose of living there under their own religious polity; and that in the infliction of penalties on Non-conformity they aimed, not like Alva and Torquemada, at the forcible conver-

sion of heretics, but only at the exclusion of intruders. The Quakers, who were the greatest sufferers, thrust themselves on the settlements for the very purpose of disturbance. So completely in those days was morality, public as well as private, bound up with religious belief, that it may be doubted whether, without a system of religious discipline such as we should justly condemn as intolerant, it would have been possible to sustain, among bands of wanderers, generally restless and unsubmitive, the political order which was destined to be the organizing force of society in the New World. In the meantime these not unredeemed bigots were founding the system of public schools. Torquemada did not found a system of public schools, nor did Sheldon; nor did the Royal Governors of Colonies in which there were no Puritans.

—The Hon. Alexander Morris has given us a collection of the Treaties with the Indians in the North-West, of which he was a principal framer, and he has added some valuable remarks on that dark subject, the future of the tribes. We have reason to be thankful, so far, for the character of our relations with these people, at least since Canada has been in any measure her own mistress. The early missionaries of Christianity going forth among the barbarous tribes of the North implanted in them, together with a new religion, the germs of a higher civilization, and made them the progenitors of Christendom. This is about the only page of light in the dark history of the dealings of civilized with uncivilized races; and the higher the civilization on one side the more fatal seems the contact to the other. But if the Indian, in presence of the Canadian, has died, he has not been murdered: he has not been poisoned or stalked as a noxious animal like the Australasian or the Kaffir; he has not been goaded into war and butchered for the sake of his land like the Maori and the Zulu. Slight symptoms of trouble in the North-West perhaps there have been; but so far it has been found that fidelity to treaties and kind con-

duct are as effective as the rifle in subduing what the Jingo advocate of extermination called "that most mischievous of all wild animals the wild man." We have so far escaped the horrors of the Indian war in the United States and the brutalizing influence of such conflicts on the character of the civilized race. Perhaps it is just to the Americans to say that the intentions of the government, and of the people generally towards the Indians, have been kind; though they have been always baffled by the roguery of subordinates and the cupidity of the frontiersman. The guilt of destroying the Indian, Canada has escaped; whether anything that her statesmen can do will save him from the doom towards which destiny appears to be hurrying him is far more doubtful. There seems to be a gulf between the nomad and the settled, the hunter and the agriculturalist, which, only under happy circumstances, can be passed. Into that gulf the Indian generally has fallen. He has given up the things which sustained and preserved him in his old state without embracing their substitute in his new state. Of the fitful energy of the hunter, he has lost the energy and retained the fitfulness; he has doffed the hardiness of the child of nature without donning the protecting raiment of civilization. His camp, which, when frequently shifted was healthy, becomes unhealthy when it is made stationary and turned into an uncleaned village. Then come fire-water and small-pox. The sale of the liquor may be prohibited, but to enforce the prohibition in a wild country must be very hard. A bridge to pass the gulf might be afforded by employments intermediate between hunting and agriculture, giving play to the hunter's faculties and in keeping with his energy and hardihood, yet gradually inducing habits of settled industry if enough of such employment could be found. As hunters and trappers under the Hudson's Bay Company, for instance, the Indians seem to have done well and to have accomplished in safety the first steps of the perilous transition. From the life of the hunter to that of a herdsman is a less stride than to that of the farmer. Mr. Morris speaks in sanguine terms of the readiness with

which the Indians avail themselves of agricultural facilities ; but the savage, like a child, is easily caught by novelties ; what he generally lacks is perseverance. "Induce the Indians," says Mr. Morris, "to erect houses on their farms and plant their gardens, as they call them, and then while away on their hunts their wives and children will have houses to dwell in, and will care for their patches of corn and grain and potatoes." It is to be feared that the corn and grain and potatoes of the hunter will not make much of a show beside those of the regular farmer, and that the loss of a crop or two will be very apt to disgust him with his attempt. Such allotments Mr. Morris prefers to large reservations, as suiting the Indian's local attachment, as less likely to excite the cupidity of the whites, and as dispersing the Indians and rendering them less dangerous, should they become restless, than they would be if collected in a mass. If the patient dies after all, Mr. Morris's book will at least be a proof that the efforts of a kind physician were not wanting.

