

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

THE BYSTANDER.

MAY, 1881.

OPPOSITION estimates of the value of the lands in the North-West, and of the sacrifice made by the Government to the cupidity of the Company, will be checked by the Company's circular inviting immigration. The land, which we were told was worth, at least, \$5, is offered at \$2.50 per acre, with a rebate to the amount of \$1.25 for every acre brought under cultivation within three to five years following the date of purchase, according to the nature and extent of the other improvements made. This looks like liberal dealing, and there can be no rational doubt that to deal liberally and content the people is the policy of the Company. That it is a very serious thing to make such vast grants, and to create such a power as the Company in the North-West, has never been denied or dissembled in these pages. But the choice lay between this and the continuation of the system of Government construction, with its attendant contract-mongering and jobbery of all kinds, of which we had seen enough to be convinced that we must get rid of it almost at any price. That the organizers of the Company are honourable, nobody pretends seriously to doubt. In the fury of debate, Sir Richard Cartwright threw out an insinuation that the Minister of Railways had received a bribe from them; but had there been any ground for such a belief, the Opposition would not have failed to bring the charge formally before the country, since they must have known that if it were proved or even supported by evidence sufficient

to make a strong impression on the public mind, it would certainly be fatal to the Agreement, and in all probability to the Ministry. The Ministerial majority would have been unavailing; the Governor General would unquestionably have refused to sign the charter, and, if pressed, would have called the leaders of the Opposition to his councils and empowered them to appeal to the country. We have since been asked to accept the charitable hypothesis that the illness of the Minister of Railways was feigned, and that he slipped away to England for the purpose of carrying on clandestine intrigues with the members of the Company who are there. It was forgotten that, though Sir Charles Tupper might have a motive for compromising himself, the members of the Company could have none, inasmuch as, according to the Opposition organ itself, they had already secured under the Agreement all that the most criminal compliance could yield, or the most unbounded rapacity desire. This is childishness as well as injustice. The leaders of the Opposition must surely see that, the inevitable faction fight being over, it will be better policy for them now to sheathe their swords and settle down into amicable relations with a power which cannot be slanged out of existence, which is probably too much governed by its commercial interests to cherish any political antipathies, and the consent of which is necessary to any future modification of the compact.

It is only to be lamented that anything remains in the hands of the Government beyond the police of the new territory and the creation of legal titles to land. Even the Block System seems to have done mischief by scattering the settlers and pushing many of them, in a country where road-making is desperately difficult, far away from markets, and from the means of civilized life, especially schools. Mr. Pope's scheme of providing houses and ready-sown farms for Irish immigrants, as the work is to be done by contract, opens up a fresh vista of the jobbery from which the country has just escaped, and, though on a smaller scale, perhaps in a worse form, since simple-minded peasants, bewildered by the novelty of the situation, are likely to

be particularly easy and tempting victims. The tune of the Indian Agencies in the United States may be played with an Irish variation in Manitoba. Moreover the scheme itself seems doubtful. How will an Irish peasant prosper if he is set down by himself in a strange and wild country, with a shanty and a bit of sown land, but without money, with poor clothes and insufficient equipments of every kind? Will he at once take heartily and cheerfully to the work of a farmer? Is not the net result too likely to be a number of deserted shanties partly broken up for fuel? At the same time, emigrants of other races will perhaps be disgusted and repelled because houses and sown lands are provided for the Irish alone.

Irish emigrants employed on the railway will find work suited to them, and the companionship for which they crave: those who have an inclination for farming can afterwards take farms; they will have been acclimatized and will know the country. This seems the best scheme for Irish immigration. The core of the new population must be Canadians and Americans, or other people equally accustomed to a rigorous climate and handy as pioneers. Of our Canadian farmers, many, we hear, are going; and no wonder, considering how heavily farms are mortgaged and that the high rate of interest which the mortgagors, especially those who fell into the snare of "table rates," are now paying, has become still more oppressive since the rate of interest generally has fallen. To supply the places of these men on Canadian farms is an object of vital importance to Canada, and it can be done only by commending the country to the notice of British farmers, many of whom, in their present predicament, must be thinking of emigration, and who would certainly do better on land already tilled, and with all aids and appliances within their reach, than they would as pioneers. Extension from sea to sea may be politically very grand; but, in an economical point of view, this is an anxious moment for Old Canada.

—The leader of the Opposition has been expounding his policy. At Toronto it was merely the negation of the Pacific Railway Agreement and N. P. At Montreal it was Imperial Federation. This phantom still haunts us, though, like one of the spirits evoked by the mediums when a sceptic is present at the *seance*, it persistently refuses to “materialize.” Mr. Blake’s plan seems to be a union solely for the purpose, of mutual defence; but he does not answer the argument that union, by involving the Colonies in the quarrels of the Imperial country, will itself be the main and almost the sole source of peril. This brilliant scheme creates the very liability against which, by means of enormously complicated and expensive machinery, it provides. It is needless again to dwell on the difficulties which would beset the admission of distant communities, differing widely from each other in their external relations as well as in their internal character and interests, to the diplomatic and military councils of England. The episode of Jingoism, moreover, has surely proved that it is impossible to sever the department of foreign affairs from the general concerns of a country and to consign it, with questions between moderation and aggrandizement, between war and peace, to the keeping of a separate assembly. Each of the political parties in England has a foreign policy vitally connected with its general principles and congenial to its general temper, and neither would see the Federal Assembly taking a line antagonistic to its own without using all the means of opposition and obstruction in its power. A Jingo majority in the Federal Parliament might find itself in collision with an anti-Jingo majority in the Parliament of England which, in spite of any formal regulations that might be made, would practically have the control of the English purse. One or two such conflicts would shake the machine to pieces, and the net result would be anything rather than the increased union of the English race. A friendly hearer and critic of Mr. Blake’s speech said that when the speaker talked of Imperial Federation every one knew that he was thinking of Independence, and that the audience applauded in

that sense. To say one thing and mean another on a fundamental question is, for a leader, perilous work : and the timidity which feels a cloak needful will be apt to shrink from declaring for Independence if the expected opportunity arrives. But the opportunity will not arrive. It arrived some years ago and it did not find its man.

—No one can be surprised to hear that Sir Alexander Galt feels his situation as Canadian Ambassador unsatisfactory. The Ambassador of a dependency is a diplomatic hippogriff, a creature of the imagination unknown to the actual world. Between England and Canada there may be a private understanding, by virtue of which Canada has a voice in commercial treaties affecting herself : but of this Foreign Powers cannot be cognizant ; in their sight Canada stands precisely on the same footing as Jamaica, Algeria, Cuba or St. Thomas. Necessarily at every step of negotiations they require the sanction of the English Foreign Office, and the Ambassador of Canada in effect finds himself unable to negotiate at all. But perhaps the gale which bears Sir A. Galt away from a bootless mission on the other side of the Atlantic may waft him to a post of greater usefulness and distinction on his own side. He seems to be the only man who can take the leadership of the party in power, supposing that the present Premier finds rest indispensable, and his position during the last ten years has become so independent that there would be nothing to prevent him from seeking assistance in any quarter he might think fit. The hope of a national government, and a respite from faction fighting, faintly dawns upon us once more. It was perhaps too much to expect that Sir John Macdonald, so late in his political life, should shake himself loose from old party ties, and widen the basis of his government. Yet it may turn out that his accession to power was practically a step towards our final liberation from Machines.

—Talk of an Imperial Zollverein seems on the increase. The idea pleases English manufacturers galled by the American tariff. It is, at all events, more feasible than that of Imperial Federation, and aims at a more substantial object. There is no insurmountable obstacle in the way of an arrangement, by which England should bind herself to discriminate in favour of Colonial wheat and cattle, while the Colonies would bind themselves to admit English manufactures free, and exclude those of other countries. Yet we should be surprised to see a step practically taken in this direction, either on the part of the Colonies collectively, or by any considerable section of the Imperial Parliament. The Colonies would have to surrender the commercial autonomy which Australia and Canada have just asserted; while the English masses would fear and, for a time at least, would actually experience, a rise in the price of food, for abundance of which they care much more than for political relations with countries which they could not point out on the map. To the Protectionists in the Colonies, the free admission of English goods would of course be, commercially speaking, ruin, and desperate resistance might be looked for from that quarter. In the case of Australia, there would be no difficulty, other than that arising from adverse opinion, in the fulfilment of the compact; but, in the case of Canada, there would be the difficulty of guarding a long open frontier against American smuggling, of which there is, probably, not a little under the present tariff, though it is always left out of the account in stating the relative importation of English and American goods. It is a weak point in the position of ardent Imperialists that, whatever may be the feeling of the politicians, our people have no antipathy to the United States, or to anything good that comes from them. In the North-West especially, where the population will be mixed, and a large element of it will be American, commercial considerations may be expected to prevail; and as there is absolutely no natural boundary, the difficulty of maintaining the Chinese wall in that quarter would be very great. The wrath of our neigh-

bours on the other side of the line would, of course, be kindled by this great combination against them, and their Civil War has proved that, whatever may be their love of the dollar, they have also a temper as well as other nations. They might deprive us of winter ports and stop the transmission of our goods in bond. The sole object of England would be, by putting pressure on the United States, to compel them to reduce their tariff: that gained, the discrimination in favour of Colonial produce would end. But with the reduction of the American debt, which is going on with marvellous rapidity, the tariff must be lowered; it will be impossible to maintain duties no longer needed for revenue, merely for the sake of Protection; and there are certainly some among the leaders of opinion in England, who have more faith in this process, combined with the growth of international unity, than in any pressure which can be put on the Americans by a Tariff war.

—After remaining open for nearly a year, the Collectorship of Customs for the Port of Toronto has been given to a person against whose character and general ability there is nothing to be said, but who is a stranger to the service. This may be political gratitude, but it is not Civil Service Reform. The first requisite of a good Civil Service is promotion by departmental merit. The mainstay of the English system are the permanent under-secretaries, who, not being political, do not go out with the Ministry, and who, if they are not actually taken from the office over which they are called to preside, are, at all events, appointed without reference to party, and solely on administrative grounds. There is little use in an apparatus of competitive examinations for the lower places, if the higher are to be treated as fees for political supporters, or even as personal patronage. The last time that the Collectorship was vacant, it was bestowed on a party wirepuller, with results which it is needless to rehearse. No particular Minister is to blame. We may be sure that there has been during the last

year a struggle among the political retainers of the Government for this prize, deemed by them their property, most perplexing to the holder of the patronage; and the decision in which, by the conflicting currents of importunity, he has at last been landed, is not so bad as others to which he might have come. But, we repeat, this is not Civil Service Reform. Nor is it Civil Service Reform when, on the other side of the line, President Garfield removes one Chief of the New York Custom House and appoints another on political grounds. The President's intentions are excellent, but Party is too strong for him, and the Reformers who are disappointed by his action will in time be led to discern the real seat of the evil, and learn that they must probe deeper to effect a cure.

—Among the mysteries of our time may be reckoned the Pacific Railway Commission. With what object it was appointed we have never been able to divine. The Grit hypothesis is that it was devised by the jealousy of Sir John Macdonald for the purpose of ruining Sir Charles Tupper. No treachery can, of course, be too dark for the Author of Evil; but there is a limit to the simplicity of his supposed victim. It occurred to us that the object might be, by revealing the hideous details of government contracts to provide an argument in favour of transferring the undertaking to a Company; but this solution we discarded as too refined. The most natural supposition appears to be that the Commission originated with Sir Charles Tupper, and was by him intended to drag to light the bad things which had been done under Mr. Mackenzie, and thus to furnish, in case of need, the means of proving that the kettle was no whiter than the pot. If it was so, the petard, while it perhaps has blown up the enemy, has not left the engineer unscathed. Bad things occurred under both Administrations; but the two jobbers who preëminently deserve to stand in the dock, as it happens, are partisans of Sir Charles Tupper. The Commissioners appear to have done their duty; yet the cost to

the country will be large, and the only result, besides a great moral stench, will be a fresh demonstration of the unfitness of Commissions of Inquiry to fulfil the quasi-judicial purposes for which they have of late in this country been employed. They have no power of bringing an offender to justice: it is doubtful whether they have the power even of branding him with censure without laying themselves open to an action for libel: all they can do is, after dragging his guilt to light, to leave him a noxious example of impunity. Their action in these cases is an abortive encroachment on the province of the courts of justice. The information of Government is the sole proper function of Royal Commissions of Inquiry, and the only one ever entrusted to them in England where they rigorously abstain from entering into any question or receiving any evidence affecting personal character or conduct. The subject was thoroughly discussed, and the right principle was distinctly laid down, as an able writer in the *Globe* some time ago pointed out, in connection with the University Commission of 1850. It is to be hoped that "the well-known" principles of the British Constitution will prevail in relation to this matter for the future.

