

## 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.

- |                                     |   |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured covers /<br>Couverture de couleur  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Covers damaged /<br>Couverture endommagée   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Covers restored and/or laminated /<br>Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages restored and/or laminated /<br>Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Cover title missing /<br>Le titre de couverture manque  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/<br>Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured maps /<br>Cartes géographiques en couleur  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Pages detached / Pages détachées  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /<br>Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transparence  |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Coloured plates and/or illustrations /<br>Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies /<br>Qualité inégale de l'impression  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material /<br>Relié avec d'autres documents  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Includes supplementary materials /<br>Comprend du matériel supplémentaire   |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | Only edition available /<br>Seule édition disponible  | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Blank leaves added during restorations may<br>appear within the text. Whenever possible, these<br>have been omitted from scanning / Il se peut que<br>certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une<br>restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,<br>lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas<br>été numérisées. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion<br>along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut<br>causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la<br>marge intérieure. |                                     |   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments /<br>Commentaires supplémentaires:  |                                     | Continuous pagination.  |

# THE BYSTANDER.

---

---

APRIL, 1881.

---

---

THE Session of Parliament which has just closed will be memorable, especially in the annals of the North-West, as that in which the sanction of the national representatives was given to the Pacific Railway Agreement. When the actors in this transaction stand before the tribunal of opinion in the future, upon one of the parties will rest the responsibility of having committed the country to the undertaking by the fatal treaty with British Columbia; upon the other party will rest the responsibility of having not only acquiesced in the undertaking, in deference to conventional opinion, but through its principal organ for years and till yesterday denounced as traitors all who tried to warn the people against the danger. Upon the Party System itself will rest the responsibility of having left the nation through the whole course of this momentous struggle without a single patriotic and fearless counsellor. Partisans of the Opposition will, no doubt, take exception to the last assertion, and contend that its leaders did patriotically and fearlessly struggle to prevent the ratification of the Agreement. Patriotically, perhaps, but not fearlessly. Had they been fearless they would have avowed that the object of their hostility was not merely the Agreement but the enterprise itself, at least so far as the unproductive portions of the road were concerned. But upon that subject deference to Imperialist sentiment sealed their lips and constrained them to confine themselves to attacks upon the terms of the Agreement and the composition of the Syn-

dicade, which, as the Agreement was the work of able men and the Syndicate was the best that presented itself, were exaggerated, hollow and consequently weak. We understand, of course, the exigencies of party tactics, though we are strongly of opinion that the statesman will prove the most successful of tacticians who shall first learn to act without reserve on the conviction that the people want to be governed by honesty and truth; but you cannot have the advantages of tactical finesse and those of a morally sound position at the same time.

The remark may be extended to the case of the Coal Tax. A few months ago what denunciations of that tax we had from all Opposition speakers and writers! Anybody suspected of upholding it, or even of failing to treat its authors as public criminals, was held up by the leading Reform organ as a flinty-hearted oppressor of the poor. But when the time came for giving effect to these convictions by raising the issue in the House of Commons and voting against the re-imposition of the tax, the storm of indignation died away and was succeeded by ominous silence. By allowing the tax to be re-imposed without a division, the Opposition has virtually sanctioned it. It will be said that it was futile to divide when the Government had a large and sure majority. But a minority which never risks a division for fear of a defeat will remain a minority for ever. The Ministerial members for Toronto and other western cities, at all events, would have voted with halts round their necks if they had supported the tax. The duty of resisting to the utmost unjust taxation in any case was clear. It was not the fear of being beaten that caused the Opposition to shrink from dividing or even from speaking above a mutter against the Coal Tax. It was the fear of losing the support of the Maritime Provinces, a prize which is now within their grasp. For this they consented to dry up their tears of pity and harden their hearts to the sufferings of the western poor. Once more we recognise the strategical necessity, but once more we say that compliance with strategical necessities is not inflexible patriotism, and that the game of Party is played pretty much in the same style on both sides.

— Next to the Pacific Railway Agreement, the most important matter of the session has been the trial of Mr. Blake as a leader. It is not necessary to draw comparisons between him and his predecessor. Without reference to the question of ability the change was inevitable. Under Mr. Mackenzie, the party had suffered a total and ruinous overthrow, and his continuance in command would have damped the powder as effectually as the continuance of Mack after Ulm or of Villeneuve after Trafalgar. The sympathy which the Tories hastened to express with him on his shameful deposition by party ingratitude did credit to their hearts: but among the things which wisdom allows you to be taught by your enemy is not the choice of your general. This, however, was not all. Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Blake represented different wings of the party and different principles. Mr. Mackenzie represented Gritism, or, to put it more plainly, the *Globe* and its proprietor. He was the instrument of a policy the aim of which was to keep the party under a dictatorship, to stifle the spirit of progressive Liberalism which from the would-be dictator had become entirely estranged, and for definite principle to substitute as a standing ground and title to power pretensions to superior purity, which unfortunately could not be sustained. To anything National, Mr. Brown and his organ were fiercely opposed, notwithstanding his own appeal to national ambition at the time of Confederation. Especially was he opposed to Commercial Autonomy, which the *Globe* used to denounce as severance from the Empire. It is impossible not to think that the connections of the commercial man exercised in this respect some influence over his public policy. Mr. Mackenzie was taken to England, led to the altar of British capital, and there bound by a vow to be forever true to the principle of Commercial Dependency. Upon the issue between Commercial Autonomy and Commercial Dependency the battle of September, 1879, was really fought; and whether Autonomy played with the black or with the white chess-men mattered little to those whose sole object it was that the right should be affirmed. The *Globe* section was

beaten and almost annihilated on its most fundamental and distinctive question. Naturally, it and the leaders nominated by it had to stand aside, and allow the Liberal section to pass to the front. Though Mr. Blake and his followers were entangled in the defeat, and he has since used equivocal language in attacking the new tariff, he is not the enemy of Nationality or of Commercial Autonomy, but the reverse. In truth, he might, with some reason, have said that the National Policy was his axe, and had been stolen by the Conservatives when out of power to cut down the Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. Blake's title to his place, therefore, is necessity; to talk of intrigue is senseless. In judging of his performance as leader, allowance must be made for the difficulties under which he has laboured. It is a trite remark that lawyers have not succeeded in the British House of Commons. It would be wonderful if they had. How is a man whose mind is engrossed by legal business, and who is perhaps exhausted by a day spent in pleading a cause in a law court, to compete in the political debate of the evening with men exclusively devoted to politics, and coming down fresh from their libraries or their clubs? Mr. Blake's time has been given mainly to the profession at the head of which he stands. The inevitable consequence is that when he takes up the special subjects of the other arena a want of grasp sometimes appears. It is unlucky that tariffs and other economical questions should have been the first with which he was called upon to deal. If he can now afford to give himself wholly to politics, he will no doubt become as complete a master of them as he is of law. Moreover, he has some professional habits to shake off. The division of labour prevents any labourer from being a perfect man. It cannot be denied that so far Mr. Blake has had too much the manner of a standing counsel against the Government, speaking from a brief put before him, and too little that of a statesman looking into the heart of the matter and shaping his own course. His treatment of the Agreement was, in the opinion of the most friendly judges, altogether too forensic. But in this respect also he is sure to im-

prove. For all the arts of party management, he has a first-rate tutor in front of him. Whatever may be the ends of the Prince of Darkness, there can be no doubt that he is skilful in the choice of means. He exercises forecast in the choice of his line of action; he studies men, though perhaps too much on the weak side; he is enabled by the knowledge which he thus acquires to speak not to the reporters, but for votes: and he makes it felt that he will always stand by his friends and be loyal under all circumstances to the party cause. Standing by his friends is in fact a habit which he carries to excess, certainly as regards the public interest, probably as regards his own; and the legal maxim *noscitur a sociis* applied to his connections might bear hard on him. Yet the reputation of being a true and gallant comrade is, in a general way, as useful a point of character as a party leader can possess.

Everything portends that Mr. Blake will soon be tried not only as the leader of a party, but as the head of a government. The growing tendency of Administrations to die with Parliaments is not likely to be reversed at our next general election. The Government has been successful, by its financial measures, in raising the revenue to the level of expenditure; at the same time, it is increasing the expenditure and adding to the pile of debt. The manufacturers are pleased with the National Policy, and expect from it more than it will give them: but the people in general groan under the enhanced expense of housekeeping, which all additions to taxation, let their author be never so great a conjuror, must entail. Election promises and hopes can never be fulfilled; disappointment turns to resentment, and from a multitude of causes malcontents and enemies gather along the path even of the most adroit of Ministers. The mere ebb of the tidal wave raised by the attraction of the National Policy in 1879, is sufficient to sweep back constituencies then won by narrow majorities from the party to which they usually belong. It can hardly be doubted that if a General Election were now to take place, many seats in Ontario and still more in the Lower Provinces would be lost by the Ministerialists. But the

party is also threatened with internal collapse for want of leaders. Sir John Macdonald is always reminding us of his advancing years, and he was a good deal absent from the House during the Session. Sir Charles Tupper appears to have broken down from overwork. Sir Leonard Tilley has warned us of his approaching departure. Mr. Langevin, as Prime Minister, is capable but quite impossible. Sir Alexander Campbell, though an able speaker and a good manager, is in the House of the political dead, and he has not sufficient hold on the country. This about exhausts the list of conceivable Tory Premiers. Apparently the reins, as they drop from the hands of Sir John Macdonald, must slide into those of Mr. Blake. Would there were ground for hoping that he would receive them as Prime Minister not of a party but of the nation, and that what we have said as to the necessity of certain arts of party management might thus become superfluous and void. There still floats before our eyes the image of a National Government under which, laying faction and its machinery aside, we might attend to the replanting of our forests, to the conservation of our rivers, to sanitary legislation, to all things which really affect the substantial welfare of the people, and perhaps undertake, in the light of experience, a calm and comprehensive revision of the Constitution. If this seems utterly visionary, let it be remembered that once at least there has been a Coalition.

In one respect Mr. Blake's position is made easy. The leadership of his party is now really in the leader and not in a dominant journal. Facts which are as public as the Stock List prove that the attempt to maintain a monopoly of opinion by a policy of lavish expenditure and denunciatory violence has finally broken down, and that the balance of power in the press of Ontario has been definitively restored. Our thanks once more are due to those by whose enterprise the deliverance has been won. The same facts cast a singular light on the pretensions of the censorship beneath which this Province so long cowered, and, if the events and characters of the last thirty years should come before the judgment seat of history,

will relieve a multitude of reputations against which the most infamous charges have been placed on file.

—The Coal Tax, as has been before noted, is the only item in the Tariff which can be designated as Protective, in the proper sense of that equivocal term. It is laid on avowedly, not for the purpose of raising revenue, which it does only to a very inconsiderable extent and in a manner most oppressive to the people, but for the purpose of compelling the people of Ontario to buy Nova Scotian instead of American coal. But the language of the Finance Minister in the Budget debate, and notably with reference to the question of Beet Sugar, if correctly reported, shows that he is in danger of allowing himself to be drawn, by a success which he somewhat misconstrues, and by the sweet applause of certain commercial sirens, into a general policy of Protection. He ought to know that no home interest can be protected except at the expense of some other home interest, and that the unprotected interest almost inevitably suffers more than the protected interest gains. The principle of his Tariff, so far as the Tariff is good, is not Protection but Adjustment. No sane man can deny the truth of the broad doctrine of Free Trade. To buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest, is the manifest dictate of common sense: in no other way can the various fruits of the earth and of human labour be duly distributed, or the industry of each section of mankind directed to the most profitable objects. If all the nations of the world were one community, Free Trade would be the law of their intercourse, as it is the law of intercourse between the different citizens of the same nation whom nobody proposes to protect against each other. But the nations of the world are at present very far from being one community: each of them wants money for its separate establishments; each of them raises, and is likely to continue raising, a large portion of that money by means of import duties; and each of them in regulating the duties has regard, and will always have regard,

to its special circumstances and industries. England is no exception to the rule, though it suits her to lay her import duties on tea and tobacco rather than on other things. Canada has asserted her commercial autonomy and exercised the common power of adjusting her tariff to the interests of her native industries. So far she and her Finance Minister are on safe ground; but if Sir Leonard Tilley is going to be seduced into laying on taxes, not for the purpose of revenue, but for the sake of protecting special interests, the case will be entirely changed.

