

transformations can be set to their credit. But is this not too bad? Did not Portia for example, inflict a prodigious moral and social transformation on Shylock when she imposed upon him the task of taking Antonio's flesh without shedding a drop of his blood. And how shall a missionary lose credit for teaching a company that they must treat a volcano in a somewhat similar manner? The New Hebrides Company may take all their purchase out of the volcano of Tanna, but the sulphur which is inseparably connected with the object of their purchase, they must not touch. Let this be recorded to the credit of the *reverend* Watts. And again, is their no social and moral transformation involved in the appropriation of other men's lands? Where, *par exemple*, is the Irish landlord who cannot answer? But let the *reverend* MacDonald receive all that is his due. Decidedly our contemporary, the *Néo-Caledonien* is mistaken. If to transform an unsophisticated community of naked savages into one, well clad as elsewhere we presume in profitably imported cotton and skilled in the art of amending bad bargains, or of quietly resuming possession of that which has been disposed of by them, and exceedingly sharp in all their dealings, is not a social and moral transformation, we should like to know what is so. But as for the white people who look on and are scandalised, are they not mere Papists, that deserve no consideration? The missionaries did not go to the New Hebrides to convert them, and that, as we all know, can be done much more easily—and also with profit, more or less—at home.

AMONG the most able deliverances that have from the first been made on the Irish question is to be reckoned the plan for an Irish constitution proposed by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy in the September number of the *Contemporary Review*, for it is to this shape that the report reduces itself, which informed us here that Sir Charles had gone over to Ireland, with a constitution cut and dry for adoption by the people. His undertaking is much more modest and consists in making way for a discussion which he earnestly invites. Sir Charles is of opinion that no nation would be justified in accepting, as the Irish people, nevertheless, were prepared to do in the case of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, a constitution framed for them abroad, but that the very test of their fitness for self-government must depend on the ability with which they prove themselves capable of acting, in the matter for themselves. And Mr. Gladstone, we may remark in passing, seems to share in this opinion, if we may judge at least by the refusal he has given to consider Mr. Chamberlain's proposal that he should draw up a constitution for Ulster. Sir Charles Duffy cites the example of many countries as well in the new world as the old, and counting among them states of various magnitudes from France and Italy to Prince Edward's Island and Van Dieman's Land. The instance to which he particularly refers, however, is that of the United States whose constitution, pronounced the other day by Mr. Gladstone, in declining an invitation to be present at the celebration of its centenary, the greatest political work of the human intellect accomplished in modern times. But Sir Charles Duffy ascribes its perfection to debate in the Press, its bases being laid more by controversy in the *Federalist* than by anything else. The first step in the controversy which we may now probably expect to arise, and which if it be conducted with even a tithe of the ability with which Sir Charles Gavan Duffy begins it, must necessarily result in a noble construction, enters very fully into the minutiae of the matter, and seems to leave no detail unexamined. The salient points, meantime, strike us as being those in which the guarantees required by the minority and the necessity for the existence of two chambers are treated of. The man, indeed, must be hard to convince and anxious to cavil who can find in Sir Charles' dealing with the question of the protection of the Protestant minority anything to doubt, or any room for the *arrière pensee* which the writer disclaims. He condemns most candidly the notion that a Catholic ascendancy should succeed that of the Protestants, and asserts the right of this body to demand specific guarantees—not based on any assumed good will of their Catholic fellow-countrymen, arising from experience of their conduct in the past or otherwise—but so established as that it shall be impossible for them to suffer injustice. And the passage, moreover, in which the writer claims that such an impossibility is the basis of all securities, and even generally of law itself, strikes us as singularly powerful. In order to afford the necessary protection he rejects the half-measure of limiting the functions of the Legislative and Executive, which, he says, would be thus made powerless to do much good in order that they might do no wrong—and advocates the formation instead of a Legislative and Executive possessing the full powers enjoyed by the Australasian and Canadian Parliaments—in which, he says, would consist the only perfect guarantee. But as to the constitution of the Parliament, Sir Charles assumes, as a matter of course that it must consist of two Chambers—the single Chamber, as he conclusively shows, having proved a danger and a failure even among democracies, whose particular instrument it is supposed to be. And he condemns it especially as making it impossible to secure habitual fair play to minorities. In the Lower House he would have minorities

