

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

- Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires: Continuous pagination.

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

Mrs Marcus Smith

A MONTHLY
REVIEW

THE BYSTANDER

OF
CURRENT EVENTS,
CANADIAN AND GENERAL.

NOT PARTY, BUT THE PEOPLE.

CONTENTS.

	Page.		Page.
THE DOMINION :		UNITED STATES :	
The Pacific Railway Negotiations..	459	The Chances of the Presidential Contest ..	488
The New Opposition	460	American Social Tendencies..	491
The Grand Army of Canada..	462	Female Suffrage	492
National Currency	465	The André Case	499
Strong Governments and Liberty..	472	ENGLAND :	
The Rate of Interest	473	The New Phase of English Politics	500
Commercial Union	474	The Illness of Mr. Gladstone..	502
Royal Commissions.. .. .	476	The Disaster at Candahar	503
Principal Grant on the Destiny of Canada	477	The Irish Question	505
The University Classical Professorship	483	Changes in the Law of Libel..	507
Religious Journalism and Prohibition	483	France and Belgium	509
The Handford Case.. .. .	486	The Origin of the Laws of Nature ..	510
Bye Elections in Ontario.	487	The Robertson-Smith Case.. .. .	514
		The Education of the Clergy	515
		The Copyright Question	518

Toronto :

HUNTER, ROSE & COMPANY, WELLINGTON ST.

PUBLISHERS.

WHOLESALE AGENTS:

THE TORONTO NEWS COMPANY.

MONTREAL AGENTS:

THE MONTREAL NEWS COMPANY.

AGENTS IN MARITIME PROVINCES: J. & A. MACMILLAN, St. John, N. B.

THE BYSTANDER:

A Monthly Review of Current Events, Canadian and General.

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

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

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

---

## PRESS NOTICES.

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MESSRS. HUNTER, ROSE & CO.,

25 Wellington Street West, Toronto.

TORONTO, June, 1880.

---

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

# THE BYSTANDER.

---

---

SEPTEMBER, 1880.

---

---

WE are obliged to go to press just when the news on which we should have most wished to have the opportunity of commenting is expected every hour. It has been joyously proclaimed by the Opposition organ that Sir John Macdonald has failed. He may not have succeeded in his first attempt, but that he has failed, or will fail, we cannot believe. He is the most skilful of negotiators, and he has everything at stake. The state of the English money market is in his favour, and the improved position of the Grand Trunk will somewhat mitigate the strong prejudice against Canadian Railways. Some sort of agreement, we are confident, Sir John Macdonald will bring back with him. Whatever it is, it is condemned beforehand by those who said that his failure would "be inspiring to every true Canadian." Their cue will most likely be to exaggerate the value of the land, and contend that it has been thrown away. But land is of value only when opened up, and a single railway can hardly be said to open up more than a belt of fifty miles. The mass of our people will, as we believe, irrespectively of party and the rivalries of politicians, welcome any reasonable settlement which will relieve the country of the peril. We may differ very much on political questions, but we all abhor bankruptcy. We may vary in our speculative views as to the future destiny of the country, but we all desire that Canada should remain her own mistress, and that her pos-

ition among the nations should be settled by her own will and not by the pressure of financial disaster.

—In the dead season of politics, Ministerial journals employ their leisure in exposing the discrepancies and inconsistencies of the Opposition creed. They enjoy the satisfaction of going through the list of leading questions, and finding that on no one of them are the Opposition leaders and organs agreed saving the duty of hating Sir John Macdonald. Perhaps even on that point practical unanimity hardly prevails. But the Opposition is just now changing its skin : it is casting off the slough of Gritism : soon it will come forth renovated and burnished in Liberal youth. To mix our metaphors : the fleet is going over from the Grit to the Liberal tack : the sheets of the *London Advertiser* have filled, and it is cutting the water merrily ; while some of its consorts are hanging, and two or three, perhaps, will forever hang, in stays. Candour, however, must admit that there is more than this. There is an extensive fermentation of public opinion on questions which neither of the parties has hitherto taken up, though they are the great questions of the future. It is natural that the Liberal party should be the more affected of the two by this movement, and that it should betray symptoms of half conviction and vacillation, from which a party of resistance to all movement is free. In time, opinion will settle, and those who comprehend the situation, and know their own minds, will, as usual, take a decisive lead. In the meantime, Parliamentary history is full of proofs that an Opposition, divided on some questions, may still find a point of united attack. Mr. Blake may give battle on the Coal Tax without touching the Senate or Commercial Union.

With regard to the question of the Senate, we confess that we ourselves occupy a position in which it would be difficult for us to frame a mere party motion. That the system of two Chambers is a mistake, having its origin in a total misconception as to the nature of the House of Lords, is a conviction in

which we are confirmed by all that occurs either in the European Legislatures or in those of the British Colonies. The House of Lords is the chamber of a territorial aristocracy, as it is now showing in a signal manner; it represents and guards certain interests, distinct from those of the great body of the nation. In countries where there is no territorial aristocracy there are no real materials for an Upper Chamber. Sometimes, as in Victoria, a senate becomes the organ of a special interest, and is rendered noxious as well as odious thereby. Whatever of high character and mature wisdom a nation possesses ought, if possible, to be sent to the assembly in which supreme power, under the elective system, must centre, there to control and guide the real councils of the nation. In Victoria, and wherever the Senate has become the organ of a special interest, the results have been collisions and dead-locks; elsewhere the Senate has been a nullity, or, rather, it has done mischief by concealing the want of a real Conservative element in the Constitution; nowhere has it fulfilled its ideal function as a body of mature wisdom regulating and tempering legislation. In Canada it has rendered no service at all commensurate to its cost; it is filled with superannuated partisans, and is hardly anything more than an addition to the bribery fund of party. Very little would be lost by simple abolition. But, if we could have our way, the abolition would be accompanied with a general revision of the Constitution, of which the Senate is a part, with a view to actually supplying those securities for deliberate legislation which the Senate is vainly supposed to afford. We would have both the mode of election to the House of Commons and the mode of doing business there so regulated as to make that House itself, if possible, a Senate, in the best sense of the term. We would introduce regular election of the Executive Council by the Legislature instead of putting up the great offices of State as the prizes of a faction fight which turns a deliberative assembly into a cockpit. We would try at the same time to take the elections out of the hands of the wire-pullers, and restore them immediately or mediately to

those of the people. These, it will be at once said, are the impracticable reveries of doctrinaires. Possibly, but as it is the unexpected that always happens, so it is the impracticable that in the end is always done.

—Having the national fish to sell our Prime Minister seems to have thought it lawful to do everything in his power to propitiate the market. If he is rightly reported, he told the guests at the Trinity House dinner that every man in Canada between 18 and 45 was a soldier, and that this mighty host, in number about double the regular army of England, was in a perfect state of organization. Had we been there, we should have loyally backed up our Chieftain's statement, and declared that every man of the force was thoroughly drilled, armed, and provided with uniform and accoutrements; that the officers, commissioned and non-commissioned, were perfectly trained to their duties; that the cavalry was exceeded in strength and efficiency only by the artillery; that the commissariat and the ambulances were ready for the field at a moment's notice, and that the country voted with enthusiasm four hundred millions annually for the pay. Next morning all this would have been repeated in the English papers as an important and gratifying proof that the military resources of the Empire were far greater than was commonly supposed. If it had been added that the men were all more than six feet high and that their ordinary diet was cariboo, which accounted for their remarkable agility, this would have been believed as well as the rest. He is a wise Canadian militiaman who knows his own colonel. A late judge whose weight avoirdupois equalled the weight of his authority as a lawyer, was an officer of light infantry; yet few were in the secret. How the chieftain's audience would be taken aback by his urgent call for British troops on the outbreak of a Russian war, and how nimbly would his prolific fancy supply an excuse for the entire disappearance of his perfectly organized legions! Yet Lord Kimberley evidently shares

the illusion. We sometimes wonder whether the Colonial office has any means of obtaining trustworthy information at all, or picks up its knowledge on the luncheon ground at Wimbledon. A correspondent at Cape Town told us long ago that the case of South African Confederation was hopeless, giving the decisive reasons against the practicability of the scheme: evidently he spoke the mind of all men of sense on the spot. Yet the Colonial office, kept by a few flatterers under the dominion of a strong delusion, plunged on through blood and ruin to certain failure. The present Colonial Secretary plainly has not a notion that, in cheering us on to expenditure in politico-military railways, he is endangering our financial solvency, or that a blow given to our financial solvency may shake the half cemented edifice of Confederation.

While we are talking of martial affairs let us repel the insinuation of a malicious contemporary that the *Bystander* must, of course, be opposed to sending a team to Wimbledon because it is Jingo, inasmuch as the Canadian marksmen "are showing how unerringly they would send a bullet through the body of a Frenchman, a Russian or a Yankee." The *Bystander* trusts that he is not so deficient in proper bloodthirstiness as not to revel in the thought of sending a bullet through a Yankee's body, though, it must be owned, the scores at Wimbledon suggest the possibility that the Yankee might, with his usual forgetfulness of decorum, send his bullets through ours. But smallbore shooting is not allied to anything sanguinary or unchristian; if we may trust the opinion of our military friends, it is more nearly allied to playing billiards. Canadian oarsmen, though their sport is less military in appearance, are probably, providing more of the real material for an army than our marksmen.

—Our late Governor-General appears to be, socially, as great a hit in Russia as he was here. "While the other ambassadors in St. Petersburg have contented themselves with very mixed society, Lord Dufferin has entertained none but the most aris-



tocratic and select. So exclusive are his receptions that even some members of the diplomatic corps are not admitted to the more private ones. The Dufferin receptions have been much talked of naturally, especially in connection with the charades that are acted at them. The host himself is the central figure of these entertainments. He throws himself into the thing with the greatest ardour. One day, for instance, he welcomed his guests in the costume of a cupid—pink tights, wings and quiver, all complete. On another occasion he donned a Scotch costume and appeared bare-legged. In some charade or other it was one night necessary to work in the word "river." Lord Dufferin calmly piled up a heap of chairs, climbed to the top of one of them, took off his dress-coat, waistcoat and white necktie, threw himself flat on the floor, and began moving his arms and legs about frantically, like a swimmer in distress. He then got up, and beckoning to the band to strike up, opened the ball in a waltz with Lady Dufferin. The originality of these entertainments and the systematic exclusion of all outside the pale of the most aristocratic society in the Empire made a great sensation." Such is the picture Correspondents give.

"He throws himself into the thing with the greatest ardour," and, we may be sure, with unparalleled success. In St. Petersburg "the thing" is exclusiveness combined with frivolity. In Canada "the thing" was Spread-Beaver. How Lord Dufferin threw himself into Spread-Beaver stands recorded in his speeches, which are at once about the prettiest pieces of rhetoric of their sort and the most remarkable monuments of the capacity of the human mind for absorbing flattery and exaggeration. The effect was not confined to the passing hour, nor did it pass away with the exhilaration of the champagne; a joyous impulse was given to the policy of Pacific Railways and general inflation, out of which the Prime Minister is now trying to find a way. That Mr. Mackenzie, sober-minded as he is, yielded to the spell like the rest, his expenditure in British Columbia and his Military College at Kingston seem to prove.

—We trust that the ire of Sir Francis Hincks has abated. The knights of old were called upon to display chivalrous courtesy and command of temper in the tilting yard: he is called upon to display them in the literary tourney. Government paper currency, to which he is so much attached, and our want of attachment to which caused him to explode, or as our cousins say, to erupt, has surely furnished food for reflection on this continent. It is needless to rehearse the history of the Legal Tender Act in the United States, or to say what its effects were on the national finances, on public credit, on the faith of private contracts, or commercial and general morality. There is probably not a man of sense now in the Republic who does not most heartily wish that the politicians had been as honest as the people, and stuck to the straightforward policy of laying on as large an amount of taxation as the community could bear, and borrowing what more they wanted upon their credit, which would then have remained sound. A practical deduction of at least a third from the burden of the debt would have been the smallest of the benefits which would thus have been secured, and which were forfeited by raising a forced loan under the guise of issuing unconvertible paper, and making it legal tender. Generations may pass away before the United States will have thoroughly worked the mischief out of their commercial system; nor will it be less difficult to expel from the social frame the evil habits contracted during the war by the reckless expenditure of phantom wealth.\* As to the South American

---

\* "By a remarkable delusion our people came to regard the paper money, every note of which was a certificate and reminder of indebtedness and loss of property, as a real and boundless addition to our wealth, which not only made good our material losses, but made us far richer than we had been before the war. Under the influence of this astounding error the people and the Government plunged at once into reckless extravagance and expenditure, thus greatly increasing the loss which the nation had suffered by the war. . . . This extravagance and the delusion which fostered it had some important results in the domain of morals. Manual labour came to be regarded as in a great measure unnecessary, and to be despised as a badge of inferiority by many who had always been engaged in it. Multitudes of men, who had until then honestly earned or produced their living by the work of their hands, now began to live by their wits, by starting and controlling business

Governments, and the coloured gentlemen who preside over the finances of St. Domingo, they have so regulated the paper currency that it needs a strong man to carry a dollar in paper home. And now Canada has taken the first step in the same descent by empowering her Government to issue eight millions of legal tender paper, convertible indeed, but without a proportionate reserve. This Sir Francis Hincks condemns, though he seems disposed to reserve the prerogative of condemnation to himself.