— When we said that the only sign of life given by the Senate during the last Session was its attempt to amend the Scott Act, we intended to speak of its life as a co-ordinate and independent branch of the legislature, modifying in important questions the action of the Commons, and originating measures which would not have originated with them. These are the purposes, we imagine, for which the Senate is supposed to exist, and for the fulfilment of which it draws its pay. But a friend, whose authority claims the highest respect, tells us that our observations were unjust, since most of the Government measures of the Session were introduced in the Senate. So they were; but can they be said, in any practical sense, to have emanated from the Senate, or even to have been really forwarded.

by its intervention? Was their introduction there much more than an expedient to save time by pushing the bills through the forms while the Commons were occupied with the Pacific Railway Agreement? Would the previous approbation of the Senate give any contested measure a better chance in the Lower House? A third of the Senate Report for the Session is occupied by the debate on the Pacific Railway. In that debate, a speech worthy of any assembly, and regarded by those who heard or read it as the ablest exposition of the Government case was made by Sir Alexander Campbell; but the conclusion was foregone, and the Conservative organ itself said that the Senate could act only as a court of registration. How much of the Senate debates was reported even by the journals most friendly to the institution? How much attention did the press or the public pay to its proceedings, till it ventured on an amendment to the Scott Act, which had our hearty approval, but which the nation flung under the table? It is in no revolutionary spirit that we approach this subject. In the interest of democracy itself, we wish the Conservative elements of the Constitution to be strong. But where the national will is supreme nothing can be strong without an elective basis. A body of nominees representing nobody and irresponsible will never be suffered to exercise real power. Give the Senate an elective basis of a Conservative kind, and it may become a most important institution. Unless that is done, we venture to say once more, the anchor will not hold.

--The change of leadership, or rather the revolution by which it was brought about, has, at all events, enforced a nominal deference on the part of Grit Machinists to the most sacred article of the Liberal creed. To the great edification of the public there appeared the other day in the *Globe* an editorial in favour of freedom of individual opinion within the Liberal party, ending with this paragraph:

“ We are not at all alarmed by the picture of the individualisms of the present Liberal leaders which is now set up to scare us by some of our contemporaries, whose ideas of unity are evidently that of a lifeless uniformity, or abject submission to the guidance of a single leading mind. If our Blakes, and Mackenzies, and Casgrains, and Huntingtons, and Mills, and Lauriers have the temerity to think some original thoughts, and cherish some personal convictions, we are stupid enough to prefer the living energy of the coming Government with all the combined strength derived from a union of such individualisms in subordination to the demands of a broad public policy, to the lifeless operations of a political machine operated by a single and not over-scrupulous hand.”

The unconscious and involuntary felicity of the concluding words may be called unique. Liberals will gradually see from what they have been delivered, and what, under the circumstances of the case, were the indispensable means of their deliverance. Their organization had become “ a machine operated by a single and not over-scrupulous hand.” It had become a counterpart of that American machine, from thralldom to which the better section of the Republicans the other day emancipated itself by a desperate effort, but with this difference—that the American Bosses exercised their power openly, and were true to the principles of the Anti-Slavery party, whereas the Grit Boss exercised his power in secret, and had in heart completely apostatized from the principles of the Liberal party in Canada. An effort was made to break the Canadian Machine from within like that by which the American Machine was broken in the Convention of Chicago; but not with the same success. Mr. Blake was “ whipped into the traces ” by the Machinists, and though he afterwards left their government his influence had been fatally impaired. After this, only one mode of escape from “ the body of that death ” remained, and Liberals will, in time, perceive that the disaster of 1878 was salvation in disguise.

—The Grand Jury question continues to be the theme of observation from the Bench. Everybody knows that the his-

tory both of the Grand and the Petty Jury is in its details a chapter of accidents. But in its main character neither of these institutions is accidental; nor is the origin of either of them so local or personal as some recent antiquaries seem to imagine, the Jury being found in Scandinavia as well as in England. In fact the court of freemen and peers, which the Petty Jury represents, was the complement of the free institutions which are the special pride of the Teutonic race, and stands contrasted with the despot's tribunal as the Witenagemot, the Parliament, or the primitive assembly of warriors out of which these were developed, does with the despot's rule. In primitive times functions afterwards distinct; not having been separated from each other, the court of freemen was judge and jury too; the growth of legal science added the presidency of professional judges. The Grand Jury was, perhaps, in its origin merely an instrument for bringing offenders to justice, very necessary at a time when there was no regular police, as well as for presenting local matters requiring reform. This function is now almost obsolete; but the same cannot be said as to the cognate function of determining what cases ought to be sent to trial. Some sort of preliminary consideration of the evidence there must be; it will never do to put a man in the dock on mere suspicion; all the authorities say in effect that, if the Grand Jury is abolished, a public prosecutor must be instituted in its place. Certainly the Grand Jury, in its present form, seems a waste of time and money. Nor, sitting in secrecy as it does, and without the guarantee afforded by clear personal responsibility, is it perfectly fit on all occasions to be entrusted with the key of justice. Into its conclave political and social considerations may find their way. This liability was brought home to the minds of most people in England by the case of Governor Eyre, which the Grand Jury refused to send to trial. Governor Eyre and William Gordon, a member of the Jamaica Assembly, had been not only political opponents but deadly personal enemies, and the violence of temper shown by Eyre in their quarrel had brought down upon him a rebuke from the Colonial Secretary.

When, in consequence of a disturbance, martial law was proclaimed in a part of the island, Eyre himself arrested Gordon at a place out of the pale of martial law, carried him in his own vessel to the proclaimed district, changed the composition of the court martial in such a way as rendered its sentence more sure, and then put Gordon into its hands. The Court still shrank from the responsibility of the execution and referred its sentence to the Governor, who ratified it under his own hand. These were the undisputed facts, and no one who has read the charge of Chief Justice Cockburn on the occasion can well doubt that the case was one for investigation before a public tribunal. But political feeling had been excited, and the Grand Jury closed the gate. A public prosecutor would be guarded by his professional instincts against irrelevant considerations and though he would, in the first instance, owe his appointment to the Government, it is difficult to imagine any circumstances in which his care for his own reputation and his interest in his office would be likely to give way to his desire to oblige a minister. To the institution of a public prosecutor in time we shall probably come.

By the abolition of the Grand Jury some better materials might be set free for the composition of Petty Juries. Assuredly it can only have been accident that assigned the more important function to the weaker tribunal. In England it is appalling to see to what hands the most momentous causes and even the issues of life and death are consigned. If the Judge is strong and uses his influence he may guide the Jury right, but otherwise the result must often be a mere toss-up, or what is even worse, it must be decided by the tricks of advocates. Any sort of prejudice is sure to carry the day. Our people are, on the average, better educated and more intelligent than the English; yet we have had recent proof that a jury-box may be swayed, in the face of the clearest evidence, by local sentiment, and more than once suspicion has prevailed that grosser influences were at work. We have heard men eminently familiar with the working of our local institutions express a very unfavour-

able opinion of the jury panel. It has been said that the practical object of all free institutions is to get twelve honest men into a jury-box ; intelligence must be added to honesty if justice is to be done, especially when there is a long chain of evidence, or, when, as in libel cases, fine perceptions are required ; but the duty of a jurymen in an important cause is as high as any that a citizen can be called upon to perform.

—One of our public men said the other day that, in Canada, no one who was willing to work could want bread. This, unfortunately, is a dream of the past. It is in the more intellectual and what are styled the higher callings, such as those of clerks, and secretaries, that the overcrowding is greatest. The excessive number of applicants for employment in this line, whose existence every advertisement reveals, is a serious warning against blind persistence in any system which may be likely to create a distaste for manual labour. Young men of more than average abilities and acquirements, as well as of the highest character, find it almost impossible to get work ; and there is danger of fresh victims being brought here by the pictures drawn of the boundless resources and magnificent destinies of this country. That in such a cornucopia there must surely be something good for everybody, is the conclusion naturally drawn, and those who are dazzled by the description do not pause to ask whether it relates to the present or the future. That it relates to the future, and that at present they can find no subsistence, is the fact which dawns on them when they have landed on our shore. But even for manual labourers and mechanics, and men very willing to work, there is too often a dearth of employment in our long close season. The wise lay up a store for the winter, but not all the world is wise ; and the brief summer presents ever-multiplying temptations in the way of amusements and excursions, to which it is not wonderful that Labour, strained with exertion, jaded with monotony, sweltering with heat, should sometimes improvi-

dently yield. The combination of a short period of high wages with a long close season, is everywhere alike trying. In the University cities in England, the end of the Long Vacation often finds destitute those whose pockets were full when it began. Like every other social question, that of poverty must be studied with reference to local conditions, as well as to general laws.

When our fancy endows these communities of the New World with the attributes of youth, we forget that they have really lived ten centuries in one, and that, in the parts of the Continent longest settled, they have come nearly up to the level of those of the Old World in every characteristic of maturity, and in liability to pauperism among the rest. We have happily not yet any abodes of congregated misery on the scale of Whitechapel, the Irish quarter of Liverpool, or the bad parts of Glasgow; but in every great city, however prosperous, the inevitable accidents of trade and of life, to say nothing of vice, must create a proportionate amount of destitution; and in a Christian nation, no one, however culpable, can be let starve. To us in our turn the universal problem now presents itself, and though the unwillingness to adopt a Poor Law is most honourable as well as natural, to some public and regular provision for the poor we shall probably come. The Toronto Home of Industry, which receives a subsidy from the city, is in fact hardly distinguishable from a poor-house. There is a certain amount not only of casual want, such as may be reached by private charity, organized so as to economize relief and detect imposture, but of permanent, hopeless and friendless destitution for which nothing but the almshouse can provide. Twenty years ago, the name "tramp" was hardly heard. But vagrancy has now become a very serious evil in the States, and seems likely to become one here. In the States, they trace its existence in part to the disbanded armies which seemed at the time to have melted back with almost magical rapidity and completeness into the industrial population. But considering that sixteen years have passed since the Civil War, this can hardly be the sole source.

The labour wars of Europe, especially of England, have probably contributed their quota of perturbed and wandering spirits. Apart from these special causes, the vast enlargement of the industrial continent, the facilities of locomotion, the migratory habits produced by the shifting of trades, were sure to produce unsettlement among the working class. At all events, Canada has to deal with vagrancy. The Labour Test is the obvious expedient, and it has been applied with the best effect in the States. Its proved efficacy in reducing the number of applicants is the answer to the natural objection that work, even the roughest and most repulsive work, is sometimes wanted for the resident and respectable poor. While labour is enforced, the refuge should be clean and the treatment of the tramp such as not to degrade him, especially as decent wanderers, emigrants perhaps who have failed to get employment, will sometimes be fain to put up with the same asylum. Even the tramp is not necessarily a bad man: he may be simply restless; a member of the race out of whom the nomad has not yet been thoroughly worked; and though averse to settled labour, capable of great and gallant exertion in his way. If we had a standing army, many of the tramps, perhaps, would be recruits, and very likely they would be the best of soldiers.

—A pitched battle has been fought between the Prohibitionists and the Anti-Prohibitionists at Hamilton, and has resulted in the signal defeat of Prohibition. It need not be dissembled that, on the winning side, there were bad influences and men whose triumph is always a public misfortune, or that, on the losing side, there were good influences and men whose triumph is, in all ordinary cases, to be desired. But it is not less certain that among those who voted against the Scott Act were many whose motive was a fear, and as we think a reasonable fear, of social tyranny. We have had occasion, more than once, to state our own position on the subject. The presumption, we must once more maintain, is against sumptuary laws. One man

thinks beer poison, another tobacco; neither, generally speaking, is entitled to interfere with the tastes and habits of his neighbour. Still, we by no means deny the right of a community to enact exceptional laws in cases of extreme need; but the case of extreme need must be made out, and those who have known Canada best and longest almost unanimously testify that intemperance has not been increasing, but visibly decreasing, among us. The movement in favour of prohibitory legislation itself is a proof that sentiment is active on the right side; and its force may be augmented by voluntary organizations and the usual means of propagating opinion. But if coercive measures are to be adopted, reason and public morality alike require that they should be effective; and no coercive measure will be effective unless it prevents the production of liquor. To legislate against the open and regular sale while the production is left unrestricted is simply to generate, by a well-tried and infallible process, habits of secret drinking, unlicensed dens, the class of men who keep them, and habitual disregard of the law. An expedition of inquiry sent into Maine has only discovered, what everybody acquainted with the United States knew before, that the Act is observed in the rural districts, where there is no need of it, the people being of themselves abstemious, and set at nought in the cities, where alone it is required. No one will act as an informer, or an agent of the police, against a neighbour whose self-indulgence does no harm, no direct and tangible harm at least, to anybody but himself; this is the rock upon which sumptuary legislation always splits. By refusing to consent to the requirement of an absolute majority of the constituency for the adoption of the Act, the Prohibitionists have declined the only practical test of the existence of a public sentiment sufficient to enforce the law. Much may be done, in the way of legislation, to encourage the use of light and wholesome beverages in place of the common whiskey, which is really poisonous, and is by far the commonest source of that sort of drunkenness which leads to crime. For the rest there are the ordinary moral forces opera-

ting among an educated people. Alternate adoption and rejection of the Act seems to be the result to which the struggle is tending; and the consequence of this will be along the skirt of each of the prohibited districts a line of frontier taverns.

