

the German capital is deplorable. Murders, suicides and accidents of all descriptions have pestered the great city during the month of May and the first half of June. On the 15th June only 81 corpses were delivered at the amphitheatres or at the morgue. Amongst them were two cases of infanticide, five women and three men who had poisoned themselves, three women, seven men and a boy drowned, and thirty-three persons who had lost their lives through unknown causes." The Bishop then goes on to describe the habits of the Parisian working-classes, whose creed we have recently found described by a French writer of high reputation as identical with that preached in philosophic circles among ourselves,—and no doubt professed, for the most part, by that hopeful sect of no religion in Victoria. "In Paris," he says, "I need be at no pains to prove to you that the men of the working classes, especially the artisans, are almost all irreligious. And what is the moral condition of those classes? It has been reported by one of themselves—a sceptic, but a man who by his conduct and industry had raised himself to the position of a master manufacturer. Its substance is given in a sketch of France and the French, by Karl Hillebrand which some of you may have read. Those specially dealt with are the employees at the railway works, but the author assures us they form one-seventh of the workmen of Paris, and that 'the other six-sevenths resemble them exactly.' The steady workmen, he says, constitute one-fourth of the whole, though the conduct of a large proportion of these is by no means uniformly good. A little more than one-tenth of the whole constitutes an intermediate class. If married, the men of this class have to excuse themselves to their wives for keeping Saint Monday, and for drinking too much on pay-day; if unmarried they usually live with a mistress. The rest—65 per cent. of the whole—take the nickname, *les sublimes*. There are several sections of them arranged in successively descending moral stages. The description of the best of them is as follows:—'He is always in debt. He changes employers five or six times a year. He is proud of himself if he can cheat a relation or his employer. If his wife or mistress reproach him he beats her. He spends his Monday in playing cards or billiards . . . and invariably gets drunk, nor does he begin work again as long as he has a sou left.'" But what is this the Bishop has to say about Melbourne itself? "Not drunkenness, but immorality, is the worst temptation here. A southern climate is sure to tell in this direction more and more, and if I dare repeat to you the facts which I have read in reports of our own Parliament, you would see how terrible is the present mischief, how menacing the future danger." Can it be, then, that there is something besides those bare statistics of the prisons to be considered in order fairly to determine what the results of secularism are? And must we reluctantly find a flaw in that brilliant argument which should convince any jury in the world?—that because Catholics who have never been at school are apparently more criminal than Jews and Protestants who have—although not nearly so apparently criminal in proportion to their ignorance, and relatively to Jews and Protestants, as they might be expected to be, therefore, Catholic schools are productive of crime. The very thought, indeed, of its being possible that a flaw could be perceived in any part of such an argument would be overwhelming—particularly since we know that unless it be admitted that Catholics who have not attended Catholic schools owe all their depravity to those schools, nothing can be proved against the results of a religious education. And we really are anxious to be as accommodating as ever we can be,—but, then, we must stop short of accepting a conclusion, to accept which would prove that any man in the world was out of his wits—and even badly so.

WHOLESOME ADVICE.

M. CHARLES DE MAZADE hardly seems impressed very highly with the nature of the progress of the day—and, from what he says, there would seem to be even some suspicion in his mind that the darkness with which the middle ages are commonly accredited, has extended its skirts up to our own highly favoured times of liberalism and liberty.—It is, in fact, both startling and suggestive to find that persecution is among the phenomena of the century. Our century, writes M. de Mazade, in effect, which has flattered itself on witnessing the reign of tolerance, and of unshackled reason, is perhaps destined to end among new religious struggles, fanaticism, and persecution. The truth is, strange signs are sometimes to be noted in this old Europe of ours, which every revolution has shaken. Blind hatreds and glowing intolerance that were believed to be extinct are suddenly rekindling, and if, in France, in the name of a pretended freethought, war is made on Catholics, on their beliefs, and on their emblems; in other regions, and in many countries, war is made on the Jews. This is a singular progress in ideas and manners. These wars which, in certain countries, no doubt, are caused by a combination of circumstances, are not the less extraordinary because of that. For a long time the condition of the Jews in the Danubian Principalities has been unsafe, and after the war that created Roumanian independence, the question appeared grave enough to call for consideration by the Congress of Berlin. In Russia of late years, there has been a series

