

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured pages / Pages de couleur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages damaged / Pages endommagées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur | <input type="checkbox"/> | Pages detached / Pages détachées |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Showthrough / Transparence |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents | <input type="checkbox"/> | Includes supplementary materials /
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 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. | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires: | | Continuous pagination. |

THE BYSTANDER.

MARCH, 1881.

THE opponents of the Pacific Railway Agreement cannot seriously have looked with hope to the action of the Governor-General or the Senate. Had the charge of corruption against the Minister of Railways repeatedly made by the leading organ of the Opposition press been brought forward by the Opposition leaders in Parliament, it would undoubtedly have been the duty of the Governor-General to withhold his signature from the charter pending the investigation, and, in case of conviction, to dismiss the Minister. A Governor-General is responsible for the enforcement of the Privy Councillor's oath. But the charge has been allowed to fall to the ground, and on no other pretext could His Excellency have interfered. There was no deadlock, no doubt about the decision of Parliament, no feature in the situation which rendered necessary or warrantable an appeal on the part of the Crown from the national representatives to the nation.

The Senate might, indeed, have been expected, if it had any capacity for usefulness at all, to be useful on an occasion like this, when the matter in hand was not one of party politics, but one of business, with which the veterans of the commercial world were particularly qualified to deal. Yet, who has looked to it for any sort of help or guidance? How many have read its debates? The weakness of its title to a costly existence could hardly have been shown in a more striking way. In discussing the Reform of the Senate, too little attention is paid to the simple question

of public right. Many of the members, no doubt, are excellent and distinguished men, worthy in every respect to take part in the councils of the nation, but they have morally no better claim, individually or collectively, to legislative power or to an absolute veto on the will of the nation, than any one you meet upon the street; and it is the latent consciousness of this fact, both on their part and on the part of the nation, that renders them practically cyphers and "registrars of the decrees of the Commons," whose decrees might be registered just as well by a clerk at five hundred dollars a year. Representation and responsibility are the principles of our Government, as they are those of common sense and justice. A Senator, though said to represent a Province, really represents nobody except the Minister who appoints him, and when that Minister is gone, nobody at all; he is wholly irresponsible, and cannot in any way be called to account by the people for his votes or even for the grossest neglect of duty. There have been instances of Senators who drew their pay and hardly ever appeared in the Chamber. Yet, if the Senate should think fit to veto the most deliberate decision of the whole country, the country would be powerless; nor is it possible to effect any reform in the body without its own consent, which would very likely be withheld. The power reserved to the Crown of appointing in extremity half a dozen extra Senators for the special purpose of turning the scale and bringing the Senate into harmony with the Commons might prove wholly inadequate, to say nothing of the strange character of a provision which implies a pledge on the part of a new member of a legislature that he will vote in a certain way. Such an alienation to an irresponsible conclave of the national privilege of self-government by a party of gentlemen holding their sittings in a distant capital, however excellent the intention of those gentlemen may have been, was a public wrong. The chief author, if the common belief is true, was a politician who, having been one of the most violent of demagogues in his early days, his hot fit over, and his personal object gained, became, as violent demagogues have often become, estranged at heart from

popular institutions. Let us have Conservative elements in our polity by all means ; they are necessary to save democracy from suicide ; but this anchor will not hold.

—From the storm of debate on the Agreement, which at last rose to a hurricane of invective, we have come to the calm consideration of a question in which all have an equal interest, that relating to the peopling of the North-West. In the Syndicate we have the men who can do that indispensable work, if the work can in any way be done : their aptness for it, and readiness at once to take it in hand, are a great set-off against the excess in the price demanded by them over that demanded by their rivals, and anything else that may be unwelcome in their terms. But whence are the people to come ? A vague impression prevails that there are in Europe multitudes longing for a happier home, who have only to be made acquainted with the existence of our North-West. In the purlieus of the English cities there are, no doubt, multitudes who may well long for a happier home ; but they are, unluckily, for the most part, fit for nothing but the wretched callings by which they have been accustomed to subsist. Of agricultural labourers there does not appear to be a great surplus ; and for such surplus as there is, the other Colonies are our active competitors, exerting through their agents an influence quite as adverse to us as that of the much-abused speeches of Mr. Blake ; while the upper classes, so far as they can control the movements of the peasantry, are inclined to direct emigration to New Zealand, which still retains the faint odour of its original Conservatism, and is in no danger of being annexed to the American Republic. The English farmer is not easily moved ; he is much wedded to the aids and comforts of the garden-like country and the hive of industry in which he lives ; in his cast of character and habits he has nothing of the pioneer : moreover, he is not a labourer, but a director of labour, and half a gentleman, while his wife, in her notions and aspirations, is more than half a lady. At the time of the Agricultural Labourers'

strike, *Punch* had a cartoon depicting the agony and deliquescence of the portly farmer compelled, for the first time in his life, himself to hold the plough. The thought of an importation of Irish on a large scale into the prairie makes the friend of humanity tremble, though it appears to be contemplated by both Governments, the British Government no doubt being willing enough to deplete. Let the Minister of Agriculture sow a crop in advance for his Irish emigrants, as he proposes: perhaps they will reap that crop, but it will too probably be the last. As a labourer on the railroad, employed in a gang, so as to satisfy his gregarious propensities, the Irishman may do well; as a pioneer farmer on the lonely prairie, hardly. We speak of the mass; and, if a satisfactory Land Bill passes, the best farmers are likely to stay at home. There is no use in concealing the severity of the North-Western winter, or the shortness of the summer. Lord Dufferin tells the people in England that the Icelanders are so delighted with their settlement in Manitoba that they have called it Paradise; if he will enquire again, he will learn that some of them found it an "Eden." The Germans are excellent as settlers; but they are drawn by their social feelings to the masses of their compatriots in the United States, and by their political feelings, as fugitives from an aristocratic and military system, to the country which they suppose to be the most thoroughly democratic: besides, Pharaoh, in the form of Bismarck, treats emigrant agents as crimps. The Swedes and Norwegians are equal to the Germans, perhaps superior; but there are very few of them, and they cling to their homes. Denmark, so far as we are aware, has not yet been tapped: she is unprosperous, as a seaboard cut off commercially from its continent must be, and stands high in criminal statistics, which commonly denote poverty as much as wickedness: perhaps she might afford a field; but it would be one, like the Scandinavian peninsula, of limited extent. Of Eastern Europe there is no use in thinking, though the Magyar would no doubt be glad to send the Croat, as the Croat would be to send the Magyar. The upshot seems to be, that for the peopling of the

North-West we shall have to look chiefly to Old Canada and the United States, and to find, if possible, in England occupants for the farms which the Canadian settlers will leave vacant. In that case, it is to be hoped that the first comers from England to Canada will fall into good hands, and be well advised in their purchases. Every one who has been connected with a Loan Society knows what tricks have been played in the way of factitious assessment and colourable sales to put up the apparent value of land.

The course which the flow of population is likely to take in the near future over the whole world is a profoundly interesting question, though too large for discussion here. We are inclined to think that it is by a series of historical accidents, such as the occupation of the South by great military empires, than by choice, that man has been compelled to settle in the realms of winter, where, besides the suffering, much of the produce of his labour is expended in fuel; and that when the barriers raised by those accidents have been removed, a process which is rapidly going on, there will be a return of the current towards the regions of the sun.

—If the North-West fills up, it will make four or five large Provinces, to which self-government must be granted. What will these provinces do when they get their power, and when they awake to political life and a sense of their own interests? Above all what view will they take with regard to the land? Will they allow that it is the property of the Dominion, to be used in building the Pacific Railway and for other Federal purposes, or will they claim a special interest in it and a special voice in its disposal? Legally, no doubt, it belongs to the Dominion, which purchased it on the transfer of the country; but the North-west Provinces will in time be a powerful portion of the Dominion and in a position to extort, by their votes at Ottawa, and if they fail there, by threats of disunion, whatever they may deem their right. We fancy we hear the voice of

the coming time in the letters of Julius on the "Situation in the North-West" reprinted from the *Montreal Gazette*. Julius says: 'When we are self-governed, as soon we must be, we shall have no means of paying for the machinery of self-government; we shall have not an acre of land on which to borrow or raise revenue; the resources of land taxation will not be available in the new country for many years; unless provision is made for us out of the land before it is all gone we shall have to come on the Dominion for subsidies, and we shall be always demanding Better Terms.' He denies the justice of treating the land as a fund to be appropriated to the building of the Pacific Railway, maintaining that the railway is not a local but a national work, which, by opening a new commercial route, will, as its projectors themselves declare, bring a flood of wealth to the Eastern Provinces while the North West will have to shoulder its part of the debt incurred in building the Intercolonial and other public works hitherto unremunerative. These arguments are not without weight, especially for believers in the productiveness of the Lake Superior road, and the political fist of the North-West will soon be more weighty than the arguments.

—A cry of alarm is again raised about the Destruction of the Forests. No question can be more vital. In the pioneer period, when men are few and the wealth of nature is comparatively boundless, waste seems impossible, and this idea is apt to survive and to beget recklessness when the pioneer period is over and the careful husbandry of resources has become imperative. But if we may believe Mr Mackey, of Ottawa, the prodigal use of the axe is not the greatest of the dangers which threatens the most important branch of Canadian trade. The greatest are forest fires, due in most cases to criminal carelessness either on the part of lumbermen and fishermen, who fail to put out their smudges, or, what is more exasperating, on the part of worthless squatters, who, on pretence of settling, spend most of

their time in fishing and hunting, camp in the shanties of lumbermen, and at their departure leave smouldering embers. Mr. Mackey has been informed that, in four townships lying between the Madawaska and Mississippi rivers, which fifteen years ago were one of the best pine countries known, the pine has been nearly all destroyed by fires started by one vagabond of this class. In some cases there has been reason to suspect that the forest has been wilfully fired by miscreants who expected that the lumbermen rather than lose the burnt timber would give them small jobs in cutting it during the ensuing winter. A feeling approaching to anguish is excited when we learn that the bread is being taken on an enormous scale from the mouth of the community by the carelessness, or worse than carelessness, of the very lowest of its members. In Ontario there is an Act to preserve the forests from destruction by fires. But, according to Mr. Mackey, it is almost a dead letter; not because there is much difficulty in tracing the fires to their source or in identifying the persons who have caused them; but because there is not a proper staff of foresters, and because lumbermen dare not prosecute for fear of having their limits burned in retaliation; because, in short, Government is too weak to defend the public interests against private recklessness or selfishness. Too weak to defend the public interests the Government will be so long as it is a party government—so long as it is the government of only half the nation while the other half is arrayed against it and bound to discredit it and pull it down; so long as mutual slander makes reasonable respect for rulers and hearty support of them impossible; so long as the energies of the rulers themselves, instead of being devoted to useful legislation, are expended in holding partisans together and repelling the attempts of opponents to trip them up. There is a law against throwing slabs and sawdust into navigable rivers; yet slabs and sawdust are thrown into the Ottawa under the very nose of a parliament which is spending its time in scrambles for power. There is no reason why a popular government should not be strong and responsible at the same time; there is no

reason why it should not be the object of a rational loyalty and derive from that loyalty a power for good as great as any despotism ever had for evil: the great obstacle is organized faction, to which people have become so accustomed as to receive with derision any suggestion that free institutions can exist without it. Serious reflection, however, if we mistake not, has commenced among those who think for themselves and have no personal interest in the spoils.