—For one thing, at all events, our thanks are due to the new leader. He makes the war one of politics not of scandals. So long as Liberal principles were tabooed in the Liberal party and no political questions could be mooted, scandal-hunting was the only game left, and scandals were hunted with a vengeance, especially when the overthrow of a Conservative Government by the Pacific Railway affair had roused boundless hopes of the results to be achieved by earnest effort in that direction. No good citizen can have any desire to stand between Sir Charles Tupper, or any other incriminated Minister, and public justice. But public justice let it be, not place-hunting under that name, and let the arraignment be as deliberate, the trial as fair, in the case of a man accused of betraying a public trust as they would be in the case of one accused of a private theft. Attention has more than once been called in these pages to the absence in our Constitution of any proper provision for the trial of corruption and other criminal breaches of public duty. A party House of Commons is totally incapable of sitting in judgment on such cases. Had a regular and impartial tribunal existed, those who accuse the Minister of Railways of corruption, instead of using their charges as mere missiles of party war, either in Parliament or in the Press, would be compelled to take the responsibility of putting them into a regular form and proving in a Court of Justice. The present system of irre-

sponsible incrimination is not only unfair to innocence, but by raising a cloud of indiscriminate calumny forms the best possible cover for real guilt.

—In our last number, speaking of the “Boom,” we observed that a solid and permanent revival of commercial prosperity could be produced only by increase of substantial wealth. This remark we designated as a truism, though one which amidst the excitement of a commercial revival it might be useful to bear in mind. But it appears there are those who take it to be not a truism, but a gross fallacy and a putting of the cart before the horse, inasmuch as “it is increase of profitable commerce which produces substantial wealth, and not *vice versa*.” Distribution, according to these economists, precedes production, and commerce, which is exchange, may be active and profitable before you have anything to be exchanged. When the notion is stated thus plainly, its folly is apparent. But enveloped in fine phrases, such as stimulating commerce, promoting enterprise, doing what is good for trade, it does possess the minds of men, even of very sensible men, to a wonderful degree, and pervades the speeches of Finance Ministers who, because they can alter the laws of trade, fancy they can create prosperity, when the most they can do is to remove obstacles to its progress. It also is apt to cause an undue degree of attention to be paid to the condition and interests of the trader in comparison with those of the producer. Canada has been made substantially richer by two good harvests, with high prices in Europe, and by the revival of her lumber trade: she is, therefore, able to buy more and to employ to a larger extent all the various agencies and instruments of distribution. If, by a failure of her harvests, a reduction of the price of grain in Europe, or a renewed depression of the lumber trade, she were to suffer a loss of substantial wealth, to continue trading without regard to that loss would be merely to run into debt and bring on a financial crisis. Once more we beg leave humbly to claim

for our position the title of truism, and to commend it to the consideration of "boomers."

--An Amendment of the Scott Act passed by the Senate, and confining prohibition to the more fiery and intoxicating drinks, so as to permit the sale of the lighter and more wholesome beverages, has merely served to make it more manifest than ever that the people will not permit an irresponsible body to take any serious part in legislation. Yet this is the only sign of activity which the Senate has given during the Session. The Amendment in itself was based on the reasonable principle of discriminating between those beverages which are really poison and those which, unless taken in great quantities, are nothing of the kind. The common whiskey is poison, and an Act to prevent it from being manufactured would at least be an effective measure, and would go straight to the mark. Legislation which allows the poison to be openly made, formally recognises the manufacture, draws a revenue from it, and at the same time affects to treat the retail trade as criminal, does not seem worthy of much respect. That the whiskey, so long as it is made, will be sold, and that the main result of prohibition will be the addition of contrabandism to intemperance, is a fact which no prohibitionist seems much inclined to face. But with sincere respect for the movement, we say, their refusal to acquiesce in the requirement of an absolute majority for the adoption of the Act, seems to us a death blow to the justice of their cause. In Kansas they are interfering with the administration of the Lord's Supper, because wine is one of the elements. This, surely, is the climax.

—Exhausted, as usual, by the grand faction fight, Parliament had little time or energy for practical legislation. A Bill for the Conservation of the Forests, if any independent member had introduced it, would have been impatiently tossed aside. At the fag end of the session, too late for discussion, a

number of Government Bills are brought down to a House dwindling in number, and about as much in a mood for business as people whose carriages are waiting for them after a ball. Among them was a Bill relating to the litigated boundary of Manitoba, the question respecting which has evidently passed out of the domain of topography into that of inter-provincial jealousy and party. An untoward tendency of the other Provinces to combine against Ontario is perceptible on these occasions. Among the items of expenditure was one of \$10,000 for a monument to Sir George Cartier. By demurring to this, Mr. Blake has drawn upon himself imputations of bad taste and want of generous feeling. We cannot think that the imputations are deserved, or that Mr. Blake did anything but his duty. Let monuments be set up to those who have deserved them by the spontaneous act of the people. A political party which, having a majority in Parliament, uses public money to set up a monument to its leaders is in fact paying, at the national cost, a tribute to itself. In the case of Sir George Cartier, it may be said, without unearthing recollections which all sensible people wish to leave buried, that there were special reasons for adhering to the usual method of voluntary subscription. But perhaps the chief object was to pay a little pecuniary compliment to Quebec.

—Competitive examination, in place of the present mode of appointment, is recommended as the conclusion of an inquiry, evidently conducted with great care, by the majority of the members of the Civil Service Commission. Their arguments are those which have prevailed in England and are urged by the friends of Civil Service Reform in the United States, who appeal to the results of their system in recent appointments to the New York Custom House as a proof of its general excellence. On the other hand, an experienced civil servant, and one, we will warrant, as much opposed to jobbery as it is possible for a man to be, urges that it is well to have

a certain connection between the service and the holders of political power; that where such a connection exists the service will respond more readily to public needs than it would if it were a caste made up of the special style of men who usually do best in examinations; that a man who owes his appointment to a political friend will have one point of union with the political world, and, if he is a man of force and intelligence, will soon have more; that one of the school-teacher type who has gained the highest number of marks in an examination will be apt, in the first place, to be puffed up by his success, and, in the second place, to fancy that he belongs to a body independent of all the powers of the State, and set to rule the country for the country's good. Our friend would be content with a qualifying, instead of a competitive, examination, which he thinks would be a sufficient safeguard against improper appointments. The man who had merely passed a qualifying examination, he argues, standing on a level with many others, would not have any such temptations to conceit, and having, through the very circumstances of his appointment, a certain insight into the political institutions of the country, would be more in sympathy with those institutions and with public feeling; he would not be so likely as the other to become a red tapist. The responsibility of patronage our friend, moreover, maintains is good for a legislator, who may well be proud of having given a good man to the public service. We confess that we incline ourselves to this view. The strongest argument in favour of competitive examination, as it seems to us, is that it effectually prevents the use of the patronage as a bribery fund. In England it has been an immense relief to the Ministers, whose lives were made a burden to them by applications for small places. Its effect on the mind of the people, on the other hand, would be questionable; it would make employment in public offices too much of a prize, and for one youth who succeeded, it might unsettle twenty, and fill them with a misleading ambition. In the case of the United States, the evils of party patronage have been so great as to call for the most drastic remedy. But this cannot be said

of Canada. With us the most serious ground of complaint, perhaps, has been the occasional intrusion of outsiders into high appointments, which ought in justice to have been given to veteran and deserving members of the service ; and this is a fell necessity of faction against which it would be hardly possible to guard. The Commissioners have been wise in not confining their attention to the mode of appointment, but considering the securities for efficient performance of the work. The vigilant self-interest which presides in a bank or a counting-office does not preside in a public office, which is proverbially apt to become a paradise of loitering and gossip. A conscientious head of a department, if he has also powers of command, will make his subordinates conscientious ; but, on the whole, it can hardly be doubted that the public gets less work for its money than a private employer. The Commissioners recommend that the rooms should be enlarged, by throwing down partitions, so that instead of a little party of clerks in each room there may be a large number, working under the eye of a superintendent. This is a thoroughly practical suggestion, and reminds us of Bacon's shrewd remark about the difference made by the long and the round table in the relations of those who sit together at the Council Board.

—When the Legislature of Ontario rose, the members of the Government must have said to each other that it had been a very pleasant session. An Opposition so feeble could be nothing but a screen for the Government, which had everything entirely its own way, put a stop to discussions which it disliked, cut short inquiries where they threatened it with embarrassment, and made perceptible progress towards the permanent possession of office without practical control. We by no means say that in some of the instances the power was not well used. On the question of Education, the Opposition had good reasons for moving, and their party interest in pressing inquiry would have coincided with the interest and, as

we believe, the wishes of the Province; but the leaders were not familiar with the subject, and the case was frittered away in abortive attacks made by single members without concert, and not urged home. On the dangerous patronage of the liquor trade given to Government by the Crooks Act, an effective appeal might have been made to the constitutional sentiment of the Province, even if the division had been poor; but the subject was barely touched. We once more invite political observers to mark that the result of the party system, where there are no real party divisions, is Junto Government, with the system of interest and patronage, with the avoidance of important public questions and the "Rest and be Thankful" policy, by which Juntos keep themselves in power. If people like Junto Government, well and good, they have it; though we should have thought that it was the very thing which representative institutions were intended to prevent. If they do not like it, the only course is to break the party Machines; let the Assembly elect the executive officers, thus giving a fair chance to all ability in its turn; and throw open the representation to all who are worthy and willing to serve the Province. That members of the present Cabinet are very worthy as well as willing to serve the Province, we are as far as possible from denying: if we object to them it is not personally, but as a Junto, and especially as a Junto supported by a compact with the masters of the Catholic vote.

—Among the Private Bills passed by the Local Legislature is one which seems to raise a grave question of public principle. It is entitled "An Act to amend the Acts incorporating the Toronto Gravel Road and Concrete Company." We all remember the consternation, caused some years ago by the Goodhue Will Case, in which the Legislature undertook, at the instance of interested parties, to alter the provisions of a private will. The present case looks like one of the same kind. The Company under its charter possesses, as the preamble to the

amending Act distinctly admits, the right of using a steam motor on its tramway. The exercise of this right the County Council of York seeks to restrain on the ground of danger to passengers on the Kingston Road. The parties are in Chancery, when, at the instance of the Council, the Legislature steps in and cuts the knot by an amending Act taking away the right from the Company. It must be said that this bears a sinister resemblance to an act of confiscation. It seems to involve the assumption of a power not less dangerous in its nature than indefinite in its extent. There is no necessity for impeaching the motives of the Legislature, which may naturally have thought that it did right in withdrawing a privilege granted by itself when found to be productive of unforeseen inconvenience to the public. But the establishment of the wrong principle might in the end take private right and private property out of the guardianship of the law to put them at the mercy of the lobby. The Act altering the Goodhue Will was happily defeated by its own ambiguity, which enabled the Courts of Law to treat it as a nullity. In the present instance it is to be hoped that the Governor-General will be advised, before allowing the Act, to have the question fully argued. The truth is there ought to be no room for argument at all. The powers of the Local Legislature ought to have been clearly defined and limited by the written constitution. But we have often occasion to observe that the authors of the Confederation Act were men more versed in party management than in political jurisprudence. It would not be difficult to prove even that they had no very clear idea of the difference between National and Federal Government. They seem indeed to have been not above half conscious of the fact that it was a written constitution that they were framing, and that it was necessary explicitly to define all jurisdiction and to limit all powers. They fancied that they were only applying to Canada, with certain variations, the British Constitution, which they took to be something perfectly definite and well-known. The British Constitution is really nothing but a balance of power adjusted after a

long political struggle, and is incapable of furnishing distinct rules for other countries, though British experience may have given birth to invaluable maxims for the general conduct of Parliamentary Government.

—We are glad to see that the Government intends to prosecute the inquiry into the management of the Education Depository commenced by the Public Accounts Committee, though it would have been still better if the inquiry could have been prosecuted by the Committee itself. Not that we wish to see anything harsh done towards the officers of the establishment, whose practices may be almost said to have been carried on with the cognizance of the Government, which can hardly have failed to hear what everybody else heard. So far as anything of that sort is concerned, we should be well content to draw a veil over the past. What we wish is that future administrators of this and every department should have before them distinct proof of the results which follow, when a Government, especially such a Government as ours, usurps the business of a trader. Laxity and loss are the invariable concomitants of the system. As we write, there comes under our notice a report of an inquiry into the Dockyard at Portsmouth, resulting in the discovery that a quantity of gold-leaf, valued at £300, is missing from the storehouse. It further appears that no survey of the gold-leaf books in store, had been held for three or four years. The vigilance with regard to other stores is probably not greater than with regard to the stores of gold-leaf. We have more than once heard it remarked by competent authorities, that the expenditure on the British arsenals and dockyards generally is unaccountably large; and that the nation could build more cheaply in private yards, if it could afford to run the risk of being left, in extremity, without the means of building ships of war in its own hands. We cannot help remembering, by the way, that the absolute perfection of the Depository and the futility of inquiring into it were asserted as vehemently as the perfection of the Provincial system of Education is asserted now.

