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.

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 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.

- ☐ 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.

☑ Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires: Continuous pagination.

THE BYSTANDER.

JUNE, 1881.

IMMIGRATION into the North West, up to the present time, though large, has not been quite so large as was hoped. The country will be peopled: but it will be peopled, we apprehend, by the general march westward of population on this continent rather than by a special stream of immigration drawn from England through Canada. All attempts to give the current an artificial direction for the benefit of British dependencies must be said to have failed: at least if they have ever succeeded it has been, as in the case of New Zealand, by lavish outlay and by burdening the colony with taxes which will in the end drive away as many settlers as the subsidies brought. Besides, New Zealand is geographically so situated that when the emigrant lands, there he must stay; whereas when he lands in Canada he finds himself on the skirt of a great continent, full of wealth, over which he is always tempted to extend his wanderings; for abundant experience has shown that with the man who leaves his native shore in quest of bread, the visions of Imperialist politicians have no influence whatever, nor does the political line for a moment arrest his steps. Moreover, the emigrant chosen by natural selection is the only one worth having. There are indigent masses in the purlieus of the English cities which might possibly be tempted hither, but would come only to perish. Of that agricultural labour of which there is assumed to be a large surplus in England cer-

tain to emigrate if the good tidings of Canadian prosperity could only reach its ear, there is in reality no surplus at all. According to the best authorities the population in some agricultural districts has decreased. Western Australia, the youngest of the colonies, hopeless of obtaining a sufficiency of British labour, has formally opened herself to the Chinese. Her sisters load her with reproaches, but what is she to do? Before long they will themselves yield to the same necessity. Whether the Anglo-Saxon race or the Chinese will ultimately prevail in Australia is, as we have before remarked, an open question of the future. Races when they reach the height of opulence and become amenable to the checks of social pride, no longer multiply like those in a lower stage. The peopling of the world with Anglo-Saxons is a dream from which we are now awaking. Had British emigration been steadily directed to these shores instead of being scattered over Australia and Africa, as well as America, rhetoric would have lost a splendid theme; but this continent would have received an ampler allowance of the organizing race, and cities which in Australia may perhaps one day be Chinese, would have remained British here. Of the foreign sources of population for the North-West, the most hopeful, probably, are Sweden and Norway, the people of which are first-rate settlers and seem greatly inclined to leave their inclement and barren home. The Danes are of the same blood, and so little prosperous, that they, if skilfully approached, might be inclined to join the train.

— In Canadian politics there is not much stirring. Changes have been made in the Ministry, partly owing to the transfer of one of its members to the Bench, without altering its character or enlarging its basis. The Premier is evidently what Carlyle called "a shut-up man," imprisoned in the circle of life-ong habits and associations; nor, at his age, would it be fair to blame the tree for not putting forth new shoots. No light

appears to be thrown by the arrangements made during the Premier's absence on the dark question of the succession. It is a great mistake, as we venture to think, to imagine that Canadian parties have, like English parties, a life in themselves, independent of the personal ascendancy of their leaders, and that when Sir John Macdonald resigns, the Conservatives will have to cry *Le Roi est Mort, Vive le Roi!* The only Conservative platform is N.P., the monopoly of which seems not unlikely to be lost; the support of the priest party in Quebec is a source of weakness quite as much as of strength; and if the question of the leadership is to be comfortably settled, remarkable self-abnegation and regard for discipline must be displayed. There is a gleam of hope for National Government as well as for National Policy. Sir John Macdonald, therefore, in clinging to the helm, is acting more in the interest of his friends than in his own. In the meantime, the great organ of the Reform, not of the Liberal, party, as it is unprovided with principles, and there is at present a dearth of the scandals which are its familiar food, is reduced to a precarious subsistence on the maladies of its opponents. It joyfully proclaimed that Sir John Macdonald was suffering from Bright's disease; but, that pleasant dream being dispelled, it is compelled to fall back, in a tone of subdued hope, on a disease which makes less short work of the wicked. It must almost regret that it pronounced Sir Charles Tupper's illness a feint, since it is thereby precluded from visiting the iniquities of that human fiend with a creeping palsy or a cancer in the stomach. In Mr. Pope's constitution, however, the seeds of decay have happily been observed, and the faithful may hope that a similar mercy will soon be vouchsafed them in the case of Sir Charles Tupper. What is the policy of the Liberal leader, who has superseded the nominees of the *Globe*, and whom the *Globe* would at once strike if it dared, we cannot at present say, but we may be sure that it is something better than climbing to power on the coffins of opponents.

—In the speech which, while our last number was in the printers' hands, Mr. Blake made at the Toronto Banquet, we find a passage, which, if we do not greatly mistake its import, denotes something like a change of front on the part of his section of the Opposition in relation to the Tariff. He lays down in language which we should be very willing to adopt, and which we may almost say that we have ourselves frequently used, the principle of Free Trade as manifestly right in the abstract, with the qualification that it cannot be applied without reference to the actual state of things. Mr. Blake pronounces the English policy of laying all the duties on a few articles, and of taxing nothing that can be produced within the country, incapable of adoption here. He proceeds to designate the new tariff as an experiment on which the country has decided, which must be fairly tried, and towards which no political party would be justified in assuming any attitude but one of careful examination and candid enquiry into the results. In effect, he renounces opposition, which it is hardly to be supposed he would have done, without taking counsel with the other leaders of the party; and Sir Richard Cartwright, though he did not follow in the same strain, appears to have acquiesced by his silence on the subject. Neither the *Globe* nor the *Mail* called attention to this notable deliverance; the *Globe*, no doubt, because its rolling-stock being all on the line of opposition to Commercial Autonomy and the Tariff, it felt that the change of track by no means suited it: the *Mail*, perhaps, because it did not wish to have the patent of its party infringed, or, think itself called upon to point out that the adversary had taken a tenable position. It may be questioned whether Mr. Blake is in time to win over manufacturers from the other party, but he is in time to keep those of his own. He has another step to take in the process of reasoning, which has led him to embrace Commercial Autonomy, and to admit that regard must be had to national circumstances in applying the abstract principle of Free Trade. He will in time see that the circumstances of Industry, on both sides of the line, are the

same; that this identity points to the expediency of a common tariff; that to maintain across the Continent a Customs line, tempered by smuggling, is preposterous; and that the only policy on which a liberal statesman can consistently and firmly stand is that of Commercial Union.

—Public gratitude is due to the present Governor-General for having disregarded certain brilliant examples, and declined to win popularity for himself at the expense of Canadian Society, by stimulating the love of extravagance and display. The moderation and simplicity which he has known how to combine with a generous hospitality have earned the applause of sensible people, however strong might be their feeling in favour of Viceregal State. It was not to be expected that he would refrain from propagating aristocratic sentiment by creations of knights: to propagate aristocratic sentiment and rescue, if possible, a section of the New World from democracy, is the chief object of his presence here: if he attempts to do any act of Government, or even to withhold his consent from any, Conservatives as well as Liberals at once denounce him for overstepping the line of his duty. It is the belief of English statesman that all colonists are passionately fond of titles and can be lured with them as a child is lured with sweets: the comparison will hardly be thought overstrained by those who remember the exposition of this profound policy put forth some time ago with candid simplicity by Mr. Froude. With regard to those colonists who spend half their time in London, and form socially a group almost separated from our people, and connected with the minor aristocracy of England, the belief may be well founded. But the mass of Canadians, whatever they may be politically, belong socially to the New World: they neither covet titles for themselves, nor are they in any way pleased by seeing their fellow colonists tricked out in them: they resent on the contrary the attempt to create a petty aristocracy over their heads. Some

time ago, a striking editorial appeared in a great Conservative journal maintaining the thesis that Canada was, in sentiment, the most aristocratic of colonies; but Conservative leaders were heard to avow that the article had done them mischief, even among their own partisans, at the ensuing elections. Apart from the political purpose, what good object can be served by inoculating our people with a love of titles? We ask the question with unfeigned willingness to receive social benefits from any source whether old or new. Will anything really chivalrous or graceful, will anything in short but vulgar vanity, be produced. In a social system, entirely different from ours, there may be some force in the maxim *noblesse oblige;* in our social system there is none. Democracy has a nobility of its own, the honour which is freely paid by public gratitude to the benefactors of the community. This, though sometimes misbestowed, is not artificial, but confined to the semblance at least of worth; it cannot be obtained, like titles, by backstairs canvassing and intrigue; if forfeited by misconduct, it can always be withdrawn, whereas the Premier Earl of England after seducing another man's wife is still the Premier Earl of England, and a knight, though he had stolen public money, would be still a knight, and continue to gild infamy with his rank in the eyes of the world. After all, only the crumbs from the table of English aristocracy are thrown to colonists. Knighthood is the regular meed of a Lord Mayor of London who happens to entertain Royalty at dinner, or to be in the chair when a Prince is born. Literary and scientific knighthood is now totally discredited in the Imperial country: the great men of letters and science there have grown too proud to accept it; it is classed among articles suited for exportation to the colonies. The colonies, if they are wise, will ship it home again; it entails invidious and often unjust selection; eligibility to it is now becoming a question of orthodoxy as well as eminence; while many of our intellectual benefactors are clergymen, and as such, are excluded from recognition by the mock-military character of the honour. In one of the

names selected for titular honour it is charitable to suppose that we see another proof of the ignorance of men and things around him, in which a Governor-General, like Royalty itself, may be kept. A heavy blow will have been dealt to our political morality, unless the good sense of our people rectifies the error, and from this signal instance of misbestowal learns the worthlessness of artificial rank.

—A descent from the Bench to the Bar is not so bad as a descent from the Bench to the political arena. Yet the day on which a Judge descends to the Bar is by no means to be distinguished by a white mark in the annals of the Canadian Judiciary. That the self-deposed Judge may be called upon as an advocate to cite or to impugn his own judgments is a consequence, which, though possible, may perhaps be deemed fanciful and remote. But the precedent which has been created by Vice-Chancellor Blake, should it be commonly followed, will assuredly be injurious to the dignity, and at the same time to the authority, of the Bench. Counsel will learn to regard the Judge, not as a functionary of a superior order, but as one of themselves, destined perhaps to contend again at the bar to-morrow with those over whom he is exercising a temporary presidency to-day. Nor will the Judge himself be likely to clear his mind entirely of the Advocate, as it is essential to the interests of justice that he should. That the Judges in the United States are generally wanting in integrity is a misconception traceable to the iniquitous proceedings of two or three scoundrels placed on the Bench at New York by Tammany in the evil days; but from the smallness of their salaries, which are insufficient to tempt the ablest men from the Bar, and the insecurity of their tenure, they are wanting in authority, as even a layman who has the opportunity of comparing American with English courts may at once perceive; one consequence of which is the dilatoriness of American proceedings, counsel being allowed to consume time in maintaining untenable points

or digressing into irrelevant argument when in an English Court they would be promptly overruled. No price is too high to be paid for a thoroughly trustworthy judiciary, especially in communities where it is difficult to keep anything sacred from the corrupting influence of faction. For extravagant salaries there is no necessity: the security of a Judge's position and its dignity (so long as its dignity is preserved) will always countervail, to a great extent, the higher gains of the Bar, at least with the senior men. But whatever the requisite amount may be, the people, if they know their own interest, will pay it, and at the same time prohibit by law a Judge from ever being anything but a Judge. It would be a good thing if an end could be put even to promotion on the Bench itself; that the removal of the Judiciary from all political influence, and even from the shadow of such influence, might be final and complete.

It is due to Sir John Macdonald to say that, in this most vital matter, he has kept the national ruler above the party chief. His last appointments sustain the excellence of his record. In regard for the character of the Judiciary, at all events, he has not shown himself inferior to professed Reformers. In his long, chequered and tempestuous career he has given to party nine-tenths of what was meant for the nation, but of one-tenth he has made a better use, and it is reasonable as well as charitable to infer that if party would have let him alone he would generally have governed well.

—Another notable descent is that of a Senator to the Commons. This seems to strike away the last prop, or semblance of a prop, which supported that otherwise unstable fabric, the Canadian House of Lords. In England the line of separation between the Lords and the Commons is strictly guarded by the exclusion of the Peers not only from the Lower House, but from any interference in elections, and its preservation is regarded as essential to the character of the Conservative insti-

tution. A body of men invested with the robe of moral authority, raised above the dust of the faction fight which rages below, and revising legislation in the calm light of a perfectly independent judgment, without fear either of Royal or of popular resentment, is the ideal, however imperfect may be the fulfilment. If it were open to a Duke at any moment to get himself elected to the Commons and, doffing his coronet, to cross the hall and mingle once more in the fray as a member of the Commons, the last remnant of illusion would be dispelled. That a nominated Senate is worthless, is the result of our experience as well as of that of other communities, and to replace it in the machinery of the Constitution by some Conservative element of an effective kind, so far from being revolutionary, would be a measure of the policy which averts revolutions. The Grit organ, after a tardy and inconsistent utterance, seems to have lapsed again into silence on this subject; but Liberals are not Grits, and a Liberal programme must be a strange embodiment of Liberal principles if it does not include the reform of a nominated Senate.

—During the drought of April we had a monitory instalment of forest fires. If the BYSTANDER were now addressing the Canadian public for the last time, our parting word would be Conserve the Forests. The lumber is the real wealth of Canada and the staff of her trade. Take away that, and she would be simply an agricultural country with her range of production limited by the severity of her climate, and her soil, in the long-settled districts, everywhere more or less reduced in fertility by improvident farming, and in some places worked out, so that the destiny of large areas seems to be to go back into pasture. As to the opening of the North-West, its immediate effect has been a fall in the value of Canadian farms of at least twenty per cent., in spite of good harvests, and the process is not yet at an end. Our manufactures must, of course, be limited in their development by the wealth and purchasing

power of the nation, though from the language sometimes held, it might be supposed that they were capable of indefinite expansion under the magical touch of legislation. The forests are the bread of our people. Far be it from us to say anything against the Militia, if there is money enough to pay for it and to provide for more practical exigencies at the same time. But while the need of a Militia is uncertain, or rather it is morally certain that there will never be a need, that of a good corps of Foresters as well as that of a Central Constabulary is pressing. It is not unlikely that some of the restless spirits who will not settle down to sedentary labours, and for whom we are devising refuges and labour tests, might make good Foresters under proper command, and they would be fully as available a nucleus for an army, in case the most unlikely of contingencies should occur, as any force which Canada at present possesses.