—The sage who said that he would let others make the laws for a nation if he could be allowed to make its ballads, would have shown still more sagacity if to the ballads he had added the games. A national game cannot fail to exercise a great influence on character. What is the national game of Canada to be—Cricket, Lacrosse, or Base Ball ? The result of the recent matches with the Philadelphians, which was mere carnage of Canadian wickets, will do not a little to decide the question against Cricket. In favour of Cricket is British sentiment ; but, on the other side, there are many serious objections, the shortness of our summer, its dryness, which renders it difficult to keep the grounds in order, and above all the absence of a leisure class. A cricket-match now takes two or three days. In England there are plenty of men who can afford to play in a game which lasts two or three days, who have nothing else to do, and whose lives are as completely devoted to the sport as that of any professional or more so.

In this country, where all are engaged in making their bread, it is not easy to find a man who can spare even one whole day ; and we understand that the Toronto team in its match with the Philadelphians was weakened by the defection of some of its best players. Philadelphia, with its accumulated wealth, has a *jeunesse dorée*, which, though it does not rival in numbers the young squirearchy of England, can more easily supply a team than commercial Young Toronto ; besides which the season there is longer. The scale of Cricket, we suspect, has kicked the beam. Lacrosse shall speak for itself, by the lips of Mr. McNaught, the Secretary of the National Lacrosse Association, and the author of "*Lacrosse and How to Play it.*" "The game of Lacrosse," says this gentleman, "has perhaps attracted more attention among young men than any other field sport that has ever been introduced to their notice. That this game, comparatively unknown until within the past few years, should have so suddenly become popular, seems almost a wonder. If ever any game has been persecuted, abused, or belied by envious rivals, that game has certainly been Lacrosse ; and yet in spite of all the opposition and ridicule it has received from the adherents of older established sports—in spite of its being declared unscientific, and not at all gentlemanly by those whose notions were rather prudish—this game has, on account of its own intrinsic merits, not only been adopted by *Young Canada* as the *National Game* of the Dominion, but has also won its way high into the favour of athletes, both in England and in the United States. It is affirmed by its opponents that there is no science in the game, it is all hard work, and is injurious to the constitution. A good player seldom hurts himself ; it is only the novice who does all the hard work and gets no return for it. Lacrosse is yet in its infancy ; the fine points in the game are only now becoming apparent. But the day will come when the public verdict on it, even as a scientific game, will be materially changed, and its opponents be obliged to confess that, measured only by their scientific standards, it will take its place as king of out-door sports.



Lacrosse has so many advantages over other games, that perhaps it will not be out of place to mention a few of them. It is the cheapest of all games. It requires no pads, gauntlets, or other expensive equipments. A single lacrosse-stick and simple running gear, is all that is required for action. It develops the muscles better than any sport we know of. The muscular action is confined to no particular part, as in rowing, skating, or football—it exercises equally the arms, legs and body, and at the same time there is sufficient excitement about it to make it the most fascinating of games. It develops self-reliance, and awakens the energies of all who would excel in it. It is conducive to temperance and sobriety, for no young man can belong to ‘a first twelve,’ or be a ‘crack player’ who does not attend to his way of living, and shun entirely the flowing bowl or other vices. It is so simple to look at that any one can readily master its first principles in a few minutes, but to excel at it requires careful and steady practice, which not only acts healthfully on the body, but exercises an exhilarating effect on the mind. The game is always alive, and no player need ever complain that he has not had innings enough. As a matter of fact, it is nearly all innings, if a player only chooses to make it so.” Setting aside, in this panegyric, general expressions of the fondness and hope which cannot fail to swell the breast of a Secretary, the points really made in favour of Lacrosse seem to be its cheapness, the ease with which its principles are learned, its general development of the muscles, and its liveliness,—the excitement never flagging and every player having perpetual innings. The last consideration may be extended to the spectators, whose presence and interest, after all, are no small part of a match: it is almost impossible to make a Canadian lady enter into Cricket sufficiently to sit through a game. On the other hand, the weak points of which the Secretary seems partly conscious, which at least he admits have afforded marks for the calumnies of a censorious world, are the roughness of the game and its unscientific character. We hardly know exactly what a