—They strangely mistake us who fancy that because we demur to Junto Government, we are hostile to local institutions. On the contrary, we set a value on them beyond, perhaps, that which is set upon them by our opponents, and anticipate for them an importance in the future which, so far as we are aware, nobody but ourselves does. The great experiment in Elective Government, which has now been going on for a century on the two continents, begins to yield definite results. One of these results is the futility of Second Chambers, which, according to the mode of their appointment, have either proved cyphers or brought on collisions and deadlocks. Another is, the vanity of relying on Party as the permanent basis of government. A third is, the difficulty, amounting almost to an impossibility, of the direct exercise by the people of the power of electing their representatives in Parliament. A common man knows his neighbours, and is able to choose among them with tolerable accuracy the one best qualified to manage the business of the neighbourhood: beyond this his personal power of choice hardly extends, still less does his power of inviting the man of his choice to come forward. Elect rightly he probably might, if he were let alone; but the difficulty lies in the nomination, though curiously enough the framers of constitutions have all overlooked this vital point, confining their attention to the election. The constituent cannot nominate; nor can the candidate well nominate himself; the worthiest, at all events, are pretty sure not to do it. The upshot is that the nomination, and virtually the election, falls everywhere into the hands of some ring, caucus or convention: the people lose their power of choice altogether, and their exercise of the suffrage becomes illusory: at all events, they are confined to an option between two parties. We are inclined to believe that the only possible mode of restoring any real power of choice to the people, and excluding the fell necessity of the caucus, is the introduction of graded elections. We do not mean the election of electors, as in the case of the American Presidency, which, of course at once leads to a mandate. We mean the election of

assemblies by assemblies, from the lowest local council up to the supreme legislature. In every case the suffrage might be really exercised, and at each step upwards we should come to a higher grade of intelligence and a larger capacity for extended choice. Nobody can doubt the immense superiority of the Senate of the United States to the House of Representatives, and it arises chiefly from the mode of election. If any system would call out the ability and integrity of the community, this would. We may wish that the people could exercise the highest franchise directly themselves, nominating and electing their representatives in the supreme legislature: but experience shows that they cannot, and the privilege, when given them, is little more than a name. This view will appear to some, perhaps, revolutionary, to others reactionary: we hold it firmly, however, and believe that in graded elections will some day be found the salvation of elective institutions.

—Gratitude is due to the Agricultural Commission, and the Government by which it was appointed, for the carefully prepared and well-digested Report which is now before us. If the inquiry has been expensive, it has probably covered its cost by the collection of information valuable to our farmers. On one point we should have liked the Report to be more explicit. The two most serious questions for this country at present, are the destruction of the forests and the exhaustion of the soil. On the second of these, we hoped the Agricultural Commission would reveal the truth, whatever it might be, and, if the danger was serious, sound a sharp note of warning, at the same time inculcating the use of the means necessary to restore fertility. In this we are disappointed. A good deal may be gleaned from the evidence of individual witnesses, and it points to a constantly decreasing yield as the general fact, and to the total exhaustion of a good many farms; the main cause being improvident farming, a secondary cause being the loss of shelter for the crops through clearing. But we have failed to find any

summing up of this class of evidence, or any collective expression of opinion by the Commission. Mr. Clarke, the late Principal of the Agricultural College, in his lecture before the Dominion Grange, was explicit enough both as to the fact and as to the danger. Canadian farms are rapidly running down, while those of England are more productive than ever, after being cropped for a thousand years.

—We are glad to find that we were not the first to suggest the institution of a Central Constabulary, and that the project had already commended itself to minds practically qualified to judge. It is useless to blink the fact that while our people, in the main, thanks to the justice of our polity and our system of public education, are law-loving in the highest degree, there are among us elements of a more turbulent kind: it must be so in every new country receiving constant additions to its population from, the restlessness and discontent of the Old World. Hence will arise calls for the occasional reinforcement of local authority beyond the measure of strength at all necessary for the country at large. We are also liable to party or sectional conflicts, especially between the Irish Catholics and the Orangemen, the repression of which can be safely entrusted only to a perfectly neutral and thoroughly disciplined force. Other dangers loom in the social and industrial future. Not many years ago, some of the chief manufacturing cities of the United States were the scene of a murderous and devastating insurrection of labour which threatened at one moment to spread through the Union and with which the ordinary police was unable to cope, while the militia in some districts proved totally ineffective. One has only to look at the Socialist and Nihilist demonstrations which are going on, to know that the source of such disturbances is far from being exhausted; and Canada, with a population identical, industrially, with that of the United States, and responsive to all the vibrations of American sentiment, cannot expect to enjoy immunity behind a mere political line. There

may well be need of a force such as, without in any way threatening public liberty, or the supremacy of the civil power, shall effectually confine everybody who wants to change the laws or the constitution of society to the use of freedom of speech and a free vote, putting pikes and dynamite out of the question. We do not know why there should be a question between the maintenance of such a force and the maintenance of the militia, while there is money to be lavished on the building of railways through Intercolonial and Lake Superior wilds. But, supposing that question to arise, we should say that the Central Constabulary is a necessity, while the maintenance of the militia on exactly the present scale is not. We know what is said about the social advantages of the militia; nor do we wish to disturb the impression, though on inquiry at the places where the camps are formed you will find a difference of opinion on the subject. In the possibility of war nobody now believes; but were war to come, we suspect the militia, to be a real defence of the country, must be far more highly trained and better provided with officers, and above all with non-commissioned officers, than it is at present. Military history, if its teachings may be trusted by those who have no practical acquaintance with these matters, seems to indicate that a soldier who does not know his trade is little better than any other man in the same condition, and that the difference between a half-trained militia and a mob, when placed on a field of battle, is that it takes about three rounds to reduce the former to the condition of the latter. The march of modern war is swift. In England there are a few crack Volunteer Corps which might perhaps be brought up to a high enough point of efficiency to take their place in the line before the war was over. But most of the corps, if we are not misinformed, are Rifle Clubs, excellent in that way, and highly available, no doubt, for service behind works. The social advantages of a Rifle Club are probably almost as great as those of a fortnight in camp once in every two years.

—The Montreal *Gazette*, alluding to the defeat of Mr. Nelson for the Mayoralty, says that, henceforth, every man who aspires to municipal honours ought to have *French Spoken Here*, written over his door. “Not so bad!” cries *Le Monde*, “this is the truth told in jest; at least so we hope.” The hope seems likely to be fulfilled, and the prospect of its fulfilment is a very serious feature in the political situation. French feeling, instead of departing, is growing more intense. So long as Quebec was a mere boulder of Old France, entirely unconnected with the France of modern times, the dissolution of a colonial nationality, sluggishly tenacious, rather than vigorous, and fed by no infusion of spirit from the mother country, seemed to be merely a question of time. It was sure to come, and likely to come with a rush, like the dissolution of the Gaelic nationality in the Scotch Highlands; like that of the Welsh nationality, which is rapidly going on in Wales. But now the connection with France, commercial, literary and social, has been renewed, and it is certain that to strengthen the bond will be henceforth an object of French ambition. Algeria is nothing but a garrison; Quebec is the only colony of France. Napoleon III., when he was prowling from house to house all along the row, laying his plans for future burglaries, made a little plant against Quebec, as well as against Louisiana; but before our turn came, he fell into the hands of justice. A revived New France will be beyond our powers of absorption. Fusion could hardly have failed to be facilitated by Legislative Union, and there are some who think that, if that bold measure had been ventured on, resistance would have been overcome; but no doubt the step would have been bold, especially as Nova Scotia was in so uncertain a mood. The time, however, is now gone by, and though there may be two Canadian nationalities, one French, the other English, there seems to be less ground than ever for hoping that the two will become one. The conquest of Quebec will have a curious epilogue. Imperialists must admit that the fashion of Empire, at all events, has changed. In former days, the Roman did as he pleased with

the conquered territory : in these days the conquered territory does as it pleases with the Roman.

— “ We seize this occasion,” says *Le Canadien*, “ to declare anew that a complete change is necessary in our provincial system of government. Agriculture and Colonization ought to be placed above political claims and intrigues. Of the large sums which we expend now towards these ends, half at least is thrown away. Our population needs instruction in agriculture, guidance, prompting, example. A good department organized on the same plan as the Council of Education, and directed by an able, practical and enthusiastic man, would in ten years change the face of Lower Canada.” We, of course, heartily concur with *Le Canadien* as to the end ; but *Le Canadien* will find itself constrained to concur with us in advocating the adoption of the necessary means. So long as in Provincial Government the party system continues to prevail, the maintenance of a party in power will and must be the chief aim of Government, and the object to which its energies and resources will be primarily devoted. To political claims and intrigues will be given the first place ; agriculture, colonization and the other real interests of the people will be matters of subordinate concern. This is not merely an accidental abuse, it is the inherent tendency of the system. That the change would be difficult, everything and everybody being steeped in party feelings and traditions as they are, is only too clear ; but it will have to be made, if the wish of *Le Canadien* is to be fulfilled, if the highest objects of Government are to be put first, and to get something better than the crumbs which fall from the party table. The Premier of Quebec has been shrinking from meeting the Legislature. Why ? Because, say competent observers on the spot, there are more hungry mouths than he has food wherewith to fill them, his store being further reduced by the necessity under which he has found himself of having Liberals in his Cabinet. Patronage is and, while the system lasts, will be the politics of Quebec.

— We never want to be foremost in broaching a scandal, least of all one affecting the judiciary. But we learned long ago, from a source of information which we deemed thoroughly trustworthy, and which was certainly untainted by party, that public justice in the young Province of Manitoba was receiving a sinister inauguration at the hands of its Chief Minister. We cannot agree, therefore, with those who confidently ascribe to malicious motives the petition for an inquiry into the conduct of Mr. Wood. His ability is, we believe, indisputable; but he had certain other peculiarities which more than cancelled that title, and his elevation was the meed of a service rendered to party in a struggle for place hardly more chivalrous than that rendered by Stanley on Bosworth Field. Considering how much the early rulers and judges of a community have it in their power to raise or lower the tone, both this appointment and that of another man of indisputable ability, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, must be deemed unfortunate. Both, no doubt, would be defended or excused on the ground of party necessity. We have so often drawn the moral ourselves that we may leave it, in this case, to be drawn by others. It seems the Chief-Justice is charged, among other things, with meddling in politics, than which a judge can do nothing more unbecoming or more pestilent. It may be worth consideration whether it would not be well to complete the severance of the Judiciary from the political arena by enacting that no one should be eligible to any political office within a certain time after having held a judgeship. If this would not eradicate the propensity of old politicians to stray into their favourite field of discussion on the Bench, it would, at all events, remove from them any direct temptation to keep up party connections, in the hope of being called back to political life. The example of Chief-Justice Chase, in the United States, warns us that no available safeguard ought to be left untried.

—Nova Scotia retrogrades in the matter of University Consolidation. A bill is introduced by the Government into the

Legislature to abolish the University of Halifax, and grant subsidies, against all principle, to half a dozen denominational Universities. Half a dozen Universities for four hundred thousand people means the lowest debasement of standard and the most wretched quality of instruction. The denominations which use their political influence to enforce the adoption of such a system in their own supposed interest are laying up for themselves wrath against the day of wrath. The passion for multiplying these places is like the passion for multiplying monasteries in the Middle Ages; and is likely to produce an analogous effect in taking men away from the work which they had better be doing. Graduates, of a poor kind, will be bred in excessive numbers. All the professions will be overstocked and then there will grow up a sort of literary proletariat, consisting of men drawn away from business and taught to consider themselves above common work, yet without means of subsistence, unhappy and often mischievous. There was a paragraph in one of the American journals the other day rejoicing over the number of new foundations. It seemed to us that a note of warning would have been more in place.