Ethical exaggeration is to be avoided, because it is always followed by a recoil. Abstinence and temperance are different things, though in the heat of this conflict the distinction has been denied. Medical science may pronounce that to take anything but water is bad for us; perhaps the ban may extend to tea and coffee as well as to wine; prudence will then enjoin us to obey; but so long as a man avoids the excess which is offensive and injurious to his neighbours, morality has no more to say against one of the pleasures of the table than against the rest.

—Quebec politics seem complicated; but the key to them is simple. A single motive power produces all the divisions, combinations, rattings and coalitions. Mr. Chapleau, having pretty well exhausted his means of feeding his followers, is in danger of being torn by them, and defections are already announced. He will, probably, not be inclined to prolong the Session which is just opening much beyond the thirty days necessary to entitle members to remuneration. The one great question is the North Shore Railway, the sale of which would ease the Finances for a time, and put off the evil day of direct taxation, to which everybody is looking forward, though woe will betide the political party which is the first to proclaim the fell necessity. It is by the small body of thoroughgoing Liberals, misnamed Reds (for they have nothing in common with the Red Republicans of France), that really political questions will one day be mooted, and the wearisome strife of cliques for patronage brought to a close. Direct taxation, when it arrives, will be the bankruptcy of the present order of things, and it may be the opening of a new era.

In the Maritime Provinces we hear that there is a commercial improvement which, though slight, fosters hope. At the

same time we learn, without surprise, that smuggling has been very active, that the Government finds itself obliged to take extraordinary precautions, and that even these precautions are not likely to stop the trade. At St. Stephen, N.B., the two countries are separated only by a bridge, and though captures have been made, the impression of our correspondent is that they bear no proportion to the number of smugglers. This was sure to be the case. To carry into effect the provisions of an Imperial Zollverein, by excluding American goods, an army of Custom House officers would be required.

—It is wonderful that the people of the United States do not sometimes lose all patience with Congress, that they do not go with clubs and beat it back into the path of its duty to a too-long suffering nation. There has been a dead-lock in the Senate attended by serious inconvenience to the Executive Government, and even to the administration of public justice, because the Republicans did not choose to proceed to business and confirm the President's nominations till they had turned out a set of petty officials—a serjeant-at-arms and some secretaries—who had been appointed by the opposite party. An august spectacle for the civilized world, and one likely to propagate the love of Republican institutions! The Bosses have also been illustrating the real nature of party spirit by rising in rebellion against the chosen head of their own party, because he does not happen to be their own nominee, and because, under him, they are no longer masters of the pelf. The same lesson is continually preached to us. Where there is a great principle to be asserted, or a great organic reform to be effected, party is, or has hitherto been, almost indispensable. Nothing else could have beaten the Stuarts or terminated the rule of privilege in England: nothing else could have overthrown Slavery. Under extraordinary circumstances, not Party only, but even a Civil War may be a necessity; and by being so is redeemed and sanctified: but under ordinary circumstances party is faction, and faction is the ruin of Free States.

—Reliance can hardly be placed on the exact figures of the census of the Southern States. Yet there seems to be no doubt as to the momentous and pregnant fact that the Blacks are increasing faster than the Whites. When Emancipation first sent the Blacks adrift, helpless and thriftless, there was great mortality among them, and predictions were freely hazarded that the social and political problem which perplexed statesmen would be solved by the gradual extinction of the Negro race. The problem, on the contrary, now seems likely to present itself on a larger scale than ever. There are those who fancy that education will turn the Negro white; but generations, probably, must elapse before his low intellect can be brought up to the Anglo-American level. You may teach him his letters at school, but you cannot force him to keep up any mental culture afterwards. If supreme power were in his hands, he would make the South a Hayti. The Whites will, of course, struggle against his political ascendancy; they will prevail, at all events, so long as they retain anything like an equality of numbers; and the result apparently will be the perpetuation with ever-increasing sharpness of a mastery of race, Anti-Republican in all its tendencies, which can hardly fail to taint the life blood of the Republic. Fusion of the races by intermarriage is impossible, and without it there can be no political or social union; there can only be the ascendancy of one race over the other. With a Black population superior in numbers and White ascendancy the South would be a magnified counterpart of the West Indies, an unwholesome element in the composition of a Republic. We are told, and can readily believe, that the relations between the races, like affairs generally at the South, have greatly improved since the liberal policy of President Hayes was substituted for the Carpet-bagging rule; and it seems happily to be the fact that the Southerners have entirely ceased to deplore the fall of Slavery. As General Garfield is likely to tread in the steps of President Hayes, matters may go smoothly for the present; but this does

not solve the problems of the future. Optimism is rebuked when we consider what a train of evils the cupidity of a few slave traders has entailed upon this Continent.

On the other hand, the Census appears to show that the danger from the foreign element is less than was supposed. The foreigners born are not more than fifteen per cent. of the population. This, however, is hardly the measure of the foreign influence: the Irishman is often an Irishman, and votes as an Irishman, even in the third generation. What cannot be doubted is that the proportion of Anglo-Americans, who are the organizing race, declines. So much, any one's observation may tell him, without statistics. More children are born to the Irish and other immigrant races than to the Anglo-Americans; and the movement now going on for the removal of what is called the limitation of sex, and for turning the minds of women to employments other than those of the wife and mother, as it scarcely extends beyond the Anglo-Americans, can hardly fail to increase the disparity. Social Reformers, in the war of words which they wage against nature, are victorious because she is mute: her arguments come in the form of practical consequences. The race, which rebels against the limitation of sex, will put a limitation to its own existence.

— Though England has said nothing about the surplus of the Geneva Indemnity, Americans are still disquieted on the subject. Nor is this surprising: no honourable man or nation can feel at ease as the holder of money about the right to which there is any doubt. The question seems, in effect, to be whether the payment was a general settlement of the account between England and the United States or a sum handed over for the satisfaction of certain specific claims. In the first case the surplus would belong to the United States, subject to any hesitation which there might be on the ground of having obtained an excessive amount by exaggerated statements: in the second case it clearly ought, by all principles of law and

honour, to be returned. In private life, when a man has a doubt as to what he ought to do, and feels that his interest interferes with a clear perception of his duty, he takes the advice of a right-minded and judicious friend. Why should not a nation do the same. President Grevy, for instance, would be a very trustworthy adviser. Lord Russell, we know, once answered such a suggestion by saying, that England was the guardian of her own honour. But he was wrong: England could guard her honour only by doing what was right, and what was right she could know only by calling in the aid of an unbiassed judgment. If any thing is to be done in the present case it ought to be done quickly: long dallying over a question of honour is hardly less damaging to character than a wrong decision.

— We cannot help heartily chiming in with the English journals in the expression of the hope that the Celebration of Yorktown may be the last of the series. The fact is that when the plain truth is told, when skirmishes are rated as skirmishes and not as great battles, when inequalities of number and disparities of local circumstance are taken into account, the military glories of the Revolution bear but a small proportion to its moral importance. In this, as in all other wars, disciplined valour asserted its ascendancy whenever it could get fair battle with its foe. But this is the least part of the matter. Not only has the independence of the United States been diplomatically acknowledged by England, it has long ago been morally ratified by her in every possible way; every Englishman with the slightest pretension to sense at once sees that it must have come, and deplures the fraternal strife through which it came; while, by the Liberal party, that is by the great majority of the people, it is regarded as the victory of their own cause. We would almost venture to say, that the American Republic herself contains as many enemies of the Revolution, in the persons of High Anglican clergymen and other representatives of the old Tory sentiment, as does

the Mother Country. It is true, that at the time of the Civil War, the British aristocracy showed its teeth; but this was not the animosity of George III. and his partisans against the revolted Colonies: it was the sympathy of Privilege with Privilege all over the world in the common struggle against Equality. On the American side, thanks to Jefferson and his party of Slave-owning Jacobins, the hatred was cherished long enough to range the Republic on the side of the universal oppressor of Europe against the uprisen nations, and make her practically the ally of as bad a cause as any in history. The old quarrel is a thousand times dead. A totally new set of relations has sprung up, bringing with it new and important objects of international statesmanship, which can only be defeated by reviewing the evil memory of Yorktown.

—For a man so distinguished as Mr. Evarts, better employment might be desired than attending a Bi-metallic Conference. He can hardly be a victim to the fancy that it is in the power of Governments to fix, by law or convention, and to keep fixed, the relative value of two commodities. Gold and silver are commodities, as truly as beef and mutton, and their values, positive and relative, are liable to be changed by the rate of production and other circumstances beyond the control of any Government. Beef and mutton, at least beeves and sheep, have actually been the standards, and the mediums of exchange in primitive communities, as have many other commodities, iron, copper, cowries, salt, sugar and tobacco, in communities either primitive or reduced to primitive necessities. But, by the great commercial nations, gold has finally been adopted: it was chosen in the first instance on account of its intrinsic qualities, such as beauty, scarcity, and portability; but to these has now been added a prescription, which, though scarcely noticed by economists, could hardly be disturbed without throwing trade into confusion. The standard of the great commercial nations has practically been that of the commercial world.

Certain nations, notably China and India, have clung to silver, which possesses in an inferior degree the recommendations of gold, and require to be exceptionally dealt with on that account, as they would if they had clung to copper or to cowries. By the great commercial nations silver has been used as change for gold, and though the proportional value cannot be exactly ascertained or kept fixed, a rough equivalency is sufficient so long as the silver remains change only. Let the State make silver a legal tender as well as gold, so that loans contracted in gold may be paid in a conventional amount of silver, and it will find itself in a predicament something like that of uttering base coin, while trade will be liable to evils similar to those which a debasement of the currency entails. It was hardly to be expected that England, having an immense amount of wealth accumulated in gold, would be persuaded to go into a Conference for the purpose of tampering with the value of that metal. Bi-metallism is a move of the Silver kings with the Greenbackers behind them.

—Michigan reverts to Capital Punishment, and this is not the first instance of what some philanthropists would call a relapse. Total abolition was the reaction from the cruel prodigality with which despotic or aristocratic governments, reckless of the blood of the people, once lavished the death penalty. The hideous penal code of old France, with its chambers of torture, and its breakings on the wheel, had a rival scarcely less hideous in the code of England, under which there were two hundred and twenty-three capital offences; and, so late as 1826, fifty-eight persons were lying under sentence of death at the same time. But after a trial of abolition, the tendency at present is to retain or revive capital punishment, limiting it strictly to the case of wilful murder. What death is, whether it closes existence altogether, or opens the gate of another life is a question about which many are now in doubt; while not a few seem to have made up their minds that when a man dies

he is as though he had never been. But it is certain that to the ordinary man, and particularly to those men of coarse and low nature, by whom murders are commonly committed, the death penalty is the most terrible, and that it invests with a transcendent horror a crime to which it is exclusively attached. This is the voice of nature, let philosophic jurists debate as they will on the comparative efficacy of certainty and severity as characteristics of punishment in deterring from crime. The thought of an approaching execution has not ceased to fill the whole community with peculiar awe. To guard the lives of innocent citizens is the first duty of the State, and if experience proves that they can be guarded only by taking the life of the guilty, that necessity is a sufficient warrant. Nor will the case be changed if we look at it from the side of the culprit. A murderer, if he has any remnant of moral sensibility left in him, must feel that it is not desirable for him to live. He has placed himself out of the range of human sympathy and beyond the possibility of human affection; he can never be anything but an object of detestation and abhorrence. What is the value of such an existence? Supposing perpetual imprisonment to be substituted for death, is it really merciful to shut a man up for years between stone walls, apart from his kind, with the furies of his conscience, or, if conscience is dead, as in the case of the coarser criminals it usually is, to keep him in a protracted state of apathy or despair? We should not wish to hang Othello, whose crime springs from a passion essentially noble; but Othello himself feels that it is impossible for him to live. To the argument that the State, by putting a man to death, itself violates the sanctity of human life, which it is the alleged object of the punishment to preserve, the answer is, that the life of a murderer has lost its sanctity because he has by his act cut himself off from humanity.