It is the business of the Government to put its stamp on the coin, as an assurance that the piece is of a certain weight and fineness. You take your gold, if you please, to the mint and get it back stamped in the shape of sovereigns. There is nothing of fiat about this, more than about any other stamp or certificate of value. Happily Governments may now be trusted to discharge this function honestly. In former days they were in the habit of stealing a portion of the gold and substituting

---

enterprises for the investment of other peoples' money, and by taking Government contracts and corporation jobs. The abounding dishonesty which has since then been our curse, the repudiation of the debts of States, towns, and cities, with the alarming development of the disposition to steal trust funds,—these and other unfavourable elements in the life of the time had their source and main impulse in the delusion about the nature and powers of paper money, in the uncertainty of its value, and in the extravagance engendered by the war. A passionate greed for riches was developed among our people. Men had no longer any vision for realities, but built upon illusions and impossibilities as if they were the solid facts and laws of nature. The leading clergymen and writers of the nation encouraged and defended this enormous and reckless acquisitiveness, and talked in philosophical phrases about the aspirations of the masses for improved conditions, leisure for culture, and a higher civilization. The pulpit gave to luxury the sanction of religion, and the press urged the people onward in their career of extravagance, in the name of patriotism, and declared the national debt a national blessing. It was not to be effected that the working-men should be wiser than their teachers. The increase of wages for all kinds of manual labour was very great, but comparatively few of the working-men saved anything. They imitated the profusion of their employers and guides. Economy was deemed unnecessary, stupid, and mean. New wants were invented: prudence and simplicity of life went out of fashion; and habits were formed and sentiments adopted which have wrought most important changes in the character and aims of the working men of this country. The sheer wastefulness of that period, if it could be adequately portrayed, would appear incredible to all who did not witness it." *From* "Certain Dangerous Tendencies in American Life."

base metal. To show what tricks people are capable of playing with their understandings on this subject, a historian styles the debasement of the currency by Henry VIII. "a loan from the Mint," and treats it as a perfectly legitimate measure of finance, in face of the facts that commerce was thrown into confusion by this royal embezzlement, and that the restoration of the coin was one of the glories of Elizabeth. Mr. Finlay ascribes the wonderful vitality of the Byzantine Empire partly to its commercial ascendancy, which again he attributes to the wisdom of its Government in steadfastly maintaining the integrity of the coin.

But Bank Bills, once more, are not coin nor "money," which means the product of a Mint: they are notes promising to pay coin, and like other paper, instruments of commerce. Why is Government to issue them, any more than promissory notes of the ordinary kind? In order that it may appropriate the profit? But why should Government be bound to appropriate the profit of issuing Bank Bills any more than that of discounting, or receiving deposits, or selling exchange? A commercial community is made up of different trades, each earning its profits in its own line of business, and the Banker's trade is one like the rest. Why, we ask, should it be the duty of the Government to transfer to itself the profits of this particular trade? No reason, we suspect, can be given which would not resolve itself into a confused notion that Bank Bills are money, and that to issue them is the province of Government because Government stamps the coin. As to regulating the circulation, in the first place that is a function entirely distinct from making a profit by issuing Bank Bills, and supposing the thing to be practicable, would perhaps be better committed to the hands of some independent authority above trade and profit altogether. But, in the second place, we must ask once more, how can the amount of paper requisite for commercial transactions in any community be regulated otherwise than by the current demands of commerce? How can a Government possibly foresee the number and amount of transactions? How, without

such prevision, can it possibly determine the volume of paper which it is desirable to issue? Banks obey, and cannot help obeying, the natural law of supply and demand in their issue department as well as in the rest. But what is there to guide a Government? What guided our Finance Minister when he determined on a sudden to issue additional paper to the extent of eight millions? This is what we want to know.

There are Governments and Governments. A thoroughly commercial Government like that of France or Holland in former times, or that of England in the present day, might, perhaps, be safely trusted with the power of issuing paper. But a demagogic Government, to which democracy in its crude state is always liable, cannot be safely trusted with such a power. We see what demagogic Governments have done. We see that Sir Leonard Tilley, a man whose personal integrity is beyond question, when pressed by political necessity, proceeds, under colour of inflating the currency, to levy a forced loan. We know what was done by Secretary Chase, though his character stood very high. No wild cat bank has ever exceeded in profligacy or in mischievousness the doings of certain governments in this line; so very far is a national currency, as it is styled, from affording extraordinary security to the people. On the Banks you have a hold; you can compel them to keep a sufficient reserve of coin or conform to any other rules that you think fit; and you can enforce the penalty for their defaults: nobody has any interest in screening them: the politicians, on the contrary, seeing that they are objects of popular jealousy and envy, are always ready for an attack on them. But a party Government has only to appeal to its majority in order to be relieved from all restrictions and exempted from all penalties; and experience shows that it will commonly do, either in the way of issuing bad paper or in any other way, whatever it thinks necessary to keep it in power. Sir Leonard Tilley is able to increase his issue without increasing his reserve; if he pleases he can do it again: perhaps his less scrupulous successors may do it till there is practically no reserve at all. Not the politicians saved the United States

(if indeed the United States have been saved) from Greenbackism and Repudiation, but the honesty and good sense of the people, aided by the Press, which rose above the party level on this occasion. The politicians were ready for anything that would bring them votes, from the Dollar of the Fathers to downright Repudiation. The allegation of the National Currency men that the Government is responsible while the Banks are irresponsible, is unfortunately the very reverse of the truth.

Sir Francis seems to think that it is great presumption on our part to have an opinion about the Bank Charter Act. It is impossible to have been in the thick of the discussion when the Act was on its trial without forming some notion of it, however imperfect and erroneous. We are aware that it has not been repealed, though it has been thrice suspended, (in 1847, 1857, and 1866), and these suspensions, to say the least, are not a proof of its perfect adaptation to all commercial circumstances. That of which Sir Francis Hincks does not seem so distinctly aware is that the Act has not yet really gone into operation. Peel contemplated the extinction of all note issues save that of the Bank of England, and expected the process to be rapid; instead of which there are still more than 170 banks of issue remaining in England, while in Scotland and Ireland the old system remains unchanged. The Act was the offspring of the alarm caused by Bank crashes; but we have never seen any proof that stricter Bank Laws would not have been the better as well as the more obvious remedy. Each suspension has been full of injustice to the houses which had been allowed to fall before the interposition. We have said before that in times of alarm the Act seems to produce a sort of hysterical contraction which aggravates the panic. Still the Charter was a *bona fide* attempt to regulate the currency in the public interest: it was not a plan for bringing profit to the Government, much less for replenishing the exchequer from an illicit source; while the character of the Legislature, on which commerce has a firm hold, and the relations between the Government and the Bank

of England, to which there is nothing analogous here, afford a sufficient security against any wild cat measures.

That this dangerous power will ever be wrested out of the hands of our politicians is in the last degree improbable. So far as that goes, Sir Francis Hincks may be comforted. But the use of the power may possibly be kept within some sort of bounds by the united action, whenever action is required, of all who have the interests of commercial industry at heart. Our commercial institutions, on the whole, are sound, and have been proved to be so by the searching ordeal of the crisis through which we have just passed: they are administered by commercial men, thoroughly acquainted with the subject, who have themselves to bear the consequences of mismanagement. Our political institutions are not so sound: they may, and we hope will, work off their defects, but at present they are in the hands of Party, which when hard pressed will do anything, while Governments are too ephemeral to feel much responsibility for the future. To bring that which is sound more under the influence of that which is unsound would not be the wisest policy.

The Government paper, though not unconvertible—at that point happily we have not yet arrived—is Legal Tender. Why should anybody's paper be Legal Tender? That is a question to which we have never seen a good answer, and to which it is most desirable to have one, for Legal Tender lies at the root of the notion that the Government has power to create money by fiat, and of all the dangerous chimeras which that notion brings in its train. If Sir Francis Hincks is in favour of Legal Tender, he is a Greenbacker, or a Beaverbacker, *in posse*. If the paper is good, nobody will refuse it: if it is doubtful, why is anybody to be compelled to take it. Supposing a creditor so eccentric as to refuse Bank of England notes, and prefer to encumber himself with a half a hundred weight of gold, he can be accommodated by taking the notes to the Bank of England. The principles of commercial justice are the same in all cases and extend to the dealings of a Government as well as to those of private traders, though a Government which breaks them can

snap its fingers at remonstrance and a private trader cannot. We really can see no public convenience in Legal Tender, or any reason why the promissory notes of a Government should be forced currency any more than its Exchequer Bills or its Bonds ; while we do see a bad principle, and one of the most dangerous kind. But our distinguished critic, we apprehend, is himself the author of the system in this country. He set the example, as Finance Minister, of making profit by the issue of Government paper. From him to Sir Leonard Tilley is a natural step in the financial Rake's Progress. He, like a hen, has sat on the duck's egg and hatched the inauspicious bird which he now, with maternal horror, sees taking to its natural element of Inflation.

As our eminent financial contemporary, the *Monetary Times*, says, this question is still dangerous. It is difficult to understand the prevalence of the fiat money fallacy. It is difficult to understand how an artisan can fancy that he would be the gainer by being paid his wages in paper for which no one would give him a loaf of bread. No doubt he would see many richer men than himself, who have loaned their money, ruined ; and this might gratify his feelings ; but it would hardly mend his condition, especially if he was employed in producing anything that rich men buy. No sane man surely can think that a bill is based upon that into which it is not convertible, or that bills issued by the Government could be convertible into the general wealth of the country, which belongs not to the Government but to private owners. If it be said that the Government has the power of taxing all the property, and thus satisfying its creditors, the question meets us, in what are the taxes to be collected. In the Government paper ? Then you will have nothing after all but paper to give the public creditor, and you may as well dispense with an illusory form. In gold ? Then you come back to a gold basis in the end. But the truth is that through the monetary fallacies glimmers legalized Repudiation, and this it is that gives the fallacies their vogue.



—The phrase "National" applied to Currency evidently has a charm. "National" ought to have a charm whenever it denotes attachment to the community as opposed to anything sectional or selfish. But in this case it seems to be closely connected with the Socialistic desire for "a strong government," which we find expressed in journals and addresses appealing to the working-men. A strong government, in plain language, is a despotism; only it is to be a despotism animated by the sentiments, and acting in the interests, of the artisan class. Consequently, it would be the enemy of the other classes; the other classes would fight for their rights and their property, and it is doubtful, to say the least, whether the military force of the community resides in the artisan. But the fact is that a despotism, whatever its origin, once set up, is apt to act in nobody's interest but its own, and to ally itself with that class which is most willing to support its authority. In France a strong government, elected by universal suffrage, with Democratic and semi-Socialistic professions, came into supreme power under a revolutionary flag; and its first step was to deport the leaders of the working classes by thousands to Lambessa and Cayenne; after which, without entirely laying aside its pretension to a democratic or even a semi-socialistic character, it proceeded to govern in the interest of the rich generally, and especially of the stock-jobbers. Massaniello was a tyrant before he had been in power for a day, and Kearney, if he could become supreme, would repeat the history of Massaniello. We have had specimens on a small scale, of strong governments set up by the votes of the artisans, and for their supposed benefit, in most of the cities of this continent; and what has the result been? It has been a general domination of men like Tweed, who have made immense fortunes by theft, and outvied in vulgar luxury the shoddy rich, their chosen associates, while not a thought has been given the habitations or the condition of the poor. The world is not what we would wish it to be, but liberty has done most to improve it. Experience bids us cast away for ever the thought of class gov-

ernment, whether the class be that of the aristocrat or that of the artizan, and try rather to make society a community indeed.

— That which concerns ninety-nine people in a hundred a good deal more than any political question is the fall in the rate of interest. This was evidently coming. The banks have reduced the rate on deposits, and the general rise in stocks and shares may be taken to be partly a direct consequence of this measure, partly a consequence of the commercial conditions by which the measure was enforced. The mortgage rate in this country is down to 6, in the United States it is down to 5, or even, for short periods, to 4. English Consols sell at prices that yield 3 per cent., United States Bonds at prices that yield  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., while French Fives sell at 120. It is stated that in England two hundred millions sterling seek investment. At Quebec, we learn, bankers and large capitalists are in despair; large deposits have been refused; the banks have reduced their rate of interest to 3 per cent., and the best paper is freely discounted at 5, or even  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., ordinary paper at 6 or 7. The whole commercial world appears to be surcharged with accumulated capital. During the thirty years of great manufacturing and railway-building activity immense accumulations of profits took place; and this money, the supply of everything having outrun the demand, and the construction of railways and other works having for the time found its limit, lies for the present without profitable employment. In these days of almost automatic machinery, the instruments of production are created with a rapidity unknown when a large number of additional hands had to be procured and trained; and the consequence is that in prosperous times the volume of production increases at a prodigious rate. Governments will, no doubt, take advantage of the state of the money market to reduce the interest on their debts, and the possibilities of profitable investment will thus be still further diminished. How long this state of

things will last is a serious problem for buyers of stock and for those who live on the interest of such investments. In the United States the best authorities seem to think that the renewed activity of commerce will soon create a larger demand for money, and that the rate of interest will rise again. Of course, the surplus produce, in the way of manufactures, so far as that is the cause of this state of things, will be worked off and production will recommence. But there is that vast reservoir of money in England ready to overflow unless some outlet is found for it. Will any new demand for capital on a large scale present itself, like the construction of the railway system, or the clothing and equipment of the armies in the Prusso-Austrian and Franco-German wars? Will the Turkish Empire, when disencumbered of its deadiy Government and opened to commercial enterprise afford a field for a great outlay? Will any Government borrow again? The Government of India apparently will have to borrow a few millions, but this is a trifle. On the whole, it is difficult to see what is to raise the rate of interest again for some time to come. One thing seems certain: capital, especially English capital, having been forced to go so far afield for profitable investments, the rate of interest in different countries will be equalized more than it has hitherto been. The days of ten, and even of eight, per cent. in Canada are probably over.