—At last the catastrophe of overcrowded excursion boats has come, and on such a scale that it has made the blood of the nation curdle, and will mingle a drop of bitterness with the cup of this summer's pleasure. There was, of course, an outburst of indignation against the manager and captain of the steamboat; but the blame rests equally on the multitude who insisted on crowding on board, and on the general laxity of our law. We have enactments on paper against overcrowding steamboats, against overcrowding street cars, against kindling fires in the forests, against throwing slabs and sawdust into navigable rivers: but they are all dead letters, because Government is not strong enough to enforce them against individual wilfulness and cupidity, aided by the general spirit of irresponsibility and recklessness, which are as natural as are adventurous activity and sanguine hopefulness, to society in a New World. Nor will Government be strong enough, or its police effective and vigilant enough, to enforce such law till it is the Government of the whole nation. So long as it is the

Government of only half the nation, and its main business is to hold the fort against the storming columns of the other half, it will have little energy left for its proper work, and it will shrink from measures of repression, however salutary, which would swell the electoral forces of the enemy. To prevent the overcrowding of steamboats, strong measures would be required, at least till the bad habit had been broken. But if a Government were to venture on such measures, at the next election all the steamboat companies would fight against it with demoniac energy, and the Opposition, regardless of the common weal, would joyfully accept their unholy aid. Such an event as the London tragedy may give authority spasmodic force for a day, but to-morrow's weakness will return.

—It was to a holiday crowd that the London disaster happened, and we are led to ask ourselves whether holiday crowds are the best form of recreation. This is no trivial matter. Godwin said that "leisure was the real wealth;" increase of leisure he regarded as the great aim of social improvement, and though he was himself all mind and assumed that the enjoyment of leisure would be purely intellectual, we may acknowledge the element of truth in his doctrine while, beside purely intellectual pleasures, we claim a place for those of affection, and for others which are demanded by common flesh and blood. Increase of leisure rather than increase of wages seems to be the object of some of the strikes in the United States at the present time; and it is easy to sympathize with such a craving in those whose sore toil, under the pitiless exactions of a high pressure system, hardly divides the Sunday from the week, especially, if as Agnosticism tells them, after a life of unrest here, there is no hope of rest in Heaven. Even those who have hope of rest in Heaven feel the need of rest here. It is hard if all the inventions of labour-saving machinery cannot afford some respite to the human worker. But leisure may be taken and it may be used in different ways; and the question how it

is best taken, and how it is best used, are, we repeat, not trivial, but superior in importance to many which look more grave. The option lies practically between leisure concentrated in a public holiday, and leisure diffused through life by the adoption of short hours of work, by the concession of a half-holiday on Saturday, by the regular observance of Sunday, as a day not of ascetic mortification but of rest and peace. Recreation, regularly alternating with labour, is a quiet restorative; a public holiday is a dram, not seldom followed like other drams, by lassitude rather than by renewed strength. On a public holiday, people think it necessary to be laboriously and sometimes boisterously happy, and the consequence, as employers say, often is unsettlement of industry for several days; nor is a public excursion with a great crowd so propitious as is a quiet afternoon to domestic affection. Many perhaps, on the day after a holiday, even if they had not had to swim for their lives from an over-loaded steamboat, would be ready to vote for the more tranquil style of enjoyment.

— It appears likely that the Separate Schools will soon become a practical subject of consideration. Their inferiority to the Public Schools may be taken as an established fact, even when due allowance has been made for the sort of material on which they have to work. Originally the measure was right and statesmanlike. While it was essential to the political welfare of the community that Roman Catholics, like other citizens, should be educated, they may well have had reason, in the state of feeling which then prevailed, with the Roman Catholic disabilities fresh in remembrance, and Orangeism still menacing, to apprehend interference with their religion. To concede to them a special security against that danger might, therefore, be politic and just. But they can hardly pretend to feel any such apprehensions now, when, instead of being politically weak and liable to aggression, they have become, through their numbers, their organization, and the military obedience which

they pay to their ecclesiastical leaders, disproportionately strong, and have the Government of the Province very much in their power. The only other assignable motive for maintaining Separate Schools is the retention of the people under the influence of the priest; and this, so far from being a proper object for the policy of the State, is an object which the policy of all modern States abhors. The pretension that Roman Catholics shall be not citizens of the commonwealth to which they belong, and under the protection of which they live, but liegemen of Rome, or, at least, that they shall be liegemen of Rome first, and only, in the second place, citizens of the commonwealth everywhere put forward by the priesthood, will have to be everywhere combated by the nations; nor in combating it need anything be done inconsistent with perfect toleration and respect for the Roman Catholic religion. The Roman Catholics object that there is a religious element in our school system. It is true that there is a slight religious element, and the mass of our people would probably be unwilling to surrender it. But if it can be seriously alleged that the faith of any Christian child, to whatever Church it may belong, is likely to be subverted by reading a few verses of Scripture and joining in a neutral hymn, the remedy is obvious, and has been already applied elsewhere. Let the Roman Catholic child come to school a quarter of an hour later than the others. The secular character of the rest of the teaching would, of course, be strictly secured. It would be for the parent in each case to say whether the child should attend or not: with the parent, not with the priest, the State has to deal; this is a principle which ought to be steadily asserted, though the parent is always at liberty, if he pleases, to be guided by the advice of the priest. Anything like an attempt, under colour of public education, to seduce a child from the religion of its parents will be abjured by all wise as well as by all right-minded men, however opposed to priestly influence they may be. But, we repeat, while it is alike the duty and the interest of the State to respect and guard against aggression the religion of all its members, it is

not the duty any more than it is the interest of the State to uphold the influence of the priest over the citizen.

— Sir Francis Hincks writes in the *Fortnightly Review* on "Commercial Union." He begins by taking Mr. Anderson to task for his want of generosity in speaking unfavourably of Canadian finance. But it is possible that Mr. Anderson may have been misled by a certain article in the *Journal of Commerce* which drew an appalling picture of the mass of debt which Canada was piling up, and announced that a terrible "reckoning day" was at hand. Sir Francis, apparently, is conscious that he has an arduous task before him, when, writing in an English periodical, he undertakes to convince Free Traders on Free Trade principles that Free Trade with the Continent of which she is a part would not be a good thing for Canada. He would find it about as easy to convince them that Free Trade with England is not a good thing for Scotland. He, therefore, prudently evades that issue, and fills his paper with a summary of a work on the "Political Destiny of Canada," interjecting angry comments on the opinions of the author, and assuming, in his usual fashion, that to think that events are tending in a certain direction, is not only to rejoice in their tendency but to desire, and even to seek by illicit means, to precipitate, their course. Sir Francis says that it is as wrong and as offensive to speculate on the future of Canada as it would be to speculate on the future of England or Ireland: the answer is, that speculation on the future of England and Ireland, both severally and with regard to their destined relations to each other, is always going on. So is speculation on the future of the Colonial system: at least we presume that Imperial Federation will be admitted by its advocates to belong to the future. We are not without misgivings that some passages adverse to the extension of aristocracy to this continent which Sir Francis Hincks cites with pious horror, as proof of a mind utterly given over to darkness, will seem less por-

tentously criminal to some of his readers in the *Fortnightly Review*. He has no idea how bad some people are in England. Where there is no argument, there can be no reply; and, therefore, we need not again discuss Commercial Union. We maintain that it is as distinct from the political question, as is Reciprocity, which Sir Francis Hincks advocates, and which Commercial Union would only complete. Those who contend, that in the case of Germany, the Zollverein led to political Union, would be nearer the truth if they said that union of race, language and territory had produced the Zollverein: political union was at length brought about by arms. That the people of the United States cherish a thought of armed interference with Canadian liberty not even the most hysterical of alarmists dreams. Not only so; but we apprehend that Sir Francis Hincks greatly overstates the case when he says, that "no effort will be spared by the Republican and Protectionist party to bring about the annexation of Canada." If the people of the West did not desire an open St. Lawrence, they would be in their dotage: so would the people of the United States generally, if they were inclined to reject such a federation of this continent as would secure perfect freedom of intercourse and exclude war. It must also be present to the minds of Americans, that had Canada been in the Union before 1860, she would have turned the political balance decisively against Slavery, and there might have been no rebellion. But any one who has really lived among the people of the United States, and had full access to their thoughts, must be as convinced as we are that Canada is no less safe against pressure, or coercion of any kind, than she is against armed invasion. If the United States are ever driven into hostile measures, it will be by a war of tariffs commenced here. To tax the advocates of Commercial Union with anything like correspondence with an enemy would therefore be utterly unjust, as we believe all English Liberals will see.

—The gentlemen of the *Globe*, not content with undertaking to dictate in politics and exclude independence from the press and public life, have attempted to interfere with the social relations and courtesies of the profession, by putting their veto on a friendly dinner tendered by the members of the Press Association to a journalist, whose opinions the *Globe* disapproves. The result has not been doubtful. The affectation of political alarm as a pretext for a personal persecution deceived no human being.

—Battle between the President and the Primate, as Conkling's personal followers call him, was inevitable. When the President accepted it he was not in a strong position, but in one where he was liable to be turned by both flanks. On the one hand, in removing from the Collectorship Merritt, who was an unexceptionable officer, and appointing Robertson, he contravened the principle of Civil Service Reform; on the other, by nominating a prominent enemy of the local Boss and the regular organization in the State of New York, he seemed to set at defiance the principle of party. His theory appears to have been that he would act on the party principle but hold an even balance in the distribution of his patronage between the two local sections, the Stalwarts who supported Grant, and the Administration Republicans, or, as their opponents nickname them, the Half-breeds, who supported himself. Had the two sections been merely divided by a shade of difference this policy might have given satisfaction and conduced to harmony; but as they are deadly enemies, and nothing less, it had the reverse effect. Conkling, however, by his overbearing assertion of State Boss Right against the nominating power of the President, who is also the national chief of the party, transferred the battle to ground on which the weakness of the President disappeared. His angry resignation proved an abortive earthquake, as angry resignations are apt to do; and the result is the triumph of national appointment and the

total overthrow of State Boss Right. But will any party organization bear the strain of such conflicts, or be able to include, without disruption, two sections which hate each other so bitterly, and make war upon each other so openly, as the Stalwarts and the Half-breeds of New York? Is not this another step in a process of disintegration destined to lead the Independents out of party altogether?

—A Manifesto has been put forth by the National Republican League, an association which has its headquarters at Philadelphia, and consists of men who took a prominent part in beating the Machine at Chicago. It has been objected to this document, that, saving the special articles affirming the policy of protection, and advocating civil service reform, it is merely an exhortation to virtue, such as the Machinists themselves would applaud. In form it may be open to this criticism; but, in substance, it is a protest against dominant vices of the political sphere such as Machinists would by no means applaud, and which if urged with vigour, as it was at Chicago, may lead, as it led there, to consequences practical enough. Its weak point, as we venture to think, lies not in the indefiniteness of the object which its framers have in view, but in the inappropriateness of the means by which they seem to hope that the object will be attained. They propose "to place the party machinery in the hands of men of superior character." What is this but casting out devils by the Prince of the Devils? What is party, under ordinary circumstances and under those of the United States at present, but faction; and how is the machinery of faction to be worked by the hands of public virtue? What are the wheels of that machinery but intrigue, corruption, calumny, appeals to public passion, from which men of superior character will always recoil with abhorrence? On the ground of party, Conkling is in the right: he thoroughly understands the party game and its exigencies; while he is, himself, the very model of the man by whom alone that game can be unflinchingly and successfully

played. It is a mistake to suppose that the Chicago nomination was, in anything but form, the mere victory of one section of a party over the other section. It was a victory of patriotism over party; and if those who gained it continue to advance in the same line, it will hereafter be celebrated as the first step, unconsciously taken by men who supposed themselves to be still acting as partisans, in the transition from party to national government.

— Strikes are going on, and their effect is felt in a rise of the price of building. No one, we believe, now questions the right of the men to hold out for higher wages, or to combine for the purpose of enabling each other to hold out; and, for our own part, we have no doubt that in the Old World the Trade Unions have been instrumental in emancipating the working man from practical serfage, and raising him morally as well as materially in the social scale. Still, strikes, like all fights, are attended with havoc: they entail loss to both parties, as well as inconvenience to the community at large, and they breed enmity where there ought to be partnership, and where, if the trade is to prosper, partnership must be. There are two facts which, by those who are meditating strikes, ought always to be borne in mind. The first is, that the real employer of the working man is not the master or capitalist, who is merely the middleman, but the purchasing public, which can never be compelled, by any strikes or Trade Union machinery, to give for any article whatever more than it pleases and can afford; so that the effect of striking, beyond the narrow limit traced by the excess of the middleman's gains, must be to diminish and in the end destroy the trade. The second fact is, that the artisan is an employer himself to exactly the same extent that he is an employee, inasmuch as his earnings are spent in purchasing the products of other workers whose wages he thus, in effect pays, and to whom he stands in the relation of a master. Nor does he ever think of paying these

his employees higher wages, in the shape of a price for the fruits of their labour, than he can help. If there could be a strike all round, as the price of everything would rise with his wages, he would be exactly where he was before.