One objection there is to capital punishment which it is difficult to meet. Human tribunals are fallible, and death shuts out the possibility of revision. But the case of a man who is wrongly sentenced to penal servitude for life, as we saw a man

was on the point of being the other day through the treachery of his partner, and has no means of getting his cause re-tried by the authorities, is as hard and almost as hopeless as that of the man who is put to death. In some countries they do not inflict the last penalty until they have extracted a confession. This seems to put a premium on callousness. A regular appeal to a higher court such as exists in France, is a provision of less doubtful expediency, and if it is sometimes abused for the mere purpose of delay the evil is trifling compared with that of haste in taking life. Its place is ill supplied in our system by an irregular use of the prerogative of mercy for the purpose of having a case re-tried by the Home Secretary or the Minister of Justice without the securities for justice supplied by the machinery of a Court.

—All overtures on the part of the British Government for a treaty of International Copyright were, till recently, repelled by the Americans. The other day the United States Government surprised and gladdened British authors by itself taking up a proposal which is understood to have come from an American firm; and a treaty is now under consideration giving protection to the British author provided his work is produced and registered in the United States within a certain time after the publication in England. But, like the concessions of the French Monarchy to Revolution when the insurgents were in the Tuileries, this proposal comes too late. Cheap printing has completely changed the situation. All rules and courtesies of the American trade by which a partial substitute for copyright was practically afforded to the English author have given way. American firms which once were the great opponents of International Copyright are now fleeing to it for their lives, in the hope that it will save them from the cheap printer: in fact, it is their conversion under the influence of alarm that has brought on the present negotiations. It is not likely that they will succeed. The American people, having once tasted the

advantages and pleasures of a free library at trifling cost, will hardly be induced to submit to curtailment and restriction. The water is let out and the flood cannot be stayed. For our own part, we have put little faith in International Copyright from the beginning: the chance of preventing a western journal from reproducing a popular English novel always seemed to us very small, and we have believed all along that the existence of a vast English-reading public on this side of the Atlantic, and beyond the pale of English legislation, would prove a death-blow to copyright in both countries, and ultimately throughout the world. The result of the one-sided system which has hitherto prevailed has been the discouragement of American literature, since publishers would not pay an American for his copyright when they could take the fruit of an English author's brains without payment. It is not to be supposed that the English public will long see a paradise of cheap reading on this side of the water without desiring to have the same on their own side. If matters take the course which we anticipate, sellers of literature, unsentimental as the proposition may seem, will have to fall back, like sellers of other productions, on their commercial advantages and facilities. They will have to bring a book out in the first instance at the rate which suits their market, so that there may be no danger of their being undersold by competitors. Nor will this necessity be always adverse to their interests: a recent example shows that heavy loss may be incurred upon a book issued in an expensive form and condemned by the select circle which can afford to buy it, when, issued in a cheap form, it would, from the curiosity prevailing about it and the interest attached to the name of its author, have sold at once like wildfire. English publishers must learn to doff their buckram and meet reasonable requirements: people will not submit to extortion practised under the guise of etiquette. Before us lies a book of travels published by a British firm. Everything in the book which is of any interest or value might be comprised in a hundred pages; by padding, the number of pages is swelled to five hundred and

seventy: these are printed on heavy paper in large type, and the volume, which would be dear to the reader at half-a-crown, is sold for twenty-five shillings in England and seven dollars and thirty-five cents in this country. As the title is taking and the author's name well known, the book would probably have sold well if brought out cheaply. Legal objections have been started to a treaty, on the ground that the subject does not come within the scope of the treaty-making power, having been assigned by the Constitution to Congress and already regulated by Congressional legislation. That Congress will pass an International Copyright Act is in the last degree improbable. When Copyright is in peril, Patents are in peril also, and it is not premature to speculate upon the destinies of Invention as well as Authorship when left to the chances of trade. In the case of Authorship, the result will probably be a diminution of the number of publications by a more rigorous action of the principle of commercial selection, which can hardly be regarded as an unmixed evil. The future condition of great public libraries, such as that of the British Museum, bound to keep everything which is published, is an appalling subject of contemplation. It would be, at least, if the paper was as fine and durable as that on which books were printed in the so-called infancy, which was really the acme, of the art of printing: with such paper as is made now, the difficulty will be solved by decay.

The dime novel has, perhaps, been too much maligned; its sentiment, if not rational, has been for the most part generous, and people have read it who would otherwise have read nothing, and never have had their minds awakened at all. But the cheap library has got far beyond the dime novel; it includes standard works of philosophy, history, divinity, poetry and science: and though, like other novelties, it may have been overdone and there may be a check to its progress for a time, it cannot fail to work an intellectual revolution. Its appearance calls for the consideration of those who are promoting Public Libraries, which will be less needed when literature of the kind that most people read is brought within everybody's reach, though as depositories

of old books and works of reference they will always be useful to the literary class.

—The victory of Chili over Peru and Bolivia is probably the triumph of right; certainly it is the triumph of a higher civilization. It was the blessedness of Chili not to be an Eldorado. Colonies, such as Mexico and Peru, rich in the metal which foolish cupidity deemed the only wealth, became the miserable seats of a population consisting of a drove of enslaved Indians who dug the gold, with a few Spanish drivers who squandered it. Chili, dependent on less dazzling but steadier and happier industries, became the home of something more worthy of the name of a people. The Government has been in the hands of a body of great landowners, and compared with that of any other South American State, excepting, perhaps, Brazil, has been stable, wise, and honourable in its dealings with other nations, though the commercial evils attendant upon a landed aristocracy, if not the social and political evils, are, it seems, beginning to be severely felt. It is very doubtful whether, in essential respects, Chili will really be the gainer by her success in this war, that is if its prize is to be the annexation of the nitrate beds and guano grounds at present in the possession of Bolivia and Peru, an Eldorado almost as unpropitious to regular industry, according to Mr. Gallenga, as one of gold. It seems also that from the prostrate condition of her defeated neighbours the victorious republic can scarcely avoid assuming towards them an Imperial position which is too likely to consummate her moral ruin.

The Republics, as they are pleased to call themselves, and as the enemies of popular institutions are delighted to style them, which succeeded to Spanish dominion in South America, have not been really Republics for an hour. Populations devoid of any political idea, and totally incapable of self-government, hereditary monarchy and its viceroys being withdrawn, have passed, by a series of convulsions and civil wars, from the hands

of one dictator to those of another, the despot of the hour being selected by the same simple process which selects the leading animal of the herd. Sometimes the dictator has ruled on tolerable principles, as did Juarez; sometimes he has been an atrocious and brutal tyrant as was Rosas, Carlyle's favourite Francia, and above all the Paraguayan Lopez, a sanguinary and barbarous ape of the Bonapartes, whose wars, extortions and oppressions have brought Paraguay to utter ruin. The people, ignorant and embruted, desire only to be relieved of freedom, and yield a slavish submission to any adventurer who vaults into the seat of power. Politics, if intrigue, conspiracy, and corruption can be so called, are everywhere the appanage of a small group of lawyers and soldiers whose objects are merely those of buccaneers. Nor in the Spanish Creoles, of whom these gangs are usually formed, or in the debased and half-savage Indian, educated neither by school nor by regular industry, does there seem to be any gleam of hope for the political future. A succession of plundering despotisms, with interludes of bloody anarchy, has only made both elements worse than they were in the beginning. The sole hope for the political future lies where the industry, the greater part of the wealth, and all the character and intelligence lie—in the immigrants of various nationalities, who have so far confined themselves to commercial pursuits and kept aloof from the political struggles, but are now beginning in self-defence to use their influence, and will, in the end, find it necessary to take the country into their hands. Already at Lima they have found it necessary for the protection of their own persons and property, to constitute themselves the police. When this revolution shall have generally been effected, and the Spanish Creole shall have been supplanted in the government by the better race, the hour will come for proposing that a Confederation of States in the Southern part of this Continent, similar to that which exists in the Northern part, shall be formed for the purpose of securing peace, freedom of intercourse, and the general interests of civilization.

— Others may excel in oratoric finish or in party strategy ; in framing and expounding great measures Mr. Gladstone is without a peer. His Irish Land Bill is evidently worthy of his hand, and in carrying it through the House of Commons, his power of Parliamentary advocacy will, no doubt, be displayed. It contains three sets of provisions ; one set reducing the interest of the landlord practically to a seignior, with a rent fixed by arbitration, a power of eviction for non-payment of rent only, and a privilege of pre-emption in case of sale ; another, facilitating the purchase of the fee-simple by the tenant ; a third, promoting by advances the reclamation of waste lands. It is to the second set, as we have said before, that we look with confidence for a permanent settlement of this quarrel and for an extinction of the confiscating tendencies to which the quarrel has given birth, and against which the diffusion of ownership is, as the example of the United States proves, the surest safeguard. The first set may appease, and it seems likely that it will appease, for a time ; but its ultimate effect can hardly fail to be the creation of a body of landlords less than ever interested in the land, more estranged than ever from the people, and more than ever absentees. Apart from the attractions of fox-hunting and shooting, to which tenant-right is not propitious, a landowner has little inducement to take up his abode in a rural district, far from the temples of pleasure, saving the social dignity attached to real lordship, and the satisfaction of overlooking and improving land which is his own. Much less will he be tempted to rusticate in fields where, if a difference arises as to the definition of a fair rent, he will be liable to be confined to his own mansion, and, if he ventures forth, to be shot from behind a hedge. His annual claims, made through his agent, and his privileged interference with a tenant who wants to sell, will be regarded as vexatious extortion practised by a mere stranger on the proper owner of the land, and the next period of distress will probably give birth to a renewal of the agitation for the purpose of throwing off the incubus altogether. It was not against landlords proper, but

against non-resident seigniors, with their oppressive dues and privileges that the French peasantry rose at the time of the Revolution; and such semblance of anti-rent movements as we have had upon this Continent, both in New York and in French Canada, has been of the same kind. In the third set of provisions there can hardly be said to be much hope. In England itself, the lighter lands have of late years been rapidly going back from arable into pasture; and, in the face of American competition, there is surely little to be made by the reclamation of Irish bogs.

The Bill has at once received the auspicious condemnation of Mr. Dillon, who says that it will destroy the power of the Land League. Mr. Parnell apparently feels that it has given too much satisfaction in Ireland to admit of his persisting in his attempt to overthrow the Liberal Government by a union with the Conservatives. For himself, his previous conduct shows that, if he could, he would ruin the Bill and keep up the agrarian grievance as a feeder for his political agitation. But in this the Irish farmer is not with him. What the Irish farmer wants is the land, and if he thinks that the Bill will give it him, he will not throw away the substantial boon to pursue the shadowy hope of a Hibernian Republic. Mr. Parnell's game, if he means mischief, will most likely be a protraction of the debate, and a series of battles on points of detail, in the course of which he may practically receive the aid of the Conservatives, whose hope like his own will be in delay. Open resistance to the measure as a whole they seem to regard as desperate policy, and Lord Elcho when he rushed into that position was promptly disavowed by the leader. Had Mr. Parnell been able to induce his men to vote against the Bill, it would not have passed the Commons by a large majority, and moreover, the Lords would have been able to say that a measure avowedly exceptional, and infringing on the general rights of property, had lost its only justification, since it had been opposed by the very people whom it was framed to appease.

What will the Whigs do? It is not easy to say; but it is

very easy to say how they will feel. The Duke of Argyll, who has resigned upon the Land Bill, is a typical Whig, and his secession is rendered more marked by his strong personal friendship for Mr. Gladstone. It has long been evident that the train of historical accidents, beginning with the ejection of the Whig houses from power by George III., which had thrown a section of the territorial aristocracy into the Liberal camp—having come to an end, no bond of union save the tradition of a few leading families remained, and that this could not long prevail against interest and social ties, combined with attachment to a privileged order. It is only surprising that the Duke of Argyll and his compeers should have remained till now under the same political roof with Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, to say nothing of Mr. Bradlaugh. The first serious question affecting the land was almost certain to produce a rupture, and there can be no doubt that, before the Land Bill was framed, the two sections had been pulling different ways upon the subject of coercion. On the other hand, the Whigs are cool-headed; they will not vote against the Bill without forecasting the consequences of its rejection; and they will probably come to the conclusion that the first consequence would be the extension of the agrarian agitation to England, and that the second would be a pitched battle between the aristocracy and the people, which would end in the overthrow of the House of Lords. It is not unlikely, however, that, from the secession of the Duke of Argyll, may date the new arrangement of parties in England, to which most people have begun to look forward; that the evanescent line between Conservatives and Whigs may now finally fade away; and that the division henceforth may be between Moderates and Radicals. It is possible that England may some day, like France, see all the Conservative sections united in support of a government of combat formed to stem the progress of social revolution.