—Our good-tempered critic, the London *Free Press*, rallies us on what he flatters himself is the death of our favourite hobby, Commercial Union. This is always the way with great practical politicians. They see very clearly the backward sweep of the wave at the spot where they stand, and they take it for the turn of the tide. To choose an example from a larger field, after Novarra, all the great practical politicians of Europe thought there was an end of the dream of Italian independence: after 1848, they thought there was an end of the dream of a United Germany. On which side are the great forces? If the

question is economical, as that of Commercial Union is, on which side are the great Commercial interests? This question answered, the rest is a matter of time. The time may be long if the secondary forces or interests which tend to delay the event are many and strong; but at last the event will come. Commercial Union will come, if the great interests of the two nations concerned are on its side. It will come in spite of any amount of anxious and uneasy prediction to the contrary, of any amount of denunciation. There is not a more instructive passage in Burke, than that in which, while he is desperately combatting the advance of the new order of things, the feeling suddenly comes over him that resistance is hopeless, and that he cannot put off the hour of fate. "If a great change is to be made in human affairs, the minds of men will be fitted to it; the general opinions and feelings will draw that way. Every fear, every hope will forward it; and then they who persist in opposing this mighty current in human affairs, will appear rather to resist the decrees of Providence itself than the mere designs of men." For the same reasons, every statesman who has satisfied himself that a great change is desirable, and must come, will be content to allow opinion to ripen, and the secondary forces, especially if they are sentimental, to expend their power of resistance in the natural way. Let the *Free Press* prove that Commercial Union would not be a good thing for the two sections of this continent, especially for the Canadian farmers in its neighbourhood, and we will invite it to the funeral which it says is so scantily attended; a mere momentary recoil, even if there really were one, would not disturb our conviction in the slightest degree. But from our point of view no recoil is visible. Instead of receding, the doctrine appears to us to gain ground in the Press, even in the Party Press, which speaks under the restraint of discipline. Our critic thinks to confound us by asking, "How many journals have declared for Commercial Union?" We reply by asking him how many journals had declared for the National Policy five years before it came, and how many declared from the begin-

ning against the Pacific Railway as a Government work? The Press too, to bring it round, requires time.

—A well-informed correspondent tells us that we have not done justice to the scope of the Pacific Railway Commission, and the intentions of the Minister who appointed it. If we find when its report appears that we have underrated its probable usefulness, we shall certainly acknowledge the error: fallibility is our line. But all we said was that to give it authority in judicially deciding between the late Government and the present, the Commission should have been appointed when Parliament was sitting, so that opportunity might have been given for discussion. These Commissions of Inquiry are useful, but in appointing them, as in the exercise of any other prerogative, there are certain rules to be observed. With all due deference to Mr. Alpheus Todd be it said, no Royal Commission can be allowed to meddle with any question which belongs to Parliament as the Grand Inquest of the nation, especially when Parliament is already seized of the inquiry; and if a Royal Commission should hereafter meddle with any such matter, it will be the duty of Parliament to refuse to receive the report, and itself to proceed with the inquiry as though the Commission had no existence. It is to be wished, no doubt, that Parliaments were better constituted for performing a judicial duty; but nothing will be gained by transferring its functions to a Party Government, particularly if the conduct of that Government is itself the subject of investigation. Wherever the duties of a Commission are to be quasi-judicial, or where party considerations can at all come in, justice and true policy will alike dictate a frank communication to Parliament, and a fair representation of both parties in the Commission. In any case, care should be taken that every considerable body of opinion has its voice.

There is another little constitutional question on which there is a word to be said. We cannot help thinking, with the Toronto

*Telegram*, that the issuing of election writs, as soon as a vacancy occurs, ought to be prescribed by law, and not left to the discretion, that is, to the electioneering convenience, of a Party Government. An emergency requiring Parliament to be summoned may any day occur, and it is not right that a constituency should be left without its representatives, while the wirepullers are fighting over the nomination, or some sham candidate is haggling about his withdrawal fee. These things, like the more serious affair of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier, point to the necessity in our case of a written constitution, explicitly defining all functions and limiting all powers. Unwritten understandings are very well in a country where they are understood, where tradition has been fixed by immemorial usage, and is enforced by settled opinion; but in a new country, if you give men legal powers they will be apt to use them to the utmost, especially under the stress of party conflict, and the only way to prevent exorbitancy, is to render it impossible by law.

—Principal Grant, of Queen's College, has concluded the last of a very pleasant series of papers on Canada in *Scribner's Monthly*, illustrated in Scribner's admirable style, by giving his reasons for believing that Canada will maintain her present relations towards England and the United States. He thinks that those who hold that the economical forces will in the end prevail have "never taken full account of the depth and power of popular sentiment." Popular sentiment is a thing of which there is no exact gauge. We are all of us apt to believe that our sentiments are popular: we know that they ought to be, and we charitably conclude that they are. Forty thousand Canadians, at the least, will have testified to the ascendancy of the economical forces this year by migrating in quest of better land or higher wages to the United States. If you had asked these people before they went leading questions about their sentiments, you would have gone away satisfied that every one

of them was invincibly attached to Monarchical institutions, and determined never to live under a Republican flag. "Sentiment," says Principal Grant, with much force and beauty, "is the strongest thing in human nature; it binds the family and nations together, and rules the world." To befit a reasoning being, however, it must have a rational basis, and it seldom, as we believe, survives the usefulness of an institution. Even the blind loyalty of a clansman would not last long if his chief ceased to be his protector. Sentiment, in short, is the bloom on the fruit of beneficence: it cannot subsist without the fruit. There is something, says Principal Grant, kinglier than cotton. But what does cotton, if that is a sarcastic name for national prosperity, mean? It means not only a full belly and a warm back, but the respect for law which attends the possession of property, the kindly feelings which go with contentment, a bright home with domestic affections, early marriage, a nice wife, a circle of happy children. In this there is a good deal of sentiment, if not of romance, while there is often much that is far from sentimental or romantic in the hovel of bare-legged fealty. To Principal Grant it appears that the decisive feature of the situation is the thought which he supposes to be present to the minds of all Canadians that if we joined the United States we might possibly be called on to fight against the Mother Country. To how many of the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who are now on the other side of the line did this horrible idea ever present itself? We will venture to say not to one of them. A war with the United States is a notion which, in spite of all the official drumming and trumpeting, nobody can be induced practically to entertain. Even at the time of the American civil war, when there appeared to be some danger of a rupture between the United States and England, Canadians enlisted by thousands in the army of the United States.

Principal Grant admits that the case would be changed if effect could be given to a conception which he ascribes to the late Joseph Howe, and that there could be "some kind of alliance or league of all the English-speaking peoples." Formal alliance

or league, in all probability, there will never be. What could be the objects or conditions of it? What special interests, commercial or diplomatic, have the English-speaking peoples in common, apart from the rest of humanity? The measure of political arrangements is convenience; and a political federation spanning all the oceans and embracing communities in all the quarters of the globe is a chimera really as senseless as any that enters the head of an Oriental despot under the inspiring influence of bang. People who indulge in these day-dreams mistake politics for religion, science or affection. But a moral league or alliance there will be; it is, in fact, growing daily, and the sentiment inspired by it is gradually superseding the narrower and less genial sentiment bred by the Revolutionary quarrel, as even the tone of Principal Grant in this passage of his work shows. Let U. E. Loyalism work away with its reminiscences of Lundy's Lane as hard as it will; Lundy's Lane was a signal exhibition of the obstinate valour of the Anglo-Saxon race in fraternal strife: but before Lundy's Lane were the defeat of the Armada, Blenheim, Dettingen, Quebec, in which our fathers, and the fathers of the English over the line, stood as Englishmen side by side. To fight sentiment with argument is folly; it is reasoning with the unconvincible: but the flame of sentiment, unfed by reason and utility, will die; and there cannot be a sentiment the flame of which is less fed by reason or utility than that which was kindled by the wretched quarrel of 1765.

In one instance, at all events, Principal Grant must allow that popular sentiment in Canada has been mis-read by those who might have been expected to read it aright. Like a man of sense he scoffs at the idea of importing aristocracy into Canada. Yet there can be no doubt that the erection of a Court and the shower of titles were a part of the Tory Premier's general policy, or that he was advised by those whose information he had every reason to trust that Canada was ripe for the experiment. The leading organ of our Government proclaimed that this was the most aristocratic of all colonies. Nevertheless the



experiment fizzled : the word is homely, but there is no other so expressive. Of the Court part of it, though we have heard enough, we will say nothing, because it is difficult to speak without a violation of the hospitable courtesy which is due, and which our people have unanimously desired to show in unstinted measure to the Governor-General and his Royal Consort. Those high personages have, probably, by this time formed their own opinion as to the value of court life when conjured into existence in such a capital as Ottawa, by the wand of Professor Fanning. As for the other part of the scheme, we will hazard the opinion that if a member of Parliament next session were to move an address to the Crown against the granting of any more titles, he would find that he had not impaired his popularity. A philosophic study of history has taught us to give all phases of humanity and all the successive forms of political life their due, not approving or condemning absolutely, but in relation to time and circumstance. Aristocracy was perhaps the necessary organization of a feudal kingdom with unintelligent masses, provinces imperfectly united, no regular legal system, no centralized administration. The titles in those days were official, not simply territorial, much less mere badges of social exclusiveness ; they denoted needful duties really performed to the state. It is needless to add that the titles of chivalry, which are thrown as crumbs to the vanity of colonists, are about as laughable an instance of perversion and debasement as the whole museum of historical curiosities affords. A man who chooses to parade in such antique gew-gaws, ought to be made to carry out the joke and wear an iron pot on his head with the thermometer at a hundred. Where opinions differ it is useless to dogmatize ; but there are not a few to whom, even in Europe itself, aristocracy, its original functions having passed away with Feudalism, seems to have become an almost unmixed nuisance. Politically, it is a standing conspiracy against progress, not in the interest of order or of caution but in the interest of class, and its reactionary efforts are in fact productive, not of safe and sober

councils, but of dangerous convulsions. On the famous 16th of May, it all but plunged France in civil war; and in England it has lately been doing its best to divert the minds of the people from domestic reforms by driving the nation into a course of wild and immoral adventure abroad. Create a privileged order and you are sure to find it arrayed against the interests of the community. Nor does the mischief stop there. In an aristocratic country, the spirit of exclusiveness extends downwards through all the grades of society, drawing artificial lines, and setting class against class, embittering by social estrangement industrial conflicts and economical antagonism of every-kind. The employer as well as the duke plays the aristocrat to those under him; the farmer and the farmer's wife play the aristocrat to the labourer, and the upper servants in a household play the aristocrat to the lower. A paper published in one of the London suburbs was complaining the other day, that it was impossible to get up a High School, because the children of clerks were too aristocratic to go to school with the children of the tradesmen. Wealth is taught, instead of seeking popularity by munificence, to seek admission to the privileged order by lavish expenditure and political corruption. We speak of the institution and its effects: nobody denies that kindness and beneficence are to be found, often in large measure, among the lords and ladies of England. Nor can we believe that the evil is compensated by any great good. Every report of the betting ring and the Divorce Court shows that titles are no security for morals. They are not even security for manners, though people who always have deference paid them naturally acquire a certain dignity which they preserve till something comes to disturb it. In *Vanity Fair*, the special organ of aristocratic sentiment, we read:—

“A most disgraceful scene took place last week at Newmarket. A number of ladies of high position and rank, and well-known in society, assembled after dinner, at the house of one of their number to play baccarat. The hostess took the bank, together with a gentleman of the party; but at her first deal an objec-

tion was made to her manner of dealing. She dealt again, when another point was raised, and thereupon ensued the most discreditable 'row' that probably ever took place between ladies. Smoking and swearing, the heroines of the affair hurled every kind of uncomplimentary remark to each other for the space of something like half-an-hour, to the great fright of such of them as still retained the ordinary timidity of womanhood. At length the 'row' ended, but so great an effect was produced by it that it was thought necessary by the hostess to ask an exalted personage to come down and play the next night at the house in order to rehabilitate it and her—which the personage was good-naturedly pleased to do. It is right to add that the hostess herself is said to have acted properly throughout. But the point is that it is a simple disgrace that ladies should gamble at all in this business-like and professional manner; that it is doubly disgraceful that they should gamble as they do with mere paper; and that it is trebly disgraceful for them to adopt the manners of scullery-maids, and the language of coal-heavers. While this scene was taking place inside, the crowd were engaged in killing a policeman outside, while the doors were not even shut. It reminds one of the preliminary scenes of the French Revolution." The rowdy mob beating the policeman to death outside is the natural concomitant to the scene within. When refinement is a matter of privilege, the unprivileged are sure to be exceedingly coarse. However, let aristocracy be what it will on its native soil. Transplanted to ours it would be a upas tree of vulgar vanity and servile flunkeyism: that even our brief and limited experience has been enough to show. As a Conservative force it would be a mere delusion, like other artificial importations of Old-World state, which merely serve, as we have said, to mask the necessity of developing Conservative forces of an effective kind. Wise, therefore, have the people been in summarily rejecting it. But we repeat there was a serious attempt to introduce it, which showed that, even by those who should be the best authorities, popular sentiment may be utterly misunderstood.