—In the English Conservative party there are, not two sections, for the line of division is not distinct, but two schools the Conservative proper and the Tory Jingo, and the two' have tried their strength on the question of the leadership. It is probable that the Conservatives proper would have gained the day if they had possessed the man; but the ability and the personal ascendancy were on the other side. The moderates, or some of them, apparently, wished to compromise by making the Duke of Richmond figure-head. A figure-head leader of the House of Lords under a real leader who is in the Commons, is one thing; a figure-head leader of the party is another. The Duke of Richmond had been called to play the first part for the purpose of adjourning the question as to the succession between Lord Salisbury and Lord Derby, and he had played it creditably; in the second his impotence was sure to stand revealed, and to be trampled on by his lieutenants. Lord Cairns is a Jingo, who conveniently combines Evangelical unction with a fillibustering foreign policy; he is also a powerful debater; but he is not a magnate, nor has he personal ascendency enough to make up for that defect. A large portion of every human conclave is unwilling to have its shins kicked; and, this being the case, the Marquis of Salisbury was pretty sure to grasp the prize. What he will do with it is a question for Zadkiel. That he is imperious and opinionated, is true; but his vaunted strength of will, if it means firmness of purpose, has failed on trial. Language could not convey more perfect mistrust and aversion than did that which he had used, even in Parliament, about the chief to whose ascendency, nevertheless, he at last submitted, vailing the proud crest of his honour in a way that surprised the world. Had

firmness been his characteristic, he would have shown it at the Conference of Constantinople, instead of allowing himself to be thrown over by his government, and thereby have saved humanity from that hideous war. He used to be taken for a Tory of the Old Cavalier school. But the Schouvaloff agreement and the Tunis understanding have now dismounted the Cavalier. That his temperament will lead him to take advanced positions is certain: that he will have nerve to maintain them is not so certain. On the whole, those who think it time that aristocratic privilege should be removed out of the path of human progress have little reason to be dissatisfied with the nomination.

—With war in the air, the mind of England is turned to her defences, the efficiency of which has to be reviewed under new military conditions. With steam, Hoche would have landed in Bantry Bay. With steam, surprises and sudden blows have been possible which would not have been possible in the time of Nelson; besides which the superiority of the British sailor has been reduced to some extent by the disuse of sail. In the *Fortnightly Review*, a military man, writing under the name of Captain Kirchhammer, and Admiral Lord Dunsany discourse on the absorbing theme. The upshot of Captain Kirchhammer's paper seems to be, that, as a military power, England is able only to defend herself, not to protect her dependencies or to make her authority felt in Europe. Lord Dunsany dwells on the insufficiency of "The Silver Streak" as a bulwark against invasion in these days of rapid movement and easy concentration. It is doubtful, he thinks, whether the British Navy is superior to that of France; certain that it is inferior to those of France and Italy combined. The great weakness of England, however, compared with her possible antagonists, lies in the fact that, while their force would be concentrated, hers would be fatally scattered over a number of distant points, owing to the necessity of covering her com-

munications, commerce and colonies. It is highly probable that the next European war will teach a decisive lesson on this subject and justify the moderation of Bismarck, who, not we may sure through lack of ambition, has abstained from the acquisition of distant dependencies. Mr. Davin assures, and if eloquence could by itself convince, might convince us that in case of war between the Mother Country and any foreign power thousands of young Canadians would burn to rush to the defence of Heligoland, Fiji or Beloochistan. It may be so, but their ardour would be ineffectual and their rushing would be impracticable if the enemy was superior at sea.

If England wants to be a military power she must, like her rivals, have recourse to conscription: an army on the requisite scale cannot be raised in any other way, as was shown when, in the Crimean war, it became necessary to resort to the ignominious aid of German mercenaries and the other day when it became necessary to resort to the still more ignominious aid of Sepoys. But, against conscription, commercial and industrial England would at once rebel. Commercial and industrial England wants peace, which is daily bread, and it is strong enough at the polls to prevent the expenditure of money on large armaments; while it is not strong enough to prevent, nor always wise enough to try to prevent, the assumption of an attitude befitting only the greatest of military powers and the adoption of a policy which tends to war. As Captain Kirchhammer says, a Prime Minister proclaims peace and renunciation of aggrandizement as the cardinal principles of English policy: but the practical commentary is that, "In 1874 England occupied Lahedsch, in Arabia, and annexed the Fiji Islands; in 1875, purchased Mohammareh, at the mouth of the Euphrates, and, by the acquisition of 177,000 Suez Canal shares, gained a *casus interventionis* in Egypt; in 1877 she occupied Khetsa, in Beloochistan, and annexed, in spite of the protests of the population, the Transvaal Republic, in South Africa; in 1878, she occupied Cyprus. During this period she felt herself threatened and disturbed by

the French, the Turks, the Russians in India, and by the first named also in Africa. She has had repeated differences with Egypt, and quite lately also with Burmah; has been very near a warlike collision with Guatemala, China, and Russia; and has actually gone to war with the Ashantes, Afridis, Afghans and Zulus." The military and ambitious policy, which leads to all these perilous entanglements, is that of the aristocracy, which neither toils, nor spins; the opposite policy is that of the democracy, though the democracy, too, sometimes allows itself to be carried away by appeals to its pugnacity and pride. The net result is a combination of aggressiveness and impotence which will one day tend to a catastrophe, unless by political change England is brought into harmony with herself. We see now how hollow was the late demonstration of British force and by what means the semblance of "honour" was purchased at Berlin.

—The verdict of the Court, the aristocracy, and all who are under the influence of the same social or political sentiment, upon the career of Lord Beaconsfield, has been pronounced in a flood of eulogy. The verdict of those members of Parliament and of those journalists who are generally considered best to represent the labouring masses, has been pronounced in a different sense. The verdict of history remains to be heard. We shall not attempt to forestall it. It would be well if when a great party leader died, judgment could be stayed for a year. Obituary biographies, let them be written by whom they will, are worthless: they merely pile up heaps of fiction for the besom of history to sweep away. Beside an open grave, the lips of criticism are sealed. Opponents even allow themselves to be hurried away by false and hysterical sentiment into vying with the panegyrics of partisans, and making a holocaust at once of public principle and of their own self-respect. Why is it that so few can see the morality and dignity of silence? The objections to public monuments voted to the memory of party leaders, on which we touched in the case of

Sir George Cartier, apply of course equally to the case of Lord Beaconsfield. Entire spontaneity is the essence of all such tributes. It is a tyrannical absurdity to compel a minority to unite in the expression of admiration and gratitude for a career which it condemns. To erect a monument is not only to pay a tribute, but to set up an example, and to set up a bad example for the rising generation is a crime, in which no man ought against his will to be made an accomplice. So probably thought John Bright when, upon the motion being brought forward to erect a monument to Lord Beaconsfield, he left the House.

— A word spoken over the grave of Edward Miall is a tribute rather to a principle than to an individual career. The strength of will and tenacity of purpose which others have been lauded for displaying in the pursuit of the objects of ambition were by this man displayed in the championship of a public cause. Steadfastly and without flinching, alike in bright days and in dark, he fought through his whole life for religious equality. The complete triumph of his cause he did not live to see: towards the end of his life, social and political forces, wholly unconnected with religious belief or with religious motives of any kind, came unexpectedly to the rescue of the English Establishment, and gave it a new, though brief and unhallowed, lease of life. Yet he saw some great victories; the removal of the lingering remnants of political disability, the abolition of Church Rates, Irish Disestablishment, the passing of the Burials Act; nor can he have doubted, when he turned to his rest, that Scotch, Welsh, English Disestablishment would follow. The march of justice across the ages, if it has not been swift or unswerving, has been sure; and Ecclesiastical Privilege, though it may cling to a legal existence, is morally numbered with the past. Mr. Miall was a Nonconformist of the Old School, a representative of the Puritans, and there was no man whose theory of society was more profoundly religious, or who would have insisted more strongly on the necessity of re-

ligion as the foundation of a State. But he knew that to uphold the State, religion must itself be strong, that, to be strong, it must be sincere, and that to be sincere it must be free. He was not the assailant of a National Church. A Church which can subsist and maintain its ascendency only through the patronage of the State, is a State Church; national it is not. The Irish Establishment was not national, though its clergy averred it was: the Scotch Establishment is not national, for the religious life of the nation has gone out of it; the Welsh Establishment is no more national than the Irish, it is merely the Church of the landlords: the English Establishment itself is mainly the Church of the rich, for the religious poor even in the country go to the Methodist chapel. The name national might be more justly applied to a group of churches practically co-operating under the rule of equality, like the Churches of Canada or those of the United States. The denominations, even the Catholic and the Protestant, are hardly divided by lines sharper than those which divide Ritualists from Low Churchmen within the Anglican pale; in moral and social questions they, especially the Protestant denominations, act really, if not formally and ostensibly, together; and the tendency to practical union becomes stronger every day. Nor has the duty of rebuking national sins been less efficiently performed by the Free than by the State Churches: from the Free Churches of the United States there did go forth a strong protest against slavery; but it would be difficult to show that, in any single instance, the voice of the Anglican Establishment had been uplifted against iniquity however flagrant, and only too easy to point to instances in which she has been, and still is, the tacit accomplice, at least, of the oppressor.

—The attempt to keep Mr. Bradlaugh from taking his seat now stands confessed as a social and political persecution under the pretext of religion. The names of the leaders are proof enough. Such defenders of the Christian faith would be too much even for the stomach of Parson Trulliber. If we thought

Christianity as false as Mr. Bradlaugh thinks it, we should condemn his mode of assailing it as at once unfeeling and unwise. It is needless to say how we regard the social and moral views which he has promulgated in his literary partnership with the portentous Mrs. Besant. But all these things have been brought under the notice of his constituents, who have deliberately and with full knowledge of his opinions on all subjects elected and re-elected him, as they had a perfect right to do. His exclusion, after this, and when he was ready to take the oath prescribed by law was a wrong done, not merely to him personally, but to the constituency, and a monstrous outrage on the Constitution. History is repeating itself: Bradlaugh stands in the place of Wilkes; his pious assailants in that of Lord Sandwich; and the House of Commons is on the verge of another struggle with a constituency like its ill-starred conflict with Middlesex. To what extent does the House of Commons, or the tyrannical majority of it, claim the power of excluding representatives duly elected by the people if the choice does not happen to coincide with its political and social prepossessions? There are men, it may safely be said, in both Houses of Parliament, whose practical lives are a good deal worse than anything in the theoretic heresies of Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant. Is it open to the party of piety to say when such men advance to the table for the purpose of taking the oath: You shall not be allowed to swear because we know very well from your conduct that you are a practical Atheist; that your conventional profession of belief in the Almighty is a mockery, and your lips utter it you deride religion in your heart? Parliament will require a set of Familiars to investigate the private characters and opinions of members fo the purpose of this New Inquisition. Religion it is that suffers by a union with hypocritical iniquity, and will continue to suffer till the last test is swept away and the saying of the Master that His kingdom is not of this world is accepted in its plain sense and faithfully carried into effect. Surely even Tories, if they are men of spiritual mind, ought by this time to

have had enough of political religion. Their late leader through his life zealously courted for the support of the clergy: his first venture, "Young England," was a High Church as well as a Jacobite movement; he championed Church Rights and the Irish Establishment; opposed the Burial Bill; made a great parade of religious observances; received the Sacrament; restored the parish church at his place in the country, and celebrated the opening with much unction; attended missionary meetings; dated letters on Church Festivals, and was hailed by all parsons as a Heaven-sent defender of the Anglican faith and its endowments. But he ordered that no clergyman should be allowed to come near his death-bed. This is the second experience of the kind that the Tory party has had. Bolingbroke also, during his life, appealed to the religious bigotry of the Anglican clergy as well as to the political bigotry of the Tory squires, hallooed the parsons as well as the country gentlemen like a huntsman to the prey, and bound them to him by carrying the last and most infamous of the persecuting Acts against Dissenters. All this time, the great champion of Orthodoxy was himself a secret Freethinker as well as an open debauchee; and, as Johnson said, he left behind him a blunderbuss charged with arguments against Christianity and bequeathed a Scotchman half-a-crown to fire it off. It would have been strange if so true a Christian as Lord Selborne had not seen that these scandals practically cancel, and far more than cancel, any advantage that Christianity can derive from the countenance of political power. Whom has he at his side? The Duke of Somerset who, though the author of an Anti-Christian treatise, sits without remorse and unmolested in a House where the test-oath still involves not merely belief in a Deity but belief in Christianity. Justice is a part of Christianity: so says Lord Selborne, let Bolingbroke, Lord Sandwich, and Lord Randolph Churchill say what they will.

—It is hopeless for a monthly journal to deal with the shifting phases of the struggle in the British House of Com-

mons. The enemies of the Land Bill appear to be intending to wage a war of delay, in which Conservatives who want to defeat the Bill, because it interferes with the interests of landlords, can practically co-operate with Mr. Parnell, who wants to defeat it because he fears that it will satisfy Ireland. Mr. Parnell's faithful followers seem now to number only eighteen, so that Ireland may be said through her representatives, who are freely elected, to accept the Bill. That the measure is substantial, is proved by the landlord's cry of confiscation: though in truth there is no confiscation in the proper sense of the term, since the State takes nothing, but only a rough-and-ready settlement of a question between two warring interests, which could not be settled in the ordinary way, and which had become full of peril to the Empire. The landlords are forfeiting all sympathy by their behaviour: instead of awaiting the decision of Parliament they continue to evict, and thus to fan the flames of a conflagration which at one time seemed about to expire. The Lords, since their weakness was revealed by their submission to coercion in 1832, have wisely preferred to have their battle fought in the House of Commons. If they attempt to reject the Bill on the ground that it is sent to them too late in the Session, Mr. Gladstone will meet the attempt by keeping Parliament sitting till its work is done: on such a point he is sure to be firm: it is not so certain that he would be ready to engage in a mortal struggle with the Lords, his social connection with the order being strong. At the crisis of his last administration when the Lords threw out his Army Reform Bill, instead of accepting the challenge he evaded the conflict by having recourse to the Royal Prerogative. But the decisive battle between hereditary privilege and national right cannot be far off, and it can end only in one way. In the meantime, the House of Commons also is on its trial. If, in a moment of extreme public peril, needful legislation can be blocked, not only by the obstruction of hostility but by those of self conceit, loquacity and perverseness, will not misgiving be ex-

cited as to the capacity of great assemblies, with their present modes of action, to do the necessary business of a nation?