of risings, violences, and murderous acts against the Jews. These scenes, which were often bloody, took the character of a sort of organised persecution which, in many instances, obliged the victims to take to flight, and the government, without being the accomplice of the agitations, was often very much embarrassed in repressing them, and in protecting the unhappy people against the furious onslaughts of the multitude. Even in Germany, the movement against the Jews, without being marked by scenes of murder as in Russia, has been revived of late in a manner quite unforeseen. It has found warm adherents, and has been concentrated in a kind of league formed to combat the invasion of Israelitish influences. There has been, in a word, what is called the anti-Semitic movement, and it is not certain that M. de Bismarck has always been very energetic in discouraging this reaction of German and Protestant feeling, which he can make use of, on occasion, as he does of everything. In Hungary, distrust and popular hatred against the Jews are revealed in a drama which is now being played in a court of justice, and which resembles some scene from the middle ages brought before contemporaneous opinion. What adds to the gravity of this sad trial is, that it is only an episode in the revival of animosity against the Jews that is breaking out, more or less, everywhere—even in peaceable Switzerland, in the respectable little town of Saint-Gall, where a Jew was attacked in his house, for having written a rather unfavourable pamphlet on the Zurich exhibition. There, as elsewhere, the manifestations were made with the watchword—Turn out the Jews. It is, indeed, a strange fact that towards the end of the century, eighty years after the French Revolution, there are born anew these race-animosities, these religious struggles which were no longer believed possible in a civilisation wholly impregnated with ideas of tolerance. There is what progress means! when it was least thought of, we perceive that, in many respects, we have turned back towards the past. Populations blinded by old prejudices, can still believe that the Jews make use of the blood of a young girl for the rites of their worship, and in one of the most cultivated countries of Europe, that is Germany, there are crusades against the Shemites, as there are in other countries crusades against the Catholics. It would be the duty of enlightened governments to react against these tendencies, in every sense to resist these wanderings of opinion which lead us back to other times, to be the first to give the example of tolerance and of liberal equity in their relations with religious beliefs.—So far M. de Mazade, but, for our own part, we will add that those governments who are persecuting by means of secularism, and so carrying on a crusade against their Catholic subjects that is no less bitter because it is dissembled, might, to their own profit and to that of the countries concerned generally, be guided by the advice of this veteran political writer, and wise and moderate man.

HERE is news that should make the hair stand straight upon the heads of sincere democrats in these colonies—that is if there be any such body of men, in lesser or greater numbers, to be found among us.—For, to tell the truth, there is some

reason to conclude that colonial democracy is merely the manifestation of a regard for self, and of a certain jealousy that is anything rather than democratic. The West British section of the Irish Press, then, expresses an extreme mortification because the colonies seem considered more worthy of honour than the party they themselves represent in Ireland is found to be. Says the *Dublin Evening Mail* "Almost every time we take up the *Official Gazette*, we are reminded that no Irish need apply for the distinctions so liberally dealt out to every twopenny-halfpenny colonial judge or successful Australian squatter."—And, again, he says, "the wife of a Fiji Chief Justice is accorded the same rank enjoyed by the wife of an English Judge. Why should Irish Judges be alone denied the titles which are, of course, no distinctions for themselves, but which give to their wives a certain rank? Again, while consulting surgeons at Sydney are decorated, surgeons and physicians in Ireland are unrecognised."—There we are, then, recognised and envied as the recipients of honours, that should make the very marrow turn cold in the bones of our sincere democrats.—What the rank to be conferred upon a lady by a distinction that would be perfectly worthless to her husband may be, we shall not stay to inquire. The subject is a delicate one, and its investigation might land us unawares in the middle of some question of woman's rights, on which Heaven forbid that, with our knowledge or without it, we should ever attempt to enter.—Common politeness, however, would seem to teach us that if anything whatsoever is no distinction to any man in the world, it ought naturally, if possible, to be less so to his better-half.—Perhaps, however, it might result in taking her in to dinner, or sending her out of a room, before somebody-else's better-half.—And there is probably a great deal in that, if it be rightly considered.—It seems, nevertheless that there are in these colonies, to the great envy of those who frequent Dublin Castle, ladies of this "rank,"—whatever it may be, and who enjoy all its privileges.—The thought of its being so is overwhelming, and fills us, even at an immense distance, with reverence unspeakable.—But we should be, on the whole, better