—At last the University of Toronto has a Classical Professor, though up to this time no appointment to the Presidency has been announced. Mr. Hutton brings to the Classical Chair high credentials in the shape of Oxford honours, and no doubt he will be cordially received. No objection was raised, we believe, against the appointment of a Professor from Oxford, provided Canadian claims were fairly and respectfully considered. The objection expressed was to the election of the youngest Professor, with an exceptional title and salary, over the heads of all the rest, merely because his subject was classics; and this is about the only point connected with the University and public education which is not treated in the elaborate State paper put forth in vindication of his conduct by the Minister of Education. The “cultured youth of Canada,” whose “know-nothing yell” brought down upon them the censure of Mr. Gordon Brown, may be comforted by observing that their censor himself thinks it not indecent or unjust to hold up to odium as “a carpet bagger” an Englishman settled in this country, who, so far as we are aware, has shown no special tendency to selfish encroachment. It is written, if we mistake not, in our annals that Mr. Gordon Brown himself was a native of Scotland, who migrated first to the United States, and afterwards to Canada. Some day the Reform leaders will begin to moralize on the character of this “righteous and beneficent” organ of theirs, and to consider the aspect under which it presents their cause and its probable effect in attracting or repelling generous and really Liberal minds.

—It seems that on the question of Prohibitive Legislation it is necessary once more to mark our position. We respect the promoters of the movement and their object: if they fancy that our respect is feigned, let them in justice ask themselves what conceivable motive we can have for feigning it. But we refuse, in the first place, to subscribe, under any threat of anathema, to what appears to us to be a false morality.

When a man, say a French or Spanish peasant, drinks wine with his meal, provided he does not drink enough to affect his head, we cannot call him intemperate; the name seems to us more applicable to one who overloads his stomach, clouds his brain, and sours his temper with a heavy dinner, though he may boast of drinking nothing but water. As soon as medical science distinctly pronounces wine or any other kind of liquor to be bad for us, the indulgence will become immoral, because in what concerns health, the dictate of medical science is the dictate of morality. We apprehend, however, that medical science would bear us out in saying that human diet is a complex thing; that even supposing a change to be desirable, there might be danger in abruptly enforcing it on a whole community; and that the sudden suppression of the liquor trade would be apt to be followed by a great increase of the trade in opium. So much for the ethical part of the matter. With regard to the question of prohibitive legislation, we hold it to be a valuable principle that, in a free country, people, if they want to alter the habits of their neighbours, shall do it by argument or example, and not by force. Still, if there is a real necessity—if the evil is truly formidable and transcends all voluntary agencies of reform—we are as ready as any one can be for prohibitive legislation. But then we want the legislation to be thoroughgoing, effectual, and without respect of class or person. Show that you have the courage of your opinions; forbid liquor of any kind to be made or imported: only in that way can you really prevent it from being drunk. By harassing the retail trade, you merely throw it into disreputable hands and beget secret drinking, low dens, and contrabandism. Such is our conviction, founded on what we have seen and heard both in this country and in the United States. A tour of enquiry round the outskirts of Toronto would show, we believe, that the apprehension is not utterly baseless. By this policy of forbidding liquor to be openly sold and drunk, while we allow it to be made, and the State actually draws a revenue from it, the object is not gained, and at the same time society is filled with suspicion, scandal, and inquisi-

torial denunciation. The same class of people that in the days of Cotton Mather would have been busy in witch-finding, are now busy in detecting cases of intemperance. A "religious" paper which persists in forcing itself on our notice, scatters imputations of beastly excess and fancies that it is displaying its superior Christianity; while in another article, on the same subject, it betrays a personal malignity which would disgust any decent heathen. Why cannot the editor address himself to topics really theological, such as that of "Infant Damnation," which we see mooted at the same time in his columns, and settle the question which appears to agitate the minds of his correspondents, whether "babies a span long" are liable to be sent to a place where they will be forever deprived of the bliss of the editor's society? We do not allude to the *Christian Guardian*, nor is it the *Christian Guardian* the language of which forces on us the reflection that Christianity must have deep roots indeed if it can withstand the efforts of a certain portion of the religious press. Yet we think that even the *Christian Guardian* might make more charitable allowance for honest difference of opinion. There was a Guest at the Marriage Supper in Cana who must have deemed charity of more value than total abstinence from wine. It is not likely, at least, that He would have wrought a miracle to supply people with "poison" or have bid His disciples drink "poison" forever in remembrance of Him.

It seems not impossible, from the present tendency of thought, that this and other questions of human diet, may, like less material questions, receive a relative and historical, instead of an absolute and quasi-theological, treatment. There are people who want all the world at once to give up animal food, which they call "corpses," as the Prohibitionists call wine "poison." The world will hardly consent. Yet there seems to be some reason for believing in progressive, though not in sudden vegetarianism. In Homer we find the heroes eating enormous masses of flesh, cooked in the rudest way, with apparently no vegetables and little bread; not only so, but they and their poet revel in the

work of the shambles, as a poet of our day would in that of harvest, or (if he were not a Prohibitionist) of vintage. In more civilized times the proportion of vegetable food increases; and the taste grows more fastidious, seeking the refinements and disguises of French cookery; while the slaughter house, the butcher's shop, and the preliminary operations of the kitchen, are repulsive always, and in poetry would be shocking. The digestion of a primitive hunter is not retained by man in his sedentary state. Moreover, much more farinaceous than animal food can be raised on a given area, which may become a consideration as the world grows crowded. Is there any power or faculty of the human frame or brain, to the maintenance of which meat is absolutely essential? The British labourer gets scarcely any meat, yet of all men, he does the hardest day's work. Sir Gilbert Eliot, the heroic defender of Gibraltar, was a vegetarian: Thomas Aquinas died under fifty, having accomplished perhaps the most prodigious of all the dry works of the intellect, and as a Saint, he is sure to have kept the rule of his Order, which forbade meat; while Shelley, on the other hand, the most imaginative of poets, was a vegetarian like Aquinas. Unless there be something abnormal in these instances, it would appear that meat is not indispensable; in which case, it seems possible that the tendencies we have mentioned may in time completely prevail, and that to Vegetarianism may belong the future.

—A Toronto Minister has been cashiered by his congregation for proved incontinence; but he finds another congregation of enthusiastic followers ready to accept him as their spiritual guide. The moral world stands aghast, and the phenomenon undoubtedly is noteworthy; yet, perhaps, Handfordism does not come from the pit of Tophet. In the first place, men, young men especially, are inclined, from chivalrous feeling, to rally round any man who is being run down, even though he may be in the wrong. In the second place, people feel that in

these eager investigations of clerical scandals there is a good deal of prurient hypocrisy and dirty sensation-mongering at which they wish to express their disgust without knowing precisely the best way of expressing it. In the third place there is an admiration of intellectual power, or the semblance of it, which blinds the worshipper to the moral guilt of his idol, as, to take an illustration from a higher sphere, Bacon-worshippers blind themselves, in the face of overwhelming evidence, to the moral guilt of Bacon. After making these deductions, however, there does remain a residuum of ethical heterodoxy in a defiant attitude of which it concerns our spiritual pastors and masters to take note. Morality has hitherto been bound up with religion, and the great moral systems, pagan as well as Christian, have presented themselves in a religious form. The decay of religious belief is therefore sure to be attended with a disturbance of moral principle; and if our religion is destined to be in any measure reconstructed, so probably are our ethics. No person of sense has said more than this, and this daily occurrences attest. It would not be surprising if, among other modifications, a change were destined to take place in our estimation of the relative turpitude of crimes of lust and crimes of malice. Perhaps there may be something in the Handford case premonitory of that change.

—In the bye-elections for West Toronto and other places, the one issue, of a public kind, has been the interminable N.P. The discussion is still without form and void. Opposition leaders do not tell us what they would have done to fill the deficit which they bequeathed, and until they have told us, it is impossible to say whether their policy would have been better than that of the present Government. That the increase of taxation is, in itself, an evil, and nothing but an evil, we at least most cordially concede to them: but unluckily it was inevitable, though it might not have been so, had they taken the course which we should have thought their principles prescribed, and discarded, instead of adopting and continuing, the



system of Imperialist expenditure generally, and particularly the construction of political railways. They make elaborate speeches in favour of Free Trade and against Protection. No doubt the New Tariff has been represented as Protectionist by its ardent supporters, and the Government to catch Protectionist votes, has encouraged the idea. As a matter of fact, however, the only new duty which can justly be called Protectionist, as having been imposed, not for the purpose of revenue, but for that of enforcing the consumption of a home product, is the Coal duty, which will not stand. All the rest, the Opposition, if it came into power to-morrow, would have to retain, or to replace by other taxes which would equally interfere with freedom of trade. Economy and retrenchment, cheaper government, and renunciation of all public works not commercially profitable, are the financial policy which the country, justly alarmed at the growth of its liabilities, desires, and which "Reformers" ought to promise it. But instead of this, the leading "Reform" organ advocates, with vituperative energy, the construction of political railways through the rocky wilds of British Columbia, defends the Kingston Military College, and tries in these very elections to raise a cry against a candidate for wishing, as it alleges, to diminish the preposterous cost of Provincial Government. As to the mere adjustment of the new taxes, which is the only thing really open to debate, there may be room for difference of opinion, though, as we have said before, the best and most impartial judgment to which we happen to have access, is favourable to the tariff. But we may be very certain that this is quite secondary in comparison with the great causes, such as the harvests and the state of the lumber trade, which affect, for better or worse, the commercial prosperity of the country.

—General Hancock's letter of acceptance is dignified and soldier-like; but it says little more than "Great is the American Constitution." In the mouth of a Democrat, however,

“Great is the American Constitution” has a special significance: it means that the South is not to be bound to keep the national election laws. It means generally that the South is to be allowed to do as it thinks fit, Constitutional Amendments and principles vindicated by the Civil War, notwithstanding. It means this practically in the mouth of Mr. Bayard as well as in that of anyone else. General Hancock as President will be a most respectable cocked hat upon a pole under which the South will rule: it will rule as it ruled in former days, because, though a minority, it is compact, united in interest, highly political and because it thoroughly knows its own mind. It rules in the present Congress, and by its strength of will forces its Northern allies to do things which they dislike and know to be impolitic. There are some, and they not wild alarmists, who expect, as the consequence of a Democratic victory, a recognition of the part played by the South in the Civil War as equally patriotic with that played by the North, payment of the Confederate debt, and pensions for Southern soldiers. This will hardly be accomplished without a second Civil War. But we look forward to some attempt to redress the political balance in favour of the South. The annexation of Mexico, should the Southern policy take that direction, would bring a fearful reinforcement to the elements of barbarism, political villainy, corruption, and disunion. Many right-minded citizens are likely to vote for Hancock in the belief that his election will be a final Act of Oblivion. If the South had greatly changed its character and become unaggressive, that might be so; but unluckily the South has not greatly changed its character, nor has it become unaggressive. So much a glimpse into the Halls of Congress will suffice to prove. On the other hand, that section of the Republican party which, under Grant, governed the South through carpet-baggers backed by bayonets, has decisively succumbed to the better section; and there is no reason for fearing that General Garfield will do anything more than uphold the law. If the law is not to be upheld the Union is dissolved.

The Democrats are very confident, and the omens during the month following the nomination were decidedly in their favour, But the Republican party was undergoing extensive repair after the shattering collision between its two elements at Chicago. It may be surmised that secret and not very edifying negotiations were being carried on with the "Bosses" of New York and Pennsylvania, Conkling and Don Cameron, who were very sulky over the rejection of Grant, and, notwithstanding their doctrines about the divine right of party, would very likely have cut Garfield's throat in the dark had they remained unappeased. They have probably been confirmed in their respective Boss-ships, with the patronage annexed. The Garfield section of the party is comparatively pure and reforming, but it cannot escape the necessities of the party system. It yields to these necessities again in evading the question of Civil Service reform, which, whatever flattering tales hope or Hayes may tell, will never be taken up in good faith by either of the two factions, both of which are essentially dependent on the active services of place-hunters. The campaign has now opened and apparently with great enthusiasm on the Republican side. That the party has been in power long enough, and that there ought to be a change, is a feeling which will tell with many, though the truth is that there could hardly be a greater change than from Grant to Garfield. On the other hand the country is prosperous, and commerce may be inclined to let well alone. Whichever way the battle may go, it is to be hoped that the result will be decisive. The prospect of a disputed election hangs over the Republic like a thunder cloud.