—By the retirement of the British armies from Cabul and Candahar, a limit seems to be finally set to British Empire in the East: it can hardly be called a narrow limit, since it includes a population of two hundred and fifty millions. Russia, on her side, appears inclined to rest: she recalls Skobeloff, whose active ambition was probably outrunning the policy of St. Petersburg, as the active ambition of soldiers and administrators in British India has often outrun the policy of Whitehall. Russian enmity to England, so far as it has existed, has all along been the offspring of hostile demonstrations made by England against Russia, which again were the expression of a fear assiduously kept alive by the advocates of annexation in the Councils of British India, who have, in this way, twice succeeded in bringing about an invasion of Afghanistan, with results almost as unflattering to their wisdom on the second occasion as on the first. Unlike Alexander II., in whom nobody acquainted with his history or his character would imagine a restless desire of aggrandizement to reside, Nicholas, by his military pride and his overbearing temper, was an object of reasonable suspicion. Yet nothing is more certain than that Nicholas was a fast friend to England, which he regarded as the great Conservative power. The calamitous war in which he was eventually engaged with her was brought about through a long train of villainous intrigue by that arch-conspirator, Napoleon III., who wanted to gild, and, as he thought, fortify his throne with glory, to lave his perjury and usurpation in friendship with British Royalty, and at the same time, no doubt, to break up the concert of Powers which stood in the way of his projected reconstruction of Europe, and to deprive England, when her turn came, of her most trustworthy ally. The Crimean war has now few defenders; it certainly has not one in

the historian who has paid to the heroes of the Alma and Inkermann the most splendid tribute, perhaps, ever paid to valour by any pen. Yet it is evident that England was brought the other day, by the fantastic vanity of Lord Lytton and his chief, to the very brink of another war, which would have been still more causeless than the last, and have set the whole world on fire.

At such a juncture men's minds are naturally led to take stock, as it were, of the Indian Empire, and discuss the value of this vast and gorgeous possession. To the conqueror its material value is great. More merciful than other Imperial countries, England has exacted no tribute from her dependencies; but in other forms, according to an estimate which seems to be generally accepted, she drains away from India more than twenty millions sterling a year. She has control of the Indian market, though she exercises it only to secure Free trade, which, however, is nearly all that hitherto the great manufacturing nation could have desired. She has also in India a large field for investment. In the Civil Service her young men find an honourable and highly lucrative career. A large army is maintained for her of Europeans, available at need for her own defence, besides a larger army of Sepoys, which, for the purpose of European war, is probably nothing but a vain show. On the other side of the account, are not only the sums which England is obliged to contribute for Indian, and unhappily also for Chinese, wars, but what are of far more consequence, the constant dangers and liabilities incident to her retention of an Empire in another part of the world. Fear for the safety of the road to India has drawn her into one war with Russia, and brought her to the brink of a second. It is constantly present as a disturbing influence in her diplomacy. In case of a war with a league of naval powers, the distraction of her forces, by the defence of India, would cast a fearful weight into the adverse scale. This her rivals, of course, see, and they will hardly be complaisant enough to cover her weak point and rid her of her fears by proclaiming the Suez Canal exempt from the opera-

tions of war. But besides the material account there is the moral. On the side of the moral account, there are the grandeur, the glory, the prestige, though we can never write the last word without remembering that it means a pasteboard fortification, which, let its towers and battlements frown as imposingly as they may, will not deceive the wary eye, or prevent the bullets from going through. On the other side, there is the bad effect which Empire has never yet failed to produce on the character of the Imperial nation. The case of England and India is not like that of Rome, a single ruling city in the centre of a subject world, and with a mass of slaves among its own inhabitants: England is a great nation of freemen, deeply attached to the liberties which are their immemorial heritage, while the subject Empire is far away. Still the influence is felt; and we have just witnessed an attempt not only to bring the Sepoys upon the European scene, but by the help of India to turn the Constitutional crown of England into an Imperial diadem, and infuse something of Oriental sentiment into the political character of England; as well as to divert the mind of the nation from domestic progress to schemes of conquest in the East. Another moral danger was revealed by the great mutiny, which seems, like preceding mutinies of less importance, to have been mainly caused by the negligence of British officers, combined with fear created among the soldiery of intended aggressions on their caste. In the repression, hideous deeds were done, deeds, perhaps, not less hideous than any done by Spanish conquerors. A whole regiment of Sepoys which had rather caught the excitement than mutinied, and laid down its arms on the first summons, was slaughtered by the local commander in cold blood. The poor peasants of Oude, who had risen in favour of their native dynasty, were butchered as if they had been mutineers. The outbreaks of blood-thirsty vindictiveness were frightful; all the more frightful because sanguinary passion affected the language of righteousness and even of religion; while no utterances were more ferocious than those of sentimentalists, destitute of manhood as they were of self-control.

No one who remembers those times will ever think without a shudder of the possibility of an Indian rising and the effects which the struggle might produce upon the character of the English people.

When we turn to the side of the conquered, we are met by a great conflict of authorities as to the real condition of the people. Some represent the state of the Indian peasantry as wretched; say that they have barely the means of keeping soul and body together, that they are ground beyond endurance by taxation, crushed by debt, sinking into the apathy of despair. Others, such as Sir Richard Temple, late Governor of Bombay, give a brighter picture, though it is impossible for the Ex-Governor's readers not to perceive the touches of the optimistic brush. It appears almost certain, though the statistics are imperfect, that the population has increased, and in some districts largely; certain that a larger area of land has been brought under cultivation; but certain also that agriculture is stationary, and that the yield has decreased. The reduction of the rate of interest appears to betoken an accumulation of capital. Sir Richard Temple maintains that there is a rise in wages. It is impossible that the country should not suffer from the pressure of the taxation required to maintain a great foreign army of occupation, and a foreign civil service, the members of which are paid at exile rates, carry their savings out of the country, and afterwards draw pensions in England. India is not a rich, but a poor country, though such wealth as she has is of a dazzling kind, and is gathered in gorgeous centres. The service itself is excellent; high pay, together with regular promotion, secures integrity, and the Government of British India is as pure as any in the world. The code of law is a masterpiece of British jurisprudence, and justice is, no doubt, administered as well as it can be among a servile race, with a comparatively feeble sense of right and truth; for the sentence must follow the evidence, the value of which depends on the veracity of the people. All the apparatus of an advanced civilization is there, including even popular education, though the proportion

of children in the schools is small; indeed, it is useless to proffer school-books to peasants who want bread. Railroads have been built, though rather, perhaps, on military than commercial lines, and this facility of conveyance will be the best preservative against local famines. What English conquest has done for Indian trade we can hardly tell, without knowing what commerce without conquest would have done, and whether friendly intercourse with India might not have done as much as has been done by friendly intercourse with Japan. It is said that England has given India peace: she has, saving British wars of conquest, and the suppression of mutinies. But the British power came on the scene at the worst crisis of Indian history, the break up of the Mogul Empire, by contrast with which any strong and orderly government would be good. A comparison with the remaining Native States is more instructive; and it appears that, bad as the native rulers often are, the Hindoo prefers them to the foreigner. The very words foreign rule sum up a multitude of evils, which no administrative improvements can countervail, even where there is so little of national unity or patriotic spirit as there is in the motley population of Hindostan. Lord Elgin has described, in touching words, the gulf of estrangement which exists between the dominant and the subject race; it is widened by the facility of communication which keeps up the close connection of the Anglo-Indian with his own country; nor can it ever be closed by the domestication of the dominant race, since English children cannot be reared in India. In their behaviour to "the nigger," officials of the lower class, and the common soldier, will be influenced, not by the benevolent intentions of their superiors, but by their own rude pride; even in the Ionian Islands, the bearing of the British soldiery towards the natives was said to be the principal cause of what seemed unaccountable discontent. It is the sincere desire of the British Government to associate natives in the work of administration; but the privilege of race holds its ground, and of 928 officers of the civil service, only seven are natives. That foreign rule should extinguish

national spirit and patriotism is inevitable: it perverts the very vocabulary of public virtue. Sir Richard Temple uses the terms loyalty and disloyalty as synonymous with attachment and want of attachment to the British domination; he forgets that loyalty to the conqueror is treason to the country. All native germs of authority and government are, of course, killed; so is the power of self-defence: populations once martial have become sheep; and if the legions of England were withdrawn they would leave, like those of Rome, a helpless anarchy to be the prey of the first invader. Among the educated Hindoos, British influence has produced a semi-European civilization, the value of which remains to be seen. A travelling Rajah appeared the other day at the Queen's levee with the upper part of his person arrayed in a costume which seems to have been a mixture of the Hindoo and the Highlander, while his nether parts were encased in black dress trousers and patent leather boots. We have heard of patent leather boots worn over jewelled toes. These hybrids are seldom fruitful. Whether much has been gained by killing the art, the architecture, the tasteful manufactures of Hindostan, and replacing them with the architecture of Piccadilly and the products of Manchester machines, is a question on which the artist and the economist might differ. The ancient grandeurs, splendours, and mysteries which fired the imagination of Burke, are supplanted by importations about which there is as little of grandeur or splendour as there is of mystery. Never has conquest been half so benevolent in its intentions towards the conquered as it is in Hindostan: time will show whether it can really prove itself the angel of a genuine and moral civilization.

Time will also show whether conquest can be made the effective preacher of the Christian religion. Bishops and clergymen, who ought to be acquainted with the counsels of Heaven, always say that the Almighty has given Hindostan to England for the purpose of propagating Christianity; some of them saw a spiritual object even in the Afghan war. Blowing away men from guns is rather a curious illustration of the Sermon on the

Mount. When the buccaneering Spaniard overran Mexico and Peru, it was for the purpose of religious conversion. There are five thousand missionaries in India of various nationalities, churches, and grades: the alleged number of native Christians is four hundred thousand. The more educated Hindoo, if he renounces his ancestral faith, embraces not Christianity but Deism, and confronts the missionary with the weapons of modern scepticism, of which he seems readily to learn the use. If the missionary had ever stood as the genius of mercy between the conqueror and the conquered, he would have presented Christianity to the natives in a winning form; but it does not appear that he has ever done this: according to Lord Elgin, he is fond of calling in the secular force; and the same authority says that in China the shrillest advocates of a sanguinary policy were the missionaries and the women. The Northern tribes which overthrew the Roman Empire were converted to Christianity, and civilized at the same time, by men who went among them as missionaries in the proper sense of the term, with the gospel in their hands, and not in the train of conquest.

Have the missionaries, or the Churches which sent them forth, ever raised their voices against the Opium trade with China? Lay friends of humanity and of the honour of England have raised their voices, though hitherto in vain. To prop the ever-tottering finance of over-taxed India, nine millions sterling are raised by the Government on this infernal drug. Official apologists pretend that the Government intervenes for the purpose of minimizing the evil. This is a hypocritical falsehood: the Government encourages the cultivation, and pushes the traffic to the utmost of its power: in Bengal it is itself the cultivator, and itself brings the drug to market. To the pretence that China would find the opium elsewhere if she did not buy it of Christian England, there is a still more crushing answer. War, cruel war, has been more than once made on China, for the purpose of compelling her to admit the drug, and the Treaty of Tientsin contains articles removing the prohibition, to which her consent was extorted at the point

of the sword. The Chinese Government, though but half-civilized, is paternal, and there is no sort of doubt that it earnestly tried to save its people. As Lord Salisbury, when being Minister for India he was pressed on the subject, said, "there are inconveniences of principle connected with the system, but it is wrapped up with the finances of the country." There is not a more flagrant iniquity on earth.

India, we may remark in passing, has made what must be deemed a thorough trial of the merits of competitive examination. There is at present a reaction against that system, the opponents of which charge it not only with imperfection as a test, but with being fatal to practical vigour. It is impossible that practical vigour, or practical qualities of any kind, can be more severely tested than they are in the case of the Civil Service of British India, all the officers of which are now selected by competitive examination. Yet Sir Richard Temple, who must be an officer of the old school, and is certainly Conservative in tone, pronounces the system successful, and we have ourselves heard the late Lord Lawrence, an example and a judge of practical qualities, if ever there was one, emphatically express the same opinion. The fact is, that the man who breaks himself down bodily by overwork has as poor a chance of success in an examination as in anything else; his memory, being half-physical, will certainly fail, and he will succumb as he would under heavy office work or a severe ordeal of any kind. A competitive examination is more like the ordinary struggles of life, and demands more robustness of body as well as of mind than is often supposed. We say this without being at all devoted to the system, which on the contrary, we would gladly see replaced, as far as possible, by interest in the subjects and by duty.

— It is not surprising that the production of the Tunis papers should have been, as even Conservative journals admit that it has, a heavy blow to Jingoism, if the Jingoes and the

nation at large have any regard for old English honour. Let us look at the history of these transactions. When the Treaty of San Stefano was made known, Lord Salisbury and his chief sent forth a thundering manifesto denouncing it as fraught with fell purposes of aggrandizement on the part of Russia and subversive of European law; and they demanded that its terms should be submitted to the grand tribunal of international right. Yet it appears from correspondence subsequently published that a project of treaty, in substance identical with the Treaty of Stefano, had been confidentially communicated to them by the Czar, and that, instead of protesting against it, they had thanked the Czar for communicating it, and transmitted it for the consideration of the Porte. Feeling that they had taken up a dangerous position they proceeded, as the next step, to make a secret agreement with the Russian Ambassador Schouvaloff, practically conceding to Russia the main objects of the Treaty. This they did behind the back of that Congress, before which they had insisted, in the name of public right, that everything without reservation should be laid. Their secret agreement was disclosed by the treachery of a clerk in the Foreign Office. They tried to deny its existence, or to mystify Parliament as to its purport, but in vain ; discredit fell on them and confusion on their party. To redeem themselves they determined to obtain from Turkey the cession of Cyprus, which they purchased of her by a defensive alliance. But the jealousy of France was aroused, and to buy her acquiescence in the cession, they made another secret agreement, pledging themselves to connive at her lawless annexation of Tunis, a feudatory of the very power from which they were taking Cyprus as the price of their alliance. Interrogated by Italy, who also coveted Tunis, on the subject, they denied the agreement with France, when documentary proof of its existence was produced by the French Government. It now begins to appear that the web of deceit is more tangled still and that some unprincipled compact has been made with Italy about the annexation of Tripoli. Can anyone doubt, when these things are done, that a change

has come over British diplomacy, to which in former days, whatever its errors, conspiracy, deceit and falsehood were unknown? Does anybody think it possible that, by any diplomatic revelations, Chatham, Pitt, Fox, Canning, or Peel could have been placed before the world in the position in which Lord Salisbury now stands, and in which his chief, if he were alive, would be standing.