—Sir Leonard Tilley has the pleasure of bringing in a prosperity budget. His tariff has amply fulfilled its primary object by not only raising the revenue to the level of the expenditure, but producing a surplus, and, so far as that part of the matter is concerned, he is entitled to sound the loudest timbrel of financial jubilation, as well as to take credit for his personal achievement. But we hope he is not lapsing into the belief that taxation makes a country rich. Certain persons, of course, may be made rich by taxing the community in their interest. Apart from this, there is much in the general adjustment of tariffs to the exigencies of national industry. But it is preposterous to suppose that the mass of the people can be made wealthy by adding to their fiscal burdens. Another fallacy, against which the speech of the Finance Minister suggests the need of a warning, is the assumption that the present burst of prosperity is sure to last for ever. Its causes are the revival of the lumber trade, and two good harvests, with a great demand for grain in Europe. We have yet to see even whether it is not in part factitious and the mere result of a faith in the magical potency of the N. P. which leads to the sudden multiplication of works and factories. Now is the time for laying by, and, if possible, reducing the load of debt. Instead of that the estimates are increased, the debt is increased, and we drive faster than ever on the downward road.

During this hard winter the sufferings of the people in our Western cities from want of fuel have been great, and they

have been embittered as well as increased by the coal tax. The augmented consumption of coal by works and railroads does not warm the poor man's cottage. Nobody supposes that Sir Leonard Tilley is hard-hearted, or that he takes delight in imposing an odious tax. He wants to give a sop to the Maritime Provinces in order to reconcile them to his tariff, though they have really gained less by the coal tax than he promised and they expected. The West imposes a high tariff on the East to provide money for the brilliant railway policy of Western statesmen; and the East, to induce it to bear that burden, is allowed to tax the scanty comforts of the Western poor.

— The Bill to make an absolute majority of the constituency necessary for the adoption of the Scott Act in any district may partly have owed its defeat to the quarter from which it came. In itself it was a measure of manifest justice. The least that can be demanded of people who desire to impose restrictions on the private tastes and habits of their neighbours, is that they shall care enough about the matter to turn out and vote. Besides, unless there is this body of strong opinion at the back of the policeman, the law cannot be thoroughly carried into effect, and illicit grog selling, with all its evils, will ensue. The Scott Act, however, even unamended, is better than the Crooks Act, which gives a party Government the patronage of a great trade. We are told that the majority of those licensed are Conservatives; very likely, but are they less under the screw? A member of the United States Senate takes that which we have more than once pointed out as the only rational course, supposing the evil to be so great as to require and justify sumptuary legislation. He proposes to prohibit altogether the production and importation of drink. To prevent drink from being made or imported is the only way of preventing it being sold either lawfully and openly, which the temperance men think bad, or illegally and clandestinely, which is most certainly worse. What

can be more ridiculous than a district under the Temperance Act with a great distillery flaring in the middle of it?

—There has been much sickness among legislators at Ottawa. By some it is ascribed to the want of ventilation in the Chambers, by others to change of habit and late dinners, by the the cynical and censorious to the refreshments. If any place is likely to breed intemperance, and furnish it with an excuse, it is the political cavern remote from the influence of general society to which we consign our politicians during the Session. Strange, that those with whom the selection of a capital rested, should never have given a thought to the social consequences of this choice, though they had the examples of the political capitals in the United States before their eyes! Among the leaders of parties though there has been no death, there has been sickness which reminds us of their mortality, and leads us to think who would succeed them if they should die or become invalided. Take away three or four men from each side and who is there that could form a Ministry and govern the country? There is no use in talking of raw material ready to be worked up on emergency; the material is not raw, it has been worked up already to the utmost of its capacity, and the worth of the whole of it is well known. The calibre of every man in Parliament is measured, and we can tell exactly what we have to rely on. The present leaders are mostly the offspring of a period before the caucus and convention system, at least before it was brought to perfection. It would seem that the system produces available men, eligible men, straight voting men, but not very great men.

—A controversy is still going on as to the extent of the Exodus. There has evidently been exaggeration, and it is very difficult, especially now that party has laid hold of the question, to arrive at the exact truth. But that the departures are

numerous cannot be doubted. At least in whatever part of the country we have inquired, the answer has been the same. From the district round Quebec, notwithstanding a certain revival of trade, there has been a large exodus of French Canadians: no fewer than sixty families, we are told, have left for the United States in one week. We have already expressed our conviction that the phenomenon, whatever its magnitude, is economical, normal, and one out of which no political capital can be made.

—That the Banks are reverting to a more cautious policy is good hearing, for people were evidently becoming a little dazzled by the revival of trade, and an unpleasant pull-up might have been not far off. There seems to be in ordinary men of business a singular mixture of sagacity with liability to illusion. They do not study general influences, or scan the financial horizon: what is going on at the moment they know perfectly, but as to anything beyond they sometimes appear like children in the dark. One might almost fancy that they believed seasons of prosperity and depression to be brought on by some supernatural agency, not by definite causes which it is the business of their calling to ascertain. When depression comes they seem hardly to make an effort to trace it to its true source; they speak of it vaguely as a "crisis," and under that name they confound things totally different from each other, the consequences of over production, those of dearth, those of unsound trading, those of a scarcity of money, those of a plethora of money lacking remunerative investment. When prosperity returns they do not set themselves to measure its bounds, they call it in mysterious jargon a "boom," and commit themselves to it as if it were boundless; though a boom in a country with only five millions of people must have ascertainable bounds. Such of them as are party politicians fancy that the prosperity is produced by legislation, and that we have only to go on legislating to make it last for ever. Nor do they seem to exercise

forecast; the late fall in the rate of interest was foreshown by all possible signs in the financial heavens; the quantity of money seeking investment in England and the reduction and conversion of the American debt told plainly what was coming; yet the fall took by surprise some, at least, of our financiers, for they were up to the last borrowing money on debentures at rates which must have already made the operations doubtful, and if the fall continues, as at present appears likely, will soon make them worse. The general rise of stocks is cited as a decisive proof of increased prosperity. What it principally denotes in this case is, that there is a glut of money, which is being still lavishly imported from England, and for which it is hardly possible to find investments, together with a carnival of stock-jobbing. If any one fancies that the rise in the nominal price of his stock denotes a corresponding rise in its intrinsic value, let him sell and re-invest. That a solid and permanent renewal of commercial prosperity can be produced only by increase of substantial wealth, is a truism which it is good sometimes to repeat to ourselves.

—That Sir A. T. Galt should “find Imperialism at a discount” in England, as he says he does, is no great wonder considering how the Imperialist policy has prospered of late, and what a legacy it has bequeathed in South Africa at the moment when danger from Irish difficulties is threatening the heart of the Empire. Nor is there the slightest prospect of a recovery in that stock. The good sense of the British people, aroused as it always requires to be by stinging experience, has, in all probability, discarded forever the idea of playing over again in a world full of great powers the part played by Rome in a world where there was no great power but herself. India is likely henceforth to be the only field of British aggrandizement, and it is a field wide and dangerous enough. In soliciting special attention to Canada, then, her ambassador has to fall back on less romantic considerations than those of world-

wide sway, the responsibilities and costs of which are felt by those whom he addresses to be a serious offset to its glories. The position which he takes is, that the Empire ought to furnish its own food, and that to enable it to do so, emigration ought to be forcibly directed from the United States, a foreign country, to the Canadian North-West. Why ought the Empire to furnish its own food any more than its own cotton and other raw materials of its industry which are not less essential to it than its food? Of the food, why ought it to furnish its own grain any more than its own tea, sugar, and wine? To a besieged garrison, no doubt, it is a vital object to have the means of supporting life within the circuit of its own walls. But Sir Alexander must well know that if England were ever to be in the condition of a besieged garrison, as she might be in case of a war with a league of great maritime powers, her distant colonies would by no means be within the circuit of her walls. She would, in fact, have a better chance of receiving supplies from a neutral power. This, then, is no sufficient reason, apart from political motives, for forcing emigration into artificial channels, or for asking the British Government to incur the responsibility of selecting a destination for the emigrant, and of seeing to his welfare, as it would be bound to do, in his new home.

It seems to us scarcely possible that an economical fancy so plainly chimerical as that of a self-provisioning Empire should possess the mind of so good an economist as Sir A. T. Galt. Political considerations must, in reality, be still in his thoughts. Evidently he feels that a deplorable breach of loyalty is committed by a British emigrant in going to a foreign country; yet in the same breath he incites the millions of continental Europe to do the very thing which in an Englishman he deems wrong. "Canada," he says, "does not confine her invitation to the United Kingdom; her country is wide enough to form a refuge equally for the millions of continental Europe, who wait with almost hopeless despair for some escape from the painful penury in which they now exist. To all such Canada tenders

her aid, and offers them an equal interest in her career of progress. It is true that millions of British subjects have, in the past, unfortunately renounced their allegiance, and gone to swell the power of another nation ; but Canada hopes to repair this error by attracting to her shores the hardy Scandinavian and honest German, and thus soon to give to our beloved Queen, as Canadians, a full equivalent for the subjects she has lost." The German Emperor or the King of Sweden might say to Sir Alexander, " Is thy servant a dog, that it should be the best of deeds to induce as many of his liegemen as possible to renounce their allegiance to him and swell the power of the British crown ? " Emigration goes where it lists. In the case of the suffering millions, be they Continental, British, or Irish, it lists for the most part to go where the social system under which the suffering has been experienced is least likely to be found again. It takes a surgical operation to get into the mind of a person of quality or a loyal envoy from a dependency, the idea that the feelings of a peasant about our beloved Monarchy, our beloved peerage, our beloved squire, our beloved game-preserved, our beloved State Church, are not exactly the same as his own. Sir Alexander Galt contends that there can be no use in the Colonies, and that England must be held to have made a great mistake in founding them, if they are not to be peopled with English citizens. His own invitation to humanity at large to settle in Canada, which we have just quoted, is a sufficient reply.

If the British Government is to embark on a great scheme of emigration for a political object, it will require to be at least reassured as to the permanency of the political connection. On this subject, however, Sir Alexander refrains from pledging himself to anything beyond the present state of Canadian feeling, of which he gives, as he is in duty bound, the most orthodox account. His silence is significant, and its significance is enhanced by the incidents of his own distinguished career. No statesman, nor man of statesmanlike mind, will prematurely raise organic questions, do violence to existing sentiment, or

attempt to precipitate events. But here is a vast and most costly programme of political railways, of political tariffs, of political emigration, to which Canada and England are pressed at once to commit themselves, and which distinctly imply the correctness of a particular theory as to their relations in the future. How is it possible to put off the discussion of that theory? How can Sir Alexander Galt, or anyone else who undertakes to counsel us in the sense that he does, escape the duty of plainly stating his belief as to our destiny? Sir Alexander is, of course, too liberal and sensible to say anything against freedom of discussion. But at such a moment as the present, surely the utterances of statesmen, as well as those of journalists, ought to be perfectly frank and sincere. If the future of Canada really appears to them shrouded in darkness, by all means let them say so; but then let them not advise the country to act in regard to its most momentous interests as though all were sure and clear.