Even without the additional evil of a disputed election, these contests for the Presidency are enough to tear a nation to pieces, and they will do it some day if the system is not changed. The passions which they kindle are always increasing in violence, and each contest adds to the number of active spirits who leave honest trades for place-hunting, faction and intrigue, so that the community is continually falling more under the sway of its worst members. Our contests for the Prime Ministership,

which is our Presidency, do the same mischief here, though they are less regular in their recurrence. Such a device of devils was never dreamed of by the Fathers of the Republic, who evidently had no idea of organized party, and intended the President to be really elected, not by the popular vote, but by Presidential electors. That their sagacity was strangely at fault does not make their design less certain. It would be something if the election could be transferred from the people at large to Congress; but the proposer of such a change would be stoned to death.

—Good citizens of the United States have work enough for their political energies without flying at each other's throats. The days of self complacent perfection and boundless hope are over; those of trial and of misgiving as to the future have come. From the joyous and thoughtless infancy in which serious statesmanship was needless and finance was only spending the nation has passed to the cares and difficulties of maturity. The author of the work on "Certain Dangerous Tendencies in American Life" is rather a Jeremiah. He does not sufficiently note the evidences of fundamental soundness still presented by the society in which he lives—the general morality and intelligence of the people, the respect for law, the diffusion of property, the prosperous state of commerce, the honesty and confidence of which it is the proof, the good administration of railways and of the ordinary machinery of trade, the flourishing condition of the finances, and the rapid reduction of the debt, which would be impossible if the Treasury and the management of the revenue were not, on the whole, in faithful hands. But he finds abundant justification for his cry of warning in the decay of religious belief and of the moral forces with it, in the dangerous chimeras which prevail in close connection with secularism among the artisans, in the corruption of politics national and municipal, in the fearful legacy of reckless extravagance and of unscrupulous covetousness bequeathed by the paper-money pestilence of the Civil War. Undoubtedly the Repub-

lic has before her trying times; and such Democrats as Mr. Bayard, instead of fighting against Republicans like General Garfield, ought to be fighting with them against the powers of evil, to the malignant aid of which, while these political contests last, really patriotic men on both sides are compelled to appeal.

—Miss M. A. Hardaker, in the last *North American Review*, boldly avowed, in the face of the Woman's Rights Sisterhood, her conviction that woman is not the equal of man in intellectual power, and had better not attempt to compete with him in the arena of political ambition. This will, of course, scandalize the theorists who, in defiance of apparently substantial facts, extending even to the cases of pursuits specially female, such as music, contend that woman is "a female man," and would show herself to be one, if she were freely admitted to the male career. We do not know why it should scandalize any one else. Why should intellectual power be taken as the criterion of excellence rather than beauty of character and intensity of affection? Nothing, we should say, more clearly belongs to the Finite than human intellect, while beauty of character and intensity of affection are akin, if anything is, to the Divine. Why, again, is it to be assumed that the family is a sphere of action much less important than the State? We should say it was the more important of the two, provided only that it can be allowed to subsist on something like its present footing, though the case will be altered if marriage is reduced to a commercial "copartnership," the children of which, we presume, are no more to be allowed to feel reverence for their parents than the wife is to be allowed to feel respect for her husband. If the two sexes are to be competitors, experiment will decide which is the superior in strength and combative power. So long as they are complements of each other, there can be no question about superiority or inferiority, nor, in a marriage worthy of the name, do such thoughts ever arise on either side.

Miss Hardaker thinks that women have a right to the suffrage, but that they had better not assert it. We cannot admit that members of a community have a right to anything which it is better for the community that they should not have. If the life of a woman in the bosom of the family is unfavourable, as it appears to be, to the formation of political character, so that political power vested in her hands would produce mis-government, to concede Female Suffrage would be to do a wrong to both sexes. A tremendous wrong it would be. Americans seem inclined to treat this question with dangerous levity. They appear to think that if the "ladies" have a fancy for political power it would be a harmless piece of gallantry to give it to them. The truth is that it would be the most radical and momentous of all changes. Nobody, we suppose, will pretend to deny that, at present, there is a profound difference between the male and the female character; there would be a difference equally profound between male and female government. In England, where there is a property qualification for the suffrage, it is only proposed to give the vote to widows and spinsters owning property; but in the United States, where the suffrage is personal, the female voters would be equal in number to the male, if they would not be the majority. Let people figure to themselves the Republic in the midst of the Civil War, swayed by the emotions of the women. What would be the ultimate result it is difficult to foresee, because we cannot tell beforehand to what extent the women would be practically controlled in the exercise of the suffrage by the men. But the natural tendencies of women are to personal rather than to constitutional government, and if their inclinations were allowed free course, it is probable that personal government, formal or informal, would be the result and that republican institutions would virtually cease to exist.

For what object is it that we are to run this risk and at the same time to introduce political division into the family, and expose female character, on which the happiness of home de-

pend, to the demagogism and all the questionable influences of public life? Are women an oppressed class? They are not a class at all; they are a sex, and while Christian marriage continues to exist, they will be, "one flesh" with their husbands, who it cannot be doubted have legislated, as they have laboured and fought, for their wives and children, as well as for themselves. The advocates of female suffrage are always pointing to cases of wife-beating. There are laws already against wife-beating, and nobody would hesitate to make them more severe, if increased severity would check the evil; but it is notorious that excessive penalties fail. Women are often guilty of cruelty to children, as well as men to women, and the legislator must deal wisely, not passionately, with all these offences alike. These brutalities, though they make our hearts sick, are the consequences not of anything wrong either in conjugal or parental relations, but of the degradation which prevails in certain strata of society, and which extends to the women as well as to the men. The legislative equalization of wages, so that women shall always receive the same as men, though their labour may be worth less, is another fancy which seems to float before the minds of some people, but we need hardly say that it is a chimera. Female singers, actresses, authoresses, painters, milliners, are not paid less than men. As to general equality before the law, the fact is not that it is difficult for a woman to get justice, but that it is by no means easy to get justice against a woman. It is comparatively rare to see extreme penalties inflicted on female crime.

If the women were to pass extravagant laws in their own favour, the men would refuse to execute the laws, the women would be unable to execute them for themselves, and anarchy, or rather the overturn of female authority, would ensue. Government, even in the most civilized communities, rests at bottom upon force, which in the last resort compels obedience to the law; and force resides in the men. This is a rude but solid fact, of which those who fancy that they can place political power in the hands of the women seem never to be distinctly aware.

The notion that politics would be softened, refined, and purified by bringing women and the family into them involves a palpable fallacy. Women have remained free from political vices because they have been kept out of political life. A series of political letters by a woman appeared some time ago in a great New York journal: they at least equalled in scurrilous violence the worst productions of male pens, and their special and avowed object was to uphold favouritism and the spoils system against reform. Such, in this case, was the Angel in Politics, and such, we suspect, she would very often be.

Justice must be done. Man would certainly be the loser if woman instead of being his partner were to become his competitor, if instead of comforting him she were to confront him in the struggle of life. But if woman thinks she would be the gainer, she must be allowed to try. She must only remember that she cannot take both lines, or combine the advantages of both. The relation between the sexes has hitherto been one of mutual privilege: if it is henceforth to be one of equality and rivalry, privilege on both sides will cease. It will cease for the whole sex, though only a few women may be successful in public or professional life. We doubt whether the women who lead the movement have looked this consequence in the face. Habit holds and would for some time hold its own: the chivalrous feelings of men towards women are not to be extinguished in a moment; but not many years would pass before the Woman's Right ladies would find that if they chose to be men, men they would have to be, and either hold their own or go to the wall. The gentler sex would, to use Burke's phrase, be put out of the protection and guardianship of the other—as momentous a revolution as it is possible to conceive.

The Women's Right movement does not seem to have been spontaneous, or to have had its origin in any sense of wrong prevailing among the sex at large. It has apparently been worked up mainly by a few ladies who wish to take part in public life. But its prime author was Mr. Mill, who, with all his ability and excellences, was not on this subject a trustworthy



guide. We learn from his autobiography that he formed relations with another man's wife, which, though they were pure and we desire to speak of them with all tenderness, could not fail to place him at a fallacious point of view. His work on "The Subjection of Women" is the manual of the crusade; and in that book there are passages about the tyranny of the husband and the worse than slavery of the wife, which, as applied to Christian marriage in England, may be said to border on hallucination, and which, had they taken effect upon the imagination of women, must have marred the happiness of many an English home. The natural inference from them would be, that there ought to be an almost unqualified liberty of divorce, which must, of course, be extended to husbands as well as to wives, and which, when extended to husbands, would hardly improve the condition of women; for marriage is especially a restraint on the wandering passions of the man. Some of Mr. Mill's disciples in England have been and are pushing on legislation with regard to the relations of married people, based apparently on the belief that too much injustice cannot be done to such an ogre as a husband, and that the natural enemy of a woman's interests is the man on whose breast she lays her head. It is not unlikely that by making marriage onerous and odious to men, they may succeed in producing, among classes little under the influence of refined sentiment, a great increase of concubinage, for which they will receive but scanty thanks from the women of the future.

—It is curious that the same people who assert for women an equality of intellectual force with men, and claim for them on that ground a share in political government, should propose to legislate about Seduction on the assumption that, in the matters most nearly affecting her personally, a woman is totally devoid of will and of the power of self-control. Against violence the law is stringent already; but where violence is not used, a woman is the guardian of her own honour, and to affirm by legislation that she is not, but that the guilt of her

consent rests wholly on her partner in the offence, would be to remove the bulwark of her virtue and to make the law practically an accomplice in seduction. Suppose the man does promise marriage in order to compass his end, the woman knows very well that she ought to wait for the fulfilment of his promise. If the chief blame usually rests on the man, whose passions are the strongest, the woman can never be blameless, and sometimes she is the more sinning of the two. Even Mrs. Wetmore must have been self-betrayed. After all, the majority of the women who fall owe their ruin to the wickedness of their own sex. As we write comes the intelligence that a pair of procuresses have been caught on board a steam-boat with two girls, one of twelve, the other eleven years old, in their fiendish clutch. By passing a law treating the conduct of the man, and of the man alone, as criminal, an opportunity would be afforded to those ladies of combining the trade of the blackmailer with that of the procuress. So Lord Angelo, amidst the transports of his virtuous zeal, had better pause a moment to reflect on the probable consequences of his measures. The mighty passion which, under happy circumstances, leads a man joyously to take upon him the heavy burden of maintaining a wife and family, exists too often in excess or where, through the imperfections of our social system, there is no possibility of marriage; and the fire which is a good servant is, in this case too, a bad master. Such is the broad fact with which the practical legislator or social reformer has to deal, and he must deal with it as it is: legislation built on high-flown sentiment always comes to the ground. Whatever facilitates marriage prevents impurity, and whatever adds to the prosperity of the people facilitates marriage. Penal laws stamped with extravagance and injustice will merely enlist the sympathies of the community on the side of the offender. Preachers, however, when they are compelled to address young men on this subject might do well by giving them less of mysticism and more of humanity. Spiritual purity is a motive which operates chiefly with the spiritual and pure. But those who

can neither be called spiritual nor pure, those in whom the animal propensities are unusually strong, are not necessarily heartless; and with any one who is not heartless no argument can be imagined so effectual as a faithful picture of the unspeakable degradation and misery to which the poor victim of his self-indulgence is consigned.

—The ethical and social difficulties of the Transition continue to present themselves, notably in regard to the relations between the sexes. A Presbyterian Assembly has been dealing with a knotty case. A woman, having, as it is stated, a right to be divorced, on account of adultery and desertion, but finding a legal divorce not practically attainable in Canada, solved the difficulty by taking a ticket for Illinois, and going through the form of divorce there; after which she deemed herself free to marry again. We cannot help agreeing with those who would treat the Illinois divorce as morally and legally null. Bigamy would be legalized in Utah. The lady ought to have gone to the Canadian House of Lords. Said Judge Maule, of witty memory, to a prisoner in England, a poor man, who had been convicted before him of bigamy, for marrying again under similar circumstances—"Prisoner, you must understand that in this country there is not one law for the rich and another for the poor. Your proper course was, when your wife went off with another man, to institute proceedings in the Ecclesiastical Court. If successful there, you should have proceeded to bring a private Bill into the House of Lords. This would, probably, have cost you a thousand pounds, and you never in your life possessed a thousand pence. Therefore, the sentence of the court upon you is, that you be imprisoned for three years." Deprived of the Divorce cases, the Senate would feel that the only thread which binds it to life was severed. Nevertheless, a rational Divorce law, and a proper Divorce Court, Canada ought to have, at least, if any of her statesmen can spare time from the party struggle to give their thoughts to a grave question of domestic morality.