—Any tendency which there may be to union between the Whigs and Tories is pretty sure to be seconded by the awkwardness of the position in which the Tories will now find themselves. After following a meteoric light, and being led by it into strange and unsafe places, they have to find their way back without a guide to the familiar path, and to firm ground. The revival of the name Tory in place of Conservative denotes the transmutation which, since 1846, the party has undergone. Before 1846, it was really Conservative, and the core of the Conservative party of Europe. Peel and his colleagues accepted the situation as it was after the passing of the Reform Bill; disclaimed reaction, but resisted further organic change, offering the nation in place of it administrative reforms, good government, sound finance and commercial prosperity. They relied on the morality, intelligence, and order-loving temper of the middle-classes. Their foreign policy, while it was not wanting in firmness or dignity, was peaceful and unambitious, for they were perfectly conscious that war breaking out in Europe was likely to rekindle revolution. They played no tricks, walked in no crooked paths, indulged in no theatrical strokes or surprises, but sought and won the confidence of the nation by strict integrity, veracity and honour. The temper of the English people being what it is, Conservatism might have satisfied and ruled them to this hour. But after 1846 a new and more adventurous policy took its place. New, perhaps, it could hardly be called: it was a revival of the policy of Bolingbroke and the Jacobites. It sought to restore the ascendancy of the territorial aristocracy, to revive the influence of the Court, and by forming a political alliance between the two extremes of society to depress the middle and commercial classes, whom its author always professed especially to dislike and despise. Imperialism and militarism were additions to the Bolingbrokian programme, suggested by the circumstances of the present day. This game was played for a time with a degree of success which could not have been foreseen, owing mainly to the unparalleled influx of wealth which heated

the blood of the nation, made it indifferent to political reforms, and gave birth to a vast number of new fortunes, the possessors of which were very amenable to the influences of the aristocracy and the Court. But the man who understood it is gone, and even before his death, his policy had sunk in utter and apparently final ruin. The Tories, we say, have now to find their way back to firm ground with the Reform Bill of 1867 and Jingoism round their necks. But the Whigs, so far as principles and policy are concerned, occupy, as nearly as the lapse of thirty-five years will permit, the old Conservative position; they have nothing round their necks, and their leaders, though they do not dazzle the nation by the brilliancy of their genius, command public confidence, which Lord Salisbury has to no small extent forfeited by his compliances with the late system. It would not be surprising, then, if the Tories, though their leader, the late Lord Derby, in 1867, triumphed in the thought that he had dished the Whigs, should seek the Whig alliance in 1881. If the object of the Confederacy is to be the preservation of the English Land Law, the House of Lords and the Established Church, the combined forces will not be too strong for the undertaking.

—We were not mistaken in thinking that, in the inflammable state of society, the Irish fire would spread. Meetings have been held in the United States to protest against the payment of rent for houses. It would be as reasonable to protest against the payment of milk bills; for if the house is built upon land, the cow grazes on it, and her produce, by the principles of agrarian communism, must belong to humanity at large. Mr. George, the philosophic apostle of confiscation, does not let the opportunity slip. He proclaims that the true remedy for the Irish malady is not the establishment of peasant proprietorship in Ireland, but the abolition everywhere of private property in land, including houses and, we presume, railroads and all other products of private industry and capital attached to the soil. He

proposes to effect a virtual dispossession 'by the use of the taxing power, pleasantly observing that the proprietors may keep the title deeds and the name of ownership if they like. His theories, however wild, if honestly propounded, ought to provoke no indignation. But indignation is justly provoked by his insolent and heartless flippancy. It does not appear to have occurred to him that a large and powerful class, threatened with spoliation and beggary, would strike a blow in defence of its possessions and those of its wives and children; or even that it would refuse to till the soil and tamely hand over the produce, or as much of it as he might choose to call rent, to him and a band of his fellow confiscators styling themselves the State. Let him propose to the Irish Land Leaguers to make their farms the common property of the human race, and he will get a few slugs in his body for his own share. If he will name any possession of his own—mortgages, stocks, bonds, professional salary or copyright—we will undertake to show him that his ownership is just as much "piracy" as a farmer's ownership of his farm, and that if property is theft, all property must be theft alike. His theory that rent is the universal source of pauperism, as we have said before, is a mare's nest. The sources of pauperism are various—idleness, improvidence, intemperance, infirmity, individual misfortune, commercial depression, shiftings of the course of trade, redundancy of population—and it is found in Venice and other purely mercantile communities where the land question does not exist. How could pauperism be caused by that increase in the productiveness of land which enabled it not only to remunerate the cultivator but to pay a rent to a ground owner? Fields which belonged to nobody, nobody would till; the farmer would decline to improve by the sweat of his brow land to which, after all, he would have no better title than the tramp idling at his gate; and the universal right to land would prove a universal right to famine. To seize the estates of landowners, and the capital invested in them perhaps but yesterday under the full sanction and guaranty of the law, the State must, of course, give public faith to the winds

and overturn the sanctity of all contracts. But, we repeat, the immediate consequence of any attempt to carry Mr. George's theories into effect would be a deadly civil war.

The inequality with which worldly goods are distributed is fearful. It begins, not with human institutions, but with nature, which metes out to us strength, health, intellect, accidental advantages, if on any principle, on some principle different from distributive justice. Civilization, on the whole, reduces it: a weak savage in primeval wilds, before the name of rent or capital was heard, felt his inferiority to his stronger mate more keenly than poverty in a civilized state feels its inferiority to wealth. Yet the thought of the difference between rich and poor must press upon the heart of every rich man who has one, especially if he is a follower of Jesus of Nazareth, and dispose him not only to relieve distress and avoid that ostentatious use of wealth which adds bitterness to poverty, but to give a ready ear to any theories which promise to render the conditions of men more equal. He will only ask that the theory shall bear the stamp of good-will, and not of envy and hatred, for of envy and hatred neither truth nor justice can come. Some show of practicability may also be reasonably required. In communistic schemes everything is to be done by the State. The State is to be the universal taskmaster and paymaster as well as the sole and absolute proprietor. If it is to enforce labour without the inducement of private property, it must have the power of the lash. But what is the State? From the language used about it, one might suppose that it was some perfectly wise, benevolent and semi-divine authority, subsisting apart from all the members of the community. Yet, in fact, it is nothing but the government, and we suppose no government yet exists, or has been imagined, to which anybody out of Bedlam would think of assigning functions incomparably more extensive than those of the most intrusive bureaucracy and powers far greater than those of the most absolute despotism. Mr. George describes the rulers of the United States as utterly corrupt and depraved, in the same

pages in which he proposes to transfer to their hands from those of the private owners all the real estate of the community. The first problem which the Socialist has to solve is political. He has to prove that he can create a government equal to the Almighty in its wisdom and beneficence, as well as in the range of its action and the extent of its power. Far be it from us to speak in an unsympathetic tone of philanthropic speculation, let the project be as startling as it will. But philanthropy must learn to move within the limits traced by social and economical, as well as within those traced by physical, law; otherwise the result of its efforts instead of a reign of justice will be a general wreck, which again will be succeeded, as historical experience shows, by a reactionary government of force.

—For some reason which it would be difficult to define, French ambition has always kept its eye fixed on Syria. Perhaps romantic memories of the Crusades and of the grand Oriental escapade of Napoleon may have mingled with the designs of modern policy. In 1840, this fancy brought Europe to the brink of war. It seemed strange, therefore, that the annexation of Cyprus by England should not awaken French jealousy. It now appears that France had been privately appeased by a promise from the English Government of connivance at her annexation of Tunis. Such was “the Areopagus of Europe,” the incorrupt and august conclave which was to restore the reign of righteousness among the nations! Tunis, though a small and imperfectly civilized, was an unoffending power, and she was the feudatory of Turkey, with whom England was concluding an alliance. The French wolf is now fastening upon the lamb the quarrel which the forms of moral civilization require as a preliminary to the seizure of the prey. But there is a second wolf, in the shape of Italy, watching the proceedings of the first wolf with grinning teeth and gleaming eyes. Tunis may find an avenger; she is, at all events, not likely to be a comfortable acquisition to the spoiler. France

has no surplus population ; she cannot people Algeria ; her craving for Tunis is mere rapacity. Italy would only be weakened by the division of her force, and by having, in case of war, to guard a country on the other side of the Mediterranean. But Empire is founded upon something higher than reason or the material interest of nations.

—In the direction of Greece the storm cloud still lowers, but it is hardly conceivable that it should burst. The Powers can, of course, compel Greece to abstain from war if they choose, and they must know that the commencement of war anywhere might bring on a general explosion. Had England maintained towards Turkey the position of a disinterested adviser, the Turk would probably accept her counsels, and the difficulty would be at an end : but the annexation of Cyprus has naturally impressed him with the conviction that she is no more disinterested than his other friends. Greece has unquestionably a claim upon Europe, and particularly upon England ; at the instance of England she forbore to attack the Turk when he had Russia on his hands ; but she has only to wait. Albania is now struggling to assert, or rather re-assert, its independence of the Porte : the dissolution of the Turkish Empire is evidently at hand.

—The murderers of the Czar have met their doom. They were the murderers not of the Czar only but of the unfortunate men of his train, among whom their reckless savagery scattered death. If at the Winter Palace their dynamite had taken effect as they intended, the carnage might have been appalling. Those who make up their minds to kill even a Caligula or a Nero, must take their lives in their hands. Alexander II. had given freedom to more human beings than any single man in history ; at home he had been a reformer of the boldest kind ; abroad, the only purpose for which he had put forth his mili-

tary power in a great war had been the liberation of the Servians and Bulgarians from a cruel and degrading yoke. The miserable dotage into which he sank in his declining years and which was partly the result of his crushing burden of care, could not cancel the title to the gratitude of humanity which he had acquired in his prime. His autocracy was not usurped but legitimate, nor had it ceased to be a necessity of Russia, and Poland with her wrongs and griefs was a part of his inheritance as Ireland with her wrongs and griefs is a part of the inheritance of Victoria. Not reform, but anarchy, political, social, domestic, and moral, was the avowed object of his assassins. There seems to have been no doubt as to the guilt of any of those who were brought to the scaffold. It was stated by their fellow Nihilists that they had been tortured in prison to extract information, but the publicity of their trial and the freedom of speech allowed them seem to belie this assertion. Yet it is certain that if a war of nitro-glycerine begins, a terrible strain will be laid upon those principles of mercy which it has cost so much effort to establish. Nothing is more cruel than the fear engendered by the hourly danger of assassination; and it is the highest proof of Cromwell's greatness of soul that he did not, as Hume loosely asserts, succumb to that fear, but preserved his clemency as well as his courage unshaken to the end.

If murder is a crime, the only one of the executions, the propriety of which can be questioned, is that of the female conspirator, Sophie Pieoffsky. Of her guilt there was no doubt. But to those who, like ourselves, still believe in sex, it might have seemed better that a woman who had so far forgotten her womanhood as to take part in a murderous conspiracy should, instead of appearing on a political scaffold, have been treated as an instance of portentous aberration and consigned to seclusion for the rest of her days. This, we say, would have been the natural inclination of those who cling to old opinions on such subjects. But those who demand that all distinctions on the ground of sex be abolished, and yet

claim immunity for female conspirators will find it difficult to give a logical account of their position. Some of them seem disposed to maintain that the presence of a woman in the plot is a proof of the excellence of its object, but this theory would scarcely hold good when applied to the case of Catherine de Medicis. Conspiracy in itself and apart from the object has a terrible fascination for weakness. An attempt is being made to combine old privilege with new equality. The two conditions cannot co-exist; if the equality of the sexes is to be proclaimed, the privileges of women must be relinquished; as, after a period of transition, during which the old sentiment will linger, the crusaders against sex will find. Not many women wish to take part in public life, but the position of all will be jeopardized by the aspirations of the few.

—It was to be expected that the assassination of the Czar would give birth to serious questions between governments about the limits of the right of asylum. We may trust the British Government to resist any attempts on the part of foreign sovereigns to curtail the hospitality of Great Britain in the case of political refugees living quietly under the protection of her flag. But no nation is bound or entitled to let itself be made the lair of assassins; by doing so it would afford its neighbours a cause of most righteous war. Formerly, a Russian Nihilist resident in England would have been almost in another planet: in these days of railroads and telegraphs he directs from London every movement of a conspiracy at St. Petersburg; and a certain unification of preventive police seems the almost necessary consequence of the change. The less done, however, the better, even for the object immediately in view. *Die Freiheit* incited to murder, and incitement to murder is a crime whether the life threatened be that of a king or that of a peasant. In principle the prosecution is right, but its wisdom is not so clear. In the United States the *Anarchist* preaching barricades and “chemicals” was allowed to appear unmolested, and unmolested to die. It showed what

were the aims of its writers, and what the extent of their influence. In press prosecutions there is the double danger of breaking the barometer and of closing the safety valve. Worse than this, there is the danger of stifling the voice of a class which may be suffering keenly, and whose utterances, however wild and savage, may have less in them of criminality than of despair. The poverty of the Faubourg St. Antoine was hideous, but it was the offspring of oppression. Remote from us as it seems at present, the international question may, in time, arise here, in case Nihilism, hunted out of its European caverns, transfers its base of operations to this side of the Atlantic.