represented, if not on Mr. Hare's theorem, as being, according to Mr. Bright, too complicated, by means of three cornered constituencies against which no such objection can be urged. To obviate the danger of a dead-lock between the two Houses he would adopt a clause in Mr. Gladstone's Bill which provided that in case of a protracted disagreement of the two orders the question should be submitted to the joint voting of both Houses, and that the majority should decide the point at issue. Sir Charles, however, would require an "absolute majority" of the united body rather than a majority of those voting.—Should any measure be so rejected, he argues, there would be valid grounds, at least against its immediate adoption. And behind this joint majority, again, there would be the possible veto of the Crown. Such appear to us to be, as we have said, the salient points of this article, which, however, is very exhaustive, and every point of which is deserving of deep attention. Even apart from the knowledge that the writer is Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, it is evidently the work of a reflective mind dealing with a subject of absorbing interest to it, and bringing to the task not only the results of wide research and close observation as well as profound study, but also of personal experience fully utilised. As to the style, among its perfections are an unsurpassed lucidity, and something of the urbanity which Mr. Matthew Arnold so highly commends in the writings of Cardinal Newman.

#### MORE MISSIONARIES.

WE find a little testimony also to Evangelical missions in Madagascar, and what is thought of them even by French Evangelicals, in our contemporary the *Néo-Caledonien* which in common with all French settlers in the Pacific just at present is a good deal interested in Evangelical missionaries. Our contemporary quotes an article from *La France* in which a meeting is described that lately took place at Paris in connection with the Madagascar missions.—The Pastor Hirsch was present at it and, in the heat caused by the manner in which the meeting treated him, he let slip a sentence or two that clearly betrayed his mind. The indignation of the meeting—which was not a Catholic one—was directed first against the Pastor by the statement made that the Protestant pastors of France were subsidised by the Bible Society in England,—to which he replied—*Oh! si peu! si peu!* Afterwards when he stood up to speak he was met at every sentence by furious cries.—"You're paid by England!" "You're sold to England!" "Sold! Sold!"—The Pastor, however, at first gave it as the rather peculiar reason of his rev. brethren and himself for not going on a French Protestant mission to Madagascar—that they repudiated every war of conquest and did not wish to seem to associate themselves in the conquest of Madagascar by going there in the train of the army—an excellent reason, as we all must admit for leaving a heathen people in their darkness. It was not, however, until the Pastor was completely goaded beyond his self-control that, he let slip the truth. "What would you have us do there!" he cried. "We are neither chemists, nor grocers, nor calico sellers. We teach of God and that is all." M. Francisque Sarcey, who has written the article in *La France*, very fairly comments thus. "He supposes that to teach of God, under the flag of France, the Catholic priests suffice for the task. The Protestant pastors do not feel themselves strong enough to struggle against their English colleagues on the grounds of business."—It is easy to believe on the involuntary testimony thus given by Pastor Hirsch the statement also made by M. Sarcey to the effect that the Missionary Ellis brought back as the fruits of his enterprise in Madagascar the handsome sum of fifteen hundred thousand francs—or sixty thousand pounds.—We are, however, unwilling to accept it as proved that he was concerned in the murder of King Radama II, the patron and ally of the French, or that he derived part of his profits from such a crime. M. Sarcey, nevertheless, puts the matter boldly. "The English Protestant mission," he says besides, "is all powerful to-day among our great enemies the Hovas. This it is that had our ally Radama II assassinated; this it is that raises for us all the trouble we have in the island."

#### A TEST CASE.

THE *Univers* cites the details of the trial of Pranzini, the man lately executed in Paris for a triple murder, as certain evidence of the rottenness which pervades society in France. As the matter bears on that universal question, the effects of a godless philosophy whose results are most fully seen in the characteristics of the Parisian people, and whose general spread throughout the world is warmly advocated by certain wiseacres and strongly supported by multitudes who are more or less blind, we think it opportune to quote the passages in question. They run to the following effect:—The jury of the Seine have returned their verdict in the Pranzini case. The accused is condemned to death. . . . But shall we say that justice is satisfied? Alas! the trial itself, all of whose details it has been impossible for us through respect for our readers to publish has presented one of the most repugnant spectacles seen for a long time in the courts of assizes. The composition of the public, their unwholesome and ferocious curiosity, made up of purulence and lowliness, the