—Dean Stanley has learned that in this perverse world the Peacemakers are not always blessed. His attempt to reconcile England with the Bonapartes by erecting a Bonaparte monument in Westminster Abbey, has brought a hailstorm about his ears: his attempt to reconcile the American Republic with the Old Country, by suggesting an American monument to André, has revived the André controversy. Few questions can be more unsavoury or less capable of satisfactory solution. If André was a spy, his case fell under the law which condemns spies to be hanged and which all military men apparently deem a necessity of war. On that supposition we should only have to say that there is nothing disgraceful in being a spy; that King Alfred went as a spy into the Danish camp; that you may as well inspect an enemy's position in this way as through a telescope; that he who thus braves danger by himself, instead of doing anything particularly mean, is a greater hero than he who braves danger as one of a multitude. But with us the question has been, and still is, whether André really was a spy. He did not enter the American lines for the purpose of privily inspecting them, but for the purpose of holding a conference with the commander, by whose invitation he came. This, at all events, belongs to a different class of acts, and for our part, though we see clearly enough that the Americans would have been warranted in hanging Arnold if they had caught him, we have never been able to see quite so clearly that they were warranted in hanging André. To take advantage of overtures made by the malcontent officers or troops of the enemy is surely fair play. Franklin was party to a scheme for tampering with the fidelity of the Hessians. Concealment is a necessary feature of any such enterprise, and can be no crime in itself, apart from the object of the person who resorts to it. It is fair, however, to say that when the malcontents in Soult's army, during the campaign in Portugal, opened communications with the Duke of Wellington, it was with great reluctance that a British Colonel consented to act as negotiator, and that when his mission took him within the French lines, he scrupulously

retained his uniform. Nor have we the slightest doubt that the Royal commander would have hanged an American André. All these questions are perplexed by the peculiar character of civil war, which confuses the relations of the belligerents: there is necessarily a period in which the belligerency of the rebels is but half recognised by the army of the Government; and to the end there are political objects on both sides and justifications for a mixture of political with military measures which have no counterpart in ordinary wars. André gave his life for the power which he served, and at the hands of that power he deserved a monument: it is not likely he will receive one at the hands of the nation which he nearly overthrew.

—English politics are entering on a phase profoundly interesting to the political observer. The majority by which the Lords rejected the Compensation Bill was so large as to place out of the question any resort to the constitutional method of restoring "harmony" between the branches of the Legislature by appealing to the country and then creating new peers. It was not the vote of a party, but of a landed aristocracy resolved that whatever else is to be meddled with, there shall be no meddling with the land. To large political concessions the order has consented, under the advice of sagacious and trusted leaders; but to touch the land and territorial privilege is to touch its life. The rejection of the Compensation Bill will, in all probability, prove the first gun of a long-deferred battle. Little as the Lords think it, the delay has been partly due to certain aristocratic sympathies which linger in the mind of Mr. Gladstone, who has always remained personally on the best of terms with the Duke of Argyll, Lord Granville, and the other patrician leaders of his party. In his last administration, the Lords threw down the gauntlet to him by rejecting his Army Reform Bill, and he might have taken it up with advantage; but he declined the combat, and preferred to surmount the obstacle by making a questionable use of the prerogative of the Crown.

Now the inevitable has arrived: the Liberal Associations throughout the country have answered the rejection of the Compensation Bill by a demand for the reform of the House of Lords; and they cannot recede from that demand, or again adjourn the conflict without permitting hereditary and territorial aristocracy to resume its effective veto on progress, at least with regard to questions in which it conceives its own interest to be vitally concerned. The final result can hardly be doubtful: the House of Lords is the last survivor of the European group: the social conditions on which it was founded have nearly ceased to exist, and the hour of its doom has already been tolled from a hundred towers. The age of Democracy has come; though Democracy itself, as we now behold it, may be merely the vast fermentation of political and social elements preparatory to the birth of a more impartial and more rational Authority. That six hundred families should long be permitted to keep one of the two co-ordinate branches of the Legislature to themselves in a country full of political life and activity may be safely pronounced impossible; especially as England, however Conservative, is being daily drawn more within the sweep of the European tide. It is true that the British aristocracy has, of all aristocracies, shown the greatest power of accommodating itself to necessary change: but then the change, as we have said, has been political, not economical or social, and it has spared the hereditary principle. When the hereditary principle was touched by Lord Palmerston's proposal to use the Royal prerogative of creating, *ad libitum*, Life Peers, the House of Lords showed itself ready to rush into what, had Lord Palmerston been resolute and a real enemy, would have been a very perilous conflict. During the most critical period of its history, that which followed the Reform Bill of 1832, the Lords happened to be under the guidance of one who might be truly called a heaven-sent leader. Peel, though the faithful guardian of the interests of aristocracy, in which as a Conservative he believed, was not himself an aristocrat, nor did he share the passions of the order whose game he was set to play. He

was himself a scion of commerce, not without a strong popular fibre: he touched on different sides of his mind and character every considerable section of the nation; he assured to it, as a whole, prosperity by his financial genius, and he knew how to satisfy its desire of progress, by combining with organic conservatism administrative reform. With the aid of the Duke of Wellington, who took a strategical view of the situation, he had succeeded in persuading the Peers, while they exercised their social influence, to avoid political conflict with the people, and to let their battle be fought in the House of Commons. But after him, and on the ruins of his power and system, appeared a more dazzling genius, the inventor of an Empress of India, the author of the Anglo-Turkish Treaty, the purchaser of the Suez Canal and Cyprus, the conqueror of Afghanistan, who assured the Lords, as well as the Court, that by turning the proletariat against the middle class, and by exciting the military pride of the nation, they might change the political current, and enter again into possession of real power. The Lords gave ear to the enchanter, and the result is that they have quickened the slow march of Fate. For, we repeat, the Liberal party cannot now draw back without allowing a group of privileged families to exercise a political veto on the legislation of the future.

—Still, the drama may be long in unfolding itself. The advanced Liberal party is likely soon to be left without a leader. Mr. Gladstone's constitution is powerful, but he is over seventy, and he does not know how to take rest. Moreover, the ceaseless abuse, though it may not wound him, must wear him: ceaseless abuse wears, if it does not wound, all but those who are morally case-hardened, which a man of cultivated sensibility never is. It will be surprising if the recent breakdown, for such evidently was the nature of the illness, does not prove premonitory of a retirement from public life. Who then is to take the reins? Not only has Mr. Gladstone no peer, nor anything like a peer, among the advanced Liberals

in genius, or in power of impressing the minds of the masses : but the advantages of his position are unique. His religious character attaches to him a great body of devout men, both High Churchmen and Non-conformists, who would not follow an Agnostic ; while his culture and his social connections have enabled him to retain a hold on auxiliaries with whom the party can hardly dispense at present, though it will have to dispense with them in the future. The three Radicals in the government are Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, and Professor Fawcett, who have respectively their merits, but who would hardly, if united, make a chief. Before Mr. Gladstone's retirement, it is not unlikely that there may follow an interlude of coalition government, for which the Whig portion of the present cabinet is evidently ready. The Whigs could not act under Lord Beaconsfield : their traditional policy is unlike his, though their paramount aim may not be very different, and he has always affected to hate them : but Lord Beaconsfield cannot remain much longer on the scene. The Radical, and not only the Radical but the Republican, party in England is stronger than is commonly supposed. Political intercourse with the Continent, and sympathetic interest in the revolution there have told, especially on the artisans. Mr. Gladstone is highly impressible ; he is a sensitive index of opinion ; and the Radical tendencies of his later years mark the action of a great force which has carried him away from his old social moorings. But a great force may exist for some time without assuming an organic form, or finding a leader who can bring it to bear.

—Were we not right in saying that, if respect were had to party interest alone, the Liberal party in England had better have remained a little longer out of power ? Coming in when they did, they inherited not only the Eastern complications but a legacy of almost inevitable calamity in Afghanistan. Nothing can be more certain than that the disaster of Candahar, like the disaster of Cabul, is a consequence of the disregard by the late Gov-



ernment of the experience of 1840 and of the advice of all the greatest and wisest of Anglo-Indian warriors and statesmen, including the Duke of Wellington, Lord Hardinge, and Lord Lawrence, who unlike the restless clique in the councils of Calcutta which has always been bent on the conquest of Afghanistan, earnestly recommended the preservation of the neutral zone. But the blame of General Burrows's defeat is of course cast by the Opposition on the new Government. The Jingoës in India ascribe it, not to their own folly in acting against the strongest warnings, but to English humanity which has prevented them from shedding blood enough and sufficiently outraging the rights of man. The death of Major Cavagnari, they say, ought to have been avenged. It was avenged by the execution of eighty men, without sufficient evidence of their guilt, as well as by the slaughter of undisciplined mobs in what were styled battles, and the burning of villages, from which the aged, the women, and the children must have been driven out, probably to perish on the hillside. But the Jingoës would have made Afghanistan an Acel-dama, as they would have made India itself at the time of the mutiny, had their diabolical frenzy not been crushed and the honour of England saved by him whom their hatred branded as "Clemency Canning." They are now beginning to rebel against the restraining tutelage of the Home Government, saying that if the Empire is to be upheld, they must be left free to work their sanguinary will upon the natives; and it is not unlikely that the Mother Country herself will have a taste of their violence of temper. Evidently the policy of Peel's disciple now is that of his master in 1841: he means, after sufficiently asserting the superiority of England, to retire from Afghanistan. No bad consequence followed on the former occasion: nor is it likely that any will follow now. That the blow received by British prestige will lead to a rising in India is in the last degree unlikely. No doubt the natives, especially the Mahometans, whom English conquest thrust from the throne, are ill-affected to the alien rule and would shake it off if they could: but they have long been disarmed; such of them as had a mili-

tary character, the people of Mysore for instance, have entirely lost it and become like a flock of sheep ; they are without leaders and without union, as well as destitute of weapons and of all the material of war. Native princes, especially the two great Mahratta powers, have considerable armies ; but they are not likely to stir unless they are disquieted by Jingo threats. Not in that direction but in the direction of finance the real peril of the Indian Empire lies. The worst part of the defeat near Candahar, perhaps, is the break-down of the Sepoy. The army which mutinied was high-caste : after that catastrophe it was thought politic to recruit from the low castes, and we have heard British officers speak with the utmost dissatisfaction of the results. Had the Sepoys, instead of being paraded about the Mediterranean, been actually opposed to European troops in a Russian war, there would probably have been a headlong rout, with which the British regiments might have been swept along. The world will note this and will never again be scared by the apparition of an Indian army in the West.

—Everything confirms our belief that Ireland has found in Mr. Parnell, not a leader but an agitator, one of that fatal race whom she has been following at intervals for the last half century, and whose main object it is not to attain any definite measure of reform or improvement, but to keep alive the excitement by which they live. Mr. Parnell seems to hate most those who, by doing justice, would allay the agitation. What he would do himself, we may be perfectly sure he does not know ; what he wants is, that this storm should continue to rage and he to ride on it. It rages with a vengeance ; agrarian murder is stalking abroad, and Fenianism is landing arms and drilling by night. We have avowed before that we can fully enter into an Irishman's desire of independence for his country ; in truth we should think it wonderful if an Irishman could read a work like Mr. Froude's, breathing the rampant immorality and the maddening insolence of conquest, without feel-

ing a burning desire to break the yoke. Strafford, when charged with arbitrary government in Ireland, pleaded that the Irish were a conquered nation. "They were a conquered nation!" retorted Pym. "There cannot be a word more pregnant and fruitful in treason than that word is. There are few nations in the world that have not been conquered, and no doubt but the conqueror may give what law he pleases to those that are conquered; but, if the succeeding facts and agreements do not limit and restrain that right, what people can be secure? England hath been conquered, and Wales hath been conquered; and by this reason will be in little better care than Ireland. If the king, by the right of a conqueror, gives laws to his people, shall not the people, by the same reason, be restored to the right of the conquered, to recover their liberty if they can." What is the greatness of the Empire to an Irishman, if his country is to be its washpot? Had Tyrone, had Phelim O'Neil, had even Wolfe Tone succeeded, he might have ranked with Tell or Wallace; as, if England had been the smaller and weaker country, would an Englishman who had rescued her from Irish domination. But the time is past. A Scotch and English population, large in number and strong out of proportion to its number, occupies the North of Ireland, and forms throughout the island a wealthy and powerful class. The native language is all but extinct. A Liberal policy has brought the wealthy laity, with few exceptions, and a large portion of the priesthood, to the side of the Union, while the priests as a body, and especially the hierarchy, are opposed to Fenianism. The Irish Channel is still an important fact; but fast boats and trains have made it far less important now than it was when the Lord Lieutenant's travelling carriage had to be taken to pieces and carried over Penmaeur, and when from Dublin to Holyhead was a voyage. The Irish colonies in England are as yet unassimilated, but assimilation must take place, and when it does, it will amount to a fusion of the races. Even O'Connell, though he formally kept up the Repeal agitation, and drew his rent as Liberator, evidently felt that the movement was hopeless, and in truth a

sham. Rebellion would be madness. What could a crowd of peasants, armed with old Enfields, and taught their facings in small parties by night, do against discipline, rifled artillery, and the Martini-Henry? The Irish have no partisans in Europe. As Catholics, they have been liegemen of the European Reaction, and they had the misfortune to bear arms against the independence of Italy. They have no partisans in America but their own kinsmen: for following their priests into the Democratic party they banded themselves with slavery against the Union, and earned the lasting hatred of Unionists by their insurrection against the Draft at New York. If England had another enemy on her hands, a rising in Ireland might be dangerous; but even in that case the result would probably be what it was before; Ireland would be used by her foreign ally and then left to British vengeance. "The Irish have made a diversion," said Bonaparte to the Directory, "what more do you want of them?" The interest of Ireland seems to dictate hearty co-operation with that party in the Imperial Parliament which has shown itself willing to do justice: an instalment may be accepted without prejudice to further demands; but it is not the interest of Ireland that governs Mr. Parnell's actions. If, after disgusting every body, including the more reasonable Home Rulers, he brings the Tories back to power, they will crush him and his followers like an eggshell.