—The President's Inaugural will certainly bear comparison with any King's speech. In point of literary form it is excellent, and suggests that its author has studied the classics. The review of the past, with which it opens, is intended to place the supremacy of the Nation over the State on the adamantine basis of history. But, apart from this political object, we confess that we do not object to a moderate measure of Spread Eagle, executed, as President Garfield executes it, with good taste. To flatter the vanity of the people is mischievous, but it is necessary to keep up their hearts. If you want men to reform, you must make them feel that they have something worth reforming, and that in reform there is hope. Certain excellent critics are too exclusively critical; they would breed indifference or despair. We can pardon those who refuse to

attend to the homily when the preacher does not make it felt that he is heartily loyal to the Republic. On the Southern question, the language of the President is temperate but resolute, and he holds firmly by negro suffrage. Yet he admits the plea of danger from negro ignorance. Illiteracy is evidently to his mind the great peril of the Republic, not only in the South but everywhere. Perhaps he overrates both the gravity of this particular disease and the virtue of its special remedy, public school instruction. New England morality was not sustained by education alone, but by other supports, which are now being weakened by the break-up of belief. Education itself was probably in no small measure both created and sustained by the sense of religious duty, which led parents to take care that their children should be able to read the Bible. What is mainly needed, we suspect, is something to underpin morality till it again rests on some solid foundation, either of science or of renovated religion. On the Currency question, the President's position, in the main, is sound, and we rely upon his good sense, honesty and energy to defeat the tamperings of folly and roguery with this vital subject. We feel sure that he will show himself as firm and honourable as his predecessor, whose last act was to veto the attempt of a demagogue to make the nation break its faith, despoil the banks, and throw the commerce of the country into confusion. He will, however, have to learn, for his guidance in pending controversies, that Government, though it can by its stamp declare the weight and fineness of a coin, cannot declare the "value" of anything, and that to fix the value, whether positive or relative, of gold and silver by national or international legislation is just as impossible as to fix the value, positive or relative, of any other two commodities in the market. It is to be hoped that he will also be enabled to see that to have a double standard is to have no standard, and that the standard has not really been double, that of the great commercial nations having practically ruled the commercial world. Knowing the character of the man, we see in his words relating to the Civil Service the-

earnest of a vigorous attempt to do away with the spoils system. It is devoutly to be hoped that the influence of the Bosses may prove to have been sufficiently subdued to render feasible a substantial measure of reform. President Hayes probably did what he could; in the New York Custom House he appears to have done a good deal; but a doubtful title cripples the action of presidents as well as that of dynasties, and Mr. Hayes could never emancipate himself from his thralldom to the Boss. No misgiving about his own position will unnerve President Garfield when he puts his hand to the plough of Civil Service Reform. Denunciation of the wretched Mormons is a stock piece which could hardly have been omitted; but if half of what we are told is true, the revolt against the burdens of maternity is breeding in the moral East evils really more serious, and far more likely to be lasting, than the coarse reverie of these misguided peasants in the Far West. The President will find objects for his reforming energies more important and solid, though less ostentatiously moral, than harrying Utah.

Opinions on the new Cabinet, of course, vary with the party or section of the critic. To some it is a group of first-rate statesmen, to others it is "a litter of mice." To the better and more independent portion of the Republican party it appears to give decided satisfaction. One thing about it is clear: it is the President's own choice, not a slate made for him by Bosses. The cast is what we may call Conservative-Republican. Mr. Windom, who takes the place of Mr. Sherman, has not hitherto borne a high reputation for financial soundness; but he is acknowledged to have sagacity and integrity, which may be trusted to keep him right when he is in a responsible position and the questions are plainly put before him. Mr. Blaine is a brilliant politician: if he shows as much good sense, dignity and temper as Mr. Ewart in the management of foreign affairs he will do well. The most violent opponents of the Government hardly venture to deny that, on the whole, the Commonwealth is in safe hands.

A less illustrious record than that of the Democratic Congress few political assemblies have made. All the promises of cleansing the Augean stable have come absolutely to nothing; vindictive faction has only added to the pile of corruption and abuse. The Pension Arrears Bill was as profligate as any thing ever done amidst the waste of public money which attends the frenzy of civil war. It accused the patience of the American people, who can suffer their earnings thus to be squandered for the electioneering purposes of intriguing knaves. Attacks have been perpetually made on the currency, the national credit, the banks, the sound system of finance which was redeeming the public debt; and if the return of commercial prosperity, produced by the boundless resources and buoyant energies of the nation, could not be prevented, it has been as far as possible imperilled and retarded. It is, we presume, fear of the centralizing tendencies supposed to reside in the party which fought for the Union that still keeps good citizens in the Democratic ranks. We are told that the Democrats intend to reorganize their party on Free Trade. They cannot do this without losing a considerable section of their supporters at the North and some even at the South, where manufactures are beginning to take root. The reduction of the national debt will bring with it a reduction of taxation, and every reduction of taxation is a measure of Free Trade. But it is not likely that, of the import duties, the American people will be persuaded to take off first those levied on articles which they can manufacture at home.

—The prediction that the Parnellites would ally themselves with the Tories has been fulfilled, and a Tory has been elected for Coventry in place of a Liberal by the help of the Fenian vote. What Mr. Parnell wants, besides revenge, is to prevent the passing of a Land Bill, such as would allay the agrarian discontent which it is his object to keep in existence as the fuel of political disaffection. He avowed that he would have voted

against the Compensation Bill if he had not felt sure that it would be thrown out by the House of Lords, and he began to denounce the defects of the coming measure before its nature was known even to the members of the Government themselves. The appeal to Imperial sentiment against Home Rule, upon which the late Ministry went to the country, was preceded by attempts to make terms with the Home Rulers; and any one who has watched carefully the proceedings of the Conservative leader in the House of Commons must have seen that though he could not help lending his general support to measures against obstruction, he was quietly angling for the good will of the Obstructionists. The alliance, however, may prove costly: for it is evident that the English people generally are strongly roused both in support of the Union, for the destruction of which Mr. Parnell is invoking foreign aid, and in defence of the authority and character of Parliament. In one of those political novels, which are pamphlets in the form of fiction, Lord Beaconsfield has spoken of Parliament government as a rude contrivance, and he probably sees without agony the disorganization of the House of Commons. A Tory nobleman the other day was dilating on the comparative serenity and dignity of the House of Lords, to which, he said, the business of the nation might be entrusted much better than to the popular assembly. Sentiment of this kind is in the air. The aristocracy goaded, perhaps, by a sense of approaching doom, and swayed by leaders not really Conservative but Pseudo-Jacobite, has of late been playing a new and dangerous game. Formerly it was satisfied with obstructing liberal legislation to the utmost of its power, and the nation, satisfied that no measure of first rate importance could really be delayed for more than a few years, moodily bore with the prescriptive nuisance. But now instead of merely obstructing, the aristocracy has taken to active conspiring against, the nation. The Tory Reform Bill of 1867, the object of which was to array the ignorant and irresponsible populace against the intelligent tradesmen and mechanics, was a conspiracy in the most decided sense of the

term. A Home Rule alliance will be another move of the same kind. But it will hardly delude so many Radicals as, by its popular aspect, did the move of 1867. If Mr. Cowen goes into the lobby with the Tory-Fenian combination, he will probably go alone. In the sequel, the contrivers of the scheme will most likely find that they have precipitated that conflict between the aristocracy and the nation to which everybody in England is now beginning to look forward as an event of the near future. The Liberals have a majority in the House of Commons over the Tories and Home Rulers united. This majority will carry the Land Bill; but it will not be overwhelming, and the Lords will perhaps be emboldened, if not to throw out the Bill, which would be desperate policy, to reduce it to a nullity in Committee. Then must come a battle between the Commons and the Lords, with an appeal to the country on that issue. If the Whigs flinch, as possibly they may, there will be a final rupture between them and the Liberals. The Lords, in that case, may be victorious for the moment, but their victory will not last long.

It is fair to say, at the same time, that care has not been taken on the side of the Government to deprive the Irish party of any excuse for going over to the common enemy. The objects of the Irish are public, and, to large numbers of their countrymen, seem patriotic. That on the Land Question they have a grievance, is admitted by the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry and the promise of legislation: while their nationalist aspirations, however chimerical, must at least be understood by every liberal and comprehensive mind. A suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act is hateful in itself to all the friends of freedom; they can be reconciled to it only by the necessity of putting an end to the reign of terror established by the League. Right feeling and wisdom, alike, required that a studious abstinence from anything like a display of passion, above all from insult, should accompany the prompt adoption and firm execution of the measures necessary to the restoration of a reign of law. Of this Mr. Forster showed himself mindful, and his speech,

when he brought in the Coercion Bill, was all that could be desired in point of tone. But his example has not been followed by the Home Secretary, who, seeing public feeling strongly roused against the Irish, has exultingly given the reins to his platform genius, and poured upon Mr. Parnell and his associates a torrent of gibes and insults, the memory of which will rankle when the Coercion Bill and the Arms Act are forgotten. A man will never forgive you for branding him, in stinging words, amidst the cheers of a great assembly, as a coward. The attack of Wedderburne on Franklin, with its well-known sequel, teaches a lesson to the masters of invective, which in the swing of rhetorical success they seldom heed. Louis XI., who was given to cutting remarks, said of his tongue that it did him a great deal of mischief, but that it also gave him a great deal of pleasure. Perhaps the Home Secretary would say the same. If he has laid up for himself stores of deadly hatred, he has at all events revelled in applause.

—We shall soon know what the Land Bill is. It will probably be none the better for the reaction which the conduct of the Irish leaders has created against their cause. Yet we expect from Mr. Gladstone no weak measure. For our part we shall deem the Bill successful just in proportion as it removes or prepares the way for removing that which is the root of these troubles, the existence of a class of native tenant farmers on one side, and a class of alien landlords on the other. Mere alterations of the respective rights of the two parties will not preclude the renewal of the land war in the future. It would be hard upon the English people to be taxed for the purpose of purchasing for the tenant farmer in Ireland the freehold of his farm, and resistance would almost certainly be offered to any proposal of that kind. Government advances are perilous; because the Government would thus be placed in the position of a creditor towards an immense number of hostile and excitable people. But the Irish farmers, it appears, in many

cases save money, and if they would save for anything it would be for the purchase of their freehold by instalments, supposing that privilege were to be granted them. At all events, if the English landlord is left, no matter with what reduction of his rights, the source of future agitation will be left with him. Political necessity is the justification, and the sole justification, for these exceptional measures. The unhappy relations of the proprietary to the tenants have been made more than ever manifest by this crisis. It is clear that, as a rule, they have no hold whatever on the minds of their tenantry, but are compelled, when a quarrel breaks out, to throw themselves helplessly on the protection of the Government. No doubt there are in Ireland some of the best landlords in the world; those who try to do their duty under such circumstances are sure to be picked men. As little can it be questioned that there is on the other side a great deal of blarney, bluster, imposture and tendency to live by the trade of agitation. Yet the general nature of the evil is unmistakable, and the only effectual cure will be one which puts an end to the divided ownership of the land.

—“The Irish people” is a phrase continually in the mouths of speakers on the Parnellite side of the question. But the truth is that the people of Ireland are now divided into five sections, not only separate but mutually antagonistic. First there are the Liberals, who taking the Union as an irreversible fact, seek to establish perfect justice and equality, together with as large a measure of self-government for Ireland as the legislative union will permit. This party includes not a few Catholics, ardently devoted to their Church as well as to their country, of whom the present Irish Chancellor is an excellent specimen. In the second place there are the Tories and Orangemen, who desire the maintenance of the Union, but want, in place of justice and equality, as much ascendancy as they can manage to retain in this evil generation, while to any extension of self-

government which would cut off the root of ascendancy they are with good reason opposed. In the third place there are the Home Rulers, who wish to reduce the Union to a mere federation, giving Ireland a Parliament of her own, but leaving her in nominal allegiance to the British Crown. In the fourth place there are the Fenians, who wish to dissolve the Union altogether, either by insurrection, which is the aim of the Fenians proper, or by rendering the connection intolerable to England, which apparently is the aim of Mr. Parnell. In the fifth place there is the priest party, which desires only to keep the Isle of Saints under the dominion of the priest and of Rome, and is divided between its desire to court popularity by identifying itself with the agrarian movement, and its horror of the Fenian tendency to connect the Irish cause with the Atheistic Republicanism of France. Cut Ireland loose tomorrow, and Irish factions would be at each other's throats. The Fenians might well enlist the sympathy of a friend of national independence if they commanded, or had any prospect of commanding, forces adequate even to the commencement of their enterprise. As they have not, a practical well-wisher to Ireland will surely look to the Liberals as the best champions of her interest.

Another false notion is that the Irish are fighting for some communistic principle in regard to the ownership of land. Nothing can be further from the truth. The aim of the Irish tenant farmer is not to make his land common or to assert the right of the whole people to it, but to have it entirely to himself. He wants to dispossess the landlord, but by no means himself to be dispossessed. Go to him when he has become the sole owner; tell him that there can be no such thing as private or exclusive ownership of the soil, and see what answer you will get. It may be added that when he employs hired labour, as in many cases he does, there is not a more close-fisted master in the world. Communistic sympathy bestowed upon the Land Leaguers would therefore be totally misbestowed. It was natural, however, that from the boiling cauldron of agrarian discontent in Ireland, a steam of fantastic theories should arise.

The land, we are told, "is given to the people, like air and water, as their own." No doubt it is, and it is of no more value than air and water till it has been reclaimed and tilled; to be reclaimed and tilled it must be appropriated, since nobody will pull up pine stumps for the benefit of the world at large. Nor does it matter whether the appropriation is to an individual owner, a phalanstery, or a whole community, for in each case it is ownership, and shuts out the rest of mankind. Not only in a farm but in every article which we use, however manifestly the creation of human labour, there is something in the way of raw material and natural forces originally given by Providence; in a coat there is the wool which Providence makes to grow on the sheep, and the mechanical forces which move the loom. What farmer would continue to hold the plough if he were told that he had no more interest in his land than in the lake or the sky? The house of every mechanic in Toronto stands on soil which would be liable to confiscation like the rest. The theory that people have the right to multiply without limit on the land is a physical absurdity; when all the land has been taken up, some of them must go further afield.