They have the more reason for taking care that their policy is sound, because it lays a heavy strain on the strength of their own Confederation, though Sir Alexander Galt, on the other side of the water, may not be fully conscious of the fact. He represents the Dominion as made up of three divisions, the Atlantic, the Central and the Pacific. Unfortunately it is made up of four; the Maritime Provinces being quite distinct geographically and commercially from Canada, though connected with it by the iron band which traverses the Intercolonial waste. Nothing is more certain than that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick Anti-Confederation sentiment has of late been on the increase. A well-informed correspondent even tells us that the people will not be satisfied with anything short of Dissolution. At present no leader has appeared, nor has the movement taken any definite shape, but if the feeling continues to spread, organization and a spokesman are sure to come. It is impossible to conceal the divergence of commercial interests which the framer of the tariff has striven to unify by means of the coal tax, but in vain. In 1859 Mr.

Brown, supported by the Toronto Reform Convention, moved a resolution "That the existing Legislative Union of Upper and Lower Canada had failed to realize the anticipations of its promoters; that it had resulted in a heavy debt, grave political abuses and universal dissatisfaction." This gives articulate expression to the murmurs now heard in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick against the wider Union in which an escape from the uneasy wedlock of the two Canadas was sought. Confederation, like the preceding measure, has certainly resulted in a heavy debt, the offspring of the more ambitious policy pursued especially in the annexation of the Pacific Province for which the Atlantic Provinces care little. It has not less certainly resulted in an immense development of faction and corruption. Our statesmen cannot be too quick in inaugurating, if it be possible, a policy the benefits of which, in the shape of reduced expenditure and a truly national government, all the members of the Confederation will feel; for the edifice is not yet well cemented and rifts are beginning to appear.

—In the Ontario Legislature the measure of the Session has been the voluminous Judicature Bill, which extinguishes the last vestige of a separate Equity Jurisdiction, and makes all the Courts at once Courts of Law and Equity. So perishes the last hair of Lord Eldon's wig. At the same time the Government has exhausted the reform of legal procedure, the best of all subjects for a display of activity when you do not want to be very active. The rural legislators probably passed the Bill without reading it in the vague hope that it might contain some ratsbane in the shape of a reduction of lawyers' fees. Transcribing English Acts of Parliaments is safe work, but original legislation on the highest subjects of jurisprudence might not be so safe for a legislature mainly consisting of worthy agriculturists and led by lawyers who can seldom be first rate. Railroads have been importunate: perhaps the Attorney-General might assign them that portion of his "sur-

plus" which consists in a share of the Library at Ottawa. For the rest the chronicle of the Session is a chronicle of small beer. The dragon that was to devour Upper Canada College probably had an interview with the Premier, and for the present the College is likely to escape with a little tinkering. To be made a good boarding-school, it must be taken out of the city, and the number of boarders in one house must be limited, as in the English public schools. One man cannot extend his fatherly care over more than thirty boys. The unquestionable success and popularity of the new Professors at the University upheld the Government when it was arraigned upon that subject, and the chief topic for attack was spirited away by the positive statement, both of the Minister of Education and the Attorney-General, that no offer had been made to Mr. Warren, who had come and departed merely "as a gentleman" with his gentility uncontaminated by any business negotiations. The Minister of Education will probably find it expedient next time to mollify unreason and silence clamour by advertising the appointments in Canada before carrying them in his valise to England. The first object of course is to get the best Professor; but secondary objects are the encouragement of local effort, which will cease if all the prizes are withdrawn, and the contentment of the staff which, in the present instance, it seems the Minister has been fain to restore by pouring the oil of increased stipends on the angry waves. Moreover, the University suffers in its honor, if, after an existence of forty years, it is too hastily assumed to be incapable of supplying a Professor. Mr. Morris moved in the direction of University Consolidation, but finding the brick wall of a party majority in front of him, retired. We fear that a mere union for the purpose of examination and granting degrees would not come to very much: the weaker colleges would drag the standard down to their level: an increase of proficiency can be attained only by improving the means of instruction, and while the system of local colleges continues, the instruction cannot be materially improved. What is called the University of London, it is true, is

merely an Examining Board : but it is an institution of doubtful excellence, and having served the special purpose of conferring degrees on Dissenters at the time they were excluded from Oxford and Cambridge, it has now perhaps entered on its decline. Some years ago there was a chance of founding a good School of Practical Science and of making it the nucleus of an effective measure of consolidation, but political jealousies interfered. We now see little use in mooted the question : the Denominational Universities will not give up their power without an equivalent, and no equivalent can be offered : we must make the best of the system as it is. The practical result probably will be the resort of Canadian students to foreign Universities, one of which is offering a first-rate education in practical science at our door. A Commission of Inquiry embracing all the portions of our Provincial System of Education, Primary, Secondary, and final, with the relations between them, and extending to their social and economical, as well as their literary results might, as we have said before, produce some very instructive information : but jealousy is aroused by a proposal to put anything into the hands of experts, and such an inquiry in any hands but those of experts would of course be futile as the dribble of discussion on Educational subjects through the present Session has plainly shown.

The Session, as a whole, has once more exemplified the working of Party Government, where there is no great question or marked difference of opinion whereon to found an Opposition. Not only is there no substantial Opposition, but there is not the faintest prospect of any, while on the side of the Government party discipline retains its tyrannical force ; the net upshot being that we have neither Opposition nor Independence. The longer this state of things lasts the more complete the ascendancy of a clique and the devotion of all the powers and functions of Government to the maintenance of that ascendancy will be ; the narrower the use of patronage and the character of the public service will become ; the narrower also and the lower will be the representation. A man of high

standing in his neighbourhood may be willing to serve the Province as an independent member, or even as a partisan when there is any really great issue; but he will not be willing to incur the trouble and annoyance of an election merely for the sake of being a joint in the tail of the chief of any clique.

— An inquiry instituted by the Public Accounts Committee into the management of the Educational Depository has brought serious malpractices to light. For this revelation everybody was prepared who had looked into the Institution. A careful inspection of the collection of books, from which the schools were supplied, was enough to raise the suspicion of something more than want of judgment. It cannot be said that the history of this affair is creditable to the Government, which ought long ago to have known perfectly well what the public service required. Six years ago an inquiry was undertaken, though rather into the usefulness of the institution than into its purity, by a Committee of the Council of Public Instruction, much against the inclination of some of the members, who felt that the duty belonged rather to the Government, but consented to act in the belief, which they had reason for entertaining, that a report would be welcomed by the Premier. But a personal attack of extreme violence was made by the Chief of the Department on the members of the Committee of Inquiry; and the Government, in apparent deference to his denunciations, rudely suppressed the Council, which had done nothing but its duty to the public. Those whose memory reaches back to the occurrences to which we refer will now understand the case, and be able to do justice to the persons who were concerned.

—The danger to which the commercial community is exposed, from abuse of the power of Municipal Taxation, has been once more made apparent by the proposal of a member of the Local Legislature to confiscate annually a portion of the capital of

companies doing business in Toronto. Confiscation is the right term; and though it may be ostensibly repudiated, it will not be very heartily abhorred by the authors of such motions and those to whose class feelings they appeal. A tax even of one per cent. on capital would be equivalent, if the Government rate of interest is taken as the standard, to an income tax of twenty per cent., a measure of taxation hardly reached under the most iniquitous and rapacious despotism. Many of the stockholders, too, probably the great majority of them, are persons not resident in Toronto, deriving no sort of benefit from its municipal institutions nor in any way subject to its jurisdiction. The mere presence of the head office does not bring within the limits of the City of Toronto a property owned over the whole country any more than the presence of the Bank of England brings the property of all the fundholders within the limits of the City of London. The proceedings of the ward politician in the present day are pretty much like those of the feudal baron in the Middle Ages; he despoils commerce whenever it passes by his gate. It is not in these pages, we trust, that any selfish doctrines respecting the obligations of property will ever be found; but a reign of demagogic plunder, whatever it may take from the rich, never gives anything to the poor. The result of such a reign in New York was that Mr. William Tweed counted his spoil by millions and married his daughter with a magnificence almost royal in everything except refinement, while the habitations of the poor were not improved nor their burdens diminished in the slightest degree. Even from New York there was a considerable flight of capital to New Jersey and other parts, attended of course by proportionate diminution of employment for the working class in the city. But capital is not bound to Toronto as it is bound to the great harbour and the world-emporium of New York. Still less is there anything to tie down many residents, retired farmers, merchants' widows in easy circumstances, or others who are drawn not by commercial objects but by the conveniences and attractions of the city. In Toronto if the alarm bell of confiscation were rung

the effect would soon be seen. The clause in the Act of Confederation under which these attempts are made, is in its improvident looseness, one of several proofs furnished by that Act, that a life of faction-fighting does not necessarily produce the large-minded and scientific statesmanship required in the framers of constitutions. In case of the assumption of illegal powers (and taxing property which is not within the municipality can hardly be otherwise than illegal), or of flagrant iniquity, it would be open, we presume, to those aggrieved to petition for the disallowance of the Local Act, and to ask to be heard in support of their petition before the Privy Council.

— The foundation which is announced of a great Co-operative Association at Montreal, with branches in other cities of the Dominion, may prove the beginning of an economical revolution. It occurred to the mechanics in Europe that they might get rid of the middleman and transfer his part of the profits to themselves, both in the department of production and in that of distribution, by Co-operative Associations. In the department of production the movement, on the whole, has failed; it was found impossible to dispense with the sustaining power of capital, or with the guidance of a chief of industry. But in the department of distribution the success has been signal; and the retail tradesman, trembling for his calling, casts his vote at elections against all candidates connected with the movement, a proceeding on his part selfish, perhaps, yet not unpardonable, considering that he is in danger of seeing himself, his wife and children without bread. The poor man, if his struggles and anxieties, his weary waitings for custom while his goods perhaps are spoiling, his wrestlings with bad debtors on one hand and pressing creditors on the other, were known, might move our pity as much as any member of the class the sufferings of which meet the eye more, and on which sympathy is exclusively bestowed. Nothing is suggestive of more pathetic thoughts than the vicissitudes which are observable in a long

street of little stores, and of which each denotes a protracted agony of failure. But these changes must come : commercial progress rolls like the car of Juggernaut over those who are no longer wanted. Perhaps many of those who now are retail tradesmen may, under the co-operative system, find a surer and happier employment as clerks. Co-operation will certainly do good if it introduces ready money payments. The bane of Canadian commerce, and to no small extent of Canadian society, is long credit, which breeds extravagance of living as well as an unsound state of trade, for orders are always large when payment is to be deferred. To a certain extent, among the working class, debt is caused and excused by the length of winter ; but the evil prevails in other classes without that excuse. Whatever diminishes it will increase the honesty, thrift and wealth of the country.

