

Still more interesting are the illustrations of the church question. The bishop of Verdun was in the ecclesiastical province of the archbishop of Trèves. When the news of the abolitions of August 4 came, the clergy protested on the ground of the stipulations of Westphalia. To the details of the sale of church property M. Pionnier has devoted a long appendix. Apropos of the Worship of Reason affair, he gives a list of the statues, pictures, and other objects destroyed at the cathedral, November 28, 1793, in the presence of the "pontife" (the Constitutional bishop, Aubry) and his clergy, who abjured their titles and renounced "charlatanerie". It is unnecessary to add that on this occasion the countenances of the "sansculottes" were "suffused with joy", as they also were, six months later, when the new cult was degraded to give place to Robespierre's Festival of the Supreme Being.

The portions of the work which touch the Reign of Terror show the Verdunois as "gens de nature fort changeante", to use M. Pionnier's words, and illustrate the fact that the particular use of the Terror was to maintain in power the group of politicians which had seized the reins of government in June and July, 1793. As the persons in Verdun responsible for the surrender to the Prussians in 1792 were not executed until April, 1794, and as for a large part of the intervening time it was doubtful whether their punishment would go beyond temporary imprisonment and political ruin, the final execution had no moral value. The only other executions were of those who expressed sympathy with the proscribed Girondins.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

*Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham, 1792-1840.* By STUART J. REID. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1906. Two vols., pp. xx, 409; xii, 409.)

JOHN GEORGE LAMBTON, first Earl of Durham, was a paradox, in the sense of Robertson of Brighton's well-known phrase, "my tastes are with the aristocrat, my principles are with the mob." Durham combined genuine radicalism with the ambition, ultimately gratified, of attaining high rank in the British peerage. His career fell at a momentous era in English history. A young man of twenty-three when Waterloo was fought, he played a conspicuous part in the reconstruction in England after the close of the war. From the first Durham opposed the Corn Laws, though he did not live to see their repeal. He fought for a more radical Reform Bill than was ultimately passed, voting by ballot being one of the things which he failed to carry. Had he not gone to the House of Lords, Durham's would undoubtedly have been the honor, which fell to Lord John Russell, of introducing the Bill in the House of Commons. As it was, the Committee of Four which shaped it met at his house and his influence was only short of dominant. His Whig colleagues who wished reform to go so far and no farther never wholly trusted Durham; his nickname of "the Dissenting Minister" shows that he was a difficult colleague, and his disagreements with his Whig father-in-law, the Prime Minister, Lord Grey,

were notorious. Durham retired from the Cabinet in 1833 and never again became a minister. He had some hope of succeeding Lord Grey in the leadership of the party, but he was not regarded as a safe man and Melbourne came to the front. The Whigs dared not ignore Durham, but Melbourne would not have him in the Cabinet. So in 1835 Durham went as ambassador to Russia. This post he resigned in 1837. Just then rebellion in Canada called for a master-mind to study and solve its problems. Urged by Melbourne, Durham went to Canada. He exceeded his powers, was censured at home, and promptly threw up his post and returned to England, where a year and a half later, in 1840, he died. He had long been a sufferer from disease, and the vexatious conclusion of his Canadian mission no doubt preyed upon his mind and hurried his end.

The motto of Durham's family is "*Le jour viendra.*" He died under something like a cloud. The men with whom he worked on equal terms, Grey, and Palmerston, and Melbourne, and Russell, stand prominently before posterity because they were long in the public eye. Durham's figure, conspicuous enough to his contemporaries, has for us been in the background, partly because he died so young. Now Mr. Reid, who has made an almost lifelong study of the subject, throws into clear relief, in these two handsome volumes, the chief aspects of Durham's career. Perhaps his hero needed vindication less than Mr. Reid supposes. It is chiefly with the Reform Bill and the reorganization of Canada that history will associate his name, and the average man knows that in connection with both Durham played a creditable part. Mr. Reid now furnishes much detail. We are glad to have fuller knowledge about so picturesque a personality, but we knew before that Durham was "Radical Jack", dear to the hearts of the working classes in his time; and even in regard to Canada, we knew pretty much all that Mr. Reid now tells us, in spite of his access not only to Durham's papers but also to those of the brilliant Charles Buller, Durham's secretary on the Canadian mission. One result of the long delay in producing an adequate life of Durham is that his age seems far removed from ours. Durham's contemporaries were astounded that he should praise and appeal to the workingman. That the people themselves should judge what was good for them did not please the Whig aristocrats; in the spirit of the benevolent despots of the eighteenth century they wished, like a physician, to prescribe for the people who were expected to take the healing medicine and be thankful. Doctrinaire liberalism they abhorred, and when Durham was leagued with men like Grote, Duncombe, Sir William Molesworth, and Sir Henry Bulwer, Lord Grey's disapproving comment on his relative was: "Lambton has formed bad connections." Whigs of Lord Grey's type long since became Tories, and it is not easy for a present-day Liberal to understand the resentment and suspicion which some of Durham's views excited among the members of his own party. It was Gladstone who made that party really liberal in the sense of trusting the people.