Nihilism is only Communism in its most savage and satanic form. A dark cloud of social war seems at this moment to be hanging over Europe. It may pass away, if rulers, with the daggers at their breasts, can remain cool-headed and wise; but it may also break in a terrible storm. Once more we may see an effort on the part of the holders of power to extirpate revolutionary opinion. That tolerance, which, in the sceptical eighteenth century, sheathed the sword of religious war, and quenched the fires of the Inquisition, was, in part, the offspring of indifference. Indifference will reign no more if all those who have an interest in the existing state of things find themselves menaced by the growth of a fanatical sect seeking the destruction of all institutions and the confiscation of all property, by means of secret organizations and dynamite. As in the days of the Anabaptists, the murderous frenzy of subversion may be met with an equally murderous frenzy of repression; the crust of civilization may give way, and the subterranean fires of barbarous passion may break forth and desolate the earth once more.

All eyes are bent on the new Czar, whose personal tendencies, maugre all our general laws of social science, are the problem of the hour. So far as can be seen he is a thorough nationalist, and if he avoids the visionary Pan Slavism with which Russian nationalism is apt to be allied, thorough nationalism is his right path. The two curses of Russia are a Frenchified aristocracy and a bureaucracy which is alien to the

nation, both of them productions, the 'first indirectly, the second directly, of Peter, styled the Great, the creator of that Russia which was "rotten before it was ripe." It is by gathering patriotic Russians around him, by making his councils truly national, and, at the same time, as open and constitutional as the circumstances of the country will permit, while he holds the reins of government firmly in hand, that the head of the Russian people may hope to carry his Empire and himself safely through the crisis at which they have arrived. If he were to fling the reins to Revolution, the consequence would be anarchy and disaster. By the masses the Czar is still regarded as a Father. "The Emperor," says a recent observer, "is literally among his people; he is literally in contact with them; for, as he raises his hand to reply by a salute to the enthusiastic shouts with which he is everywhere received, he is sometimes unable to do it without touching the person next to him. But it must not be imagined that there is any rushing or even pressing. The people have too much respect for their Emperor and their host, who in his turn has full confidence in his subjects and his guests; for, as at all the other popular *fetes* at Moscow, I noticed the entire absence of soldiers and police from among the people, and noticed too that their absence was appreciated." The same writer says that "all the people in the immediate neighbourhood of the Emperor were in a state of great excitement, and several of them actually shed tears after he had spoken to them." This is a state of things not favourable to democratic revolution; but, at the same time very favourable to the initiation of administrative reform by the central power, if that power is in wise and vigorous hands. Whether it is, will soon be seen. That the first measures after the assassination of the Czar's father should be repressive is not surprising, nor does it prove that reforms are not behind. Expatriation, whether for the purposes of political conspiracy or Parisian debauchery, is a practice on which the rulers of Russia may be justified in placing restraint. Universities have no more business than churches to become the centres of political

agitation; nor is it the least likely that the dreams of materialistic students have any relation to the policy demanded by the real interests of the Russian people. On the other hand, if a quarter of what Nihilists say about the prisons of Siberia is true (and this probably is near the mark), to open the gates of mercy ought on every ground of policy, humanity, and regard for European opinion, to be the first act of the new Czar.

—Those who are loyal to moral civilization will thank Mr. Anthony Trollope for saying a word in defence of Cicero. Mr. Trollope is a sensible man of the world, and above the affectation of identifying himself with force, and playing the vigorous and unscrupulous man of action upon paper, as weak sentimentalists love to do. His book seems to have been partly called forth by that of Mr. Froude, whose passion for Cæsar is as Carlylist and as feminine as his passion for Henry VIII., and whose treatment of the opponents of his favourite in both cases is a mere tissue of calumny.* Cicero had palpable infirmities; like most orators, having fed on applause, he was vain, and vanity had not then learnt to disguise itself as it has now. He poured out his griefs, with what a colder age thinks scanty regard for dignity, into the bosom of a friend. Inconsistency, or changes of opinion and policy which would wear that aspect, he could hardly have avoided amidst the raging whirlpool of events, even if there had been more iron in his blood than there usually is in that of literary statesmen; and the inconsistency of one who is always speaking is noted, while that of silent actors passes unmarked. He was a man of peace, not of war, and could not be master of a military situation; though the military chiefs courted his support in a way for which his detractors find it difficult to account, and which shows that steel

* Those who wish to know what Mr. Froude's mode of dealing with character is, will find it worth while to read the late Colonel Meline's little volume on "Mary, Queen of Scots, and her latest English historian." They will probably come to the conclusion that Mr. Froude has no rival among writers of history.

and gold were not the only powers at Rome. But he was the representative of moral civilization in his day, a genuine though very imperfect servant of humanity, in all spheres an upholder, so far as his own character had play, of righteousness and mercy; above his fellows refined in his tastes and comprehensive in his sympathies; tender and, in the main, true. If he could not carry the day against the heavy fists, so much the worse was it for the world. His conduct in the Civil War has been ridiculed as weak and wavering, but, considering that he was not a soldier, with little justice. He saw the approach of the war, he says, with horror, knowing that his country was threatened with slavery on the one side, with the vengeance of a victorious faction on the other, and he went into the camp of Pompey in the hope of restraining the cruelty of the victor as, to the utmost of his power, he would undoubtedly have done. Mr. Froude's insinuation that Cicero and Cato were governed by their mean envy of Cæsar's genius is an artifice characteristic of Mr. Froude: there can be no shadow of doubt that both men were sincerely opposed to Cæsar's designs and desirous of saving the Republic. Cato is as much an object of Mr. Froude's passionate hatred as Cicero. Of a man's policy, posterity, seeing the result, can best form an estimate; of his character and the impression made by him on the minds of men, his own age must always be the judge. By the great poet of the House of Cæsar Cato is represented as presiding over the souls of the just. Cæsar marked his importance by assailing his memory in a pamphlet, of which Mr. Froude affects to deplore the total loss, without adverting to the fact that Plutarch has preserved some specimens of its spirit which it would not be very pleasant for a Cæsar-worshipper to produce.

Can there be anybody to whom Mr. Froude's version of Cæsar's part in history was new? Can there be anybody who had continued to believe that Rome was a Republic like the United States, and that Cæsar conspired against its liberties and overthrew them? Rome was a commonwealth of slave-owners; an oligarchy riding on the shoulders of a city popu-

lace, its only constituency, mistress of a conquered world which she could not incorporate, because the principle of representation was unknown. Empire had filled her once heroic soul with corruption, and the provinces were the spoils of faction and the looting-grounds of its chiefs, except when one of them had a Cicero for a governor. Dissolution had set in; Pompey had almost made a kingdom for himself out of his military satrapy of Spain. The end was come, and there can be little doubt that the aspirations of a brilliant adventurer coincided with the decree of fate. But those who, like Cicero and Cato, struggled to reform and save the constitution under which their country had become great, took the natural course and behaved like loyal Romans. They could not tell that patriotic effort would be vain till it had been made. Narrow and corrupt as the Senatorial government was, it was the only government of law which they knew: they could see nothing beyond its fall: they could not tell that, from an obscure corner of the world, Christianity was coming to redeem the Empire of Nero. In the Senate, as Mr. Trollope, says, there would always have been a grain of salt; in fact the good Emperors, Trajan and the Antonines, were not Cæsareans but Republicans, and the heirs of Cicero and Cato. If Cæsar took the side of destiny, it was not from insight, but from ambition. He began his career by overwhelming himself with debt for the purpose of electoral corruption, and thus leaving himself no choice but that between Empire and ruin. His favourite saying was, that supreme power was the one prize for which it was worth while to be wicked. He was the man of that evil time, a grand figure, showing what Republican Rome had been, and withal in some respects worthy of love, though there never was a more ruthless representative of Roman conquest than the conqueror of Gaul. This is history; anything beyond is rhapsody. Surely it is a sorry superstition this prostrate worship of genius without regard to the way in which it is used. What is the intellectual force of the mightiest of men, measured by the scale of the Universe? Freedom from conscience goes a

long way towards making what is dubbed genius in a political adventurer. There is many a rogue in our gaols, who, put him in an element of political intrigue, would be a genius of the first order, while the policeman and the judge would be "fanatics" and "pedants."

The subject is not one of merely historical interest. Eulogistic lives of Cæsar are pamphlets in favour of Imperialism, and the last of them was written by a liberticide usurper who had mounted the throne of Bonaparte. Of all forms of reactionary revolution, Cæsarism is the only one the success of which can be regarded as possible in the New World. It is barely conceivable that a social aristocracy may be brought into existence by a union of American wealth with British titles. The American writer of "A New Nobility" shows us, in his own despite, how the New Nobility, or a certain section of it, longs in its heart to identify itself with a nobility which is not new. But the introduction of political aristocracy is not conceivable unless the character of the people undergoes a total change. Cæsarism, on the other hand, is the government of democratic despair; such it was in the case of the Bonapartes, who built their Empire on the fear of anarchy, though the speedy fate of their dynasty proved that a Christian nation, even when brought low by the effects of abortive revolution, is a different thing from the dregs of Romulus. To despair, a reign of faction and corruption indefinitely prolonged, and growing, as it is sure to do, worse by continuance, may possibly in the end reduce even the most republican of nations. There was a real, though faint, element of Imperialism in the attempt to re-elect Grant, who, if re-elected, would, most likely, have been installed for life; and we may be sure that in the days of the Second Empire Imperialist sentiment was flaunted among the denizens of the corrupt American colony in Paris. If the advocates of Female Suffrage succeed in their persistent efforts, the forces in favour of personal government, should the question at any crisis present itself, will be multiplied tenfold. The American Republic is not the counterpart of Rome nor the heir

of its political maladies. It is not an oligarchy, but a true democracy; of slavery it now has nothing, except the political subjection of the negro in the Southern States; it is, happily neither mistress of any dependencies nor vexed with imperial ambition; and its leading politicians are not military chiefs. But there was nothing to guarantee it against civil war, secure though it deemed itself; there is nothing to guarantee it against confusion and anarchy, the offspring of party violence carried beyond bounds; and in certain conceivable circumstances there may be political poison in false eulogies of adventurers who have founded Empires.

—Comparative philology is one method of recalling our forefathers from their graves; excavation is a more direct way and this also is doing wonders, such wonders that soon no mystery will be left in the sepulchres of the past. The sumptuous volume,* which embodies the results of Dr. Schliemann's researches, proves at least that the City of the Trojans was a reality, and the tradition which formed the theme of the Iliad had a local habitation and a name. Sir George Lewis lays down the law that unwritten tradition cannot be trusted at all for more than a hundred years. In ordinary cases, perhaps not: but it may be sustained by monuments, local associations, or impressive circumstances. Moreover, the strength of memory varies in communities as in men. In the Romans, for instance, who lived by precedent, memory would be very strong: so it would in any close society or brotherhood, a monastery, for example, especially as to all the events by which the corporate interest was affected. Sir George Lewis was, perhaps, a little too fond of laws: the canon which he supposed himself to have based on a sufficient induction, against living over a hundred years, has been unceremoniously broken in many instances of late.

* ILIOS, the City and Country of the Trojans: a Narrative of the most recent Discoveries and Researches made on the Plain of Troy, with Illustrations. By Dr Henry Schliemann. Imp. 8vo. New York: Harper & Bros.