—The weakness of Government has received another rebuke in the Biddulph trials. Nobody doubts that, in acquitting the prisoner in the teeth of such evidence as was brought forward by the Crown, the jury must have been influenced by the belief that the case was one not of ordinary murder but of lynching ; while the outburst of enthusiasm which greeted the verdict told of sympathy with the deed and its perpetrators, not of joy over the vindication of innocence. The feeling in the neighbourhood evidently was, that public justice being powerless to restrain the misdeeds of the Donnelly clan, the necessity of self-defence had chartered private vengeance. The affair is a slur on our civilization. If Lynch law is to prevail, we might as well be Bedouins : we shall have blood feuds and a train of homicides. Surely the case preaches the need of a central constabulary sufficiently strong to maintain the supremacy of law at any point at which the local authorities might find themselves for the moment too weak, and thus to take away any pretence for lynching. If the finances could not afford the addition, a little of our military expenditure might well be

retrenched to meet the cost. The force would be of use also in the case of riots, such as those which have more than once arisen from the feuds between the Orangemen and their enemies. A militia shares the passions of the parties, and to employ it may be to give the signal for a civil war.

—Across the line the public mind is still engaged in Cabinet-making. Fancy attaches enormous value to these offices as the prizes of a vast political game of Poker; but the only one of them the importance of which is really first-rate, is the Treasury. We hit the mark in naming General Garfield for President, but we were mistaken, it seems, in thinking that he would keep Mr. Sherman. Mr. Sherman may have done some wrong things; he has done some very wrong things in the opinion of commercial men whose judgment we greatly respect; but he has been very successful; he has acquired a thorough knowledge of the department, and he has the reins in his hands. It is yet to be seen, however, whether the President elect will himself reach Washington alive. The cloud of interviewers seems to have gathered round him again, and he is said to have received three thousand applications for places. We are told, and can well believe, that he shows signs of nervous exhaustion. Is not public opinion sound and strong enough to support the head of the nation in keeping his time and energies for the service of the country?

—The Banks are in arms against the New Funding Bill, by which they will be compelled to hold Government bonds bearing three per cent. interest, instead of four per cent., as the basis of their circulation. They say that it will not pay them to circulate on those terms, and threaten to throw up the bonds and withdraw their notes, thereby producing a dearth of currency. The truth does not seem to have yet dawned on the minds of legislators that a bank, unconnected with Government, is like any other commercial company, and is no more than any other

commercial company, a proper subject for legislative depredation or extortion. To secure the note-holder against fraud, by seeing that there is a proper basis, in the shape of securities, for the circulation, is the duty of the Government; but there the duty of Government, and its right of interference, end. It has no right, by compelling the banks to take its own securities on unfair terms, to confiscate the property of the stockholders, or make the banks the instruments of forced loans. The former connection of banks, in some cases, with Government, has left behind a false impression which stockholders, to tell the truth, have fostered by inviting Government to undertake the guardianship of their interests against their own directors. Banks are the regular targets of the demagogues, who, if they know, little regard the fact that a serious disturbance of these vital organs of commerce would at once paralyse industry and spread misery among the people.

—We have just seen how superior is the spirit which animates the great organs of the American press to that which animates the tribe of party politicians. Two or three of the State Legislatures, headed by that of New York, have been displaying their ill breeding and lack of decency by flinging insults at the English people under colour of voting sympathy with Ireland. It is needless to say that the real object with these ardent friends of an oppressed nationality is the Irish vote. Not only would not one of the whole set lend any sort of practical aid, or give a cent if he could help it, to the Irish cause, but it may safely be said that every man of them in private would laugh at the whole proceeding, and three-fourths, or more probably nine-tenths, of them would speak of the Irish with contempt. The best journals, however, have denounced the outrage, pointing out the inconsistency, as well as the indecency, of interference in the affairs of a foreign nation on the part of Americans who themselves cherish, as an article of their political faith the non-intervention principle of Washington, uphold the

Monroe doctrine, and are at this moment warning Europe, in pursuance of the most extreme version of that doctrine, to keep her hands off the Panama Canal. These wise and dignified protests were hardly needed to assure the English, now better informed than they used to be about men and things in the United States, that the sentiments of a sensible, self-respecting and courteous people are not misrepresented, but traduced by the knavish and unmannerly gasconades of two or three gangs of vote-hunting politicians.

—In dull times a resource may always be found in a Mormon hunt, which, besides, begets in those who take part in it a very comfortable sense of superior moral purity. Perhaps, without prejudice to our belief that monogamy is the keystone of happiness, we may be allowed to hint a suspicion that something of extravagance, perhaps something of hypocrisy, it may be even something of territorial cupidity, has mingled with this crusade. To dub a Mormon a bigamist, and indict him as one, is preposterous. He is not a bigamist; he is a member of a strange community, which has relapsed into polygamy, the domestic state of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and other patriarchs, kings, and holy men of Israel, whose histories are read in American churches as ensamples of godly life. Mormonism is in fact an Old Testament Utopia, congenial to the imagination of suffering peasants who had read the Bible with uncritical minds, and realized by a powerful chief, half imposter, no doubt, but extremely able and in his coarse way beneficent, who led his people through the wilderness to a land flowing with milk and honey, and ruled them with sagacity when they were there. Mormonism ought to perish, of course, and will perish; but it is a human aberration, with some features not unworthy of study, and only one of a hundred strange faiths brought forth by this wonder-teeming age. It may be doubted whether the Mormon relapse into polygamy calls for the exterminating sword of the fiery Talmage more than the advance of Mrs. Vic-

toria Woodhull towards polyandry. The end of Mormonism we see; the end of Woodhullism we do not see. Mrs. Woodhull is only the topmost figure in a group, and the group is the outcome of tendencies which are widespread and manifest themselves in various phases of the Revolt of Woman. Can not the Mormons find a Talmage?

—“ A Century of Dishonour ” is the work of a tender-hearted lady who arraigns the Governments of the United States for their dealings with the Indians. It is not so much the Governments or the people as the frontiersmen, at whose door the dishonour lies. The United States Government assuredly has meant well, especially in recent times. There seems to us to be no use in citing Grotius or attempting to set up a territorial title in hunter tribes of savages. The savages themselves have no distinct idea of territorial title, nor do they respect it in their fellow savages any further than they are compelled by force. The attempt to reserve to them large tracts of land, especially when the land contains minerals, or is otherwise valuable, will for similar reasons be always futile, and, as population advances, will end in their dispossession, probably by very bad and cruel means. That to which they are entitled at the hands of civilized men is just and humane treatment, such as the Indians in Canada happily have almost invariably received. The best course is to give them employment, if possible, suited to their habits and qualities, and thus enable them to take in safety the critical step from the savage state to civilization. This does not annul the indignation which the conduct of some of the frontiersmen must excite in every breast in which humanity is not extinct. Can it possibly be a literal fact that, in the Legislature of Colorado, a resolution has been moved by a certain Mr. Coulter, and recommended to the House for adoption by a committee, proposing that a reward of twenty-five dollars should be offered for every skunk's head *or* scalp of of an Indian with the ears? The New York journal which gives

the story hints at the possibility of a jest ; but even Colorado legislatures hardly jest in that style, and the joke would be as brutal as the serious proposal. Perhaps, if the story is true, when the reign of moral civilization shall come, the legislature of Colorado may put up a memorial tablet, inscribed with the names of Mr. Coulter and the other members of the committee, that they may receive in after-times the homage of humanity. Why should there not be monuments of disgrace as well as of honour ? In the meantime here again may be matter for a Mormon Talmage.

—No man of sense, whatever his opinions on the Irish Question, could imagine that the British Parliament, or any other national assembly, would allow its action to be suspended and its dignity to be trampled under foot by abuse of its own forms. The Parnellites avowedly took part in debate, not for the purpose of deliberation, but for that of obstruction ; and to call the removal of the physical impediment which their speaking against time presented to the progress of business a suppression of freedom of speech would be to talk hypocritical nonsense. Every one of them, and every other member of the House of Commons, is just as much at liberty as ever to deliver his opinion for the *bona fide* purposes of debate on any question which comes before the House. Nor can it be seriously apprehended that either a power of interposition vested in the Speaker, or the *clôture*, will be used for tyrannical purposes so long as the House of Commons retains its character and the spirit of liberty lives. As little could a man of sense suppose that anything calling itself a Government would permit itself, and the laws of which it was the guardian, to be supplanted over a large portion of its territory by a secret organization carrying on a reign of terror. If the British Government has erred at all, it has erred upon the side of forbearance. A renewal and application of the Arms Act, at an early stage of the movement, would have injured no one, suspended no one's civil

rights, and might have quelled the spirit of conspiracy and outrage by removing the sense of power to break the law. Had it done so, it would assuredly have rendered good service to the Irish cause. The anger of the British people has now been raised by outrage, menaces, the obstruction of legislation, the insults offered to Parliament, and the torrent of slanderous abuse which blustering demagogues have poured on England. The danger is that this may embolden the House of Lords again to listen to the evil counsels of party leaders and throw out or curtail the measure of Land Law Reform which the Government is framing for the relief of the Irish people. To give the name of coercion to legislation necessary for the protection of life and property, and for the deliverance of a great district from a reign of terror, is not less preposterous than to give the name of gagging to regulations necessary for the removal of Parliamentary obstruction. No doubt the initiation of any extraordinary measures for a repressive purpose is uncongenial work for Liberals. But Liberalism does not mean anarchy : it means the ascendancy of laws ordained by the community over personal will : it has nothing to do with the terrorist or the assassin. The record of the Liberal party for the last fifty years in regard to all Irish questions speaks for itself, and is the surest pledge that the special powers now assumed will be moderately and mercifully used. Unfortunate the Liberals may be deemed in having come in for the Irish crisis, as well as in having inherited the fruits of a policy of iniquity in South Africa and in Afghanistan. Yet, if they succeed first in restoring order without any needless act of severity, and then in carrying a great and beneficent measure of reform, their misfortune will have been a piece of good fortune in disguise, and Liberal principles will have triumphed gloriously once more.