Observe too the strange unwisdom of all this cunning. The great object was supposed to be to keep Russia from getting to Constantinople, where she would be on the route to India. Is not Tunis a good deal nearer the route to India than Constantinople, and is not France as ambitious a power as Russia? Is not the extension of French power in the Mediterranean, with the French ports and arsenals close at hand, altogether more dangerous to England than the extension of Russia's power in Central Asia? Unbar the Dardanelles, allow Russia access to an open sea, and probably her commerce will expand and she will give pledges to peace. Surely the idea of holding the route to India through the whole length of the Mediterranean by force of arms is the most extravagant of chimeras. Italy, also, is a Mediterranean power; her navy is fast becoming formidable, and the bribe given to France as hush-money for the Cyprus transaction has cut her to the soul. The price of Cyprus is likely to be high.

—That the French invasion of Tunis was not provoked by the conduct of the tribes, but was a premeditated act of Jingoism, is proved by the secret agreement made by France with the Beaconsfield Government, at the time of the Treaty of Berlin. England is debarred from effectual protest, not only by that compact, but by her own similar dealings with native princes in India, which the French have pretty well imitated, not only in spirit but in form. France herself, however, is likely to rue the day; nothing could have happened of worse omen for the vitality of the Republic. One good thing at least

the Communists did, they cast down the war god from his column on the Place Vendome. Maniacs as they were, they saw what statesmen apparently do not see, that military ambition, when it takes possession of a nation, is fatal to Republican institutions. The expenditure and the unpopularity incurred by a Republican Government which imposes heavy taxes and conscription, are the least part of the matter: the worst part is sabre sway. Ambition is the vice of the French character: it belongs not to the rulers only, but to the people, and pervades popular literature, art and everything in which national sentiment is reflected. If the late Emperor entered on the path of rapine, styled glory, it was because he knew that it led to the heart of the French people, and had he succeeded in his brigand attack on Germany, beyond doubt his success would have been rapturously applauded by his people, and new strength would have been added to his dynasty. Provinces wrested from Germany would have been not less eagerly accepted than provinces wrested from Italy had been a few years before. Till this evil spirit is cast out, there will be no safety, nor ought there to be; for robbers do not deserve freedom.

—Czars would be of more than mortal mould if any Liberal tendencies which they may have were not repressed by Nihilism. Yet, so far as can be seen, the new Czar, though his onward step may be neither quick nor unwavering, is still in the right path: he seems disposed to identify himself with genuine Russian feeling against foreign elements and sentiments. He takes in hand the redress of the practical grievances of the peasants, and it is announced that he intends to call round him, in public council, the heads of the nation. If he is wise he will, in the first instance, name the members of the Council himself, taking care that all classes and interests are represented, rather than throw that vast and motley Empire into the turmoil of a general election, the result of which, as the people are wholly without political training, would perhaps be

very unsatisfactory, while it would certainly bring on a dangerous fermentation at the very moment when the most sincere reformer, if he was wise, would desire calm. In the catastrophe of the French Revolution, statesmen have a fearful warning against flinging the rein, at the crisis of change, on the neck of an excited and inexperienced nation. What is certain is that the Czar is the only possible inaugurator, and his authority the only possible organ, of reform, unless it is desired to plunge the nation into a weltering chaos of revolution in the hope that from a bloody anarchy (and bloody the anarchy would certainly be), some new and better form of order may arise. The world by dire experience knows what form of order the womb of anarchy brings forth. No one, except the Czar, has any hold whatever upon the people, any power of guiding or controlling them, any authority which reaches a mile from the spot on which he stands. Such is the work of Peter the Great and Catherine, now tried by fire and shrivelling in the flame. The imported bureaucracy having broken down, nothing remains but eighty million grains of half-civilized humanity and a despotic throne. The army seems to be sound-and there is no doubt of the childlike attachment of the mass of the people to their Czar; so that the situation, though perilous, especially if the Nihilists continue their work, is not desperate. All other nations have reason to wish that the danger may be surmounted; for if an eruption were to commence in this volcano it might send a fearful stream of lava over the world.

— From the Danubian Provinces and Germany the Anti-Jewish frenzy spreads to Hungary, Russia and Poland. Nothing can be more deplorable than these outbreaks. But our theory of their origin is confirmed; they are not religious, but economical and social: difference of religion is, at least, only a secondary cause and a subordinate ingredient in the cup of bitterness. The ideas of the Russian Government and people on the

subject of religion are a relic of the primitive and tribal state in which God was the God of the nation and religious belief was a matter of race. Apostasy from the National Church on the part of a Russian is punished as a sort of treason; but subjects of the Empire belonging to other races, such as Tartars and Circassians, are left in the unmolested enjoyment of their own worship, and two villages inhabited, one by Christians, the other by Mahometans, are found existing peacefully side by side. The Anti-Jewish movement is not a religious persecution so much as an insurrection of the people against extortion. The cunning Oriental has got them into his toils, and is devouring their substance by his usury. The peasant, in resigning his homestead to the usurer, ought, perhaps, to be filled with grateful admiration for the financial genius of "a superior race." Not being a cultivated person he gives way to less philosophic emotions, and in his wrath and despair commits acts which are intensely to be condemned. Yet the attacks upon the Jews in the Middle Ages were, as we have said before, in reality less persecutions than economical revolts, sanguinary as all revolts in half-civilized communities are. If a race, whether Jew, Armenian or Lombard, chooses to renounce manual labour, to desert its own country and spread itself over the world without regard for the condition, character or prejudices of the communities upon which it intrudes, in order to live upon the labour of others by usury, it is certain to arouse antagonism, and disturbances are sure to ensue. Let the Jews if they are resolved to remain a separate nationality go, as Mr. Oliphant advises them, to their own country, and there live by labour as other nations do. Otherwise, where they are very numerous, as they are in Germany, Poland and Eastern Europe, and where their financial yoke is very heavy, these hideous outbreaks will recur. It will be a disastrous consequence of the insurrection if the Jews are driven to this Continent, where they will add to a money-broking element already as large as industry can well bear.

—Materialistic theories of national life have been propounded in ultra-scientific language, and with great confidence, but they have not yet been verified by application to the actual history of nations. Heathen nations, their period of physical and military vigour over, have been subdued by fresh conquerors, or sunk beneath their own vices, and have perished. But Christian nations so far have not perished: however low they may have been brought, they have risen again; they have in them, apparently, some vital principle which, if it can be traced back to a physical origin, seems now to transcend the ordinary laws of matter, and, at all events, sets utterly at defiance the mechanical formularies of Mr. Herbert Spencer. The most signal instance of this, perhaps, is the revival of Greece and other Christian communities in the East of Europe, which had been crushed by the Ottoman; but another instance, scarcely less signal, is the revival of Spain, which, after sinking into apparently hopeless "disintegration," is now coming forth from her sepulchre, though certainly with the grave-clothes about her, and the smell of the grave upon her, and feels enough of life in her attenuated limbs to reclaim, though in faint accents, her place among the powers of which she was once the greatest. Let Imperial pride remember that the first Empire of which it was said that the sun never set on it, was that of Spain. The causes of the decay of Spain were many: political despotism, to which she was reduced by the selfish refusal of a privileged nobility to support the Commons in the struggle for liberty; overweening ambition and neglect of the arts of peace for those of war; religious intolerance, confirmed by the long struggle against the Moors, which extinguished intellectual life; the aggregation of enormous masses of property in the hands of an idle clergy under the law of mortmain; the expulsion of the industrious Moors; a false system of political economy, carrying to excess the principle of protection, and prohibiting the export of gold and silver. The last cause, being common in a great measure to all the Governments of those days, may be struck out of the special account; to the others, different degrees of

influence have been assigned: they are all closely connected together; for both ecclesiastical intolerance and military ambition formed supports of political despotism; while the same superstition, which perpetually augmented the estates of the clergy, also expelled the Moors. The Moors were the best of agriculturists; yet the Spanish peasant is by nature fully equal to any Moor, and he would soon have filled the void if the arm of his industry had not been paralyzed by misgovernment. Mortmain was a fatal cancer; but other nations, when it threatened their lives, cut it out by the secularization of the Church estates; and if the Spanish nation lacked the courage and wisdom to do this, we must look deeper for the sources of the defect. In England and other Protestant countries, the liberation of society at once from mortmain, from the yoke of clerical bigotry, and from that of political despotism, was achieved by sturdy yeomen and burghers, the offspring of prosperous agriculture and commerce, so that industrial prosperity furnished the sinews of the whole movement, besides being the parent of the intelligence which rebelled against a tyranny of darkness. We may safely say that, of all the poisons mingled in the cup of national death, that was the most deadly which killed industry; and the poison which killed Spanish industry was Empire. During the century of what has been called Spanish glory, every true Spaniard deemed honest labour beneath him; he was to be a soldier, a conqueror, a lord over other nations; he was to be this, or an aristocratic idler, or a monk. Monastic houses of indolence multiplied, and their possessions grew, at a fearful rate; while by feeding a multitude of beggars they extended the plague beyond themselves. Even in 1781, the Madrid Academy thought it necessary to propose a prize for an essay, proving that useful trades do not detract from personal honour. The very phrases in which the common people, and even the beggars, accost each other, bespeak the fantastic pride of a race which deems itself imperial. Even now, little more than half the soil of Spain is cultivated, and that in the most imperfect way; ignorance and improvi-

dence having, among other things, denuded the country of trees; while, if trade and manufactures have anywhere continued to flourish, it is not in Castile, but in the capital of Catalonia, of all the provinces the least Castilian. Spain thought, and the trembling nations thought, that she drew strength and wealth from every part of her world-wide possessions; in truth, they were draining her life's blood; her men and her treasures were wasted in the wars into which they led her; the prodigious extent of her dependencies, and the military character of their government lifted the central despotism above all control, and mercenaries raised in one province were the blind instruments of tyranny in the others. Above all, the spirit of Empire finally cast out the spirit of liberty; a nation cannot hold other nations in subjection, and itself be free. It is noteworthy that while torrents of blood were poured out, and the bread of the nation wasted to maintain dominion in defiance of nature over the Low Countries and Sicily, the one rational and legitimate object of Spanish ambition was neglected, and when, by a lucky chance, it had been attained, lost again through mere carelessness and inertness. By nature Portugal is, in every sense, an integral portion of the Spanish Peninsula. The mountain ranges and the rivers run so as to unite and not to divide. The race and the religion are the same, the languages of the same stock: interest of every kind manifestly counsels union. But the successors of Philip II. repeated the error of the kings of England, who, instead of persistently directing their force to the union of the Island, which by a steady pressure they might have accomplished, chose to lead their armies to sunny but barren fields of victory in France. Perhaps in the dangerous state of Ireland under the Empress of India, we behold another instance of the far-reaching folly of ambition.

Possessed by the demons of despotism and priestcraft, Spain stood forth, in the sixteenth century, as the arch enemy at once of the Reformation and the Renaissance. The Reformation she entirely excluded from her dark realm by a hideous development of the Inquisition which had its origin in the

calamitous piety of Isabella; the Renaissance she received only in the shape of an Art which ministered mainly to a gloomy and morbid religion. She was, in fact, in that momentous hour, the great power of evil; and history chronicles no other such record of cruelty and crime. From her went forth the dark brotherhood of Loyola; her spirit it was that rejected compromise and ratified the whole code of priestly superstition at Trent. The penalty followed, and it was deserved, not only by the kings and priests, but by the people; for there can be no doubt that the heart of the nation was with the Inquisition, or that the most popular of all spectacles, not excepting a bull-fight, was an Auto-da-Fé. After Philip II., came centuries of decrepitude the most abject, the most wretched, the most squalid, of universal beggary with a government of debauchees and thieves, of superstition made darker by the spread of light in the world around it, of boastful impotence and pride in rags. Europe, at the epoch of the Reformation, was divided, not by a sharp line, for the dividing lines of opinion are never sharp, yet distinctly, into two camps, that of Protestantism with liberty, and that of Roman Catholicism with arbitrary government. The Stuarts, who all belonged in truth to Rome, as well as to absolutism, with their reactionary priesthood, would have dragged England into the same camp with Spain and brought her to the same level of degradation, or as near to it as English natures could have gone. From that fate Puritanism in arms alone saved, or could have saved us; and the elegant critic who sneers at the Puritans as uncultured fanatics, little knowing how entirely they were the party of culture as well as of liberty, should ask himself how his pouncet-box philosophy and their exclusive aristocracy of free-thought would have fared beneath the sway of the Duke of Alva, or even of Louis XIV., with his Père La Chaise.