It was on the Homeric question that German Criticism made its first essay, and was supposed to have gained at once its earliest and its most decisive victory; but on this very question it has now, if we mistake not, finally collapsed. Wolff, as he and his countrymen thought, by a critical analysis of the Iliad and Odyssey, proved that, instead of being the works of one or even of two authors, they were made up of a number of fragments of ancient minstrelsy, put together by a compiler. The personality of Homer, of course, perished with the unity of the poems. But the Wolfian hypothesis, after a long possession of the field, is now manifestly beating a retreat. Its advocates are falling back from the theory of compilation upon that of mere interpolation; and their proofs of interpolation are mainly, indeed almost entirely, inconsistencies and incongruities in the narrative. Inconsistencies and incongruities in a fictitious narrative are sure to occur: they may be found in poems and novels, as to the unity and authenticity of which there can be no doubt whatever. It is passing strange that Œdipus should have sat so long upon the throne without inquiring about the fate of his predecessor; yet nobody doubts that the "Œdipus Tyrannus" was entirely the work of Sophocles. In "Paradise Lost," flaws of this kind may be discovered; and somebody the other day gave us a long list of them from the novels of George Eliot. They are trifles when set in the balance against consistency in the delineation of the characters, manifest unity of plot, identity of thought, sentiment, expression, and general manner. One of the proofs of interpolation most confidently tendered is the passage in which Helen, at Priam's request, points out to him, from the walls, the leaders of the Greeks, whose army is ranged for battle on the plain below. This, it is said, was the tenth year of the war: is it possible that Priam should not have seen the leaders of the Greeks before? So, for fear of this cold criticism, Homer was to omit one of the most beautiful scenes in the Iliad! But he has himself given the explanation, if anybody needs it: so long as Achilles fought on the side of the Greeks, the Trojans kept within their walls, and thus the

two armies had never before been drawn out in open field. After reading the case presented on the true literary grounds by Mure, it is impossible, we venture to think, for any one not possessed with a spirit of destructive criticism, to doubt the unity of each of the two great poems, nearly impossible to doubt their common authorship. Mathematics can hardly express the chances which there would be against the selection of two very special subjects by a multitude of writers so equal in genius, so uniform in style, so concordant in their conceptions of the leading characters, that their independent productions would be capable of being pieced together into two perfect and harmonious poems, as to ordinary readers they seem, of nearly the same length. The inferior Epic writers of the Cycle evidently spread themselves over a great breadth of canvass, taking as their theme the whole history of the Trojan war: the writer of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* prefers in each case a very narrow canvass, a single incident in the siege of Troy, a limited portion of the adventures of Ulysses; his strength lying in minute painting of character, in dialogue, and fulness of descriptive detail. The case in favour of a common authorship might almost be rested on so decisive a proof of the identity of genius. The restoration of the personality of Homer gives back to us one of the greatest of men, the highest save Shakespeare, in the work of the creative imagination. It also reilluminates the glory of the race from which the poet sprang. Before Athens was Ionia; though when Ionia had been trodden down by the hoof of Persian conquest, Athens, with the character of Protectress, assumed that of Mother Country. To an Ionian poet two subjects naturally presented themselves, war with Asiatic powers, and maritime adventure: the first forms the theme of the *Iliad*, the second that of the *Odyssey*. The Asiatic powers with which Ionia came into contact before the Persian irruption, such as the Lydian monarchy, were not so barbarous or so alien to the Greeks as the Persian, and the relation between them and the Ionians may well have been much like those between the Greeks and the Trojans in

the Iliad. The birth of democracy and the opening of its conflict with aristocracy are denoted by the character of Thersites, and the hatred with which the poet, evidently a man of monarchical and aristocratic sympathies, regards it; while the beginning of Ionian scepticism appears to show itself in the light treatment of the gods, and in touches of freethinking sentiment, such as "the best of all omens is to be fighting for one's country." The man himself is lost to us, though hardly more so than is Shakespeare, or, strange to say, Miss Austen. A few utterances of personal feeling may perhaps be detected, as in the passage about Thersites, and it is natural to surmise that there is something of self-portraiture in the description of the bard who sings in the palace of Alcinous. When the Germans can be proved to have gone far beyond the mark with their destructive criticism in the case of Homer, the suspicion arises that they may have done the same in other and more important cases.

—The world is evidently passing into the scientific era, and the transition is marked not only by the advancement of the old sciences but by the creation of new. Entirely new is the Science of Language. It dates from the commencement of the study of Sanskrit, which rendered possible the historical and comparative method. Its natal work was Bopp's "Comparative Grammar," published in 1833. If Bopp had any precursors, they were the ancient Hindu grammarians, who, Sanskrit having ceased to be used for common speech, had occasion to study it as a classical and sacred language. What was called Etymology had derived at haphazard Latin words from the Greek, though the languages, as now appears, were not of kin in the first degree. This process was varied by occasional attempts to trace everything to the sacred Hebrew, or, if the philologist happened to be a Welshman, to the still more sacred Welsh. An advance of physical science, moreover, was necessary to the perfection of the portion of the Science of Language called

Phonology, which deals with the physical production and permutations of sounds. It is needless to say that a flood of light has been thrown on the relations between the different branches of the human family and the primeval history of mankind. By selecting the words common to all the members of the Aryan race, and therefore presumably in existence before its dispersion, philologists have been enabled to call up from the night of the past the image of the primitive Aryan civilization in its original seat, which was probably on the slopes of the Hindu Kush. We see it there with the rudiments, already existing, of our modern institutions, social, domestic and political. The professors of the Science of Language also assert that it has given birth to two other sciences—the science of Mythology and the science of Religion. Among other writers, Professor Sayce in the excellent work* recently published by him, puts forward this claim. So far as Mythology is concerned, the pretension no doubt is made good. The chief key to this puzzle is to be found in primitive language. “Myths originate in the inability of Language fully to represent our thoughts, in changes of signification undergone by words as they pass through the mouths of successive generations and in the consequent misinterpretation of their meaning and the growth of a dreamland whose sole foundations are the heir-looms of bygone speech.’ We would only enter a caveat against the too mechanical application of the scientific law. It is true that the Greek myths are traceable to Sanskrit forms of speech and largely to forms of speech relating to the doings of the sun; yet the Greek mythology is almost as original as Greek poetry or Greek art. *Prometheus*, no doubt, is the Sanskrit *Pramanthatas*, the fire-kindling machine, and *Erinyes* is *Saranyū*, the Dawn: but each has been completely transmuted by the plastic fancy of the Greek. As to the Science of Religion, we cannot help thinking that its footing is still precarious. A fresh perusal of Pro-

* INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE, by A. H. Sayce, Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford. 2 vols. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

fessor Max Müller's Hibbert Lectures leaves upon our mind the impression of great philological learning but of philosophical failure. The Professor has, however, overthrown the doctrine which had been considered as established that all Religion commenced with Fetichism. Perhaps the worship of ancestors which has now taken the place of Fetichism as the primæval form may meet with the same fate. Professor Sayce admits that the "science" can deal only with the letter, not with the spirit or "the intuition of the Divine." Is it given to the pure in heart to see God? If it is, questions as to the priority or other relations of Fetichism, Totemism, Shamanism, Henotheism, Polytheism, however interesting and curious, do not touch the vital essence of religion, nor will the progress of the science of language, or that of science and civilization generally, supersede or render obsolete a peasant's faith.

Language must have had its origin in the struggle of primæval man to communicate his thoughts and feelings—perhaps it would be more correct to say, his feelings and thoughts—to his fellows by sounds and gestures, the imitation of natural sounds no doubt playing a great part. The progress from these half-animal rudiments to thoroughly articulate and grammatical speech must have taken immeasurable spaces of time, as the dim annals of the earliest tongues indicate, but orthodoxy itself no longer refuses to accept the indefinite antiquity of man. In the early period multiplication of languages is the rule, each little community having its own: according to Professor Sayce's computation seventy-five at least still remain between which no connection can be traced; but the current of unification has now definitely set in. Provincial languages and those weak in literature are dying; Gaelic, Welsh, Erse, Breton, rapidly disappear in spite of the effort of local patriotism to prolong their existence. The Dutch, the Scandinavian languages, and Portuguese, being spoken by small nations, and having no very great literature, are not likely to endure for ever. All the savage languages on every continent are, of course, doomed. How far will the process go? Professor Sayce looks

forward, if not to a universal language, to a language which shall be universally used by commerce, and this language, he supposes, will be English, not inflected English (he speaks with the utmost acrimony of inflection) but what he thinks a great advance in linguistic civilization, the Pigeon English of the Chinese. It is to be hoped that the substitution of Pigeon English for the English of Shakespeare will not go beyond the counting-house. Possibly, Professor Sayce may a little overrate the influence of international commerce: it is conceivable that nations, instead of becoming more dependent on each other for commodities, may become more self-supporting, and that the importance of the trader, instead of increasing, may be diminished. In the meantime it is to be noted that with the Greek race the Greek language is rising again from the tomb of the past, and is being to a wonderful extent purged of the corruptions of barbarism and brought back to its classical form. There can be no doubt that it is the language of science: *philology*, *phonology*, *sematology*, *mythology*, and the other terms which Professor Sayce is compelled to use for the purposes of his own science, in spite of his predilection for Pigeon English, are examples of the general fact which must strike every one who opens a scientific book. The Greeks are a comparatively small race, but they are very active, commercially as well as intellectually, and they occupy a central position. They set out with a splendid literature, the legacy of the past. Perhaps, if any of us should look in upon the world at the invitation of some medium centuries hence, we may find that our notions as to the permanent importance and unique destiny of the English tongue, though countenanced by the present aspect of commerce, may require revision in favour of the Greek.

A homogeneous, or nearly homogeneous language like the Greek has an enormous advantage over a heterogeneous language like the English in the universal intelligibility of all its words. A Greek peasant knew as well as Thales that Astronomy was star-knowledge, and that Geometry was land-measuring: but to an unlearned Englishman both words are mere

counters: the jumble of Anglo-Saxon, Norman, Greek and Latin is so great that there is hardly such a thing as a set of cognates, and thought in its progress is perpetually checked by a sort of dead wall. This evil will not be removed by making English spelling phonetic, or by reconstructing the English alphabet as Professor Sayce, who is the most drastic of orthographical reformers, would have us do. We fully recognise the value of phonetic spelling and the advantage which the Italians have over us in this respect. But the adoption of a new alphabet, or even of an entirely new mode of spelling with the existing alphabet, would surely be a change of the most arduous kind; it would involve not only a simultaneous abandonment of ingrained custom by people of all ages and stations, including, of course, every journeyman printer in the community, but the most serious depreciation, if not total ruin, of all the books and documents in existence. That such a revolution has been more than once proposed is true, but the fact that the proposal fell at once to the ground seems to indicate that the difficulty, inconvenience and loss were immediately seen to outweigh the indisputable benefit. It might, perhaps, be possible to fix upon a more rational era for the computation of time than the birth of Christ; yet who would dream of making the change?

—To the series of "Sacred Books of the East," is now added a new and no doubt improved translation of the Koran, or to be accurate, the Qur'ân. Save the Bible, the Koran is the most important book in the world; in one respect its importance may be said to be greater than that of the Bible, since it is the legal and political, as well as the religious, oracle of Islam. That it will bear any sort of comparison with the Sacred Books of Christianity, nobody but a Mufti will maintain. Even Carlyle, who makes Mahomet the type of the Hero as Prophet, has to say of the Koran, "It is as toilsome reading as ever I undertook. A wearisome, confused jumble, crude, incondite; endless iterations, long-windedness, entanglement; most crude, incondite; insup-

portable stupidity in short ! Nothing but a sense of duty could carry any European through the Koran." This is still true, though better historical illustration has shed a little more light upon the murky chaos. But the literary inferiority is the least part of the matter. The Koran is a gospel of war and plunder ; to those appetites of the Bedouin, it distinctly and unequivocally appeals. The new translator, Mr. Palmer, who is inclined to take a favourable view of the Prophet and his work, remarks that Mahomet, with true political sagacity, saw that the only way to prevent the new kingdom from becoming hopelessly disintegrated, was to give its members some common interest and ambition, and that his reason for never relinquishing his design upon Syria, was that there the turbulent tribes might find scope for their warlike propensities, and a rich booty might be gained. "It was to this common bond of unity," adds Mr. Palmer, "the desire for plunder and the love of making border raids, as much as the religious idea, that the triumph of El Islam was due." Nor can there be any mistake about the Sensual Paradise with its large-eyed houris, its delicious drinks and its dresses of green satin and brocade, or about its adaptation to the tastes of the Bedouin. There are two Mahomets and two Korans. The Mahomet of Mecca is a religious reformer, a preacher of Monotheism, a destroyer of idols ; epileptic perhaps, and partly self-deluded, yet thoroughly sincere and profoundly interesting ; a virtuous man and a monogamist withal. The chapters of the Koran written at Mecca are in keeping with this character. The creed which they embody is not new ; it is a bastard Judaism with a slight infusion of still more bastard Christianity, large portions of the Old Testament history and small portions of that of the New Testament being incorporated, though in a debased version and mixed with the coarsest fables. But the Mahomet of Medina is another man, so far as it is possible for character to change. Master now of a considerable force, he becomes the ambitious schemer and the incipient conqueror : he appeals without disguise to the warlike and predatory propensities of his disciples ;

he leads them to wars and raids, in which he shows himself unscrupulous and merciless ; he repeatedly, for the objects of his policy or of his personal vindictiveness, instigates and sanctions the most dastardly assassinations. At the same time, he plunges deep into the filthiness of the Harem, and has revelations from Heaven to hallow his inordinate lusts. His religion, meanwhile, is visibly sinking into ceremonialism, and becomes centred in the Kaaba, the old lair of idolatry ; Mecca being now adopted as the Kibla, or point to which the believer turns in prayer, in place of Jerusalem, which had been the Kibla in Mahomet's earlier and better day. The Koran betrays its earthly source by changing with the character of the Prophet. Zeal for the propagation of monotheism, the universal brotherhood of believers and the love of conquest, have, no doubt, all been elements in the success of Islam ; but the last in the order has been by far the first in importance. The success of Islam has been almost wholly military ; and of military success, it might, without miracle, achieve an immense measure amidst the loose and crumbling fragments of the Roman Empire, over which it careered in the South, while tribes not more numerous than the Bedouins were doing the same thing in the North. Anything high and enduring in the way of moral and intellectual civilization ; anything worthy of the name of a polity, or even a community, it has never produced ; hardly a power that had vital energy enough in it to stand long. The brief intellectual glories of Bagdad, Cordova, and Delhi, as they were mainly the work of sceptics or Liberals, can hardly be called Mahometan. In the Arabian Nights, the great literary product of Islam, there is the charm which all of us have felt in childhood, and a fantastic beauty like that of the Alhambra, but there is no soul ; all is mere adventure, without a touch of that interest in character which is found even in the poorest of European novels. The Ottoman Empire is in its death throes ; the Kingdom of Persia is in the last stage of its foul decrepitude. When they are gone there will not be a Mahometan power of

any consequence in the world, and the history of Militant Unitarianism and Fatalism will be closed.