— The Home Rule leaders have once more collapsed, after staining, compromising and weakening a cause the enemies of which no doubt regard them with heartfelt gratitude. In

nothing has Ireland been more unhappy than in her modern chiefs. Wolfe Tone and O'Connell were men of mark in their different ways, and Wolfe Tone, perhaps, had a better chance of success, at least of doing something considerable than is commonly supposed. Since them there has been nothing but a line of vapouring agitators inspired by personal vanity and puerile love of conspiracy, without genius, without resolution, without settled aim. At what is Mr. Parnell driving? At an economical or at a political object? Does he want to induce the British Parliament of which he and his confederates are members, to pass a measure abolishing landlordism in Ireland, or does he want to sever Ireland from the British Parliament and Great Britain altogether? To avow the second object is hardly the way to attain the first. We have already given our reasons for doubting the possibility of reviving at the present day the separate nationality of Ireland, heartily as we, and all who are not Imperialists, must wish that the separate nationality of Ireland had never been destroyed. We see in the restoration, after the lapse of seven centuries, of Irish independence no prospect but that of a war of races and religions, terminating in anarchy, probably a bloody one, and followed by reconquest. Not only is there enmity between North and South, between Celt and Saxon, between Catholic and Protestant; there is enmity between the priest party and the Fenians, and it bursts into a flame as soon as Fenianism shows itself in its true character, and calls on Continental Republicanism for aid. The assumption that the Irish people are united in patriotic resistance to an alien yoke, which fills the tirades of Parnellites, and is taken up by rhetoricians such as Rochefort and Victor Hugo, has no foundation in fact. Ireland is not gagged: we can tell her mind: she has in the House of Commons one hundred and three representatives elected as freely as those from any other part of the United Kingdom; and of those hundred and three only about thirty go with Mr. Parnell, while the energy with which the Shaw section of his own party denounces him shows that a Republic under his Presidency would be a

troubled scene. When patriotic feeling is really strong, the contagion almost always spreads to the troops and the police, as it did in the case of the French Revolution. In Ireland the army is full of Irishmen, the constabulary and the police are entirely Irish, and to a great extent Catholics also: yet neither on this occasion, nor on that of any former Fenian outbreak or agitation, have there appeared serious symptoms of disaffection in any one of the forces. Even the Catholic policemen of Belfast, where the embers of religious war are always glowing, have never swerved from their duty. Under what government Ireland could place herself in case of separation nobody undertakes to say. Still, Irish nationality is an intelligible object; it is a natural object; it is a noble object; it is an object with the desire of which every one can sympathize whose political sympathies are comprehensive and who has stood in the deserted halls of the Irish Parliament. There are two ways in which it may possibly be attained; by appealing to the justice of the British people, and to their growing sense of the fact that, under the reign of a moral civilization, to hold anybody in bondage is a mistake as well as a crime; or by rebellion, which has riven many a chain amidst the applause of all to whom liberty and right are dear. But insurrection, to stamp it as patriotism, and to save it from being stamped as crime, must not only be levied in a just cause; it must be hopeful. There must at least be a possibility of success. The Fenian risings and conspiracies in Ireland, like the Fenian invasions of Canada, have been criminal, apart from the character of their object, for the simple reason that they were hopeless. Probably no one connected with them has ever dreamed that, with the means at the command of the brotherhood, there was the slightest chance of overthrowing the British power. The vengeance of the law brought down on dupes, a futile kindling of the passions of civil war, a waste of the earnings of women, the defeat or the delay of legal measures of improvement, are the only results, besides the collection of the fund, about which a somewhat sinister anxiety is always shown, and the

gratification of the personal ambition of the leaders. But unless a struggle for nationality, of some kind, is seriously contemplated, no course is left for practical patriotism but political action in conjunction with the Liberal party, in Parliament, which has borne rich fruit, and may bear more. Political action of course includes agitation, where agitation is really needed to prick the conscience of the ruling powers. The Anti-Corn Law League agitated not by secret terrorism, by personal intimidation, by shooting people from behind walls, but by holding meetings and sending forth tracts, by organized voting at elections, by motions in Parliament, and it gained its end. The idea that the Parnellites will force the British people to dissolve the Union and descend in the scale of nations by simply making themselves disagreeable in Parliament or elsewhere, is too childish to be discussed.

We said that the reason why it was so much more difficult to put down this movement in Ireland than the others was that it did not rise. Now, thanks to the indiscretion of its hot-headed leaders, it has risen, and to put it down has accordingly become much more easy. There has not been an armed insurrection; but the agrarian movement has been mixed up with one of political rebellion, seditious language has been held, threatening manifestoes have been issued, foreign aid has been ostentatiously sought, and an attempt has been made to overturn Parliamentary government in England, by stopping the action of the House of Commons. The Government is thus enabled to act, while the nation is exasperated, alarmed, and prepared to back the Government. Had the agrarian movement been kept clear of anything political; had the passive attitude been maintained; had the people simply persisted in the refusal to pay rents without being guilty of any acts of violence; had the leaders confined themselves to strictly legal agitation, and treated the English people with respect, the situation would have been far more embarrassing than it is at present. To evict individually thousands of people, and people with whom, so long as they abstained from outrage and their leaders from vio-

lent language, much sympathy was felt, would have been a desperate undertaking for any Government. Mr. Gladstone's chief difficulty is now, probably, overcome. The Home Rulers in Parliament may offer their alliance to the Conservatives, and party spirit may take advantage of the offer as soon as the fear which the Tory landowners feel for their own estates, and which has hitherto kept their political animosities in check, shall have been in some measure allayed; but the decisive result of the late election has given the Liberals, if they hold together, a majority over Conservatives and Home Rulers combined.

— Now will come the Land Bill, and full of interest its appearance will be. Can Mr. Gladstone solve the problem? Is the problem really capable of solution? The legal problem may be. The Irish tenant farmer craves, above all things, security of holding. You may give it him, with more or less confiscation of the rights of the landlord in his favour. You may concede to him, as the Commissioners of Inquiry boldly propose, Fixity of Tenure, Fair Rents, and Free Sale. Perhaps he may rest satisfied with these concessions for the future. Perhaps he may, after an interval, break out again into agrarian insurrection, and demand the transfer to him of all the remaining interest. We cannot say that we are sanguine as to the final success of any arrangement which leaves a class of landlords in the face of a class of tenants, especially as the landlord when reduced practically to the ownership of a rent charge, is sure to become more an absentee and more an alien than ever. The only sort of reform from which we are inclined to hope much is one which, by granting to the tenant the privilege of purchasing the fee by instalments, or in some other way, shall buy off the landlord and make the peasant absolute owner of his land. But regulate the question of legal relations as you will, the Irish peasant farmer is threatened, as it seems to us, with eviction not only by the cupidity of the landlord, but by the inevitable progress of scientific agriculture,—it may be, by that of civiliza-

tion itself. Perhaps the feeling that the consolidation of farms was coming has disquieted him not less than the fear of the bailiff and the Sheriff. In 1868, out of 594,441 separate holdings, above half were of a size not exceeding fifteen acres. Only 1,569 of the whole number exceeded 500 acres. Many of the small holdings would be in districts not really adapted for grain, though the peasant sometimes attempts to raise wheat in nature's despite. Upon these patches, miscalled farms, the people have multiplied without limit, clinging desperately to their land, both from traditional affection and because they had nothing else to which to turn. The potato on which, with a little milk, they mainly subsist, is a barbarous diet, and as the fearful famine of 1846 showed, may at any time completely fail. Can any legislation stereotype—is it to be desired that any legislature should stereotype—such a state of things? Economy, perhaps, will give one answer, sentiment another. At all events those who wish to understand this question and to judge fairly of the efforts of legislators to deal with it must keep its economical as well as its legal and political side in view.

—A letter published some time ago by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto on the Irish question has come back to us with the comments of English journals, which express their surprise that an Archbishop should play the part of a revolutionary demagogue. He would perhaps find more congenial work in supporting a monarchy such as that of Philip of Spain, Ferdinand of Austria, Louis XIV. of France, or Francis of Naples. We cannot wonder at the sensation produced in England by His Grace's language: it is bitter, truculent and inflammatory even for a professed minister of Peace. Has he any casuist at his side who advises him that we fulfil the precepts of the Gospel by stirring up deadly passions and talking lightly of murder? The Irish peasantry, too many of them at least, are miserable; and their misery had its origin partly in a long course of political misgovernment, which again is traceable to the act of a certain

Vicar of Christ who licensed the Normans to conquer Ireland, as one of his predecessors had licensed them to conquer England, on condition of their crushing, in the interests of the Papacy, the independence of the National Church, and enforcing the payment of an annual tribute to the Pope. Our historical respect for the clergy of the Catholic Middle Ages, cannot blind us to the crimes which Popes committed in extending their sway by the help of the secular arm. Even the religious persecutions under which Irish Catholics suffered during a later period, and which embittered the war of races, were but the counterpart and the inevitable consequence of the far worse persecutions carried on against Protestants on the Continent by the liegemen, and under the auspices, of the Popes. The last batch of penal laws was the direct consequence of the attempt made by James II. and his Jesuit accomplices to subvert at once the Protestant religion and the liberties of England. Twenty years ago, or thereabouts, a great French statesman, who had then retired from public life, and surveyed the political scene with an impartial as well as a penetrating eye, declared that in his opinion the conduct of England towards Ireland for thirty years had been excellent. He was reminded that the Protestant Establishment still remained, and that justice called for its abolition. He assented to the remark, but, with that qualification, emphatically repeated his assertion. There can surely be no doubt that ever since, by the Parliamentary Reform Bill of 1832, the English people were set free from the yoke of the Tory oligarchy, and reinstated in the possession of their own liberties, the whole course of legislation towards Ireland has been progressively beneficial, and has evinced a sincere desire to make up to her for her centuries of wrong. In important respects she has been better treated than England. She had long the advantage in popular education; she has still the advantage in religious equality and in tenant right. Of course, all these concessions have been opposed by the Tories, who, since the object of the Catholic Church was gained by the removal of the religious disabilities, have received in increasing measure, as the party of reac-

tion, the support of the Roman Catholic Bishops in England. Another measure of justice, in the shape of a further improvement of the Land Tax, is in preparation as we write; and we have little doubt that it will be followed by an extension of self-government such as may satisfy moderate Home Rulers. But Irish misery is not wholly the effect of political misgovernment. It is partly the effect of the influence exercised over national character in Ireland, as in Spain, Italy and Mexico, by a religious system adverse to independence, self-reliance, and providence. Nor is the landlord the only incubus on Irish poverty. Out of his scanty store the Irish labourer has to maintain a host of ecclesiastics. Give him his land in fee to-morrow, and no small part of what he gains will go to priests, monks, nuns and the Arch-Taxgatherer at Rome. A handsome sum of money, it appears, was carried out of Ireland the other day, in the midst of the distress, by the piety of the prelates. The recipient was not a landlord, but he was an absentee.

—In Finance, Mr. Gladstone's genius does not fail. The deficit has given place to a large surplus. With the commercial and industrial masses this, in itself, is enough to put out of sight the faults of manner and petty errors of strategy in the House of Commons which very likely are, as the newspaper correspondents tell us, breeding a certain amount of personal disaffection on the Liberal benches, and giving rise to Smoking-room cabals. A reduction of the interest on the English debt can hardly be far off, and it will probably bring with it another fall in the general rate of interest.