Under Charles III. and his enlightened Ministers, Aranda and Florida Blanca, Spain faintly shared the Liberal movement of the eighteenth century; some administrative and economical improvements were effected; the Jesuits were expelled, and a

slight attempt was made to reform education. But the national Church, to which the King, notwithstanding his partial liberalism, was personally devoted, remaining bigoted and powerful as ever, opposed an inflexible and insurmountable resistance to a policy of progress. The French Revolution, therefore, found Spain still essentially the land of Philip II. The resistance to Napoleon was not revolutionary, but anti-revolutionary; it was a rising of Spanish nationality and religion, headed by the priests, against the foreigner and the atheist; the Junta of Catalonia declared the miracle-working Saint Felix their Captain-General, and laid the baton of command upon his shrine. Yet out of the fermentation arose a Liberal party which set up a free and almost Republican Constitution. The Constitution having no root in the political character of the people, and the party which had set it up being weak as well as inexperienced and chimerical, it was overturned by the restored Bourbons, with the same ease with which they overturned a similar Constitution in equally apathetic Naples, while they wrecked their dynasty by a similar attempt in France. But, on the death of the reactionary tyrant, Ferdinand VII., there followed a dispute about the succession between his daughter Isabella and Don Carlos, who claimed under the Salic Law, which, like other disputes as to successions, broke the spell of hereditary allegiance and gave an opening for the advance of freedom. Since that time, Spain has had the form of parliamentary government; but there was wanting, and still is wanting, that which alone can make parliamentary government more than a form, political life among the people. Popular ignorance and apathy, the inevitable result of centuries of political and mental slavery, are the real key to the strange and scandalous mystery of Spanish affairs. The state of the Mother Country is, in this respect, similar to that of the Colonies as we described it in our last number. Politics are the game of a set of adventurers, soldiers, lawyers or journalists, at whose struggles for place and pelf the nation looks on as at a bull-fight, paying to the successful competitor of the hour the

abject submission which it has been for ages accustomed to pay to power. Parliament is a nullity: it is not elected by the constituencies, but named by the government of the day, which appoints in its own interests all the local officers, as well as all the members of a most corrupt Civil Service, and thus has all the engines of influence in its hands. The Opposition, knowing the case to be hopeless, frequently abstains from voting, and governments have been so wanting in sense of decorum and in appreciation of the usefulness of forms as actually to nominate a Parliament without any Opposition at all. Changes of Ministry are invariably brought about, not by the vote of Parliament, but by insurrectionary violence or by Court intrigue. Spain has a written Constitution modelled, as its framers supposed, on that of England, but with the usual failure to distinguish between the forms of the British Constitution and its real working. In accordance with the British form, and in contradiction to the reality, the appointment of Ministers is assigned to the King: in Spain he is made personally to exercise this power under the influence of intimidation and cabal; instead of his being exempt from responsibility, the full burden of responsibility is cast on him; and each change of administration is accomplished by a process which shakes the throne. During the reign of the profligate and devout Isabella, two religious impostors, a priest and a nun, had more to do with the formation of governments than the Cortes. The change from Canovas, who calls himself a Moderate Conservative, and is a man somewhat of the Guizot stamp, to Sagasta, who calls himself a Liberal, was effected in the usual manner, and it is followed in due course by what is called a triumph of the new government in all the municipal elections, that is an ejection of all the adherents of the late government by the hand of the new power. The brief interlude of a Republic, and the momentary elevation of the brilliant declaimer Castelar, served only to reveal more distinctly the political incapacity and indifference of the nation; though the disturbance called into action an element of savage anarchy which lurked in the population of

the maritime cities, and which, while it raised the flag of Communism, had probably almost as little that was really political in its character as the horde of lazzaroni headed by Massaniello. Nothing will lift Spain out of this dominion of intrigue, cabal, corruption and chronic revolution but the restoration of political life among the body of the people; and the only way of restoring political life among the body of the people is to give them, as the basis of their polity, good municipal institutions. In their local concerns, they will take interest; in that humble but effective school they will learn to think and act for themselves. Provincial sentiment is still strong. A parliament elected by provincial councils, these in their turn being elected by the municipalities, would represent the nation at least as fully as the nation is capable of being represented: it would be a genuine Parliament, not a servile drove of Ministerial nominees; and, unless actually overborne by military force, resort to which is growing morally more difficult, it might enter on the needful course of purification and reform. But in Spain, as in all nations long accustomed to monarchy and unaccustomed to freedom, the King has still an important part to play, notwithstanding the shocks given to the prestige of the dynasty by successive revolutions; and not a little depends upon the question whether Alphonso is going to be a Philip II, or a Charles III. As to the once haughty nobility, it is utterly debased, and can lend its country no aid whatever.

The Government of Spain is bad; her treasury is ten times bankrupt; her civil service is corrupt and worthless; her law is antiquated and dilatory; her press is venal and, for the most part, subsists by subsidies; her agriculture is still wretched; her greatest industries are in the hands of foreigners; her railways are few, and her other roads are miserable; her system of taxation is detestable; life and property are not safe within her borders. Yet the signs of returning life are there: there is a Parliament; there is a press; in the public men there is some patriotism and more ability; they are better than the line of Court thieves and paramours which ended in Godoy; the army and

navy are better than they were; commerce, wealth, and population are increasing, though as yet slowly; there are railways; judicial proceedings are open and regular; the Government cannot assassinate you as in the days of Philip II.; life and property are at least safer than they were in the Spain of Cervantes. Of the twin pests, Despotism has, probably, received a death blow; the Church still presses heavily on the conscience, mind, and industry of the most superstitious of nations. Only with slow and unwilling step does intolerance depart from her immemorial abode; religious liberty is still imperfect; and railway contractors are ruined, as we learn from the life of Mr. Brassey, by the multiplicity of Church festivals. Still the *Autos-da-Fé* are over; the monasteries have been dissolved, and their property has been secularized; the ruins of Poblet, once the Versailles of monkery, stand a colossal monument over the grave of Mortmain. Large editions of the translation of the Bible have been sold in Spain, and, though the peasants are still priest-ridden, in some of the cities, notably in Seville, Protestantism, or rather the Gospel, is making way. At the same time, and from the same causes, Spanish intellect has awakened from the sleep of ages, and works of importance in all departments of literature, if not of science, are beginning to appear. With Spain, at all events, it is not as it is with the Ottoman Empire: at the bottom of her box of evils is hope, and it is the hope of a Christian nation.

At present the prayer of Spain for recognition as a first-rate power will hardly be heard, though in point of morality her statesmen are, perhaps, as well qualified as their compeers to sit in a Council of Areopagites, with the maxims of public law upon their lips, and secret compacts of spoliation in their pockets. Still less is it likely that attention will be paid to her feeble reclamation of Gibraltar. The famous rock is no longer what it used to be; it no longer commands the strait, as it did in the days of sailing vessels, which were liable to be detained by wind and currents; nor does it any longer serve the less noble, but once highly useful, purpose of a smuggling depôt for

English goods. Its importance has also been diminished by the acquisition of Malta, that citadel of English power in the Mediterranean, which is impregnable, and at the same time uninvidious, since its possession is offensive to no nationality. But English pride regards Gibraltar not only as a rampart, but as a trophy, which it will never be persuaded to resign. On the other hand, Spanish pride is at least equally interested in its recovery. Even a Jingo, or an Anglo-Israelite, ought to be able so far to enter into the feelings of one of the inferior nations as to understand its dislike of a foreign flag waving on its coast. Again and again, in the period of her most miserable decrepitude, Spain dragged her failing limbs to the attack; the hope of recovering Gibraltar led her into all leagues hostile to England; and her hatred of its foreign possessor has annulled her gratitude for the aid given her by England against Napoleon. No doubt she would willingly give Ceuta in exchange; but the offer would hardly be accepted; and if Spain continues to regain her strength, the question of Gibraltar may be regarded as the certain germ of a future war.

—Mr. Mongredien, the missionary of Free Trade, whose intervention in the United States did his cause no good, has now, under a happier star, given us a lucid and lively little history of what he calls the Free Trade movement in England. His object is to show that Free Trade has succeeded in England, and that, if English industry is now suffering from depression, it is not commercial legislation that is the cause. But what he calls Free Trade consists of two things, the reform of the Tariff and the repeal of the Corn Laws. As to the abolition of duties on imported manufactures, it amounted to nothing while, in that department, England had it all her own way. The Tariff has not been abolished, it has only been simplified and adjusted to the special circumstances of England. Twenty millions sterling are still raised by import duties; and, as we have had occasion before to observe, it signifies nothing, so far

as the principle is concerned, on what articles or on what number of articles the duties are imposed, whether they are manufactures that are taxed, or tea, wine and tobacco. Cobden saw this clearly, though other English Free Traders do not. The repeal of the Corn Laws was not a measure of cosmopolitan Free Trade; it was an English necessity; the manufacturers wanted abundance of labour; they could not have abundance of labour without abundance of bread; therefore they formed a league for the abolition of the duty on corn. They acted with a view to their own immediate interest; though their action was none the worse for that, since their interest in this case unquestionably coincided with that of the community, and of the world at large. Perhaps to the reform of the Tariff and the repeal of the Corn Laws should be added the repeal of the Navigation Act; but this again was clearly an English necessity: the shackles which the Act imposed on the traffic of England were most injurious, while for its original object, that of nursing a navy, it had become needless. Nobody can doubt that these changes were wise as measures of national policy, or that they inaugurated an era of immense prosperity for England. Nobody can imagine that, for her present depression, they are to blame. The fact is that she has past her acme. The Napoleonic wars, which had ravaged all other nations and ruined their commerce, left her the sole possessor in Europe of great manufacturing establishments and a large mercantile marine. Other countries are now coming up with her in the race; she descends not indeed from her primacy but from her supremacy, and loses her exclusive command of all the markets of the world. Commerce, like Empire, changes its seat; yesterday its queen was the now dethroned Amsterdam. Therefore, if sadness reigns in Bradford, lately so thriving and hopeful, if her capitalists are in despair and her artisans are leaving her by thousands, as we hear with sorrow that they are, there is no use in looking back or arraigning the legislation of the past. Nothing presents itself in that direction unless it be Reciprocity; in other words, the declaration of a Tariff War against other countries for the pur-

pose of compelling them to open their markets, of which, when opened, England with her power of cheap production might regain the command. But this war, like other wars, would impose great sacrifices and much suffering before its end could be attained; any disturbance of the food supply of such multitudes of artisans would be carnage; and capital will most likely prefer to change its seat, even though it should be compelled to migrate to the United States. It may fairly be hoped that the extremity of depression will pass away; and that a measure, though not the full measure, of former prosperity will return.

Out of the Manchester movement, and above its local object, rose a group of cosmopolitan Free Traders, who have preached that faith to Europe with burning zeal and consummate ability, but hitherto with little success. Their universal doctrine cannot be so thoroughly detached from English interests as to prevent other nations from suspecting that they are acting in the special interest of their own country, and that what they want is to recover for England the command of all the markets, and build up again her monopoly on the ruins of her industrial rivals. It must be owned that the rapacious aggressiveness of English producers in some quarters has helped to foster this suspicion. But the main difficulty, as has been said before, is political. Nobody in his senses can deny that if the world was a single community, the true doctrine would be Free Trade; where people do form a single community, however large, it would be thought madness to propose to draw Customs lines across the country. At present the world does not form a single community, nor is it rapidly advancing, though it is advancing, towards that condition. Armaments must be maintained; the interest of war debts must be paid; direct taxation being generally regarded as vexatious and dangerous, import duties must be levied; and each nation will adjust them in what it takes to be its own interest, not in that of its rivals: it will rather avoid promoting the interest of its rivals, if it can. Nations in this are only like men, who forego a cheap purchase, or any other immediate advantage, if they think they can do

better in the long run and on the whole. Through the decrease of ambition, enmities, wars and armaments among nations lies the road to the Free Traders' still distant goal. No doubt commercial intercourse and the unity of interests which it creates are themselves among the most powerful inducements to peace; but their progress is bound up with progress of other kinds; and abstract demonstrations of their beneficence will open no gate which the general policy of a foreign nation has closed. English economists going round from one country to another, and finding that they make no way, hold up their hands in amazement at the perversity of mankind, and compare Europe to a fractious patient who refuses to harken to the voice of a wise physician. But they have themselves, if we may presume to say it, failed to take in all the facts of a complex case. The hostile character of the American tariff is traceable not merely to economical prepossessions, but to the anger aroused by the conduct of the governing class in England at the time of the Civil War. The increase of duties under the new Canadian tariff, which English manufacturers denounce as Protectionism, was rendered necessary by debt incurred in the construction of political railroads for the objects of Imperialism, and at the instance of the Imperial country. Mr. Mongredien's friends always speak of the French Treaty with unqualified joy and pride. Of the motives and skill of the English negotiators they cannot speak in terms too high. But was it quite right, for a commercial object, to assume complicity in the questionable exertion of arbitrary power by which the French Emperor forced the treaty upon the French nation? Was it even the best commercial policy, supposing the future to be kept in view? Louis Napoleon did not care about Free Trade; what he wanted was to give a sop to commercial England and to keep her from interfering with his reconstruction of the map of Europe till her own turn came.

—With spring returns that which has always seemed to us one of the hardest of problems for the Evolutionist. How does he account for the nest-building, incubation and parental solicitude of birds? Above all, how does he account for them in the case of a young pair building a nest for the first time? To produce these habits by the operation of natural selection, the struggle for existence, or any mechanical law such as Mr. Spencer supposes to govern the rise and decay of all things, would surely have taken a period of time far beyond any measure which can possibly be assigned to the existence of our planet. On the other hand, the same subject is full of sad suggestions for those who cling to the belief in Providence and in the high destiny of moral excellence and beauty. The devoted love of the mother bird for her offspring, which not only overcomes the weariness of incubation, but vanquishes fear in the little breast, seems closely to vie with what is most excellent and most beautiful in humanity: yet we must be content to believe that it perishes as the leaf, is flung back by nature as carelessly into the mass of matter, and has apparently no higher destiny than that of transmitting its life to the generations of the future. In the relation of the animal world, with its half intelligence, its rudimentary morality, its terrible law of suffering and of suffering apparently without redemption or compensation, to man theology encounters one of the darkest of the enigmas which it is now called upon to solve. Facts, we are told, with regard to animal intellect and character, are being carefully collected by a man of science, and will in due time be laid before the world. In the meantime the ground is occupied by Mr. Lindsay with his "Mind in the Lower Animals," a work composed, we may almost say, avowedly, with the object of levelling man with the brutes. Mr. Lindsay's instances of mind sometimes show his bias as much as the invectives against "selfish, proud, prejudiced man" in his opening pages. Who can believe that the dogs of a city appoint a Mayor, or that dogs show devotion in Church, distinguishing between the Protestant and the Catholic form of worship?