The mere theology of Islam and its ceremonial observances do not seem likely long to survive its military force and temporal powers. Buddhism, the second of the three religions, has produced nothing but a vast expanse of melancholy languor, with the loathsome worship of the Dali Lama, a lethargic monasticism, and the prayer-mills of Thibet; while in China and Japan, which make far the larger portion of its vast domain, faith in it is evidently at vanishing point. But Christianity remains coextensive with civilization, its historical connection with the moral element of which no candid inquirer can deny, and the Christian nations display a vitality apparently inextinguishable by disaster, which sets all the scientific laws of Mr. Herbert Spencer and other materialists and necessarians at defiance. This is a fact which stands entirely apart from any dogma, from any question about the authorship of the Christian books, or even about the nature and personal history of the Founder. We would commend it on the one side to the consideration of dogmatists who flout practical Christianity; on the other to that of writers like "Abner Dean," who, by their hatred of dogma, their contempt for the hollowness of that system, and their sense of the deadness of "Pulpit Creeds," are impelled to shake the dust off their feet against the Churches. They will find that the ideas which form their own social creed, the ideas of personal brotherhood, charity, hope for mankind, have the Gospel for their source and the Churches for their channels of transmission. Evolution itself suggests that there cannot be a great gulf between to-day and yesterday. Nor did the spasmodic effort of the French Revolutionists to break altogether with religion lead to signal success; it ended in a reign of Terror at home, buccaneering raids in the name of Fraternity over Europe, and general "brotherhood of Cain."

—In a series of lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, the Rev. E. Hatch, whose name is not unknown in

Canada, investigates, by the strictest historical methods, and after a critical survey of all the materials, the organization of the early Christian Churches. His general conclusions are those for which, as we apprehend, any one who had looked into the question freely and historically would be prepared. The Episcopate in its present form, and with its present character and claims; the Priesthood; ordination; the distinction between clergy and laity; the aggregation of all the Churches into a universal Church, legislating through General Councils or a Pope, and enforcing uniformity of doctrine and discipline, were not Apostolic institutions, but the gradual growth of ages, and the offspring of successive sets of circumstances, not ecclesiastical only, but social and civil. Originally each of the Churches was a separate congregation, independent of the rest, thoroughly democratic in its internal structure, and governed by officers who were elected by the members at large. The only distinction was between the baptized and the unbaptized; in all the baptized every spiritual gift and the power and right of preaching were held equally to reside. The Bishop (*episcopos*) was the chief administrator, analogous to the chief administrator of secular associations, in connection with which the name is also used. His most important duties at first were the guardianship and administration of the charitable fund which in those days was a matter of prime importance. He was assisted by the deacons, whose name denotes their functions. The Presbyters were simply an elective council of Elders, such as was common in the ancient world. As often as Presbyter, which means Elder, is translated Priest (the Greek and Latin for which are *hiereus* and *sacerdos*) an historical untruth is told. All members of the Church still retain the power at need of administering Baptism; there was a time when all alike had the power of administering the Eucharist. The right of the congregation at large to elect its presiding officer, the Bishop, had not been lost in the days of St. Ambrose. Mr. Hatch does not deal with the Papacy; but this generation has actually witnessed the last stage of the development from

the administrative leadership of the congregational Church of Rome into the spiritual despotism of an infallible Pope pretending to give laws to the whole of Christendom. The very title, *Pontiff* (the High Priest of Heathen Rome), shows how secular Imperialism lent its aid to ecclesiastical usurpation. The spiritual supremacy of an ordained clergy and the authority of Church Councils were introduced by a similar process. The claims of the priesthood, and the belief in the Eucharistic miracle, acted and reacted on each other: it was by exaggerating the importance of sacrificial observances that the Indian Brahmins erected themselves into a social caste and put the rest of the community under their feet. Supposing this view to be correct, does it prove that Episcopacy is not lawful or not desirable as a form of Church government? By no means: Episcopacy may have been brought into existence by the real necessities of the case, which would be a sufficient, and if everything good is divine, in a rational sense a divine warrant. Hooker's reasoning is perfectly valid against those exclusive Presbyterians who would allow the Church no liberty of adopting any form of government but their own. A regularly appointed ministry, set apart for the performance of service, for preaching, and other special purposes, though it had no existence in the primitive Church, may, as time went on and circumstances changed, have been found needful: if it was, the need warranted its institution. But there is an end of all claims on the part of the Bishops or the clergy to the exclusive inheritance or transmission of any spiritual gifts; to all, in short, that is connected with the phrase Apostolical Succession; to a belief in the supernatural effect of Ordination; to the pretension of performing the Eucharistic miracle. There is an end to any justification of an exclusive attitude towards other Churches on the pretence that they do not possess an ordained clergy. This is said, of course, on the supposition that deference is to be paid to historical facts; if faith, that is a determination to believe in spite of evidence, is to be set above history, there is an end of all rational discussion.

So with regard to Ritualism. That particular ceremonies, dresses or ornaments were not used in the primitive Churches, is no bar to the adoption of them in the present condition of society and the present frame of men's minds, if the effect is found to be good. It is certain that the primitive Churches had no instrumental music; yet the number of those who object to the use of the organ is evidently growing small, as is that of the rigorists who, like the "Square-window" Baptists, denounce the introduction of pointed architecture or of any other architectural beauty. But the plea of æsthetic influence, as a useful aid to devotion, is the only one which is sound. All attempts to put Ritualism on higher ground, to represent it as Apostolic, as part of Revelation, as the accessories of a miracle performed by Priests, will collapse under the touch of History. It will last, no doubt, in spite of the Ecclesiastical Courts, so long as the tastes which have given birth to it endure: if they should pass away again, this, like any other fashion, will subside.

— "Differences," we are told, "have arisen among the Positivists of London. Mr. Frederic Harrison and Professor Beesley have seceded from Dr. Congreve, and will hereafter hold separate services; Mr. Henry Compton maintains." The late departed Cynic used to describe the Positivist Church as "Three Persons and No God." The number of persons, we see, is now at least four. There are, in fact, we believe, a good many more. One school of Positivists, led by M. Littré, embraces of Comte's system the philosophy only—the philosophy of which we can never speak without protesting that its three Successive States, the Theological, the Metaphysical and the Positive are not mutually exclusive but may well meet and be reconciled in the Final Science. Another School embraces not only the philosophy of Comte but the Religion which he invented, and which is simply a reproduction of Roman Catholicism, with Humanity instead of God and with the Papacy, Priesthood, Sacraments, Ritual and Calendar modified so as to

suit the service of the New Divinity ; for the wing of Utopian fancy never really soars beyond circumstances, and the Republic of Plato is merely an idealized Sparta. A Church this School emphatically calls itself, and it firmly believes that it will be the Universal Church of the future. Its head, the High Priest of Humanity, is M. Lafitte who wears his tiara at Paris, that city being heart of the world according to Comte, who was a Frenchman as well as a Roman Catholic. Mr. Lafitte's vicar in England is Dr. Congreve, one of Arnold's favourite and most eminent pupils, borne to this unexpected position by the intellectual eddies of our times. It seems that the English Vicar has in him something of the spirit of independence displayed by England in shaking off her allegiance to the Pope. A difference has consequently arisen, and the Comtist Church completes its likeness to that of Rome by indulging in an Anti-pope and a Schism.

It is difficult to imagine a Religion without a God. It is difficult to understand how any one can worship Humanity, which must either be a mere abstraction, or a mixture of good and evil, the evil perhaps up to this time being at least equal in amount to the good. It is difficult even to see how the unity of the Human Race can be confidently assumed in the face of the doubtful verdict of physical science, or how a distinct line can be drawn on scientific principles between it and the brutes to which the Positivists themselves assign a share in the advancement of civilization. God is supposed by His worshippers to be conscious of worship and to respond to it ; all religion subsists on that belief ; but this new object of adoration neither is conscious nor responds any more than a stock or a stone. Yet the language of the Comtists is full of religious fervour ; no Thomas a Kempis or Madame Guyon can exceed Mr. Harrison in spiritual unction, or in antipathy to the Materialists, with whom he has exchanged some hard blows. A Japanese Positivist would tell him that he was the victim of a fancied necessity, the remnant of his theological state, and

ought to come to Japan and see how well intelligent and practical people can do without a religion. We should not agree with the Japanese in thinking the necessity fancied; but we should agree with them in regarding the Comtist religion as Christianity lingering under another name. Nor do we think, that in its present form, it will linger long. The need of a definite object of worship impelled the Buddhists to exalt Buddha from a mere Teacher into a God: it is probably too late in the world's day for a similar transmutation in the case of Comte. But the adoration of an Abstraction or a Generic Term can hardly endure; and in case of a break up it would not be surprising if Roman Catholicism should divide the prize with Science.

—No people are more ostentatiously loyal than the English, and no people are fonder of scandal about Royalty. A fresh banquet has been served them in the shape of another history of George IV., with all the savoury details. Surely it is time that those poor ashes should be allowed to rest. Even Thackeray's lecture, redeemed as it is by his genius, we have always read with a sort of feeling that in enjoying it we were trampling on a wretched corpse. George IV., had he been brought up as a man, under the training of industry, social equality, and the other wholesome influences which make up our moral education, would have been like other men; but the community, for the sake of public objects, real or imaginary, ordained that he should be brought up not as a man but as a king. Everybody and everything around him preached selfishness to him, and he was selfish. He could never know what sincere friendship and frank intercourse were, for though a prince may appear to mingle on terms of perfect familiarity with his associates, an invisible fence always guards his divinity, and he can never come into real contact with hearts or facts. All faults are magnified when they are set upon a pedestal. In private life George would have been at worst a

dandy whose pretensions to superior taste and refinement might sometimes have raised a laugh among his acquaintances: to his exalted station is certainly to be ascribed the halo of ridicule which surrounds the fat figure of the "First Gentleman of Europe." The extravagance of a Prince about town was so natural that it might almost be called inevitable, and noxious as it was, it was less noxious than the lavish expenditure of money in political corruption by which his virtuous father contracted a debt of a million on the Civil List. After all, if he had been allowed to marry Mrs. Fitzherbert, with whom he was sincerely in love, and who was a very amiable and estimable woman, she would probably have redeemed him, as far as it was possible to redeem any one who was leading such a life; but society, for its purposes, compelled him to put her away, and then to commit a moral bigamy by entering into a political marriage, which bore its fruits in hideous discord and revolting scandal. Perhaps, of all the actors in that deplorable scene, the least guilty was the man who, for reasons of State, had been coerced into giving his hand to a woman whom he had never seen. In the days of real royalty and of the Norman barons, kings had work enough to prevent their sinking into padded dandyism: they were compelled to display real qualities in order to keep their crowns upon their heads. But a constitutional monarch was bluntly described by Napoleon as a hog fattened at the rate of millions a year. After all, George III., in trying to play a more important part, did a hundred times more mischief than his son.

ERRATUM.— In the last number, page 221, at the bottom, the words "from the pinnacle of the Temple" should be struck out; they formed part of an expunged clause.