—All eyes are turned to Ireland, but the Irish question is not the only care that presses on the heavily-laden chief of the British nation. His anxious thoughts must be divided by South Africa, Afghanistan, and Turkey. The Transvaal was seized to round off the Carnarvon Empire, in defiance of all law but

that of might, the pretended petition of the people for union being a fabrication, like the pretended *casus belli* against Cete-wayo. About this there has long ceased to be any doubt. Suppose the Liberal Government, when it came into power, with a policy of justice, had at once recalled the Governor who had been the instrument of the opposite policy, told the Boers frankly that England had been misled about their wishes, and restored to them their country, would not this have been the wisest as well as the most righteous course? Considering what has since happened, the suggestion can hardly be called absurd. But it is hard for any Government, for an English Government above all, at once to reverse the foreign policy of its predecessors, and there is a nervous fear of hurting the pride of the nation, though the people, perhaps, are more easily moved by straightforward appeals to their sense of probity and honour than politicians are apt to suppose. So the ink of the treaty which will probably close the quarrel must be mixed with blood. It takes some assurance to say that the Boers would have been quiet if a party in England had not said that they were ill-used; as though a community which has suffered the greatest of all possible wrongs needed the promptings of strangers to awaken resentment in its breast, and persuade it to right itself if it could. The Boers waited for the withdrawal of the troops, which must have taken place under any Administration. The stand which they have been able to make against regulars indicates that the new fire-arms are creating a revolution in war, and a revolution unfavourable to drilled masses and to personal prowess. In both respects the change is adverse to England, as her soldiers are eminent both in discipline and valour; but it is adverse to all conquerors, and propitious to defence. Perhaps some day even the Eastern nations, over which hitherto drilled filibusters have stalked at pleasure, may find that the long range rifle gives strength to the weak, and may turn the tables on the aggressor. The peril and expense of this petty war on the other side of the globe are telling heavily, we may be sure, against Imperialism in England.

—Whether Candahar is to be kept or abandoned is a question on which not even the friends of moderation are agreed. It is easier to invade a half-civilized country than to withdraw ; in the first place, because your withdrawal is taken for weakness, and, in the second place, because you generally leave anarchy behind. The advocates of aggrandizement labour, of course, to stir up the jealous fear of Russia, and point to proof, real or pretended, of her intrigue at Cabul. Assuming the proof to be real, when England stepped into the ring as the avowed opponent of Russia, crossed the path of her victorious armies, formed European combinations to put her down, and spouted against her denunciations and threats of war, was it wonderful that Russia should have tried to provide herself with allies ? The other day an officer of the British army boasted that he had planned the lines of Geok Tepe. Suppose an officer of the Russian army had been caught in planning lines for the Zulus or the Boers ! The Russians evidently have enough on their hands, as well as space enough for their energies, and everything seems to indicate that if the Russophobists can be quiet, the two Empires will be able to co-exist in peace with a neutral zone between them, each moving in its own sphere and pursuing its own course till, by the progress of reason and civilized morality, the day of Empire is brought to an end.

—The consequences of a war in Europe would be so tremendous that all the Powers, we may be sure, will do their best to find some diplomatic solution of the Eastern question. Greece will hardly be so rash as to commence the attack with an army which, though full of spirit, is untried, and is said to be ill equipped. The Classics will not bring her support as they did in the Canning days : Agnosticism rather prefers the Turk. In the meantime, the Turkish Empire hastens to its grave. It has never been an organized polity, even of the despotic kind, or anything more than the military domination of a conquering race ; and now the military force is nearly gone. Islam will re-

main, for a time at least, and its relation with the other religions will be the problem of the years to come. An exaggerated idea of the importance of Constantinople, derived from historical association rather than from present facts, seems to us, as we have said before, to add to the difficulties of the Eastern question. Suppose the worst to happen, suppose Russia, directly or as patroness of some vassal State, to get Constantinople into her hands. She is then on the route from England to India. But all the great Powers, except Germany, are on the route from England to India. By peace alone can that waterway be kept open, and, if Russia becomes deeply interested in Mediterranean commerce, she will have given a pledge to peace,

— The opening of an article in a recent number of the *Nineteenth Century*, entitled “The Dawn of a Revolutionary Epoch,” was like the breaking of one of the seals of the Apocalypse. After noting all the signs of coming trouble, international and political, the Eastern Question, Pan Slavism, German ambition, Italian aspirations, French revenge, a Europe armed to the teeth, the prophet of woe proceeds :

“These matters, it is true, all lie on the surface, and are possibly susceptible of arrangement by mutual compromise or by general disarmament. But there is no appearance of this at present, and meanwhile the social danger which underlies and intensifies the political is becoming more difficult of solution each day. Those schemes for the reorganization of society which Fourier, Saint Simon, Owen, Lassalle, Marx, and others propounded are no longer the mere dreams of impracticable theorists or the hopeless experiments of misguided enthusiasts ; they have been taken down from the closet of the Utopian investigator into the street, and move vast masses of men to almost religious exasperation against their fellows. Ever and anon some accident shows what men are really thinking of ; an election, a strike, a prohibited meeting give the opportunity, and we see what manner of difficulties those are which have to be faced by foreign statesmen, and which we in our turn may have to deal with here. For the questions now being discussed

by hundreds of thousands on the Continent go to the very foundation of all social arrangements. It is no longer a mere barren argument about the rights of man to political representation : it is a determined struggle to change the basis of agreements which have hitherto been considered absolutely essential to the prevention of anarchy. What is more, those who hold these opinions are gaining in numbers and in strength each day, though the fear felt and expressed of their doctrines compels them to more or less of secrecy in the propaganda which they steadily carry on. Ideas which a few years ago would have caused laughter or contempt, now arouse fear and indignation, and to-morrow will stir up hatred and ferocity ; for events move fast in these days, and alike in Germany, France, Italy, and Russia, not to speak of other countries, we can now see clearly that a large portion of the urban population are being surely if slowly indoctrinated with notions that cannot be put in practice save at the expense of those above and around them."

Applied to this Continent, where Socialistic tendencies are counteracted by the general possession of property, such language would be too strong, though, even on this Continent, the distant rumblings of an earthquake are audible to the attentive ear, and the rich had better not set their hearts or ground their hopes of happiness too much on the security of riches. But in Europe there does seem to be reason for thinking that social revolution is at hand. This is an age, as was the sixteenth century, and even more than was the sixteenth century, of change in fundamental beliefs. It is also an age of vastly increased knowledge, activity of mind, and combination among the working classes, or such of them as are congregated in cities. Poverty has begun to scrutinize with a keen eye the justice of its lot. Religion has lost much both of its restraining and of its reconciling power. The difference of conditions is no longer accepted as the ordinance of God : suffering no longer looks on the present state as a probation to be undergone in the sure hope of compensation in another world. The most famous men of science and philosophers teach that this life is all ; if they are right a man must have his share of pleasure now or never ; and to give all men their share of pleasure now is the aim of

the new social philosophy which finds favour in the factory. Prophets have arisen, the St. Simons, the Proudhons, the Karl Marxes, the Lassalles, modern counterparts of John Ball, Münzer and John of Leyden, with materialistic science in place of Millenarian religion. Paris under the Commune, and Carthage under the Intransigentes have repeated the history of Munster. The intensity of the movement and the imminence of the danger arising from it vary, of course, with the amount of suffering and discontent. In Germany repressive measures have been tried and failed. Now the Emperor steps forth and says to the Socialists, as Richard II. said to the followers of Wat Tyler, "I will be your leader." Bismarck has conceived the idea of extirpating Socialism by vaccination. The State as it exists, he says, shall be to the working classes what they expect the revolutionary State to be, and do for them what they expect the revolutionary State to do. The *North German Gazette* (Bismarck's organ), in a memorable article, puts forth a theory of the duties of the State, based on the principles of Christian Socialism, and proclaims a general policy in accordance with this theory. Henceforth Government, in the German Empire, is to be to the masses not only a necessity, but a blessing; it is not merely to protect the property of the rich, but actively to foster, by legislative assistance, the well-being of the poor. The first instalment of the new policy is to be a Bill creating an Imperial institution for the insurance of the labourer against accidents, and for the assistance of widows and orphans. If this experiment succeeds others are to follow in the same direction. From the tenor of the article it is evident that Bismarck sees the difficulties which beset the path of a paternal organizer of industry under the economical conditions of the present day. They are great: we suspect insuperable. But the idea of thus taking the wind out of the sails of the Socialistic Revolution is worthy of Bismarck's daring genius, and if the Reichstag adopts his policy, the progress of the experiment will be watched with intense interest.

Communism and Socialism are often used as convertible terms, and they are closely associated in the terrors of the rich. But they ought to be appropriated to distinct things. Communism denotes community of goods, an aspiration which we conceive to be essentially religious, and which has appeared in connection with each outburst of religion—the advent of Christianity, the revival which produced the religious orders, the Reformation, English Puritanism and various enthusiasms of later times. Socialism denotes not community of goods but the fairer distribution of them, to be accomplished by entrusting absolute power to some new authority which is to be created in the interest of industry. The motive power of Communism is love; the motive power of Socialism is the sense of justice, which not unfrequently presents itself in forms easily distinguishable from love. There is yet a third movement, unorganized, without special prophets, and without a name, which is all the time quietly but steadily pursuing its course. We mean that produced by a sense of the duty of property, which is of later origin and less universal than is commonly supposed. The saying “Property has its duties as well as its rights,” uttered by Secretary Drummond in reference to the Irish question, seemed new and memorable at the time. Now, every man in the wealthier class who has a heart and brain feels, to some extent at least, that his property is a trust; that he would be happier if the difference between his condition and that of his less fortunate fellow-men could be diminished; that he ought, as far as possible, to consider what his property as wages for which some work is to be done; and that it is wretched and degrading to live in idleness and uselessness by the sweat of other men’s brows. That there are men in the wealthier class, notably among the gilded youth of New York, who are without heart or brain, is too true; but it is also true that, in the United States, wealth is to a large, and, as we believe, increasing extent, held subject to a voluntary consecration to good objects which is daily producing noble fruits. The authority to which the Socialist would commit the power of re-distribu-

tion, is as yet undefined ; nor are we told how its perfect disinterestedness and justice are to be secured ; its absolutism would, we believe, be not less fatal to progress than to liberty ; in fact progress is almost excluded by some of the Socialistic schemes, which propose organizations of the industrial community evidently intended to be final. The experience of trade unions does not encourage us to believe that an industrial government worthy of unbounded confidence, or likely to command it even among the working classes, would be produced by election. Anything in the phalanstery way involves a parcelling out of the economical world into petty sections which is forbidden by the world-wide inter-dependence of commerce, and in the case of sailors and carriers, would be physically impossible. Insurance societies, savings banks, and all the facilities for thrift which Bismarck can imagine are provided by private enterprise ; joint stock companies and other modes by which the small capitalists are enabled to hold their own against the great, have been rapidly developed of late years ; and for those who fall in the race charities are ever being multiplied. There is more, it seems to us, to be hoped from these spontaneous influences than from any government, be it as industrial as it may. Still, we repeat, Bismarck's experiment will be watched with profound interest.