—The change in the English Libel law, exempting journals from prosecution for faithful reports of public meetings, has given birth to some discussion. It is alleged that there is a possibility of abuse; that the public meeting may not be worthy of the name, and that factitious importance may be given by the report to what would otherwise be mere hole-and-corner slander. Still this change seems just. To relax any real safeguard of personal reputation, which of all rights is most precious to a generous spirit, no journalist worthy of his calling would desire. An honourable profession cannot wish to har-

hour under its immunities caitiffs and cowards, of whom the personal libeller is about the vilest. As it is, the protection for character is scanty enough. In a libel suit, as it is at present conducted, instead of the aggressor being tried for the specific offence, the person aggrieved is tried upon his whole life. The real issue is smothered by the sinister skill of counsel in matters entirely foreign to it. Judges wish to restrain the iniquity, but are not able. A man against whom, on political or other grounds, any prejudice exists, or can be created, has no chance of justice, and will rather let his character take its chance than stake it on the verdict of a totally untrustworthy tribunal. A common jury, moreover, is hardly competent to pronounce on a moral and sentimental wrong. On the other hand, the same jury would be very likely to acquit, in the teeth of evidence, the man, who, having received a gross public insult, should have lawlessly avenged himself with his own hand. Some day we shall have an epidemic of this kind. It was announced the other day that a Vigilance Committee had been formed in England to restrain the "Social" Press. Duels about insults in journals are becoming very frequent in France; and though the practice is a barbarism, and would put society at the mercy of trained bullies, it points to the want, in our modern civilization, of an adequate tribunal of honour. No man, by merely buying a set of type, can invest himself with public functions or give himself an extraordinary jurisdiction over the characters of his neighbours; and if the State, by according postal privileges to journals, makes itself a party to the dissemination of the libel, it is all the more bound to provide the means of redress. Mr. Dudley Field advises persons whose character is assailed by newspapers to hold responsible, not the writers or editors, but the proprietors, a doctrine which writers and editors will no doubt approve.

We speak of personal libel, not of party mud-flinging, which will last as long as party, and in which every one has had more or less of a hand who has ever mingled in the fray. There is, no doubt, a dangerous affinity between the two, but party

abuse is balanced by party praise ; no person of sense attends to either ; and the result is more injurious to public manners than to anybody's reputation. It is only to be desired that the combatants should observe the laws of mud war, and spare the face and clothes of the harmless wayfarer. Some time ago one of our party organs, though not in its present hands, merely, as the editor avowed, for the purpose of injuring a Minister, raked up the obscure history of a poor devil, who, born probably under an evil star, had just scrambled out of the gutter into something like respectability, and was earning his bread by a petty employment in the Minister's department. Of course, the wretched man was ruined. Such a service rendered to party would have been fitly rewarded with expulsion from the profession.

—Once more comes from England—this time from our old friend Colonel Shaw—the announcement that the English are turning to Protection. Once more we reply that we have witnessed the movement of opinion which produces this impression, the disappointment at the slow progress of the Free Trade doctrine in Europe, and the resentment against nations which exclude British goods; but that the Manufacturer will never allow the Farmer to raise the price of food, nor will the Farmer allow the Manufacturer to raise the price of tools and clothing. The friends of the Farmer are suspected of trying to shut out foreign meat by the Act respecting Diseased Cattle, and the suspicion at once rouses the Manufacturers to arms. As to the Imperial sentiment in favour of Colonial produce, it has only a rhetorical existence.

—On the continent of Europe the one important event is the result of the French Departmental Elections, which is a great victory for the Republicans. It proves, beyond a doubt, not that the people are enthusiastically devoted to the Republic, which they are not, but that they acquiesce in it, and will

resist a reactionary revolution. A slight shadow fell across the scene. A letter of Gambetta, pointing to a renewal of the war with Germany, and the recovery of the Provinces, as the ultimate goal of Republican effort, found its way into the journals: it turned out that the letter was written some years ago, and De Freycinet has removed the bad impression by a moderate speech. Still, in that quarter lies the danger: war means military government, and the Republic will never be safe till reduction of armaments begins. The French peasantry, who pay the blood tax, would be only too glad to see reduction begin at once. Alsace and Lorraine are German; they are lost; and against them France may set off Savoy and Nice, to which she has certainly no better title than Germany has to her winnings in a war which was forced upon her, and in which had she been the loser, she would unquestionably have been mulcted of her territory up to the Rhine.

Belgium celebrates her jubilee. In spite of the fierce contests between her Liberals and Ultramontanes, in spite of the antagonism between the Flemish section, which properly belongs to Holland, and the French, or Walloon, section, which high-handed Diplomacy lumped with it, Freedom has turned out well for her; but at the banquet of liberty the sword will hang over her head, as well as over that of Holland, till Europe disarms and rectification of frontiers is at an end.

—Our readers will be pleased with Sir Edmund Beckett's little book on "The Origin of the Laws of Nature." It is a vigorous critique of the Materialistic Hypothesis. Laws, Sir Edmund contends, cannot exist without a will to enact them and a force to put them into execution. The will and the force must, according to the Materialistic hypothesis, be looked for in the atoms of which Matter consists: and it must be supposed that these atoms diffused over a space at least twice as wide as the orbit of Neptune agreed by some sort of convention or concurrent impulse so to act, and continue acting, as to pro-

duce and maintain the order of the universe, including the intelligence and the moral nature of man. With regard to the most universal of all the laws, for example, that of gravity, "we must embrace one of two alternatives: either that all the atoms spontaneously adopted this law and standard of attraction by chance, before there were any laws of nature to put an end to chance, which is absurd; or that "every atom, being self-existent, had the power to adopt what laws of nature it pleased, and that they all by some mysterious universal suffrage conveyed through the infinity of space, or through the immeasurable sphere of the primæval nebula, agreed on that law and intensity of gravity, and have steadily kept to that agreement ever since." If we cannot imagine such spontaneous law-making on the part of the atoms, we must admit the existence of a Power beyond; and we are thus led, not to God, but to the Unseen. Why, indeed, should we not believe in the Unseen? In the name of reason, what divine right or prerogative have these nerves of sight, touch, hearing, taste and smell, on which the materialist exclusively relies, that we should reject as necessarily untrustworthy all information derived from any other source? On what ground are we preemptorily to reject the evidence of the eye of the mind, or that of the eye of the soul? Materialism has always appeared to us to rest on an assumption as to the sole criterion of truth, which is natural in the case of an exclusive physicist, but for which no sound reason can be assigned. Our bodily senses, according to the Evolutionists, are the products of a process which we have no reason for pronouncing terminated, and therefore finality cannot be predicated of them or their indications. Nor is it a merely negative or "Agnostic," but a positive belief in the Unseen to which we are led. The existence beyond the sensible world of a Power of some kind from which the movements and order of the world proceed, is as certain now as the existence of something which caused the perturbations of Uranus was before the astronomers had actually discovered Neptune.

We cannot hold, however, with Sir Edmund Beckett, that in



overthrowing the Materialistic hypothesis, he has established the Theistic, or that in this sense Agnosticism becomes impossible. Beyond the primordial atoms of our world, or anything that resides in these, there must be some power that made them behave as they did, and continues to make them behave as they are doing; so much, his reasoning, and the reasoning of those who have preceded him in the same line, seems to us to prove: but it does not follow, as he assumes, that this power is "The Living God." He falls back on the old argument of Design and Beauty: but this argument, if limited in its scope to the order of the visible universe or anything implied in it and deducible from it, has been undermined. If there are proofs of Design, there are also proofs of Undesign; there is waste, failure, and, what is most mysterious of all, prodigality of suffering, apparently at variance with any conception of Divine Mercy and Justice. The Pessimists, in fact, are not very palpably wrong in saying that there is about as much evil in this world as it can bear without dissolution. "Teeth," says Paley, "were made to eat, not to ache." But if teeth were not made to ache, yet do ache, there is a failure of Design. No theory can reconcile actual phenomena with the Theistic hypothesis but one which avows that, for some good purpose or other, teeth were made to ache. The Design, in short, must be supposed not physical and temporary, but moral and eternal; and the key to the mystery must be sought in the direction of moral effort leading to some far off goal, not of physical or immediate satisfaction.

Still it is something to have proved the existence of the Unseen; and the proof which is demonstrative as regards the Origin of the Laws of Nature, is valid at least against any merely physical presumption that the soul of man must cease to exist when it ceases to belong to the Seen. "We see forms of matter," says Dr. Thomas Young,\* "differing in subtlety and mobility, under the names of solids, li-

---

\* Quoted in "The Unseen Universe," p. 160.

quids, and gases; above those are the semi-material existences, which produce the phenomena of electricity and magnetism, and either caloric or universal ether. Higher still, perhaps, are the causes of gravitation, and the immediate agents in attraction of all kinds, which exhibit some phenomena apparently still more remote from all that is compatible with material bodies. And of these different orders of beings the more refined and immaterial appear to pervade freely the grosser. It seems, therefore, natural to believe that the analogy may be continued still further, until it rises into existence absolutely immaterial and spiritual. We know not but that thousands of spiritual worlds may exist unseen for ever by human eyes; nor have we any reason to suppose that even the presence of matter, in a given spot, necessarily excludes their existences from it. Those who maintain that nature always teems with life, wherever living beings can be placed, may therefore speculate with freedom on the possibility of independent worlds; some existing in different parts of space, others pervading each other unseen and unknown, in the same space, and others again to which space may not be a necessary mode of existence." Perhaps the view of the universe conveyed in such a passage places the possibility of a future state in a more vivid light, and renders it more capable of realization than the ordinary reasonings in which the material and the spiritual are opposed to each other as two entirely distinct kinds and spheres of being, from one to the other of which we are to be suddenly translated. Gradual advance in Spirituality is perfectly consistent with Evolution.

Sir Edmund Beckett is a little too combative. No one can have followed this unspeakably momentous discussion in a philosophic spirit without understanding, at least, the doubts which perplex humanity, and which extend to the highest moral natures as well as to the most powerful minds. We need all the force of intellect we have to work out our common salvation, and have none to waste on mutual assault and battery. It is true that the fanaticism and dogmatism of the

coarser scientists are sometimes very provoking; yet it is better to disregard the provocation. Sir Edmund Beckett himself has been borne along by the current: he is very far removed from Orthodoxy as it was fifty or even twenty years ago. Apparently he accepts the Nebular Hypothesis; and if he does he is committed to the general principle of Evolution, as contrasted with that of sudden and particular creation. Special theories of the process may be crude or false: too much efficacy may have been assigned to Natural Selection, though it is impossible to doubt the reality or the importance of that force: but surely we cannot take up any book of science, or any book of philosophy in which deference is paid to Science without seeing that the old Cosmogony is dead, and that its place has been taken by Evolution.

—Orthodoxy keeps its grasp on Professor Robertson Smith. "See," it exclaims, "if we let this man go free, what will be the logical consequences? Professors and ministers will be licensed to teach 1. That there are interpolations in Deuteronomy and perhaps in the Acts of the Apostles, or any other book of Scripture; 2. That the Song of Songs got into the Canon by mistake, the Church having erroneously supposed it to be allegorical; 3. That the Books of Jonah and Esther have in them poetical inventions which destroy their trustworthiness as history; 4. That the Synoptical Gospels are merely digests of apostolic tradition, not written by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but by persons unknown and at the beginning of the second century; 5. That the Gospel of John is a product of abstract reflection, and therefore unhistorical. Who, then, will go to church to hear sermons on apocryphal writings? Will it not soon be here as it is in Germany, where not above five per cent. of the Protestant population attend church on the Sabbath, and Socialism and Nihilism are the results?" Such horror is most natural; such apprehensions are too well founded. To a religious man, brought up strictly in the orthodox belief, and

secured from contact with Scepticism, it may well appear that the foundations of the world are giving way, and that the end of all things is at hand. Of the heresies just enumerated, there is hardly one which may not be said at present to have the preponderance of learned and critical opinion in its favour; and it is difficult to resist the practical conclusion which is drawn by the alarmists. Yet, all these doubts as to the authorship and historical character of books may be well founded, and still Christianity may be a true account of the relations of man to God, and as such really and in the deepest sense divine. Suppose Newton, after completing the "Principia," had died suddenly; suppose the manuscript had gone astray and been ascribed to a wrong author; suppose that legends had grown up about its origin; still the "Principia" would be true. We do not mean to press the analogy too far; but when the work of critical demolition is complete, assuming that it extends permanently to the utmost limits which the tide of Scepticism has marked, the Character and the ethical system will remain; so will the Christian Church and the Christendom which it has produced. We have before noted the avowal of Mr. Herbert Spencer and other Positivist writers that after a period of hesitancy, or, to use the expression of one of them, "tacking," Ethics would probably move on again in the line traced by Christianity. What is this but saying that Christianity is fundamentally true?