—We cited the Anti-Corn Law League as an example of lawful agitation in contrast to the Irish Land League. But attempts are made to turn the contrast into a parallel and a precedent. They are futile. The Anti-Corn Law League had no secret organization; it practised no terrorism; it never instigated outrage; it never hinted at rebellion; it never solicited foreign aid; it never obstructed in the House of Commons; it only roused opinion and marshalled electoral forces. There was much suffering, and much bitterness of feeling as the consequence; but this was not the work of the League. There was violence, but it was exhibited by operatives against mill-owners, and the League itself was a mill-owners' association. Bright and Cobden were wholly incapable of taking part in conspiracy. We must own, however, that the history even of this League

betrays the evils which attend agitation, shows its tendency to transfer a question from the domain of reason to that of passion, and warns us against employing it in any but extreme cases, such as the flagrant denial of justice by a dominant interest, or the persistence of government in a course of policy which leads to an iniquitous war. How bad is the air engendered, was shown in the memorable affray between Peel and Cobden in the House of Commons, the account of which has been published, as illustrative of the present controversy by the *Pall Mall Gazette*, in the form of an extract from Mr. John Morley's forthcoming "Life of Cobden." The account also illustrates in some degree the difficulty which a biographer has in being just to the opponents of his hero, for it certainly is not quite just to Peel. On the last of five nights of hot debate Cobden allowed himself to denounce Peel as "individually responsible" for the state of the country and for the scarcity among the people of the necessaries of life. Peel, as might have been expected, pounced fiercely on the expression; but he did not say, nor did his words, taken in their natural sense, imply, that he accused Cobden of instigating assassination; he accused him only of using personal denunciation at a dangerous time, which could hardly be denied. The furious cheers of Peel's party, perhaps, gave a more sinister significance to the emphasis which he laid on the word; and, in the storm which followed, both champions went further than either of them would have gone in a calm. To hold a man up to public hatred as individually responsible for the sufferings of the people at such a time as that is surely the way to make him extremely angry, if he is capable of being so; and Peel was capable of being extremely angry, though his fire was usually under strict control. We cannot think it just to register against Peel's memory, as a calm and impartial judgment, a passage written by Cobden before his resentment had cooled, and containing such words as "hypocrite" and "coward." Peel was reserved, cautious, astute, as in the part in which fortune had placed him he had need to be; but he was no hypocrite; and though nervously sensitive to pain and dan-

ger, as men of fine intellect usually are, he was very far from being a coward, for one of his weaknesses was his propensity to duelling. The two men were heartily reconciled: Peel paid Cobden a thoroughly generous tribute; and, after the repeal of the Corn Laws, Cobden besought Peel to remain Minister, promising him his cordial support. Statesmen are men, and there are some occasions on which we could wish that reporters were not present. But it is about time that a "Life of Peel" should be written.

—To the shame of British civilization and religion, the attack upon Mr. Bradlaugh and upon the civil rights of his constituents goes on, and has been technically successful in a Court of Law. The ringleaders are scamps, putting forward religion as a pretext for political persecution. It is Sandwich over again denouncing Wilkes for impiety. Set a coronet on Mr. Bradlaugh's head, give him a large fortune, make him a Tory in politics, and though he were the most offensive of atheists, and the most profligate of debauchees to boot, he would have these crusaders at his feet. Christianity has nothing to do with the proceedings of such men: the Gospel no more bids you rob an unbeliever of his rights as a citizen than it bids you pick his pocket or commit adultery with his wife. If Parliament allows a fine to be levied on Mr. Bradlaugh for taking the seat to which he had been duly elected, it will undergo a far greater disgrace than any that can be inflicted on it by Obstruction. To the argument of the Exclusionists, that Parliament may have to legislate for the State Church, the answer is, first, that Parliament notoriously swarms with unbelievers in Christianity already; and secondly, that the maintenance of a State religion has now become a wrong, and that one wrong does not justify another.

—While struggling with the Irish question, the Eastern question, and the Afghan question, the British Government has

suddenly become involved in one still more momentous and dangerous—the question of the Tartan. Civilized men jealously cherish any relic of barbarism which makes them interesting and picturesque. The elegant and elaborate dress, however, now worn by the Highland regiments, by Highland chiefs—many of them bred on the heathery wilds of Charing Cross—in grouse-shooting, and at fancy balls, can hardly be called a relic of barbarism: it is unquestionably modern, and is reputed to be the tasteful device of an English tailor. The loose blanket or plaid which is the usual dress of the savage, when he has left off skins, and serves as his covering by night as well as by day may, in Scotland, have been of gaudy colours, and, perhaps, of a check pattern; but the distinct clan checks are of late origin, and it is mere conjecture that they were adopted for the purpose of distinguishing regiments in the wars of Montrose and Dundee. Mr. Burton has remarked that the Highland chiefs of early times are represented on their tombs at Iona, and other burial places, in the costume of a Norman or English knight, that having been the garb of a gentleman, while the plaid was as much as possible the reverse. There has, perhaps, seldom been a more laughable scene than there was when George IV., arrayed in a Highland dress, which he took to be that of the whole Scotch nation, found himself confronted by Sir William Curtis, the fat London Alderman, arrayed so as to form his Majesty's exact double. The Government, however, without going into the antiquarian controversy, has wisely retained the fancy dress, and the danger of a Scotch repeal movement is averted. Yet Ireland may point to the jealousy with which Scotland asserts her nationality and the prompt deference which is paid to her claims.

--In the Transvaal matter the most important question of all was, what temper would be shown by the English people; for the progress of Jingoism had begun seriously to threaten the existence of England as a moral power. It is reassuring to see that though, among the rabble of Metropolitan Music Halls,

there has been a cry for slaughter, equity and humanity have almost everywhere else prevailed. Nobody can doubt that England, by putting forth her power, could have crushed the Boer resistance like an eggshell; but she would have stained her own hands with blood which all the waves she rules would never have washed out. Few people want to have this case argued again. If Sir Theophilus Shepstone really believed that the Boers wished to be annexed, why did he not, instead of being content with the signatures at the foot of a petition, take regular means of ascertaining the consent of the whole people? Who can doubt what occurred? Aggrandizement ruled the hour, and a magnificent project for a South African Empire had been conceived. Just at this moment, we are asked to believe, of the two communities whose territories were wanted for the fulfilment of the scheme, one afforded a cause of war and the other petitioned for annexation. Can any one fail to see in so happy a coincidence either the finger of Providence or the zeal of a Colonial Satrap playing up to the Jingo government at home? That the Boers are coarse, and have been cruel in their dealings with the natives, is true; but everybody at the Cape has been cruel, or more than cruel, in dealing with the natives. The Kaffir wars were marked by nameless atrocities; and it seems the Basutos have no objection to allying themselves with the Boers. This, however, is not the question; Naboth may have faults, but they do not warrant you in taking possession of his vineyard. The various hypotheses which attribute the Boer rising to Russian intrigue, to Dutch intrigue, to Fenian intrigue, to Portuguese intrigue, to Mr. Gladstone's Midlothian speeches, 'may safely be discarded in favour of the simpler one, that these people took up arms in defence of the independence, the love of which had led them out into the wilderness. But it is true that the struggle has awakened everywhere, and drawn to a head, the dormant feeling of hostility to England. If she has an enemy, he eagerly does what he can to spur on and back up the Boers. The English people have received a pregnant

lesson, and one which they will probably lay to heart, on the dangers attending a disturbance in a remote dependency, as well as on those attending the adoption of a policy of world-wide aggrandizement by a nation which is not a military power. We had just written this when the news arrived of a great English victory, a victory of the nobler England over the less noble. All Englishmen who know what the honour of England means, will pray that the settlement may close, not only the war with the Boers, but the whole series of a great country's little wars.

—A resolution of the House of Lords against the Evacuation of Candahar, though carried by an unusual majority, is totally disregarded both by the Government and the Nation. It is well understood that the Lords hope, by stimulating the people to military adventure, to divert their attention from political reforms. The triumph of moderate policy has no doubt been aided by the bill brought in for the excursion in quest of a scientific frontier which, instead of two millions sterling, the estimated cost, is found to amount to twenty millions. The Russophobists point out that the correspondence between the Russian Envoy and the Ameer took place after the treaty of Berlin. It is true, but the Russophobists must bear in mind that the Treaty of Berlin was followed, not only by an unabated torrent of invective and menace against Russia, but by the disclosure of a defensive alliance between England and Turkey, for the military purposes of which Cyprus was placed in England's hands. Suppose the cession of Alaska had been accompanied by the disclosure of a defensive alliance between the United States and Russia, would not British diplomacy have "intrigued" for support in all quarters of the globe? That British aggrandizement is moral, while the aggrandizement of any other power is felonious, may be a faith acceptable to Englishmen, but it is one which the other Powers can hardly be expected to embrace. A new light is thrown upon this.

history by the statement of the Russian Ambassador, Count Schovaloff, that Lord Beaconsfield admitted to him that what Russia had done was all fair play, at the same time complaining that his own hand had been forced in the matter of Afghanistan by the precipitation of the Indian Government. A paragraph has appeared in the English journals stating that this is a misapprehension on the part of Count Schovaloff; but the paragraph is unsigned, and the misapprehension is remarkable. There is a certain humiliation, no doubt, in the retirement of the Eagles, but the blame must rest on those who have advanced them in insensate raids. The neutral zone, which the wisest, the most experienced, the most valiant councillors of England have always advised her to respect, is now, as far as possible, restored.

—At last Gambetta's foot is evidently on the steps of power. He declares his foreign policy. France is to be, as of old, a steadfast and powerful partaker in the Councils of Europe. It is to be hoped that nothing more is meant; but we cannot forget that Gambetta's character as a statesman was moulded in a war which his ambition prolonged when it was hopeless, doubling the loss of France. It is hardly possible that he should be free from the desire of self-vindication and revenge. Probably he will become Prime Minister, not President, of the Republic, the Presidency being a constitutional kingship, filled to admiration by Grevy. Gambetta declares that he has never pulled the wires of the Ministers: technically perhaps not, but in reality they have known his will, and been constrained to do it. His path to the highest place is now clear. Whichever of the modes of voting is adopted, that by small or that by large districts, though in the large districts the personal influence of local magnates may be more completely merged, the result is sure to be in favour of the Republic and of Gambetta. Political opposition to the Republic for the present seems to have died away. Legitimism hovers, a pale spectre on the

verge of extinction, appealing in vain to the priest, who is above fidelity and gratitude, and for whose support none need look but the strong. Henry V. ought to remember that Rome, for a sufficient price, consented to anoint the atheist Napoleon I., when he was reeking with the murder of the Duc d'Enghien. To the Bonapartist cause, as the most hopeful, the Church inclines. But the head of that cause is the Jacobinical Plon-plon, the avowed enemy of priests. Real substitute for its lost Pretender it has none. Its old liegemen, the prefects and colonels of the Empire, are fast disappearing from the scene. It has only two remaining sources of strength, the Napoleonic myth embodied in the lying pages of Thiers, and the column on the Place Vendome.

In the social transition of France from Old to New, which is going on beneath the political perturbations, lies the interest of the French situation. In the expulsion of the Jesuits, the main object was not to be rid of political intrigue, but to hand over education and the training of the citizen finally from clerical to secular hands; and the absence of popular resistance to the measure seems to show that the hour was come. Gambetta would say that society was being transferred from the theological to the scientific basis: we should venture to add the qualification that the scientific basis may prove after all to be theological also, though not after the fashion of Suarez. All the more significant is the rejection of M. Naquet's Bill legalizing Divorce. Whatever may be the state of things in Paris, in France at large domestic affection is strong, and home is still sacred and beautiful. At last the Family makes a stand, and this in an assembly which cannot be accused of reaction or of superstition. It is well, at all events, that the world should give itself time for reflection, and that it should resolve to have this question settled by reason, not by a gush of sentiment. It may possibly be found that the family, like the tribe, has done its part in the development of humanity, and that its use-

fulness has ceased; that for an indissoluble union making of twain one flesh, with perfect community of interests, and a head exercising over the other members the guardianship of affection, there ought now to be substituted what the Women's Righters call the married co-partnership, with liberty of dissolution at pleasure, or on grounds of mere convenience, without a head, without community of interest, political or legal, so that there shall be nothing to prevent the partners from confronting each other on the hustings, or appearing as plaintiff and defendant in a court of law. But while some think that this would be an improvement, no one can doubt that it would be a fundamental change, a change more fundamental than any political revolution. Towards this consummation, however, as well as towards a general subversion of what is decried as "the limitation of sex," a crowd of social innovators, headed and inspired by Mr. Mill, have been actively working, and they have been aided by a number of legists, willing, perhaps, to create a new class of separate interests, as well as to improve the law. The chief arguments for innovation have been cases of cruelty on the part of husbands, by which communities and legislatures have allowed themselves to be taken by storm, without considering that there was only one of these cases for thousands in which the wife had been cherished and made happy by the union; that they occurred almost exclusively in the degraded classes and among those classes would hardly be prevented by any loosening of the marriage tie. The misconduct is often as much on one side as on the other, though only on the side of the stronger can it take the palpable form of violence. Instances of cruelty practised by women on children, especially on step-children and female apprentices, are too common, and only a small proportion of them probably comes to light, since a child seldom makes its complaint heard. Yet nobody has proposed, on this account, to alter the constitution of the household, or to take children out of the keeping of their mothers. The other day we had a curious incident in an English Court. A man had a young and dashing wife, with

whom he was desperately in love, but whose extravagance got him into debt. To find means for her expenditure, the pair took to coining. The wife was just as guilty as the husband, yet, when they were detected, the husband took all on himself, and deposed that his wife had acted under his compulsion. Alone he bore five years of imprisonment. On leaving prison, he found his wife living with another man. He besought her to return to him; she put it off, pretending that she could only get rid of her connection gradually, and he supplied her with money out of his earnings to enable her to do this. By way of requiting his love, she appointed a meeting, slipped a bag, into which she had put counterfeit coin, into his hands, informed against him to the nearest policeman as an utterer of base money, had him arrested, and was very near getting him removed out of her way and that of her paramour by a second sentence which would have practically amounted to imprisonment for life. To say that such behaviour is characteristic of wives would be the most infamous of libels; yet for the wife put the husband, and the story effectively told would suffice, in conjunction, perhaps, with a little interviewing, to make a thoughtless Legislature rush into some legislative attack upon the Family. When the Mother of Revolutions cries halt, the world in general may surely pause.