— With the Socialist controversy in Germany, the Jew controversy goes on, and the Jews and their advocates continue to appeal to the sympathy of a Liberal world against what they persist in calling a religious persecution. A religious persecution we are persuaded it is not, though there may be a certain amount of religious antipathy on both sides, and even the Agnostics may, perhaps, be inclined to support the Jews, not only on the grounds of political Liberalism, but from antagonism to Christianity. Germany is about the most free-thinking country in Europe. Nor can we accept the simple solution of the phenomenon as a mere exhibition of the "brutality" of the Germans, or of their envy of superior wealth. The Germans

are not brutal, but kindly ; nor are they covetous, but rather the reverse. The conflict, we feel sure, on which ever side the right may be, is fundamentally one of race. For the continuance of race feeling and the antagonism to which it gives birth the Jews are themselves responsible, inasmuch as they keep themselves severed from their fellow citizens by the retention of a tribal mark of separation, by manifestations of tribal sentiment towards Gentiles, and above all by the avoidance of intermarriage. Germany was utterly ruined for the time 'by the Thirty Years' war. Upon her prostrate nationality fastened themselves a group of petty despotisms, Austrian domination, French ambition, and the Jewish money power. The Jewish money power has fastened itself on other prostrate nationalities, such as that of Poland, that of the Danubian Communities, and even that of England, while she lay helpless and almost lifeless under the Norman yoke. German nationality has now risen again. It has overturned the petty despotisms. It has shaken off the Austrian domination. It has repelled the attack of French ambition, and in doing so rendered to Europe a service, for some of the Liberals were too much in love with the productions of French intellect to be sufficiently grateful. It is now struggling to set itself free from the grasp of the Jewish money power. The Anti-Jewish movements have coincided, not with fits of religious fanaticism, but with the pulses of returning national life, with the liberation of Germany from the yoke of Napoleon, the Revolution of 1848, and the repulse of French aggression. The situation and motives of the Germans can hardly be understood by communities in which the Jews are not so numerous as they are in Germany, and their special influence is not felt. All religious intolerance, all social oppression, all violence we most heartily condemn. But the mere fear of being called illiberal will not make us take part in traducing the Germans, or shrink from facing a little misapprehension in endeavouring to do justice to their cause, as they have faced the shot for the independence of all nations. Let the Jews give up their exclusiveness, cease to regard their

fellow-citizens as Gentiles, intermarry with them, and blend, as other immigrants do with the people among whom they have settled ; there will then be an end of the conflict of race, but otherwise there will not. The often repeated tale of Jewish wrongs is partly a tale of Jewish wrong-doing ; perhaps it is still more a tale of disastrous accident. This, when history is fairly examined, the world will see.

In pleading the cause of the Germans or any one else against a money power, in the present state of opinion, we are at all events not striking the weak. No recognition of the influence of wealth could be more signal than the homage which English society, with the heir to the Throne at its head, pays to the millions of the Rothschilds. The fortune of a chief of industry like Mr. Brassey is made up of small percentages on enterprises which employ tens of thousands and add vastly to the wealth of mankind. But the fortune which, as an English journal says, has placed the Rothschilds in a rank little below that of kings, denotes no such benefit conferred upon the world. The most famous stroke of the House was of a kind which the morality of the future may possibly condemn. At all events, he who uses his exclusive intelligence of an event for the purpose of buying up the property of other people at half its value, no more adds to the general wealth of mankind by his success, than he who wins money at the gaming-table. The family history of the Rothschilds, given to the world in connection with the wedding, indicates that even in marrying their object has been to keep their wealth together. Nor, so far as we are aware, are any great acts of munificence connected with their name. Their title to reverence is money and money alone. Those who repudiate, as we do, all asceticism may still hold that Mammon worship is not the goal.

—Our journals still glow with the controversy set on foot by the Anglican Conference as to the exclusive claims of the Anglican Church. One or two of the High Church disputants

have come boldly to the front and stated their case with laudable frankness. The Eucharistic miracle they say is essential to spiritual life, and that miracle can be performed only by priests who have been ordained by bishops. In that case bishops, and the priests ordained by them, are of course not only the depositories of supernatural power but masters of the world, since by refusing to perform the miracle they can cut us off from salvation. Whether the conversion takes the form of actual Transubstantiation or some subtler and less conceivable form, such as that denoted by Real Presence, signifies nothing. The miracle is still a miracle; without it we cannot be saved, and it can be performed only by a rightly ordained priest. But the Church contains besides the High Churchmen, the Evangelicals, who probably have a large majority among the laity, and deny the miracle altogether. This would seem to be a question about which, at all events, there can be no paltering. To acknowledge the existence of supernatural powers where they do not exist and take part in the performance of a false miracle is surely as great a breach of loyalty to truth as it is possible to commit, especially when the delusion is made the basis of claims, the tremendous character of which is attested by the whole history of the Church. It is true that in the Anglican Communion Service, the two opposite views of the Lord's Supper are combined, as was the way of the Elizabethan statesmen, who were thorough politicians and only wished to make their State Church comprehensive; but to combine two opposite views is not to harmonize them or to make it possible for the same mind to entertain them both. Disruption was sure to come: it came with a vengeance in Charles's reign. After a period of torpor it has now returned, and matters must reach a point at which the Evangelicals and the body of the laity will have to choose between the positive admission and the final repudiation of the Sacerdotal claim. We do not see that any one of the High Church disputants tries to explain away the dilemma in which he and his party are placed as believers in the divine right of Episcopacy refusing to hear the voice of

the immense majority of bishops. Of course the High Churchmen do not deny the authority of the Roman Catholic bishops whose ordinations they accept, and who declare that, in the Anglican Church or anywhere out of the pale of Rome, there is no salvation. If they appeal to a General Council of the Church, they will have to determine how the Council is to be assembled. In former days a Council might be called by an Orthodox Emperor. But in the present day who is to call one but the Pope? An infallibility which has no available organ is a clock with perfect works, but without face or hands.

—The battle of Clerical Tests, also, still rages, its eddies circling round the undaunted figure of Principal Grant. What is the rationale of Tests? We know what it was in former days. A Church Council such as that of Nice, a Clerical Convention such as that of Westminster, or even a lay power not embarrassed with humility such as their Majesties King Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth deemed itself invested by Heaven with plenary authority to settle the religious opinions of men, and it settled them by a creed, confession or Code of Articles accordingly. Till lately boys of sixteen at the English universities were required to declare their hearty assent to the Thirty-nine Articles, embodying the multifarious results of fifteen centuries of theological discussion. There was no pretence of consulting the individual conscience: infallibility was avowedly or practically assumed on the part of the imponent of the test, and dissent was treated as heresy, not to be met with arguments but to be put down with penalties. In the Church of Rome this view of the matter still prevails. Nobody imagines or affects to imagine that a young peasant caught in an Irish bog and trained under lock and key for the priesthood at Maynooth has arrived by discourse of reason at the conclusions of the Council of Trent. He would tell you himself that he believed his creed, not because he had personally assured himself of its truth but because it was taught him by his Church, and if any light from

a different theological quarter were unhappily to dawn upon his mind he would pray to be delivered from temptation. But for Protestants, authority having lost its hold and penalties being unavailable, a new rationale must be found. To this task the *Canada Presbyterian* addresses itself: "A creed," it says, "of any kind is not a thing for truth-seekers but for those who say they have been so far truth-finders." That no doubt is the only theory consistent at once with morality and private judgment. Yet can it be really supposed that an English or Scotch student by the time he is of age to be ordained has himself found all the truth in the Thirty-nine Articles or the Westminster Confession? Surely not. Besides it has further to be assumed that the process of thought which has brought him exactly at the same moment with other students of the same standing to the precise line of the creed, will there spontaneously end, and that the set of convictions which he has found will be not only conscientious but final, which in this world of doubt and controversy is assuming a good deal. To the Roman Catholic priest free enquiry after ordination, as well as before it, is a sin; but to the Protestant it is at all times and throughout life a duty; such at least is the principle of Protestantism, and the duty surely is not cancelled in the case of one who not only professes to be a truth-seeker himself but to show others the way to truth. The *Canada Presbyterian* proceeds to describe a creed as "the means of establishing mutual confidence among individuals and of rendering co-operation in a common cause both possible and productive of good results." This is a different idea from truth-seeking or truth-finding; and we get still further away from those notions when we introduce that of a "copartnership" or "contract" by which the clergyman is bound. The more honest a man is the less difficulty he will have in being faithful to a contract even though he may have ceased to think it advantageous to him, but the more difficulty he will have in continuing to profess a creed when he has ceased to find it true. "His course is clear," says the *Canada Presbyterian*, "let him dissolve partnership

and take himself out of the Church." But the analogy is not exact between dissolving a commercial partnership and leaving a church ; secession from the church may be bad not only for the man but for the church, and the worse for the church the more conscientious the man is. No doubt the situation is practically very delicate and calls for the exercise of much forbearance. Nobody would desire anything violent or abrupt. It is not necessary to throw the creeds out of the window, but it is necessary to recognise the change which, since they were imposed, has come both over the intellectual perceptions and over the moral sentiments of the world. Let them remain and exercise their natural influence as carefully prepared and venerable bodies of doctrine in shaping and uniting belief, which will be greater than is commonly supposed. But the one strong bond, unless religion is a dream, is practical Christianity, as all the Churches are beginning to feel. As to doctrine, the time will soon come, so far as Protestantism is concerned, for a new ordination test binding the minister at all times to teach what he believes to be the truth. The Roman Catholic principle of submission to ecclesiastical authority is thorough-going, and to cope with it to advantage the Protestant principle must be thorough-going too.

—Sympathy has been expressed by the Liberals for the rebellious Ritualists in England as people who are the victims of legal persecution for worshipping God in their own way. That Mr. Mackonochie and his compeers deserve sympathy as good men doing what their conscience bids them, nobody will deny. But if all they wanted was to worship God in their own way without being let or hindered by Lord Penzance, or any other secular power, they would only have to leave the Establishment. What they want, and have wanted all along, is not merely to worship God in their own way but to Romanize the National Church. They began the prosecutions ; by them first Mr. Gorham and afterwards Bishop Colenso was charged

with heresy before those Church Courts, the competence of which to try any spiritual question they now deny. By them a desperate effort was made to prevent Dr. Hampden from being consecrated a Bishop, because his opinion, or his way of expressing his opinion, on certain points of dogma did not coincide with theirs. By them the Professor of Greek at Oxford was for some time prevented, on the same ground of theological heresy, from receiving an increase of salary which had been assigned to him. If they could get the upper hand, any other party in the Establishment which wanted to worship God in its own way would have, ecclesiastically speaking, a short shrift. To lay liberties and lay participation in Church government they are utterly opposed; and much as they talk of restoring the powers of Convocation, they would not accept any plan for restoring its powers which involved the admission of lay delegates. It may seem hard that Mr. Mackonochie should not be allowed to perform Mass if he pleases. But it is at least equally hard that the Protestant tithe-payers of a parish should be compelled to let a Ritualist clergyman, at his personal will and pleasure, turn their service into a Mass. If the existing Church Courts are incompetent by means of their being instituted by the State to try spiritual causes, there are no Courts nor is there any Church law at all. The bishops are appointed by the State, and the Ritualist clergymen have received their Orders from the bishops. With men who seek to separate the Church from the State, that each may do its proper work under its own laws, and who renounce State patronage as well as repudiate State control, we shall all sympathize heartily; but how many of the Ritualists are so minded?