Who, again, that was not sailing on the wings of theory, would take the parrot's imitation of the sounds of the human voice for the possession of articulate speech? The sagacity of the dog is not his own; it is imparted to him by men whose companion he is; he does not seem to make any progress in his wild state. We do not doubt, however, that animals reason in their degree as men do; or that they have something analogous to the moral sentiment. Their outward perceptions evidently correspond with ours, and we should like to ask an idealist whether he applies his theory to the brutes as well as to man. We have yet to learn that they make any progress, intellectual, moral or social, in a state of nature; that they make any but a very limited progress even under the tuition of man; that there is any sort of ideal which they strive to obtain, and by comparison with which they feel as man does their own imperfections. "Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him" breathes a sentiment the rudiment of which would scarcely be found in the mind of a dog, an elephant or a parrot. Once more, we must say, things which are totally different, as a worm and a man, though they may have had a common origin, are not the same, nor is a moral and intellectual being the less what he is, or are his tendencies and hopes confined, because his genesis is discovered to have been humble. Once more, too, we must say that in the present rush of discovery we have reason to be on our guard against the enthusiasm of Science.

—By the appearance of the Revised Translation, it has at least been signally proved that the world feels as much interest as ever in the teachings and history of the Founder of Christianity. A Chicago paper thinks it worth its while to give the whole of the Revised Version by telegraph, at an enormous cost, besides the loss incurred in circulating thirty-six pages of print for five cents. What a meeting of the ages, when the invention of modern science thus transmits to the swarming emporium of the

West, the words uttered nineteen centuries ago, by a peasant of Galilee, on the quiet shore of the Lake of Gennesaret! Of the alterations, the most considerable had been divulged beforehand, including the needless and calamitous intrusion, as we cannot help calling it, of the Personality of Evil into the version of the Lord's Prayer. It can hardly be said that any of the corrections affect doctrine, for though the rejection of the words concerning the Three Heavenly Witnesses, in the First Epistle of John, removes the most explicit affirmation of the doctrine of the Trinity, the spuriousness of the passage had long been admitted.* On the other hand, enough has been done, perhaps, to awaken the critical faculty of the people, and to render them mistrustful of verbal inspiration. But by these tightly fettered, though most learned and able revisors, the main point, as we predicted, is totally evaded. The main point, as regards the New Testament, is that of authorship. Books are still positively ascribed, with what in the case of any ordinary work would be called disregard of truth, to authors by whom it is uncertain that they were, or even certain that they were not, written. There may possibly be those who still contend that the First Gospel, written in Greek, is that of St. Matthew, though the testimony of the early Church is unanimous that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, that is in Aramaic; but we can scarcely believe that a single scholar would now be found to maintain that the Epistle to the Hebrews was the work of St. Paul, whose name is prefixed as that of the undoubted author,

* If the Revisers have been in some cases accused with justice of needless alteration, there are others, perhaps, in which they have unduly stayed their improving hand. For example, they have left unchanged the translation of John iv. 6: "Jesus therefore, being wearied with his journey, sat thus by the well." This is not sense. In this passage, as in a number of others, οὕτως is used like the Homeric αὕτως, and means not "thus," but "merely," "simply." "Jesus, being wearied with his journey, was merely sitting (to rest) by the well." Perhaps "was *just* sitting by the well," if not too familiar, would be the most accurate rendering. The idea to be conveyed, at all events, is that of sitting down to rest.

Again, in Galat. i. 6, we have the clumsy and scarcely intelligible phrase, "A different gospel which is not another gospel." Perhaps ὅ may be taken as equivalent to ὅπου "whereas," here as in Thucyd. ii. 40—ὃ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀμαθία μὲν ῥᾳθύμους, λογισμὸς δὲ ὄκνον φέρει. "Whereas there is no other gospel."

in the Revised Version as in the Old. The question even of the spuriousness of certain passages, such as the concluding version of the Gospel of St. Mark, is affected by the theory which may be formed as to the origin of the Gospels: if they were not altogether individual compositions, but in any measure accretions, to draw the line between what is genuine and what is spurious becomes difficult. It is not unlikely that this version will be followed by one of a more freely critical kind.

— In the *Revue Des Deux Mondes*, the other day, there was an article by M. Renan on Montanism, which indirectly called attention to a very momentous fact in the history of the Christian Church. In the latter part of the second century, when Montanism prevailed, the Church was entering upon a period of critical and dangerous though perhaps inevitable change. From the condition of a purely spiritual brotherhood of enthusiasts, distinguished from each other only by gradations of gifts, and placed as a whole in sharp antagonism to the world, it was beginning to pass into that of a formal organization, with distinctions of ecclesiastical rank, and at the same time reconciling itself to, and identifying itself with, the society of the Roman Empire. Clerical ordination and Episcopal consecration were insensibly taking the place of spiritual gifts, obedience to the regular officers of the Church was taking the place of enthusiasm, allegiance to the system of doctrine maintained, in other words orthodoxy, was taking the place of personal conviction and inspiration. A more indulgent standard of morality, and one more attainable by ordinary people of the world, was also being gradually substituted for that of the Apostolic Church; there being, by this time, as Renan remarks, a number of hereditary Christians, who belonged to the Church simply because their parents had taken them to the baptismal font, and were unsustained by the enthusiastic zeal of the early converts. A process of materialization, so to speak, had commenced; though it was as yet in an early stage. Montanism,

with its enthusiasm, its renewals of the gifts of prophecy and tongues, its uncompromising morality, its passion for martyrdom, its expectation of the immediate coming of Christ, its disregard of the claims of the Episcopate, was a revival of the Apostolic Church, the Church of the Day of Pentecost. After a period of struggle and oscillation, during which the Church hardly knew whether to renounce her primitive character, presented to her once more by rekindled enthusiasm, or not, Episcopacy, order, obedience and orthodoxy triumphed. Renan, evidently, is glad they did: he is one of that set of fastidious and somewhat egotistical men of intellect who fancy that the world was intended to be an abode of quiet and refined enjoyment for their class; and hate not only fanaticism but enthusiasm, because it is apt to abrade polish and disturb repose. In the book, which he has not very appropriately entitled the moral regeneration of France, he proposes that the vulgar herd shall be kept quiet by a state superstition suited to the condition of their minds, with a well paid but not necessarily believing priesthood, while the aristocracy of intellect is indulged in perfect freedom; the tranquillity of the political sphere being at the same time maintained by a strong government, and the masses being brought to live contentedly on "the glory and enjoyment of others," to wit, of the illustrious Renan and his compeers. Renan's Epicurism, combined with his research, gives his judgment on the history of Christian institutions great value of a certain kind; and he is, no doubt, right, from his own point of view, in welcoming the rise of Episcopacy as the extinction of enthusiasm, and as having, in fact, terminated the distinctly spiritual existence of the Church. The alliance with the Empire was still to come, and it came in the form of a distinct surrender, for political and pecuniary advantages, of Christian morality; inasmuch as Constantine, a most equivocal Christian in all respects, was stained with the blood of his own son. Then the development continued till the following of the carpenter's Son was represented by a great State Church, with vast endowments, exclusive privileges, Lord

Bishops, Mitred Abbots, a Papacy aspiring to the temporal as well as the ecclesiastical dominion of the world, an inquisition, magical sacraments exclusively administered by the priesthood, and a code of morals the adaptation of which to the requirements of unevangelical society issued at length in the casuistry of the Jesuits. This is not the place for discussing whether Renan's sympathies coincide with the real interest of the Church. But Christianity is entitled to the benefit of the fact, noted by a perfectly cool and impartial as well as learned observer, that the moral corruption, the worldly ambition, the covetousness, the persecutions, the instigations to religious war, the resistance to the advancement of science, the obstruction of human progress, and the other offences which make up the hideous and too-well founded indictment against the Church, are all subsequent to a vital change of character in the religion itself, and belong not to the Christianity of the Apostles, of Clemens Romanus, or even of Tertullian, but to that of the Lord Bishops and the Pope. The Reformation was not merely a rejection of spurious doctrine, but a disengagement from the secularizing and materializing influences under which at the epoch of Montanism the Church was beginning to fall. Renan is quite right, too, in thinking that he and other conservatives of the school whose object is the security of opulence and refinement, have no part in that primitive and genuine Christianity, which, though not revolutionary, has always been ready to put material wealth and tranquillity to hazard if there was a hope of improving the moral estate of man, and never waves off the claims of the masses with an injunction to "live upon the glory and the enjoyment of others."

—Carlyle's "Reminiscences" are still the subject of a fierce affray in which the Editor has received a basting certainly sound and perhaps not undeserved. Unquestionably it is hard upon obscure ghosts, who, when on earth, never courted public notice nor in any way forfeited the immunities of private

life to be recalled from their quiet abodes beyond the Styx, and held up with their little infirmities and their "freckles" to the gaze of a censorious world. The moral, perhaps, is that, if you are conscious of freckles, you had better not indulge in a Prophet's Chamber. But that anybody should be taken aback by Carlyle's pessimism, we must own, surprises us. What is his Hero-Worship but pessimism in disguise, a mode of lashing the present by contrasting it with a past fancifully designated as heroic? You might almost as well look for literal fact in Pantagruel or Gulliver as in the historical writings of Carlyle. Of the "French Revolution," the nearest of them to the truth, as well as the most brilliant and memorable Guizot, who was too thoroughly a master of English to be repelled by any quaintness of style, said, "You ask me whether I have read Carlyle's history of the 'French Revolution:' tried to read it I have, to read it was impossible: it is a compound of petty accuracy with great inaccuracies: he is nothing but a bad Michelet." Carlyle is fully the peer of Michelet, but as a writer of history he belongs to the same class; he is a sentimentalist, a humorist, a phantasmagorist, with the most vivid of magic lanterns, a seer if you will, and if now-a-days seers really exist, but not a historian in the proper sense of the word. "Cromwell" is not a biography but a poem: its divine hero is a myth; the real Cromwell was only a man, the greatest perhaps of the English race, yet subject like other men to the defects and limitations of his time, his training and his party, as well as imperfect in himself. He was proved to be merely human by the commission of errors, of which none were more fatal than the execution of Charles I. for which Carlyle lauds him most highly, saying that it was a mortal blow to flunkeyism, whereas the truth is, that Charles' blood has been the seed of flunkeyism to this hour. Cromwell himself would not have wished to be called a demi-god, or to receive "prostrate adoration:" he was great enough to wish to reign over freemen, not over slaves. "Frederick" is not only a myth but an ethical paradox; and an indiscriminate deification of that brilliant buc-

cancer entails, unfortunately, some very pettifogging casuistry, and some direct outrages on morality. "Dr. Francia," like Carlyle's vehement support of Governor Eyre, is a ludicrous instance of arbitrary violence fondly hailed as greatness. Read as what he is, Carlyle may brace and kindle and elevate, as well as interest, which he never fails to do; read as a matter-of-fact narrator and a sober judge, he will fatally mislead. His arrogance ought to have been as well known to those who are now holding up their hands in horror at it, as his pessimism. The position which he assumed, and was encouraged by his circle to assume, was that of a prophet whose judgments were dictated by a moral insight superior to reason. One of his disciples the other day, writing in a Canadian journal, and in manners at least faithfully imitating, or rather outdoing his master, announced that the mysterious hero in the following of whom lay our only hope of political salvation, but who, to the great inconvenience of perishing humanity, was never named, was in fact no other than Carlyle himself, though the revelation was postponed by his modesty and by the delicacy of his followers—two obstacles which might have been deemed not insurmountable, especially when the object was to save a world. Give Carlyle his due and he will be great enough: the coterie worship of him has had a fall.

Genius cannot be bequeathed, but cynicism can, arrogance can, and so can the trick of using lofty language about the Verities and the Eternities, and fancying that it is moral superiority. All these have descended in unstinted measure to living prophets of the Carlyle type, who, like him, fancy themselves alone in their spiritual eminence, look upon the world as a Gehenna redeemed only by their presence, settle all social and economical problems by moral intuition without the knowledge of the commonest facts, treat Adam Smith and Mill as the dirt beneath their feet, fling about Billingsgate on all with whom they differ, and fancy that is the thunder of Sinai. Self-assertion is carried by these teachers to a degree wholly incompatible with the soundness of judgment without which there can

be no greatness, to the very verge, in fact, of insanity. They deem it the badge of their prophetic mission. For our part, we really have no patience with hysterical denunciations of the rottenness of the age, uttered by sentimentalists who, in all the shoddy-shops and manufactories of devil-dust will find nothing more rotten than a Gospel of grand words. Let pessimism leave off howling for a moment and look at any great department of industry, for example, the railroad system. What a multiude and what a variety does it present of admirable products of mechanical skill, the soundness and genuineness of which are hourly tested by the most tremendous strain. What exact, faithful, punctual fulfilment of duty on the part of hundreds and thousands, often unobserved by the eye of a superior, in all weathers and under the most trying circumstances, does it imply! What order also and discipline does it exhibit, and how far removed is it from the anarchy which the imitators of Carlyle are always deploring as the universal condition of the time, and which they propose to cure by putting us all under military rule! Of fraud and adulteration there is far too much, no doubt, but if anyone thinks that there was no fraud or adulteration in the Golden Past, he must have derived his version of the history of Commerce from a private revelation and not from a study of the facts. Henry VIII. is the model king of the school: that he rioted in innocent blood commends him to their masculine taste: but he also debased the currency, committing thereby, on the largest scale, and in the most noxious form, the crime for which coiners and utterers were hanged. Every literary man ought every hour of his life to thank industry and its organizers in his heart for the comforts, the advantages, the immunities, the privileged freedom to use his brain instead of toiling with his hands, which, through their beneficent activity, he enjoys. Whatever evil there is, it will not yield to grandiose professions. Christianity, when it came to regenerate the world, brought with it a new motive power; so, in a different way has Science: Carlylism has none; it brings nothing but talk;

and the net practical outcome of it, so far, has been a piece of amateur road-making, recommended as work to men whose proper duty was the use, not of their hands, but of their brains, which came to a speedy end amid general laughter. Nor do Carlylists live, or attempt to live, up to their own principles. George Fox, the Quaker, in his hermit suit of leather, was worthy of respect; he practically cut himself off from a world on the way to perdition, and was a sign and a warning to it at the same time. But the Carlylist goes about clad in the manufactures which he reviles, and draws his dividend while he raves against interest. The Hebrew Prophet has had his day: the attempt to reproduce him in the nineteenth century leads to nothing but self-inflation.

—Before this series of THE BYSTANDER passes into the limbo of back files, we ask leave of our readers briefly to restate our views on one or two points, by way of apology and explanation.