—Some Communist exultations over the murder of the Czar have shocked the ear of humanity; it was best that they should be heard, and that it should be known what is in the hearts of men. On the whole, the judgment of civilization has been distinctly pronounced. For tyrannicide, in the ancient and proper sense of the word, a strong case may be made. When a man like the first or second Bonaparte, intrusted with the national force, uses that force to crush the liberties of the nation, and to make himself a despot, placing himself by the same act above the reach of public justice, what can the commonwealth do but arm the hands of private citizens? The Roman law,

under which Cæsar fell, outlawing and devoting to death whoever should attempt to usurp supreme power, whether political or not, can hardly be called a breach of morality. A Frenchman who had shot down Louis Napoleon on the day of the *coup d'état* might well have been deemed by his countrymen a patriot, and if he had lost his own life, a martyr. But Alexander II. was not a usurper; he was exercising no powers but those which had lawfully descended to him, and which the overwhelming majority of his people, if called upon to vote, would have confirmed; for no Russian peasant has learned to desire any government but the paternal despotism of his Czar. Nor was he a tyrant, but, on the contrary, if his reign is fairly viewed as a whole, one of the greatest reformers and philanthropists who ever sat on a throne, though at the close, like our Edward III. sinking after his glories into dotage and the arms of Alice Perrers, he, after achievements higher than victories, declined into a pitiable decrepitude under the influence of a vile woman. As little do his murderers deserve to be styled defenders of public liberty. That at which they aim is not freedom or constitutional government, but the destruction of the State and all human institutions, political, social and domestic, the subversion of morality, and the supremacy of evil instead of good. Their dominion, if they could obtain power, would be the most savage and the most brutalizing tyranny ever endured by man; it would be a repetition of the French Reign of Terror on the most enormous scale. The world has had foretastes of it in the reign of the Commune at Paris and that of the Implacables at Carthage. The means are such as could be employed only by a Satanic power, as, in fact, Nihilism avows itself to be. According to the most careful inquirers the best of the Nihilists are dreamers; the mass are of the class, found in all countries, which prefers conspiracy to honest labour; there are among them not a few villains who have recently been turned out of the public service for theft; and with these are said to be mingled Jews, devoid of patriotism however perverted, and striking for some malignant or interested object of

their own. Let those who feel disposed to speak lightly of these atrocities remember that the power of secret organization and dynamite is not confined to the killing of Czars; they may be employed to establish a Reign of Terror over any community and for any purpose, as not long ago, at Ravenna, a secret brotherhood of assassins, whose objects were private malice and lucre, held the whole city in awe. It would take very little to turn an Irish Land League, or such a fraternity as set on foot the Pittsburgh riots, into a conspiracy after the Nihilist pattern which would overawe society, paralyze authority, and fill all the paths of life with fear. The part of a power of evil has in itself a fiendish fascination for certain morbid and depraved minds of the Brinvilliers type. Nor can any limit be put to this kind of warfare: if Nihilism is to be licensed to use the dagger against kings, kings must be licensed to defend themselves by the same means, and Europe will be turned into an arena of assassins. Fair and open agitation for any lawful object and to any needful extent let us have by all means; but civilization cannot afford to dally with Thuggee.

What is the character and what are the intentions of the new Czar? For Europe there is at this juncture no more momentous question. In his portraits there is a good deal of the Bear, but his manifesto breathes peace, renunciation of aggrandizement, and internal reform. To internal reform there is good reason for believing the Czar to be disposed, if Nihilism will let him alone. In any case, a revolution of some kind in Russia is coming, and coming under circumstances which will make it a subject of special interest. It can hardly be democratic. The making of a democracy, in the proper sense of the term, is not there. Democracy is the child of the city, and in Russia only a very small proportion of the population lives in cities, the mass being peasants, thoroughly agricultural in character as well as by calling, ignorant, superstitious, simple-minded, and still devoted to their earthly God, the Czar. Democracy is the tendency of aggregated masses; while the eighty or ninety millions of Russia are sparsely scattered over a large

portion of two Continents. Nor is there the exciting cause which, in the case of the French Revolution, stimulated the uprising of the middle classes generally against aristocracy; for, apart from the oppressiveness of the official hierarchy, mere nobility of birth does not seem to have made itself offensive, or to be an object of hatred in Russia. The Russian Revolution will probably be anti-bureaucratic. Peter, called with doubtful justice the Great, fancied with the usual presumption of an autocrat, that he could change, by the word that went out of his despotic mouth, the character of his nation. The character of his nation he did not change, though he forced the people to cut off their beards: if anything, he and the vain-glorious Catharine altered national character for the worse by confirming serfage, and allowing it to be converted into downright chattel slavery, by way of payment to the nobles for services exacted of them by the State. The people remained just as semi-barbarous and as semi-Asiatic as ever. But the government was turned into a pseudo-European bureaucracy, civil and military, on an enormous scale, practising an administrative science imported from abroad, and officered, to a considerable extent, by Germans and other foreign adventurers. Between the bureaucracy and the people there has remained a great gulf. The bureaucratic government has drawn no life-blood from the nation; it has never been under the controlling and purifying influence of public opinion; it has had nothing to counteract its vicious tendencies but the vigilance of the Czar, whose vision could not embrace everything, even if his eyes had not been bandaged by the sycophancy which surrounded his person. The inevitable results have been red-tapism, inefficiency, jobbery, and corruption. The first signal break down was in the Crimean War, the disastrous result of which utterly discredited the system of "The Iron Czar;" but the failure of the commissariat, and of the administration generally, as well as of the Grand Ducal strategy, in the war with Turkey, was equally signal, though the dogged valour of the Russian peasant redeemed the faults of his gov-

ernment and his commanders. The general good temper of the people, and the absence of any bitter hatred between large classes, are favourable features of the situation. The most dangerous feature, perhaps, is the total want of political experience among the reformers, who, having derived their ideas entirely from foreign books, read without due allowance for variety of circumstances, displayed, in the burst of progressive philanthropy at the beginning of Alexander's reign a doctrinairism of the most visionary kind, from which they are probably not yet free. Eyes long accustomed to the darkness of the despotic dungeon are sure to be dazzled when first brought into contact with the light. Nihilism has moreover, among its other pestilent effects, disgusted, alarmed, and paralyzed the genuine Reform party. In framing a Constitution, difficulties would also be presented, by the ignorance of the masses, by the vast extent of the territory over which they are scattered, and by the presence among the subjects of the Czar of a large non-Russian element, both European and Asiatic, including the irreconcilable Poles. Evidently, another reproduction of the British Constitution would, in this case, be out of place. Open councils, freedom of opinion, personal liberty, gradual reduction of the bureaucracy, and relaxation of the military *régime*, are the practical objects at which reform ought to aim. The Czar alone can hopefully take the initiative, because to him alone the masses of the people still look.

—The Jewish question, in its course, fires trains of historical as well as political controversy. Mr. Lucien Wolf, editor of the *Jewish World*, in an article on the subject in the *Nineteenth Century*, ascribes any defects there may be in the character of his people to "the demoniacal attitude of Christianity." Mr. Wolf avows that he writes under the influence of "an all-consuming indignation," and this is a frame of mind which, however generous, is not favourable to a calm estimate of history. Is Christianity accountable for the original tendencies of the Semitic

race, for the perfidy of the Carthaginian, for the propensity of the Phœnician to cheating and kidnapping? Is Christianity accountable for those special features of Jewish character which were already noted by the Pagan satirist Juvenal, at a time when, instead of being the victim of Christian persecution, the Jew was persecuting the Christian? Is Christianity accountable for the peculiarities contracted by a parasitic race, without a country of its own, wandering over the earth to suck up by usury the earnings of other nations? Mr. Montagu Samuel, another Jewish writer, in his "Jewish Life in the East," frankly admits that his people, even in their original seat, are "infected with that dislike for manual labour which forms at once the strength of their upper, and the destruction of their lower, classes." When people are infected with a dislike for manual labour, who can prevent them from descending to disreputable trades? Among the instances of the demoniacal conduct of Christianity given by Mr. Wolf, is the conduct of Christian rulers in forbidding the Jews to hold Christians as slaves. This, he says, prevented the Jews from competing successfully in agricultural pursuits. That the Jew should work with his own hands was, of course, out of the question. The Christian, ensnared by his money power, must be his bondsman and toil for him. His aim in Germany is to make the German his hewer of wood and drawer of water, while he draws the wealth to himself by his financial craft. We now understand the quarrel of the Christian Socialist with the Jew; and see that there is a social and economical ground for it, irrespective of religion.

Men are hardly ever "demoniac," nations never. Christian communities of the Middle Ages were in an early stage of civilization and could no more help it than the germ can help not being a plant. They were organized, equally in accordance with the tendencies of the period, on the basis of a national religion, and they were engaged, at the time when the feeling against the Jews was most strongly shown, in a struggle with Islam, which threatened to overflow the West with its

conquering hordes, and to substitute its gross militarism, its despotism, its fatalism, its polygamy, and its filthiness for what must be pronounced, apart from theological questions, to have been a far higher and more moral state of society. The Crusades, like the Mahometan conquest, were tainted with fanaticism; but they saved Christendom, with all the germs and all the hopes that it bore in it; and we cannot take part with the Jews and their Agnostic supporters in flinging dirt on the stately tombs of the Crusaders, who gave up home, lordship, and all material objects, to die on Syrian sands for the highest cause they knew. Religious liberty had not then been born; but the priests from whom our mediæval ancestors learned the duty of persecution themselves learned it from the Jewish books, which prescribe the wholesale massacre of the people of idolatrous cities, and punish with death by stoning the worship of strange gods, blasphemy, Sabbath breaking, and every kind of offence against religion. The most hideous of all Christian superstitions—witch burning—flowed from the same source. On these communities the Jew, an alien and a religious enemy, thrust himself in quest of gain; he ground the people with usury, and provoked their hatred fully as much in this way as as by antagonism to their religion. The consequences were for ever deplorable; but they were perfectly natural, and by no means prove that the Christians of the Middle Ages were demons. Let a number of aliens, no matter of what race or creed, thrust themselves into any nation in the same stage of progress and condition as mediæval Christendom then was, and the same sad results will follow.

On the other hand, Mr. Wolf may with justice say that the attempts of Christian Churches to convert the Jews, though well meant, and proofs of a feeling anything but demoniac, have been injudicious, and may well have seemed to the Jews insulting. The Jew, instead of being the best, is the worst of all subjects for missionary enterprise; because his religion, instead of being a matter of opinion and thus assailable by argument, is a matter of race, as is most plainly avowed by Mr.