— Those who fancy that nothing but malice will lead anybody to predict disquietude from a revision of the Bible must, by this time, be aware that, at all events, there is a good deal of malice abroad. For ourselves, we are so far removed from the mood of mischievous exultation that we are strongly inclined

to wish that the revision had never been undertaken, or confined to marking those passages which are unquestionable interpolations. A company of ecclesiastics is incompetent to do the critical work thoroughly, because, however learned and able, it is not free. Probably we shall find the Epistles to the Hebrews again confidently ascribed, in the teeth of all critical evidence and authority, to St. Paul. There will be a good deal of disturbance, and all our existing Bibles, including our Family Bibles, will have to be discarded for the sake of a very doubtful gain. One alteration we are led to expect, which we know a certain class of minds will welcome, but which to others will be as unwelcome as possible. The petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Deliver us from evil," is to be turned, we are told, into "Deliver us from the Evil one." No one can say that the alteration is required by the rules of the Greek language, and it is peremptorily rejected by Dean Alford on exegetical grounds which seem to us sufficient. The Lord's Prayer is the one thing which has hitherto remained unscathed by the critical storm, because it does not come into collision with modern science or philosophy in any way whatever. Its physical petition, "Give us this day our daily bread," assumes nothing beyond the existence of a sustaining power behind the laws of nature, which no one can deny without embracing the absurd hypothesis that the laws of nature enact themselves. In a psychological point of view, the prayer as hitherto understood and translated simply affirms the Fatherhood of God. It can be breathed by the man of science or the sage, if he believes in communion with the Author of his being at all, as well as lisped by the child at its mother's knee. But now there will be imported into it the idea of a personal Power of Evil, with a train of demonological and Manichean associations, from which minds not in sympathy with the divines of the Jerusalem Chamber will recoil. It is an ill-service rendered to the English-speaking part of Christendom.*

* We seem to have unwittingly offended some of our theological friends by giving as an instance of a familiar text, which would be missed in the new version, that

—Suicide appears to be on the increase. In the United States, it is said to prevail specially among the Germans. If this is true, the tendency is perhaps connected with the spread of Pessimistic opinions, though a less intellectual cause may be found in the sufferings and the home-sickness of the emigrant. Whatever may be the explanation, the fact has raised a debate about the lawfulness and expediency of suicide, which, like all other ethical questions, is brought up by the Agnostic revolution for examination in a new light. Hume wrote an essay in defence of the practice; but he did not venture to publish it in his lifetime. In moral scepticism he was before his day; now his age has come. If, he argues, suicide is an offence, it must be an offence against God, your neighbour or yourself. It cannot be an offence against God, because God governs through the laws of Nature, and the death of a man is as much a consequence of the operation of those laws as any other physical event. It cannot be an offence against your neighbour, who is not injured by your departure from the world any more than he would be by your retirement from active life, and in some cases it may be beneficial to him, for instance, when a man cognizant of a conspiracy to overturn a noxious tyranny destroys himself to escape torture which he knows would wring from him a revelation. It cannot be an offence against yourself, because every one shrinks from death, and is sure not to throw away his life till it has become worthless. The argument on the first head is evidently half ironical, and presents, beneath a thin veil of verbal Deism, Hume's belief,

of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c." We thought that we were merely recording the general judgment of scholars. Our critics say that the translation is right as it stands, if you only substitute "Avenger" or "Vindicator" instead of "Redeemer." But this makes all the difference. Neither "Avenger" nor "Vindicator" has the theological sense which "Redeemer" has acquired. The Hebrew term has no equivalent in English, nor can it be rendered by any single English word. It denotes the kinsman to whom, under the Hebrew law, belonged the privilege and duty of avenging blood and redeeming the ancestral estate. Besides, surely, it is admitted that the rest of the passage has been translated under the influence of the preconceived idea that it spoke of the Resurrection, as the Anglican Burial Service assumes.

that natural law was the only thing of which we could be cognizant, and that there was no proof of the existence of a Moral Ruler. That on the second head betrays the sentiment of a solitary man who thought of the effect of actions on society at large, not of the effect on wife and child. Assuming that the philosophy of Hume, which is identical with that of the Agnostics, is true, and that we have no reason for believing that "The Everlasting has fixed his canon against self-slaughter," it seems difficult to devise an argument which shall be morally conclusive against suicide. To talk of "self-murder" is absurd, as it would be to talk of self-theft or self-forgery. Positivists try to frame a moral argument by maintaining that society has a right to react upon the individual, and that the individual wrongs humanity by withdrawing himself from this reaction. But when a man has fallen into his eternal sleep, what need has he to care for the general rights of society, or for the jargon of sociologists? The question seems to be reduced to one of mere expediency; and without running into the bilious extravagances of Schopenhauer, we are constrained to admit, that, in a world so full of failure, disease, want, cruelty, misery, shame, there can hardly fail to be many who would have to answer in the negative the question whether this life is worth living, and to whom, if the sleep which brings an hour's forgetfulness is a blessing, the long sleep would be a greater blessing still. Over the coarser kind of misery the love of life seems generally to prevail, but it does not prevail over the misery of Hamlet. On the other hand, if we have reason, even the slightest reason, for believing in a God and a Hereafter, it is the clear dictate of wisdom, apart from any superstition, to run with resignation the full career of duty in the hope that if we do, it will be well for us in the sum of things. What is success, what is failure; what is mere suffering, what is probation; who can say till the veil is raised? The question is one of those which show that mere Agnosticism is practically impossible as a permanent frame of mind, and that even for the purpose of disposing wisely of the present life, we

are compelled to form an opinion on subjects which the Agnostic bids us regard as placed entirely and for ever beyond our ken.

The lawfulness of suicide in the proper sense of the term is a different problem from the lawfulness of Euthanasia, as in a recent discussion it was elegantly termed. Have we a right to make death painless? When medical science despairs, when death is certain and near, when moral life has come to an end, and nothing but physical suffering is left, is a man bound to remain stretched upon the rack of torture, and are his friends bound to witness his agonies, or does morality sanction the use of an anodyne potent enough to close the scene? If Heaven has sent the pain, Heaven also, it may be said, has sent the means of escape from pain. The question is one of extreme delicacy, and the advocates of Euthanasia have to face not only prejudices, but real dangers of more than one kind. We are hardly in a position even to discuss it now; but some day, beyond doubt, it will assume a practical form.

—Had Carlyle lived another century he would have had nothing new to say. He had long been, to use his own phrase, “a shut-up man,” who had ceased to take in or give out any new truth. As an historical painter, he may almost be called peerless. Where shall we find rivals to such a series of scenes as his “French Revolution?” As a humorist, also, the writer of “Sartor Resartus” is great, great in himself, whatever may be his debt to the Germans. The introduction of humour into history is, perhaps, the most original stroke of his genius, and makes his appearance a literary epoch. His style is his own and a part of his humour; in his imitators it is detestable. His philosophy, we venture to think, is naught, or worse than naught. It would have put the world on a totally wrong track. The greatest of men is not a god nor anything

like a god; and, therefore, to worship the greatest of men or to put blind trust in him is folly and degradation. But when greatness is identified with force, Hero worship becomes a superstition as gross as the adoration of any hundred-handed idol. The idea is an anachronism; in early times the chief is everything; as civilization advances the people rise to his level and his importance grows less. A passage in "Frederick" shows that Carlyle had never got rid of his Scotch Calvinism, and that at the root of his historical philosophy lay Predestination. The most unpractical of teachers, not even caring to be practical, he never asked himself how the hero, in following whom lay the world's sole hope of salvation, was to be found. The names of Cromwell, Frederick, Napoleon issued from the urn of war or political convulsion, which would be rather costly modes of election. A vague sympathy with violence Carlyle succeeded in creating, and, unhappily, it sometimes took practical forms. It must be said for him that while he perverts history by partiality for the hero and by flagrant injustice (or as he styles it "justice of the gods") towards all who get in the hero's way, he never, so far as we know, falsifies facts. But his imitators, the avenging Furies of eccentric genius, do falsify facts and turn history into a vast lie for the glorification of some hero like King Henry VIII. and the disparagement of his victims. The moral of "Past and Present" is just as untrue as that of "Hero Worship"; the world with which Abbot Samson battled was, on Carlyle's own showing, not better, but worse than ours. Here, again, Carlyle himself keeps some measure with common sense, but he is followed by howling dervishes who denounce their generation, though it keeps them pretty comfortably, as a mere mass of roguery, and, being themselves the softest of sentimentalists, affect to pine for the return of a heroic age in which they would have been the most abject and the most constantly kicked of slaves. How much insight the sage derived from his philosophy was seen when he pronounced on the greatest practical question of his day, the struggle between Slavery and Freedom in the United States, a

judgment most oracular in its form, most untrue in its version of the facts, and immediately falsified by the event. His chief disciple, in like manner, pronounces that the Irish question can be solved only by despotism, while statesmanship is successfully solving it in a milder way. To democratic optimism he administered some wholesome rebukes; but their extravagance deprives them of serious value; everybody knows that the "thirty millions," though very fallible, are no more "fools" than he is; and while he rails at the ballot-box, he proposes nothing in its room. Rosewater philanthropy again might have benefited by his preachings, if he had not ruined them by truculent sophistry and sometimes by downright brutality. His cynicism became at last as bitter, as indiscriminating, and as barren as the east wind. His sympathy with religious enthusiasm seems to indicate that his philosophy had a religious basis of some kind, but he never gave it or tried to give it a distinct form. No thinker of genius who ever lived was so satisfied to put up with haze. His tone was always high; he was a good antidote to materialism; but his Titanic vocabulary filled very weak men with false notions of their own strength, set them wielding a Thor's hammer of thundering talk, and generated the very humbug which he thought it his mission to put down. He sometimes cants terribly against cant; his praises of silence are very voluminous, and his Eternal Verities are about the best stuffing for windbags in the world.

—Our free expression of opinion as to the intense vulgarity of the view of life presented in "Endymion," seems to startle some Endymionists in England. Journalism on this side of the Atlantic, at all events, may speak without reserve of matters on the other side; and, if the people there choose of their own accord to reprint what we say, we hope they will find it wholesome. Was criticism needless? Is nobody to protest when young men setting out in public life are taught that they owe nothing to their country or to their

kind, that all they have to do is get as much of gilded luxury as they can, and that so long as they get a full measure, it signifies nothing what course they take? This is the moral of *Endymion*, which, from beginning to end, never hints at a public motive, never suggests any law of action but success, or makes success consist in anything but money, titles, the society of people of rank, gorgeous furniture and sumptuous dinners. Again, is the lurid light which this piece of oblique autobiography throws on the history of England and Europe during the last forty years to be utterly disregarded? England has poured out blood and money; she has incurred military disgrace, mingled with dishonour, in South Africa and the East; she has had her best Governments overthrown by intrigue, she has had her representation degraded, and her Parliamentary institutions placed in jeopardy; Turkey has been plunged into a hideous war with Russia, and the Eastern question has been flung into an imbroglio which still threatens the peace of the world; Afghans defending their country have been slaughtered, and their women and children driven out to die upon the hills; Zulus also defending their country have been butchered by thousands; all this not for any of those great objects which make up to nations for temporary loss and suffering, not even to fulfil the vision of a grand and soaring, though perhaps irregular, ambition, but to realize a day-dream of Houndsditch. So we have called this ideal, as such it was branded by the keenest observer of character in our day, whose memory is accordingly assailed in *Endymion* with charges as false as they are foul. A distinct perception of the vulgarity of saloon ambition is the best antidote to the attractions of its prize. We would recommend a reperusal of "*Codlingsby*" by "*Sainte Barbe*."