The account of Durham's work in Canada occupies about one-fourth of Mr. Reid's space. When rebellion in Canada came in 1837, concurrently with Queen Victoria's accession to the throne, England was profoundly interested and only to a leading man could the work of conciliation be intrusted. So Durham was made Governor-General of the whole of British North America; he was given besides plenary powers in Lower Canada, where the legislature was suspended; and with great pomp and state he went to Quebec and began his task. Though ill half the time, he worked with great energy, set on foot a multitude of inquiries, adopted a conciliatory attitude toward the French Canadians, and travelled much in the country to see and judge for himself. But in the midst of his activities came the stunning blow which ended his work. Some of the leading French Canadian rebels were in his hands. Technically they were undoubtedly guilty of treason with death as the penalty. If tried, however, before a French jury, they would not be convicted; if before a specially selected jury, there would be a charge that it was packed. Moreover Durham desired wise conciliation, not punishment. So he issued an ordinance banishing the eight principal prisoners to Bermuda under penalty of death if they returned to Canada without permission. The defect of Durham's action was twofold: he condemned men without trial, and he sent them to Bermuda, where he had no jurisdiction. As to the first point, he had been given such great authority that he probably misunderstood its limitations; as to the second, Melbourne's government could easily have aided him, since they had authority in Bermuda. But when Brougham attacked Durham savagely, Melbourne lamely acquiesced and sacrificed him, basely as Mr. Reid thinks. Durham stopped his work, hurried home, occupied himself busily on the long voyage with preparing his report, and died soon after its appearance.

Undoubtedly this report is his greatest achievement. In spite of Durham's hurry and of its many flaws the report remains the charter of Britain's present-day colonial policy, and marks the dawn of a new era. Durham said bluntly that attempts at controlling the colonies from England had failed, that they must be trusted to govern themselves, and that greater liberty would strengthen not weaken the cohesion of the British Empire. In preparing this great state paper he had competent helpers, notably Charles Buller and Edward Gibbon Wakefield, but Mr. Reid repels with some warmth Brougham's charge that to the report Durham contributed only the six letters of his signature. He was, indeed, not the man to use the work of others without retouching and dominating it. To him, one of the chief authors of the Reform Bill, involving the greatest political revolution perhaps that England has ever known, must be attributed the chief place in effecting another revolution which in time will change the conception of the British Empire from that of a mother-land protecting dependent colonies to that of a permanent league of free and equal nations. Assuredly the

man who played so great a part in two such revolutions is worthy of a detailed biography.

If one essays the task of criticizing Mr. Reid one must add that his work is only moderately well done. He lacks conciseness and sometimes lucidity; his matter is not always well arranged, not always pertinent, not always quite accurate. He makes too great a hero of Durham and resents too obviously any unfavorable criticism by his contemporaries. Mr. Reid himself naïvely admits that Durham "was not infallible" (II. 313). But because Greville tells some stories about Durham not free from malice, Mr. Reid calls him an "idle leaves-dropper" (II. 371). Others besides Greville tell similar stories. Creevey, for instance, is piquant on Durham, and calls him "King Jog" because, having £80,000 a year, he said with assumed moderation that £40,000 was a moderate income which one "might jog on with". In spite of Mr. Reid, Durham was something less than sublime. Together with his generous and honest zeal for good government we find a love of display, an arrogant hauteur, and an impatience of contradiction at times so extravagant as to make his sanity seem doubtful. None the less was he a noble character. One story of Mr. Reid's would make all generous spirits love Durham in spite of his faults:

He was dining one night at Lambton Castle with the Countess, and the only other persons in the room were the servants. He spoke unguardedly across the table to his wife, and swept aside her remarks with brusqueness. When the men withdrew she, the gentlest of women, remonstrated. Instantly, Durham, who had not realised the force of his words until that moment, sprang to his feet, rang the bell, and—fearful that his words had already been reported—ordered the whole of the household into the room. He told the astonished servants that he had been momentarily betrayed into hard and unjust words, declared that he was sorry for the fact, and assured them there was one thing they must remember, which was that, if he ever contradicted the Countess again, he had put himself into the wrong, and she was always right. Then, turning to his wife, he apologised to her in their presence and dismissed them. (II. 373.)

Such was Durham, irritable and impulsive, but above all, honest, courageous, and never sparing himself to carry out that to which his sense of duty called him.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

*Letters and Journals of Samuel Gridley Howe.* Edited by his daughter LAURA E. RICHARDS. Volume I. *The Greek Revolution.* With Notes and a Preface by F. B. SANBORN. (Boston: Dana Estes and Company; London: John Lane. 1906. Pp. xix, 419.)

In this volume we have the first installment of the definitive life of Dr. Howe. The editor has done her work well—so well that one could wish more from her own hand. The story of her father's early life she