scientific sport is; no doubt Lacrosse affords openings for skill which experience will improve. But we greatly doubt the possibility of ever getting rid of the roughness which bespeaks the Indian parentage of the game, and which when Indians play amounts to a savagery far from pleasant to lookers-on. In most of the games which we have seen, somebody has received a more or less ugly blow. The objection which, as we suspect, will prove most fatal to Lacrosse, is that it will remain confined to "this Canada of ours," and that if it is the national game there will be no international matches. A deadlift effort has been made to import it into England, and by the heroic exertions of Dr. Beers, permission was obtained to play it before the Queen—a consecration which it shared with a great variety of exhibitions. But does anybody believe that it will ever take a place beside Cricket in England or beside Base Ball in the United States? Base Ball has now gained a strong hold upon this Continent, and all the circumstances are in its favour. It can be played through the spring, summer, and fall; it does not require much of a lawn; and what is a greater advantage still, it is quickly played, so that the game is commonly finished in an afternoon. Its liveliness, too, suits the more mercurial temperament of the New World: in this respect it is to Cricket what Euchre is to Whist. We are inclined to think that it is the game of destiny; and that consequently in the course of ages our national characters will be strongly impregnated with the peculiar qualities of the catcher. The loyal Englishman who regards with pensive regret the adoption of a Yankee game may console himself with the thought that Cricket and Base Ball have apparently been evolved out of the same infantine British sport. Trap ball seems to be the primeval germ of both. It was differentiated, as the Spencerians would say, on one side into Cricket, at first with the single wicket, then with the double wicket, and all the science of these athletic days; on the other side into rounders, and so into Base Ball, the highest development of American smartness in the field. Whatever the national game

is to be, a prayer ought to be inserted in the national liturgy that it may remain a game and not fall into professional hands : otherwise the result to the nation will be a race of muscular, alert, and nimble rogues.

This is the age of physical science, of physicism generally, of rehabilitation of the body, and extension of its powers. Christianity itself has become muscular. We have had "walk-ists," as well as jumpists, rowists, and swimmists, performing unparalleled feats, and now we have a starvist in the person of Dr. Tanner, who has already awakened emulation and been challenged by another starvist to fast fifty days for a large wager. We think we noticed the other day a card from a sleepist who was prepared to sleep against all comers ; the use of sermons, Fourth of July orations, and other narcotics being, of course, excluded on both sides. A notice which we read the other day in a bedroom at a hotel seems to imply the possibility of a burnist. "Guests are requested to put out their gas at midnight : if found burning after that hour, they will be charged extra." The ukase seemed severe. No doubt prudent and abstemious people generally put themselves out at midnight ; but if a guest likes to go on burning into the small hours, he surely is nobody's enemy but his own. The result of these heroic experiments on the capacity and endurance of the human frame will be watched with interest by those who in the meantime are taking as much exercise as they find good for them, and eating and drinking in moderation what they like till they find that it disagrees with them.



FACTORY :  
18 Church St., Liverpool.

ESTABLISHED IN ENGLAND 1797.



ENGLISH BRANCH :  
33 Piccadilly, London.

# RUSSELLS' CANADIAN HOUSE,

9 KING STREET WEST, TORONTO.

For Direct Trade with the Public in the line of

SEE THE WATCH

FINE WATCHES,

SOLID SILVER

CHAINS,

and

CLOCKS,

ELECTRO-PLATED

JEWELLERY,

DIAMONDS,

WARE.



IN THE WATER.