Nevertheless tremendous questions present themselves. One regards our Church services, which unquestionably still rest on the orthodox hypothesis, and which it will be difficult to lift from that basis without wreck, though lifted in the end they will have to be, if the march of thought proceeds in its present course, and supposing that we wish to keep the comfort and the elevating influence of social worship. Another, perhaps still more pressing, concerns the education of the clergy. With this the Rev. Hugh Pedley, of Cobourg, deals very frankly and fearlessly in his paper on *Theological Students and the Times* in a recent number of the *Canadian Monthly*. What the

times are he fully acknowledges, freely admitting the power, the rapid progress, the increasing boldness, and the growing popularity of Rationalism, which, as he says, has now dominated the most thoughtful nation in Europe for fifty years. What training, then, is to be given to the ministers who, especially if their work is in the cities, are destined to encounter Rationalism everywhere and in all forms? Are they to make acquaintance with it only through the partial quotations and hostile criticism of the Orthodox lecture-room, or are they to study it thoroughly and for themselves? Mr. Pedley boldly embraces the second alternative. He would put the dangerous works "Supernatural Religion," Greg's "Creed of Christendom," Newman's "Phases of Faith," Baur, Haeckel, and Strauss into the student's hands and absolutely command him to read them; bid him grapple with Renan's axiom that the Essence of Criticism is the denial of the Supernatural; enjoin him to take nothing for granted but *cogito ergo sum*; let him "go down to the very bottom, and then work his way up by manful climbing till he found himself at last on the solid and sun-kissed heights of glorious conviction." Would the student, as the result of this heroic treatment, always, or even generally, find himself on the sun-kissed heights of conviction? Would he not often find himself in the twilight, or even in the darkness, of the valley of doubt? In the most favourable case would the process of building up from *cogito ergo sum* be over before the ordination day? However, there is no choice. A Roman Catholic seminary is an intellectual fortalice, in which the student is effectually guarded from the access of all opinion except what it suits his preceptors to instil, of all knowledge except that which it suits his preceptors to impart. Not a book, not a journal can he touch, saving with their cognizance and permission; intercourse with the outer world he has none; blissfully ignorant he generally comes in, blissfully ignorant of everything, except the routine of his profession, he goes out. But the safeguards of a Protestant seminary, its tests and the exclusive orthodoxy of its professional teaching,

are as gates of brass where there is no wall. They leave the inmates exposed to all the influences of the library, the bookstore, the press, and general society. It is with mental seclusion as with persecution: it must be thoroughgoing, or, instead of repressing, it incites.

Supposing the question of clerical education settled, a greater difficulty remains. Is the clergyman, after his ordination, when he has dedicated himself to the service of his Church and its authoritative creed, to continue his course of free reading and free thought. We should say so, if it is a part of his duty to guide his congregation to the truth. But if he does, is it not possible that his faith may be shaken by the arguments of writers whose views "have for fifty years dominated the most thoughtful nation of Europe?" Is it not possible, at all events, that he may conceive doubts as to the historical character of the Books of Jonah and Esther, the spiritual meaning of the Song of Songs, or the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel? In that case, what is he to do? We can hardly doubt that the question has presented itself practically to not a few perplexed understandings and perturbed hearts. It is not for us to attempt its solution, either generally or in any given instance. We can only presume to speak of the duty and interest of the laity, which seem to us alike to point to a frank recognition of the difficulties under which the clergy, like the rest of us, and more than the rest of us, are placed, and, as a consequence of that recognition, to the concession of the fullest measure of liberty consistent with practical union. The result of inquisitorial narrowness, under such circumstances as the present, must be either disruption, with a total loss of the privileges of social worship, or the elimination from the ministry of all minds of the higher order, and of all sincere liegemen of the truth. Strict orthodoxy in the pulpit and in the rectory may, of course, be secured, for a sufficient consideration; and, by wealthy State Churches, it is secured in great abundance. If we want to find the right way, what can be more suicidal than to bandage the eyes of our guides? We

suspect that they are not the most highly educated members of a congregation or those best qualified to form an opinion on theological questions that usually trouble a clergyman about the doctrine which he teaches.

—Dr. Ryerson said, in the Preface to his “Loyalists of America,” that the history of the Loyalists had never been written except by their enemies. We replied that it had been written by Mr. Lorenzo Sabine, who was very friendly to them, and by Judge Thomas Jones, who was one of them. To be perfectly candid, we were under the impression that the Jones manuscript had been published by the New York Historical Society at the end of 1878. The date 1879 on the title page would not have been inconsistent with this, since it is not uncommon to date as of the incoming, works published at the end of the outgoing, year. We find, however, that the work came out May 1, 1879. Still this leaves an interval of at least thirteen months between the appearance of Jones’s history and that of Dr. Ryerson’s; so that there could be no excuse for the statement in Dr. Ryerson’s Preface, even as regards Jones, much less as regards Sabine, whose work has been out for many years. Jones’s history being the most important document relating to the subject, we should have thought that its existence might have been noticed in some way, though there might not be time to work it up into the body of Dr. Ryerson’s narrative. Even as a manuscript, in the hands of the Historical Society of New York, it hardly lay beyond the scope of very diligent research. The personal slanging-match to which the reverend Doctor, after his usual fashion, invites us, we beg leave to decline. When it comes to flinging dirt, he that has the greatest command of dirt must win.

—Canada suffers with regard to the Copyright Question by the inability of the English trade to recognise her position in a country adjoining the United States and exposed to American

competition, while her hands are tied by the English law. But, while publishers and authors, English and American, debate this question and propose their different solutions of it, the flood of cheap reprints has come upon them all. Not only novels with which the movement commenced; or reviews to which it next extended; but solid works of history, biography, criticism, science, philosophy, theology are now being brought out in the revolutionary form of broad-sheets, and at a revolutionary price. The regular firms having resisted the change of form, a good deal of the trade has already been transferred from them to news-dealers and printers. What will become of our old libraries with their goodly array of bound octavos? What will become of their proud possessors thus levelled in command of intellectual wealth with any one who can afford to lay out a few dollars? What will become of the regular publishers, whose stock and stereotype plates will, to no small extent, be rendered worthless, and who will hardly find it worth their while to advertise books and create a market for them with the certainty of having their issues at once outsold by the multitudinous cheap editions of the Quarto Libraries? What will become of the English authors, including the Musical Composer and the Playwright, when they have to look for their remuneration solely to the people of their own country, while the bulk of the sale, perhaps, is on this side of the Atlantic? Will the English readers submit for ever to exclusion from the Paradise of Cheap Reading, which they will see their kinsmen enjoying in the United States? Will the trade, either of publisher or writer, escape fundamental change? Will Copyright itself remain unshaken, or will it succumb and leave nothing but the advantage which belongs in the ordinary course of trade to the first producer? Unquestionably, the revolution will be great: but it was inevitable, and we may be sure it will prove beneficent; it is the intellectual complement of political democracy: the invention of printing was the first great step, the cheap library is the second.

Probably the book question will come before the next Con-



gress. There are now three Camps. In Camp the First is a double-winged army of publishers, with which act the native American writers, whom the deluge of cheap reprints threatens almost with annihilation. The whole army calls aloud, though rather late, for an international Copyright Treaty with England; but the right wing insists, in the interest of native industries, that reprints shall be manufactured in the United States, while the left wing would leave the matter open, so that English publishers may send in editions suited to the markets at their discretion. Importers and English agencies, of course, act with the left wing, which would remove the heavy duty on books: the interest of the native American writer inclines him to the right. In Camp the Second are the Philadelphia reprinters of law and medical works, who are unaffected by the cheap broadsides, and who oppose an international copyright and the removal of the book duty, but want the duty removed on paper, cloth, leather for binding, and other things used in the manufacture of books. Camp the Third contains the Jacobins of the literary revolution—the cheap reprinters, with the mass of the public as well as the paper-makers and printers at their back. These simply want to keep their indiscriminate licence of reproducing, untaxed by author's royalty, whatever comes into their hands. The case of the native American writer demands our utmost sympathy, and the most serious part of the matter is the peril in which native American literature is placed. Otherwise, the struggle among the three camps is simply one of trade interest in its narrowest form. There will be a good deal of lobbying and bribing, but the Jacobins will win.

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

---

A

# NATIONAL TEXT-BOOK ON GEOGRAPHY.

FOR USE IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, AND INVALUABLE  
AS A REFERENCE WORK IN THE LIBRARY  
AND COUNTING ROOM.

NOW READY, 144 Pages. Price \$1 50.

---

LOVELL'S

# ADVANCED GEOGRAPHY

*With 40 Coloured Maps and 150 Illustrations.*

---

Critique from the "Canadian Monthly," for September.

*Lovell's Advanced Geography*, for the use of Schools and Colleges, 150 pp., 4to., with Maps and Illustrations. Montreal: John Lovell, 1880.

In the matter of Canadian treatises in Geographical science, we have at last emerged, not only into the clear light of day, but into the full noon-tide glare of a day in the latter part of the nineteenth century—with all the converging light which a score of sciences sheds upon it. In this branch of education, at all events, Canadian literature can now hold up its head and invite criticism with confidence as to the result. Thanks to the unwea-

ried effort and the patriotic enterprise of that veteran publisher, Mr. Lovell, of Montreal, we have in this elegant Atlas-quarto a text book on geography which, it may be safely said, is far superior to any work in use in the schools of England, and is, at least, the equal of any text-book on the subject used in the United States. Indeed, among the latter—and we are familiar with most of them—we know of no book which is at the same time so full and accurate as this, nor is there any within our cognizance which, while giving such ample detail of American and British American geography, treats so fully of that of the

Old World. While justice is thus done to countries whose political and geographical history demand the prominence here given to them, the space devoted to the statistical and descriptive account of Canadian geography marks it out as a distinctively national enterprise. Here the teaching profession, as well as the general public, will be likely to apply those tests which of local knowledge will be sure to suggest in appraising the accuracy and general merit of the work. Having ourselves submitted it to rigid scrutiny, and to many and critical tests in this, as well as in other departments of the book, we would say that he would be a captious critic indeed who failed to form a high opinion of the value of the book, not only as an elaborate educational text-book, but as an important work of reference to the general public who may turn to its pages in search of information on political and industrial matters. The myriad readers

of the daily newspapers will, in these days, appreciate what is said in regard to this latter point. The excellent Atlas interleaved with the book adds a further value to it in this respect. To Canadians especially, the admirable maps of the Dominion and the several Provinces will further commend the book to those who will use it as a school manual as well as to those who will consult it as a gazetteer and work of general geographical reference. The publisher, in this new product of his press, has put the coping-stone upon the edifice which his industry and patriotism has built up in the minds of his countrymen to his honour and credit, and we have no doubt that the work will at once take the first place in the educational institutions of the country as a manual of geography in all respects most creditable to the authorship and to the publishing enterprise of our young Dominion.

Also, Recently Published : Price 65c.

## Lovell's Intermediate Geography,

81 COLOURED MAPS. 40 ILLUSTRATIONS. 104 PAGES.

*Strongly bound in Cloth, Gilt Lettered.*

The matter, the Maps, the Printing and Binding in this Geography are superior to any one hitherto published in Canada. On sale at the Bookstores throughout the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, and the West Indies.

For Sale by all Booksellers in the Dominion, or either work by Mail on receipt of the price.

**Montreal :—JOHN LOVELL, Publisher.**



FACTORY :  
18 Church St., Liverpool.

ESTABLISHED IN ENGLAND 1797.



ENGLISH BRANCH :  
33 Piccadilly, London.

# RUSSELLS' CANADIAN HOUSE,

9 KING STREET WEST, TORONTO.

For Direct Trade with the Public in the line of

SEE THE WATCH

FINE WATCHES,

SOLID SILVER

CHAINS,

and

CLOCKS,

JEWELLERY,

ELECTRO PLATED

DIAMONDS,

WARE.



IN THE WATER.

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

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

## WATCH REPAIRING.

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

ANY ARTICLE OF JEWELLERY MANUFACTURED ON THE PREMISES.

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

**RUSSELL'S CANADIAN HOUSE,**

9 King Street West, Toronto.



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Post free on receipt of Price.

**WILLING & WILLIAMSON,**

12 KING STREET EAST, TORONTO.