Wolf, who takes his stand decisively on the anti-social and anti-national principle of non-intermarriage. The difficulty is in some respects even greater than it is in a case of caste. Millions probably have, by this time, been squandered on the Jewish Missions, the fruits of which have been absurdly scanty, and sometimes far from edifying. Rousseau's Jew, who goes about being converted, and each time getting money as a neophyte, is no mere creature of the fancy. Nor can there be anything in the theological sphere less worthy of exceptional interest than a creed which, having been once spiritual and tended to be universal, has sunk back into a religion of race; any embers less likely to repay fanning than those of a Judaism from which the fire of David and the prophets has departed: any people less chosen than that, which of all others, has most signally and steadfastly rejected the Gospel of Humanity. As though there were not difficulty enough in the relations between the Christian nations and the two tribes, excellent persons devote their lives to a search for the other ten, which, no doubt, blended with the Semitic populations, into the midst of which they were carried captive, but which a pious fancy discovers now in Afghanistan, now in Wales. This hunt for the ten tribes appears lately to have formed a singular union with Jingoism, under the name of Anglo-Israel. The Anglo-Saxons, it seems, were Jews, who having found it agreeable to transfer themselves to a cooler abode on the shore of the German Ocean, left off long noses, threw the books of Moses into the sea, took to the worship of Woden, and became a nest of corsairs. Nothing less than the resumption of the long noses will convince us of the fact. It may be hoped that, after the explanations of the real nature of Judaism which these occurrences have called forth, the waste of money and energy on Jewish missions will abate. Let the religion of the Jew be simply treated with respect and left unassailed: surrounding influences will act upon it in course of time.

It is also to be hoped that the Christian communities will be led seriously to consider the still more important question

whether it is right any longer to read the Jewish scriptures promiscuously in churches, or to commend them in the mass as divine oracles to the unlearned people. It must be obvious to all that scandals and dangers result from the practice. Such passages as those relating to the destruction of the heathen Canaanites and the occupation of their land ; to the treatment of Gentiles generally ; to the tortures inflicted by David, "the man after God's own heart," on prisoners of war ; to the punishment of misbelief or religious perversion with death ; to the execution of witches ; to the use of the ordeal ; to acts of patriarchs, deemed moral in a primitive state, but which are now moral no longer ; and even many of those relating to a religious system of ceremony, sacrifice, and vicarious atonement, ought surely to be removed from the lectionary. This is the arsenal of the Ingersolls, and most formidable are the projectiles which it contains. The passages do not shock or mislead the critic, versed in antiquities and the comparative philosophy of history, who recognises in them relics of the tribal state, while he notes the broadening stream of spiritual sentiment which makes its way through them, till at last it issues in Christianity. But the uncritical they must shock or mislead ; that they have had the latter effect is terribly apparent from the annals of Christendom. Bishop Colenso, and not he alone of Christian divines, has openly recoiled from them ; Dean Mansel exhausted his sophistry in trying to reconcile our moral sense to them, and exhausted it in vain. No part of the Old Testament ought any longer to be treated as a part of Christian teaching which is not really cognate to Christianity.

—Philanthropy says that war is an evil ; when she is hopeful, she says that some day it will cease. Moltke denies not only the second proposition but the first. The conquering hero sees the bright side of war. The dark side is seen by one who visits a field hospital after a battle, or a country through which an invader has just marched. In primitive times, human

nature being what it is, war may have been indispensable as an agency of natural selection and as a meter out of the bounds of nations, though there is just now a disposition to embrace hastily necessarian theories of this kind. In more civilized times, it has been the school of certain virtues, courage, chivalry and even, in its own despite, of humanity : but it has also infused and is infusing into the blood of all of us tendencies highly adverse to civilization. The soldier naturally defends it because it is his trade ; the makers of small arms vote for it because it uses their ware ; the money brokers like it because it leads to loans and makes the stocks jump ; the Music Halls shout for it because it is as good as gin to them. The priest also demurely favours it : he has always found the soldier useful ; military force is antagonistic to reason, and fighting is an antidote to thought. Among the sermons of that most acute of High Church writers, the late Canon Mozley, there is a very notable one in which he maintains, with much sleight of argument, that to do without war is impossible, and which nobody can peruse without seeing what is the wish of the preacher. He cannot help citing the awkward prophecy which says that the time will come when nations " shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks ; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more ;" but like the Councillors in Voltaire's novel, when the divine response contravenes the Sultan's plan, he finds that the oracle is devoid of common sense. The Ultramontane, as beseems him, out-herods the Ritualist. Joseph De Maistre, the grand prophet of Ultramontanism, concludes a rhapsody in honour of war as a divinely instituted sacrifice of atonement with these sentences : " Thus is accomplished incessantly, from the insect up to man, the great law of the violent destruction of living beings. The whole earth, continually steeped in blood, is one vast altar on which everything that lives must be immolated without end, without measure, without intermission, till the consummation of all things, till the extinction of evil, till the death of death." Our readers will

perhaps not believe that these words can have been penned by a Christian writer in the nineteenth century : nor could we, had we not found them in the seventh number of the "Soirées de Saint Petersburg." Between this and Moloch worship it would not be easy to draw the line. The passage is a lesson, by the way, for those who fancy that, though in the days of the League, the Thirty Years' War and the Gunpowder Plot, Ultramontane fanaticism may have been capable of bloody work, all that part of its character has now been smoothed away by the touch of modern civilization, and that to apprehend anything of the kind at present is to revive a prejudice which belongs to the past. So that Moltke may be said to have a good deal of support, though some of it of a kind which he would hardly understand on the question of sentiment ; on the other question, the facts seem to be with him. The world is in arms, and forging more deadly weapons every day, while the diplomatic sphere is like a powder magazine with slow matches burning in every part of it. Yet there are forces at work on the other side. The galling pressure of these armaments on labour is arraying the industry of all nations in active antagonism to the military system ; and industry now has votes, which it had not in the days of the Grand Monarque. An ambitious and unscrupulous Government may, it is true, still entangle a nation in war with little regard for the voters : but it will have to reckon with them when the war is over. The prizes of war, both in the way of territorial conquest and in that of ordinary plunder, are being constantly diminished, the annexation of territory being rendered more difficult both by the growth of public morality and by the increase of popular resistance ; while commerce, for the protection of her own interests is extending the restraints of international law, and exempting new classes of objects from plunder. The romance of war, its pride, pomp, and circumstance which have been no slight incentives to it, are being diminished and are likely soon to be annihilated by Science, with her long-range weapons, her torpedoes and her earthworks. A land battle, instead of being

“the terribly beautiful” encounter of two superb and glittering hosts, will soon be a vast sputter of shots fired by marksmen under cover: a sea fight will be a collision between two sets of colossal kettles launching infernal machines against each other. At the same time, the destruction will become so appalling, and so hideous in its forms, especially in maritime war, that soldiers and sailors will hardly be found for a shilling a day. Between the wars of Napoleon and the Crimean war there was a long interval of peace, and the nations felt the growing presence of a spell which the quarrel with Russia broke, but which served to give an earnest of the future.

—A New York journal notes the increased observance of Lent, which it seems to think is a sign of religious reaction. That there is a religious reaction against Agnosticism, and that Christianity has gained in practical intensity, while it has lost in numbers, by the discussion, we regard as certain, and the fact, by the way, proves the wisdom of allowing discussion to have free course. But it is easy to attach too much importance to the increased observance of Lent. In the first place, there is no very grim reality in the movement, which hardly amounts to more than the temporary substitution of high dress for low dress pleasures. In the second place, the change is limited to the rich. It, in fact, denotes not so much anything religious as the social influence of the Church of England among the fashionable circles of New York. Few can seriously think it possible to reimpose upon the modern world the Lent of the Middle Ages, with its irrational disregard of latitude, climate, employment, physical constitution, and everything else of which medical science takes account in regulating diet. The number is always growing smaller of those who believe that the narrative to which Lent has reference is itself to be taken literally, and that all the kingdoms of the world were actually shown by the Tempter to the Tempted ~~from the pinnacle of the Temple~~. Let Asceticism have its due from history. Its due it has

*vide p. 296 Note.*

not had from those who, like Mr. Herbert Spencer, represent it as mere devil-worship, assuming that the sole object of the ascetic is to propitiate a fiendish deity by self-torture. This is a true account of Indian Fakirism, and of that form of Christian asceticism which was spawned from the mud of the Ganges, which produced the anchorites of the Thebaid, and of which the most typical and hideous representation was Simon Stylites. Substituting lethargy for pain the censure may be extended to the monkery of Athos, which again has a counterpart in the Llamaism of Thibet. But what the term denotes is, not self-torture, but the training of the spiritual athlete; and the aim of western Asceticism on the whole has been to give the spirit a complete victory over the lusts. Perhaps in the case of barbarians, it would have been difficult to do anything in this direction without the aid of formal and consecrated observance; just as it would have been difficult to limit their military propensities without the ecclesiastical laws forbidding arms to be carried in Churches, the prohibition of war on Church festivals and the Truce of God. Medical or intellectual reasons for abstinence, they would not have understood, any more than they would have understood an appeal to the love of peace and the hatred of war. But we are not barbarians, and we have better reasons for not gorging ourselves with flesh or getting drunk on metheglin all the year round, than an ecclesiastical rubric enforced by a Papal curse. Formal restrictions, imposed by external authority, are apt to stimulate almost as much as they repress: the natural accompaniment of Lent is the riot of the carnival, and the Turk, in Ramadan, having obeyed the Prophet by fasting till he is ravenous, falls to and eats like a beast. Far more deserving of attention than this revival of a nominal deference to the obsolete precepts of the Church respecting Lent, is the movement of dietetic reform, of which Dr. Dio Lewis is the vigorous and lively, though extreme apostle, and which indirectly gave birth to the eccentric experiment of Dr. Tanner. That we could do with much less food than we usually take; that we should do better with much less food than we usually

take ; that most of us live to eat, or at least treat eating as a pleasure irrespective of nourishment ; and that we shall be healthier, happier and better when we eat to live, is the sum of Dr. Dio Lewis's preaching. His arguments are wholly rational, and have nothing to do with asceticism or with any superstition, ecclesiastical or moral. The Tanner experiment seemed to indicate, at all events, that life was capable of being preserved without three full meals a day. A London footman, when boarded by his employer, insists on having five meals, with meat at each. We think it was Sir Benjamin Brodie who used to tell the story of a butler who, when he was sick, being recommended by the doctor to confine himself to three meals a day, indignantly exclaimed, "And pray, sir, who is to make up to me for the loss of the other meals?" The Comtists, we believe, look forward to a time when, under their social training, human nature shall have been so refined and have become so ashamed of its animal part, that people when they feel hungry will retire to take food in secret. The mission of Jesus was opened at a marriage feast, and a long course of education will be required before most of us can feel ashamed to sit down with a happy party at a Christmas dinner. But in the United States, the teachings of Dr. Dio Lewis have told, and the effects are beginning to appear.

—After all Toronto has had a visit from Sara Bernhardt. Of the performance we cannot speak, our theatrical critic not having been there. Mr. Matthew Arnold, who is the Grand Connoisseur, says that Sara Bernhardt leaves off where Rachel began. It would be misleading to say that Rachel left off where Ristori began, because they were in different lines ; but we should say that Ristori, at her best, reached a higher point than Rachel, and that she reached it in virtue of a superiority of character which made her capable of nobler emotions. The pieces were of that Parisian class which cleanly minded English people cannot thoroughly appreciate, though it must be owned

that the Seine is mingling its waters with the Thames. With regard to the social question, we have only to repeat that anything Pharisaical or inquisitorial we abjure. It is perfectly true that usually no one is called upon to pry into the characters of actors or actresses, though it must be said, on the other hand, that the Stage cannot be proclaimed out of the pale of morality and at the same time recommended to general support as an organ of moral improvement. But in this case the social question has been pressed on the public conscience both by the conduct of the lady herself, and by that of her worshippers, some of whom are recognised leaders of opinion, and who have insisted on her receiving not only professional but social homage. For our own part, we hold that the pure and regular union of the sexes is the mainstay of our happiness as well as of our virtue; that without it life would be wretched as well as filthy and vile, and that everything said to the contrary in French novels or other depositories of elegant pruriency is nonsense as well as vicious. This being so, we cannot withhold our support from clergymen, who, like the Archbishop of Montreal, Canon Basil Wilberforce, and Mr. Rainsford, have done firmly but temperately, that which it appears to us was their duty. There are women on our streets, despised, abhorred, and out-cast, who are not great artists, but who have more than a great artist has to plead in extenuation of their fall. If the story of the woman taken in adultery covers one case it covers all. It must be strangely twisted to turn it into a rebuke to an honest clergyman for warning his people against paying homage to evil.