Russells' Chronometers, Russells' Quarter Hour and Minute Repeaters,  
Russells' Chronographs or Fly-Backs, Russells' Independent  
Split Seconds, Russells' Fine Keyless Levers, in short,  
Russell's Watches for Perfection of Time-keeping  
and Quality of Workmanship,

are not surpassed by the watches of any other manufacturer in England, the only country in which perfection, or the nearest approach to that point yet attained, in the art of Watch-work, was reached over a century ago, when £20,000 stg. was awarded by the Board of Longitude to the inventor of the Chronometer.

## WATCH REPAIRING.

The advantage of getting watches repaired at **Russells'** is well known. The whole management of **Russell's Canadian House** is in the hands of **Mr. Robert Cuthbert, Practical Watchmaker** of many years' experience. Watches are repaired and Regulated to Observatory Time. Satisfaction guaranteed and **Charges Moderate**. Watches by Express from a distance for Repairs receive Prompt Attention.

ANY ARTICLE OF JEWELLERY MANUFACTURED ON THE PREMISES.

Goods sent to any part of Canada to responsible parties, on approbation, from

**RUSSELL'S CANADIAN HOUSE,**

9 King Street West, Toronto.



**THE BRAIN AS AN ORGAN OF MIND.** By H. Charlton Bastian, M.D. F.R.S., with 184 illustrations, \$1.75.

**EVERY DAY ENGLISH.** By Richard Grant White, \$2.25.

**A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL GREEK LITERATURE.** By Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, Professor of Ancient History, Trinity College, Dublin. 2 vols. \$4.50.

**CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.** Being selections, personal, historical, philosophical and religious from his various works. Arranged by William S. Lilly, with the authors approval. With portrait, \$2.00.

**ALEXANDER POPE.** By Leslie Stephen. *English Men of Letters Series.* 90 cents.

**THE UNDISCOVERED COUNTRY.** By W. D. Howells. \$1.75.

**SUCCESS WITH SMALL FRUITS.** By Edward S. Roe. Profusely illustrated. \$5.50.

**MAN'S MORAL NATURE.** An Essay. By Richard Maurice Bucke, M.D., Medical Superintendent of the Asylum for the Insane, London, Ontario. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50

**THE SCIENCE OF ENGLISH VERSE.** By Sidney Lanier, \$2.25.

**THE MASTERS OF GENRE PAINTING.** Being an introduction for the study of Genre Painting. By Frederick Wedmore, with 16 illustrations, \$2.00.

**COWPER.** By Goldwin Smith. *English Men of Letters Series.* 85c.

A thoroughly appreciative biography of the poet . . . the melancholy tenor of his life is treated with great truth and delicacy, and the critical remarks on his share in English literature will commend themselves to those best qualified to form an opinion.—*Bookseller, London.*

**LIFE OF THE PRINCE CONSORT,** By Theodore Martin, volume the fifth concluding the work. With portraits \$2.25.

**THE ENGLISH POETS.** Selections with Critical Introductions. By various writers and a general introduction by Matthew Arnold, edited by T. H. Ward, M.A., 2 vols. \$3.50.

**LIFE AND WRITINGS OF THOMAS HENRY BUCKLE.** By Alfred Henry Huth. 1 vol. 12mo. Cloth, \$2.25.

**THE READER'S HANDBOOK OF ALLUSIONS.** References, Plots and Stories. By the Rev. E. C. Brewer, LL.D., 1170 pp. half bound, \$4.00.

**DAWSON (Principal). FOSSIL MEN AND THEIR MODERN REPRESENTATIVES.** 8vo. \$2.00.

**MEMOIRS OF MADAME DE REMUSAT.** Complete in one vol. 12mo. Cloth, \$2.25.

**PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN THE BRITISH COLONIES.** By Alpheus Todd, Librarian of Parliament, Ottawa. 8vo. \$5.00.

**CEREMONIAL INSTITUTIONS.** Being Part IV. of the Principles of Sociology. By Herbert Spencer. 12mo. Cloth \$1.35.

**SCIENCE PRIMERS.** Introductory. By Professor Huxley, 35 cents.

Post free on receipt of Price.

**WILLING & WILLIAMSON,**  
12 KING STREET EAST, TORONTO.