Party we have taken as the established system, and have judged the actions and characters of public men in accordance with its rules. At the same time we have always avowed our conviction that this is not the foundation on which government can ultimately rest. To make allegiance to a party rational or moral, there must be a division on some organic question of paramount importance. Without this, partizanship is faction, and faction is the ruin of the commonwealth. All attempts to justify this perpetual conflict, in the absence of organic questions, and to represent it as an ordinance of nature, come to nothing. That, as a rule, youth is sanguine and age cautious is true; but the young aristocrat is the most violent of reactionists: every faction recorded by history has contained men of all ages and of the most various temperaments; the bond has been not age or temperament, but interest or connection. The system postulates the permanent existence of two parties, and two only; if there are more than two it must col-

lapse, and the multiplication of parties or sections of parties is in fact bringing it to the ground in most of the Parliaments of Europe. The more active intelligence, the more sensitive conscience becomes, the more difficult it will be to keep men under a mental yoke; in other words, the better the community grows, the more impracticable this, which is asserted to be the best form of government, will be. Already selfish interest which always unites enjoys, under such a system, a crushing advantage over conviction which has a tendency to divide, as a comparison of Tory union with Liberal disunion in England shows. In England there are still organic questions, the House of Lords, the Established Church, the Court, the Land Laws, Public Education; there is in fact a struggle between aristocracy and democracy which has long been going on and is still far from its close. Yet even in England parties are in a state of fluctuation and impending redivision, which little bespeaks the adamantine fixity of an ordinance of nature. Our Canadian parties may respectively trace their pedigrees to the authors and the opponents of Responsible Government: little more than the pedigree remains; and saving the special crisis of Confederation, the political annals of the last forty years, made up of the tangled details of personal struggles and of combinations without principle, are almost as uninstructive to the political student as the old ship news. In Ontario the Opposition having died of inanition, the fruit of the system is a Junto, maintaining itself in power by patronage which it is always striving to increase, and by an unholy alliance with the wielders of the Roman Catholic vote. In the Confederation Cabinet and in other Cabinets not a few of the public men who are on opposite sides have sat together, and it is idle to pretend that there is an essential difference of principle between those who were partners yesterday and may be partners again to-morrow. "What do you propose to substitute for party?" is the question which has often been tauntingly put to us, and to which it is said we have not replied. Yet we have never discussed the subject without attempting a reply. What we

have always proposed to substitute is the regular election of the Executive by the Legislature, with such a system of rotation as would preserve general harmony between the two bodies; although one good fruit of the change would be that the Legislature would be relieved from its present bondage to a Cabinet in command of a majority and left at liberty to do its proper work of making laws without detriment to the Executive or interference with the stability of government. Appointment of Ministers by the Crown, though the formal doctrine of the Constitution, is, it is needless to say, a farce; the Cabinet is a committee of the leaders of the dominant party, the places being distributed by its chief. Suppose the question were open and the two plans, that of regular election and that of making the offices of government the prizes of a perpetual faction fight, were now proposed to us for the first time, would any one hesitate to choose regular election? Would not the inevitable effects of the faction fight carried on, as it always must be, by intrigue, calumny, corruption and the excitement of unreasoning passion, on national character be in itself sufficient to decide our choice?

The struggle for the transfer of power from the Crown to the people is now over, at least in these communities; and the weak points of the elective system will soon demand consideration in their turn. The object of revision will be not to restore the ascendency of a class, but to make deliberate reason and the public good prevail over the private interests and passions of us all. In time such a proposal as that of indirect election, the constituency at large electing the local assembly, the local assembly electing the central, may be deemed worthy of attention, though we are not surprised at present to find it treated as a startling novelty. A novelty it is not, for the American Senate is elected by the local assemblies, and though marred by the influence of party, it is a body infinitely superior to the House of Representatives, which is elected by the constituencies at large. In France, the Senate is partly elected by the local councils. If it were not going too far back, we might

add that the liberties of Holland, which showed their glorious vigour in the struggle with Spain, were moulded in a similar form. From the people nothing would be taken which at present they really possess. The power of election is of little value without that of nomination ; and decisive experience proves that the power of nomination cannot be exercised by the constituency at large, but must fall into the hands of wire-pullers and their conventions. Since the extension of the franchise in England, it has been found necessary to adopt the caucus system there, though the necessity is deplored by all the genuine friends of freedom. There is no analogy between the plan of election by local assemblies which are standing bodies, and that of election by a college, such as the College of Presidential Electors in the United States, called into existence merely for the term, which of course results in a ticket and becomes a farce. Our nominee Senate cannot stand : cut off from the elective principle, which in a free country is the only source of political vitality, it exercises no authority, and merely cumbers the ground. The election of Senators by local assemblies would be an experiment worth trying, were it not that in the present state of the Provincial Legislature, any power given to them would be put into the pocket of a local Premier.

It has been impossible to treat Current Events in this country without reference to the one great question, that between the Continental and the Anti-Continental policy. Those who bid us, in the name of practical wisdom, adjourn that issue, are not adjourning it themselves: they are expending without hope of commercial return, vast sums of money, earned by the labour of the Canadian people, in the construction of political railways and other public works of a political character, on the assumption that our relation to our kinsmen on the south is destined to be one not of partnership but of antagonism, of separate railway systems, separate canal systems, commercial opposition, customs' barriers and hostile tariffs. If that assumption is erroneous, Canada is being led to

ruin. Like the four millions spent on the Rideau Canal, like the thirty or forty millions spent on the Intercolonial Railway, the money about to be spent on the railway to the north of Lake Superior will be commercially wasted if the Anti-Continental policy is not sound.* The monopoly clauses of the Pacific Railway Agreement are themselves a consequence of taking a political instead of a commercial line. It has never been dissembled in these pages that regard is due to political as well as to economical objects; but nobody can live on air, and the rays of imperial glory seldom penetrate the cottage, into which the beams of plenty, comfort, contentment, domestic affection, material and moral happiness cannot fail, in a fruitful land and under a wise government, to find their way. The main end of all institutions, national or imperial, is to secure to honest labour its full reward; and a policy not directed to that end, however magnificent, will fail. We have in this country a very large number of political appointments, including eight legislatures, all the members of which are paid. This creates a great political class, the natural bias of which is Anti-Continental, because its interests are bound up with separation, and which is, moreover, drawn in the same direction by the attraction of Imperial honours and by social spells hardly less strong. If, as we firmly believe, the interest of the people points in the opposite direction, if the measure of prosperity placed within their reach by the bounty of nature can be secured to them only by a policy which opens to them the markets and the other advantages of their own continent, a special responsibility rests on the independent journalist, who alone can lend a voice to the claims of the masses, the politicians having all the party organs more or less in their own hands. It is idle to deny that on these subjects there has hitherto reigned in Canada a tyranny of conventional opinion; and perhaps it is not unnatural that the greatest freedom of speech should be found among journalists who are fresh from England.

The question as to the political relations of Canada with Eng-

land and the United States is one which no wise man would wish to bring on before the time. We, at least, have never failed to recognise the advantages of a double experiment in democracy. But here again the politicians are, by their own acts, compelling attention to the subject. Nobody can doubt that the incorporation of the North-West to Canada, or rather of Canada with the North-West, will alter the whole aspect of the case. The newly annexed territory, which will in time be dominant, is remote from U.E.Loyalist influences, divided only by a nominal line from the region to the south of it, and certain to be peopled, to a great extent, by immigrants from the United States. The assertion by a Conservative Government of commercial autonomy also snaps a link in the chain of political connection. Canada need not be prematurely agitated, but she cannot be hoodwinked or gagged. Englishmen are speaking, and will continue to speak, berate them as you will, upon a subject which concerns not Canada alone, but England, and all the subjects of the Empire. Economical forces are acting all the time with silent but resistless sway, and the current of migration running to and fro, as commercial circumstances and the reciprocal attractions of the labour markets guide its course, between Canada and the States, is gradually bringing about a social fusion which no declamation can stay, and which can hardly fail, in the end, to affect general relations. Many special influences, such as those of the Viceregal Court, of social connection with England, of conventional opinions, are drawing in one direction, but the mass, under more general influences, is all the time settling in the other.

On the side of England, there can be little doubt that the tide of Imperialist ambition, having flowed rapidly for a moment, is now as rapidly ebbing. Nor is it likely to flow again. A surfeit of wealth was the main source of Jingoism, and of surfeits of wealth there appears now to be an end. Disaster has settled upon the banners of aggrandizement; and the lesson on the cost and danger of distant dependencies taught by South Africa, the troubles of which are wholly traceable to

the interference of the Colonial Office, is not likely to be lost upon the British mind.

It is impossible to maintain that Confederation as yet is well cemented. Conservative journals lament that a large party in the Maritime Provinces still regard Canadians as foreigners. Newfoundland refuses to come in. Quebec remains firmly French, and pursues objects of her own. She is not unlikely soon to become a source of disturbance in another way, for her system of government, resting largely on patronage and jobbery, is nearly bankrupt; the connection which she has now formed with Republican France will reinforce her Liberal element, and it seems possible that the long torpor of her Bourbonism may be broken by a collision between that element and a Church which is every day becoming more ultramontane, and absorbing more of the wealth of the Province.

On some questions we may, to a portion of our readers, have seemed too Conservative. Heartily loyal to public education, we yet cannot help feeling that there is danger in the higher part of the system of overstocking the market with graduates, in the lower, of estranging from the farm. As to the relation between the sexes, and the proper partition of their spheres, without presuming to say what may be limits of wise and practicable change, it seemed well to counsel foresight, and to deprecate the sway of vague sentiment, because on this, of all subjects, false steps would be most ruinous, and woman, if she parts with her privilege for equality, may miss equality and never regain privilege. All measures which can aid the diffusion of property, and mitigate the inequalities of the human lot, will be welcome to the philanthropist, the Christian, to the faithful servant of humanity, however they may affect his individual interest; but he must be allowed to consider, when any plan is proposed to him, what its real affect would be, and at the same time, whether it is just. Abolition of private property of land, which is now being advocated, would destroy what has hitherto been deemed the most powerful of the incentives to industry, and, consequently, the greatest source of

plenty. But if, on such a point, it can be proved that the whole world and its legislatures have gone astray, let their error be corrected; only let it not be corrected at the expense of a single class, which is no more responsible for it than the rest. If justice is to be set at nought, on what foundation is the new social system to rest? On the tyrannical self-will of a small number of violent men? It is practically with some such sway as this that Socialist enthusiasm threatens us; for the dream of such reformers as Bakounin and Karl Marx is really a dictatorship, political, social and moral, which would be exercised in the spirit of Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety, though in the special interest, as the projectors fancy, of the working class, a denomination from which, however, are excluded all who work otherwise than with their hands and for daily wages. The first problem, we must repeat, which the Communist has to solve is a political problem. He has to find a government wise, disinterested, impartial, pure, beneficent enough to be entrusted, not only with the functions of a political autocrat, but with those of a universal proprietor and a universal taskmaster; a goverment qualified to supersede by its paternal action all the existing inducements to labour and the economic laws, through the operation of which, at present, labour receives its wage in the shape of a price for its productions proportioned to their value. "The State," of which Communists talk as if it were a being apart and an earthly substitute for God, is nothing but the government; the government is nothing but the men who compose it; and any one can judge for himself whether government consists, or is likely, under any system of election at present before us, to consist, of men fit to assume the general guidance of humanity. That society is an organism passing through a series of changes predetermined by natural law is a view which, perhaps, has been carried to an extreme by sociologists of the physical school: but it is profoundly true, compared with the notion that the social frame with its motive powers and relations can be modified at will through an authority planted on the outside of it by

agreement of the individuals of whom it is composed. To make the individuals agree, there would, indeed, be required at the outset the most fundamental of all changes; in fact, as Europe as seen, the only mode of inaugurating a Communist government is civil war. On the old lines, society is advancing, though slowly, not only towards liberty, but towards equality and fraternity; this a fair comparison of the ages as they are mirrored in history will show. The belief that property has its duties as well as its rights, the enthusiasm of philanthropy, the sense of social brotherhood itself, as well as that equal distribution of political power which is a security against oppression, are things of recent birth; and it cannot be doubted that they are working a great change though not a sudden transformation. The penalty of an abortive attempt to effect a sudden transformation, as the world knows, is the wreck of reasonable hopes. The latest phase of humanity is this New World which, for those who labour, is surely a happier world than the old.

No adequate account of political and social movements could be given without embracing the changes which are taking place in the fundamental beliefs of men, and which, in this as in every former great crisis of human history, are the primary source of the world's unrest. THE BYSTANDER'S notices of current theology and philosophy have been written by one who has not excluded, or tried to exclude, from his mind the doubts and perplexities of the age; who firmly believes that the only issue from those doubts and perplexities is the fearless and unswerving pursuit of truth, with entire liberty of opinion; but has not yet abandoned the hope of a reconciliation between Religion and Science, or persuaded himself that the Reign of Law is the dethronement of God. Criticism from such a point of view is necessarily wanting in decisiveness; but there is no reason why it should be wanting in honesty or in reverence. What criticism at the present juncture, can be decisive? The religious difficulties of our generation are unlike those of any before it. At the epoch of the Reformation, when the Catholic

faith of the Middle Ages and the ecclesiastical order which had rested on it was broken up, the confusion, alarm and distress were, and well might be, great; to the men of that time the foundations of the religious world seemed to be removed. Yet a limit was set to the possible extent of the destructive process by the unshaken and universal belief in Revelation and in the authority of the Bible. But what limit is there to the destructive process now?

The Current Events which attract notice and excite discussion are, to a great extent, those of an abnormal kind; controversies, conflicts, accidents, changes, and demands for change: the stream of daily life, with its industries, its affections, its peaceful efforts and practical improvements, flows unnoted all the time. Thus, in the general picture presented, the abnormal is out of all proportion to the normal. This defect THE BYSTANDER has had in common with other journals. No doubt, being on so small a scale, and lacking the varied knowledge and accomplishments which can be found only in a well-appointed staff, it has had defects from which other journals are free.