— There are people to whom the phrase practical Christianity is particularly suspicious and offensive. Our genial friend, the *Canada Presbyterian*, evidently regards it a plausible name for unconscientiousness in religious matters and even for moral laxity. We do not wish to dogmatize against dogma: there may be minds peculiarly constituted to whom the

Christian life would not be worth living without the Athanasian Creed. But to the mass of men we venture to think that the type of character and the practical precepts contained in the Gospels have been and are the strongest bond. A very partial realization of this type and a very imperfect fulfilment of the precepts have sufficed to produce a state of things incomparably better than any that went before it, and incomparably better than any that exists outside it. Far from being the special conceit of culture,—which the *Canada Presbyterian*, with singular self-abnegation, professes to regard as dross to the religious mind—practical Christianity seems to be the only Christianity possible to the poor. It cannot be common at least to find a peasant who is, above all things, a theologian. Ministers of different denominations, including Presbyterians, have of late been interchanging pulpits. What do they mean by this? Do they not mean that they find the doctrinal questions which have divided them of less consequence, and the practical principles which unite them of more consequence than had been supposed? May not still further discoveries in the same direction be made? Of the doctrinal differences which sever the Eastern Church from the Western the chief is that concerning the ultimate relations of the Trinity, the West holding that the Third Person “proceeds” from the Second Person as well as from the First, the East that the Third Person proceeds from the First Person only. A moment’s reflection on the capacity of the human mind for apprehending the genesis of Deity will suffice to convince most people that on neither side can the disputants attach any meaning whatever to the phrases which they utter, and that both dogmas are presumptuous nonsense. It is not to be expected that the great historic organizations into which Christendom is divided, will at once make up and agree to blend with each other, any more than it is to be expected that the creeds will be suddenly and universally discarded. In this respect we must take matters as we find them, little as we may believe that the controversies in which the several Churches

had their origin, would now be deemed sufficient ground for severance. What it seems reasonable to hope is, that the best and wisest men in each community, understanding the course of contemporary thought and the reasons of it, will try to lighten rather than to make heavier the burden of dogmatic requirement, to induce good Christians to *stay* in the Church rather than to turn them out, and to use the churches themselves not as engines of antagonism, but as organs of cooperation. The rest we must leave to the Future, into which we cannot jump in the theological and ecclesiastical any more than in the political sphere.

—The publication of Carlyle's *Reminiscences* seems to have been regarded by some people in England as a social offence. We cannot see why it should be deemed so, all the men and women about whom anything unpleasant is said in the *Reminiscences* being dead, though the souls of the representatives and admirers of some of them, those of Mr. and Mrs. John Stuart Mill, for instance, may very likely be roused to arms. We are not surprised, however, that society should be touchy. The craving for sensation, and the desire of producing it, have been allowed, it must be owned, to a deplorable extent, to break the seal of confidence and thrust delicacy aside. The "Lady Unknown" who sold the letters of Prosper Mérimée to a publisher deserved to pick oakum for her pains. A pang has been added to death in the case of every person of distinction, by the growing practice of keeping journals and leaving them for publication. A man mixes in society, apparently on the same footing as the rest of the company, hears everything that is said in the careless freedom of good fellowship, then goes home and puts it all down secretly in a note-book, for the delectation of a curious world. The keeper of a journal is pretty sure to be an egotist, and an egotist can never do justice to other people: but when his journal comes to light his victims are in their graves and the egotist has it all his own way. We

have heard of cases in which the keeper of a journal has himself had the good sense and right feeling to enjoin that it should be destroyed at his death ; but his executors have considered that they had a call from the higher morality to make him commit a posthumous breach of honour.

Carlyle's estimates of the men of his time are in his well-known manner, marked with his genius and at the same time with his limitations and defects. He writes in the belief that the whole world except a single house in Chelsea is a Gehenna, which, happily, was not true. He is evidently drawn to Edward Irving, as he was to the Puritans and even to Swedenborg, by a strong sympathy for religious enthusiasm which in him was curiously unattended by any effort, or, apparently, desire, to find grounds for religious belief. Of such characters as those of those of Wordsworth, Shelley, and Lamb, he naturally could not make much. The thrice-charming author of "Elia" especially he vilipends for not being a strong man ; he might as well have vilipended him for not being a short-horn. These rough, outspoken judgments of a contemporary, however, are useful corrections to mythical biographies. That on Shelley we could not help reading with some satisfaction after being sickened by the Shelley-worship which is a mania of the day. Criticism, on poetry especially, seems to be parting company with truth and running into rhapsody. Much of it reminds us of the "Femmes Savantes" of Molière who find unfathomable depths of meaning and unsearchable treasures of beauty in such a phrase of their adored poet as *quoi qu'on die*. From the dithyrambies of the critics and biographers of this school it is almost a relief to turn to old Johnson, who, though narrow and antiquated, at all events does not talk nonsense and is always trying, after his fashion, to guide you to a correct estimate of his poet, not to show you what fine things he can say himself. But the worshippers of Shelley are not satisfied with your loving his poetry : they insist on your believing that the life and character of the man were even more divine than his works. He married a young wife, grew tired of her, abandoned her and her child.

married another woman for whom he had betrayed his passion before the separation, and when the first wife committed suicide, hardly showed the intensity of remorse which a very noble spirit would have shown. That "her commonplace nature was no mate for his, and that he had never loved her with all the depth of his affection," is a plea which anyone who is really jealous for the honour of intellect will do well to abstain from urging. It might have been supposed that the interminable controversy about the character of Bacon had, at least, enforced upon the whole world the necessity of accepting the paradox, if it be one, of mental power combined with moral weakness. When Byron lampooned the wife from whom he had been divorced he proved that there was something in him less lofty than the the last cantos of "Childe Harold." The notion that poets really feel all they say and feel it at the time when they are saying it, is a superstition: the quickness of sensibility and the liveliness of imagination which enable a writer to conceive and paint strong emotions have been often found in conjunction with a shallow heart. A good poem is a great treasure and a great blessing; but there is no use in exaggerations which returning reason will soon discard.

Some of our friends think that in the short paragraph on Carlyle in our last number we failed to give him credit for some special effect which he had produced. It may well have been so, yet we find it difficult to discover what the special effect can have been. That his tone was always high, and that he was a good antidote to materialism, we have said; if we could say it in more august and striking words we fancy it would be about what our friends really mean. Did Carlyle supply any new motive power? Did he give any new practical rule? The answer to both questions must, we conceive, be in the negative, and if so, wherein does his greatness as a moral, social or political teacher lie? To his greatness, as a historical painter, we paid our homage in no stinted measure. Nothing is done by phrases however thundering, by talking spasmodically about earnestness, by mentally taking your coat off, as it

were, to set with extraordinary energy about you know not what. Mere literary excitement begets not strength but weakness, and uncommonly weak, to tell the truth, some of the most rampant of the sect are. Carlyle looks down on Mazzini, saying, that though valiant, gifted, and noble, he "was hopelessly given up to his republicanism, his 'Progress,' and other Rousseau fanaticisms for which he (Carlyle) had at no time the least credence or even any considerable respect amidst his pity." You can point to fruits and very important fruits of Mazzini's teaching. Who can point to any fruits of the teaching of Carlyle? Mazzini's teaching remained the same to the end. Carlyle's passed from Radicalism to Toryism, from treating the Aristocracy and the Established Church as the grossest of shams to lauding and upholding both, and there is no assignable ground for his conversion other than a mere change of mood. The basis of his political philosophy is history, but, as we said before, it is history misread, since he fails to see that humanity changes in its onward course; and that, as the importance of the general intelligence waxes that of the individual chief wanes, so that now to uplift a man on our shields, dub him a demigod, and put ourselves blindly into his hands, would be at least as fatuous and ridiculous as any survival satirized in "Latter Day Pamphlets" or "Sartor Resartus." Nor are Carlyle's interpretations of particular periods by any means so true as the pictures through which they are conveyed are glowing. Cromwell is to him as an autocrat sent from Heaven, to whom everybody was bound on pain of damnation, political and general, to pay absolute obedience: but the whole of the Protectorate was a constant effort on the part of the Protector himself to get back from autocracy to the constitutional government which is the special object of Carlyle's contempt. Nor does the "French Revolution," with all its admirable brilliancy, point and humour, give anything like an accurate or even intelligible account of the springs of the movement, of the forces which determined its course, or of the causes of its failure.

A man of Carlyle's genius can hardly fail intellectually to do

good. Against this there is to be set no small measure of harm done by the sophistical perversion of morality in the interest of "heroes." The more questionable the hero, the greater and more frequent, of course, are the perversions, and no work of Carlyle's is more full of them than his life of that most questionable of heroes, Frederick the Great. Often in that book does he trample on justice and mercy, not seldom does he descend to the veriest pettifogging to cover the iniquities of a brilliant buccaneer or the brutalities of an old Cyclops who would have been seen in his true colours if he had not been the buccaneer's father. When the wrong-doing cannot be veiled, it is treated as privileged, and censure is duffed aside. "It is dangerous to have spoken kindly to the Crown-Prince, or almost to have been spoken to by him. Doris Ritter, a comely enough young girl, nothing of a beauty, but given to music, Potsdam Precentor's daughter, has chanced to be standing in the door, perhaps to be singing within doors, once or twice when the Prince passed that way; the Prince inquired about her music, gave her music, spoke a civility, as young men will,—nothing more, upon my honour, though his Majesty believes there was much more; and condemns poor Doris to be whipt by the Beadle and beat hemp for three years. Radamanthus is a strict judge, your Majesty; and might be a trifle better informed." This, we submit to the Carlyleists, can hardly be the path of righteousness, or the way of salvation for mankind. The same may be said of the passages on the Katte affair and the forcible incorporation of the Saxon army into the Prussian; of that on the partition of Poland, and many others in the same history; while the whole book is pervaded by a spirit of inhumanity and a truculent recklessness of bloodshed, which when found in a literary man, who ought to be a faithful servant of moral civilization, are very repulsive. The practical consequences of such doctrines were exhibited by Carlyle himself, Kingsley and others of the sect, in upholding slavery and applauding the dastardly atrocities of Governor Eyre. Nor is the historical insight displayed in "Friedrich" superior to the sentiment. What

was the net upshot of all this crimping, all this flogging, all the savage regime and cruel pedantry of the military system, so much admired by the worshippers of Frederick and his father? It was Jena. The Prussian army was a mere machine, without a breath of national life or spark of a national spirit, which, as soon as its framer's hand was withdrawn, grew rusty, decayed, and was annihilated by a single blow. With the forces which redeemed Prussia and Germany from the French yoke, Friedrich had nothing to do: the legislation of Stein, the free heroism of the Tugend-bund were the reversal of his system political and social as well as military, and their success was the condemnation of all that he had done, saving the achievements of his personal genius as a master of the art of war.

We assumed that Carlyle's philosophy was Hero-worship. It rather surprises us to find that there are some who resent this assumption as an injustice to the Teacher, and maintain that Hero-worship was merely one of the outward and adventitious "trappings" of the revelation. The vital doctrine, it seems, was "Do your Duty." Vital certainly, but not new. That we must do our duty, we are all taught at a very early age in language, which, though simple, is every whit as effective as all the grandiloquence about Eternities, Verities and Firmaments. The business of a philosopher is to show us what our duty is, and, if he can, to give us a new motive for doing it. What the business of a "Seer" may be in these modern times we cannot pretend to determine; but if it has anything to do with moral insight into the course of destiny, neither in the case of the struggle between Slavery and Freedom nor in any other case, so far as we remember, did Carlyle make good his claim to the heritage of Merlin. "Worship of a Hero," he writes in his book *On Heroes*, "is transcendent admiration of a Great Man. I say Great Men are still admirable; I say there is at the bottom nothing else admirable. No nobler feeling than this of admiration for one higher than himself dwells in the breast of man. It is to this hour, and at all hours, the vivifying influence in man's life. Religion I find stands

upon it; not Paganism only, but far higher and truer religions—all religions hitherto known. Hero-worship, heartfelt, prostrate admiration, submission, burning, boundless, for a noblest, godlike Form of Man,—is not that the germ of Christianity itself?" It is needless to say that Christ has been adored in the belief that He was not a great man, but God. But again—"For myself in these days, I seem to see in this indestructibility of Hero-worship the everlasting adamant lower than which the confused wreck of revolutionary things cannot fall. The confused wreck of things crumbling and even crashing and tumbling all round us in these revolutionary ages will get down so far, no further. It is an eternal corner-stone, from which they can begin to build themselves up again. That man, in some sense or other, worships heroes; that we, all of us, reverence, and must ever reverence, great men: this is, to me, the living rock amid all rushings down whatsoever;—the one fixed point in modern revolutionary history, otherwise as if bottomless and shoreless." Those who, in face of such passages as these, and a hundred more of the same kind, undertake to declare that Hero-worship is not the essence of Carlyleism, but merely one of its trappings, can surely be nothing less than Seers themselves. What are "Cromwell," "Frederick," "Past and Present," "Dr. Francia," but so many embodiments of the doctrine taught in "Hero-worship" and of its corollary, propounded in the same place, "History is the biography of Great Men?" In the "French Revolution," Carlyle could not find a Hero, the men being not near so great as the events, though he does all he can to inflate Mirabeau and Danton; and to this is at least partly due the superiority of that work as a real history, over all the rest. To characters which were simply examples of allegiance to duty, such as Lafayette, Carlyle is far from being partial: he was inclined to sneer at them as formalists and pedants. Time will winnow the chaff from the grain. We suspect that the Seer will vanish, while the Historic Painter and the Humorist will remain forever.