

"age, height, and all physical peculiarities."

Not content with thus making every Chinaman legally a marked man in every community, without regard to individual character or standing, the bill requires that the Commissioner-General of Immigration shall make a complete record of the date, place, and circumstances of birth of every Chinaman, that his movements may be traced more easily. This is in line with the rogues' galleries in our large cities, and suggests at once the methods by which the European secret police follow up men whose political beliefs are at variance with those of the reigning governments. A similar procedure has been advocated, in and out of Congress, in the case of anarchists, as a result of the assassination of President McKinley. The anarchist has, however, one advantage over the Chinaman, in that nature has not stamped him as one apart from our own people. But though the Chinaman is not known to contemplate the murder of kings and presidents, or the overthrow of all governments, and is generally thought to be peculiarly law-abiding, the bill which Congress is about to pass marks him as one to be despised, shunned, hounded, and persecuted in excess of the anarchist. As for penalties for those who aid Chinamen to enter the country illegally, the bill abounds in them. Train conductors, masters of vessels, their officers and crews, employees of railroads, and drivers of carts will all render themselves liable to conviction for felony and fines of not less than one thousand nor more than five thousand dollars and imprisonment for not less than one year if they aid, abet, or "through neglect permit" the escape of any Chinaman "held in detention."

These are but a few of the features of this extraordinary measure against which Senator Hoar spoke so eloquently on Thursday, but they suffice to show its general character and the absurdity of many of its provisions, of which none is more impractical than that which requires the photographing of every one of the 50,000 Chinese in the Philippines. From water to vinegar, from vinegar to cayenne pepper, and now to vitriol—this was Senator Hoar's description of our Chinese legislation, passed at the behest of labor agitators and professional politicians.

BRITISH FREE TRADE.

We need not wonder that the proposal of the British Chancellor of the Exchequer to put taxes on imported grain and flour has been received with a burst of indignation at home, accompanied with jeers and taunts from abroad. It brings before us one of the most exciting contests of the past—one of the most notable pages of English history—the battle fought by the Anti-Corn Law League for cheap bread for the British work-

man. The names of Cobden and Bright, Peel and Disraeli, Derby and Bentinck, Fonblanque and Thompson, and a host of lesser lights rise among the memories of 1846, when the free-traders finally gained an overwhelming victory. Is it possible that England has gone back to the protective theory which she abandoned more than half a century ago?

Of course the advocates of protection, both at home and abroad, will say yes. Already they are rolling Sir Michael's budget as a sweet morsel under their tongues, and they will make every possible use of it in future contests for the adjustment of taxation. The fact must be recognized, however, that England is under the dire necessity of taxing everything that she can lay her hands on. It is not a question of protection or free trade that confronts the party in power, but a question of life or death to the Salisbury Government. They brought on the Boer war, and they must foot the bills. The cost has now mounted up to nearly a billion dollars, and the total expenses of the Government for the present year are \$800,000,000. What is to be done? asks the bewildered Chancellor. Tax everything in sight. But everything except bread had already been taxed to the utmost limit before; tobacco, wine, spirits, tea, even coal, had had the last farthing squeezed out of them. Sir Michael had stoutly resisted the Tory demand for a bread tax. He had approved himself a worthy disciple and follower of Robert Peel; but, alas, necessity knows no law. The deficit yawning before him must be filled.

It is not quite fair, therefore, to say that Sir Michael has abandoned the principles of free trade. It might be said in like manner that Chairman Payne and Gen. Grosvenor have abandoned the doctrine of protection in having agreed to admit Cuban sugar at a reduced duty, because they have yielded to a necessity, or what they consider such. But in both cases the consequences of what is being done are of more importance than the motives of the doers. The bread tax in England is called temporary by its promoters, but who knows what its duration may be? Who can say what it may lead to? If this is a protective duty in its effect, then no matter what its aims may be—no matter what the motives of Ministers may be—it will lead to demands for other protective duties. First of all, we may expect demands for differential duties in favor of the colonies—that is, that the tax on Canadian wheat, for example, shall be something less than on United States or Argentine wheat. It will be very hard to resist this demand, since Canada already has a differential in favor of English goods—a discrimination; however, which England never asked for and rather deprecated. It will be harder for Sir Michael to resist this

demand since Mr. Chamberlain has long been in favor of it. It is a part of his scheme for Imperial federation. But if Sir Michael consents to differential duties in favor of the colonies, he abandons free trade outright. He throws down the bars to every claimant for protection. He goes back to the days of the Anti-Corn Law League. Considering the powerful and growing competition that weighs upon British manufacturing industry, it is a question whether the proposed bread tax may not be the last straw on the camel's back; and when the Chancellor looks at the possibilities of taxes on raw materials yet to come, he may well recoil from the prospect.

Of course, the Liberal party will not miss this opportunity to find an issue with which to pull itself together and to oust the Conservatives. Sir William Harcourt has already given notice of his opposition to the bread tax, and the *Daily News* has sounded a trumpet blast against it. The progress of this Parliamentary battle will be watched in other parts of the world with interest as intense as any part of the Boer war from its beginning to the present time.

THE FORTUNES OF HOME RULE.

DUBLIN, March 22, 1902.

After ten years of disunion consequent on the Parnell split, the country has again pulled itself together; but there are no signs that the masses of the population will ever again, in our time at least, be so profoundly stirred by common hopes towards common ends as they were in the days of Repeal and of the Land League. For one thing, emigration has drained off that half of the population in which the seeds of discontent found most congenial soil; for another, the gospel of trades-unionism rather than political belief has taken firm hold on the artisan class, grievances in many directions have been removed, and disestablishment of the Church, instead of inclining Protestants towards Irish ideas, appears to have attached them more firmly than ever to the English interest.

Some £25,000 has within the past eighteen months been subscribed, largely in small sums, towards the support of a renewed national movement. Such fund, in addition to what it is now hoped may be received from the United States and elsewhere, is likely to be kept replenished. The spectacle of four-fifths of the Parliamentary representation in favor of Home Rule steadily maintained, in the face of all differences, through the past twenty-five years still exists. The impressiveness of this protest is considerably weakened by the degree to which, in Ireland, political opinion, as expressed on the platform and in the columns of the national press, appears to stand apart from that expressed in the daily lives of the people. In ordinary intercourse it is shown only in so far as is consistent with material interests. A stranger visiting Ireland sees little of it. Distinctive Irish opinion in shop windows and otherwise is no more to be remarked than in England. The portraits of Mr. Redmond or Mr. Dillon are not to be seen at the photographers'. Even in back

streets and poor shops the glories of the British arms are displayed; and the children of artisans of the better classes go about with "H. M. S. *Revenge*" or "H. M. S. *Bulldog*" upon their hat-bands. It would not be easy to meet a hotel proprietor, driver, or guide who, without having first discerned Home Rule proclivities in a tourist, would acknowledge Nationalist sympathies in himself, or the existence of general interest on the subject in the country. The Irish members are honorably distinguished by absence of self-seeking on their own account. I can think of but one who, in the course of the past twenty-five years, has sold himself to Government. But on general behalf of constituents in desires concerning quartering of troops, Government contracts, chaplaincies, and treatment of Irish soldiers and officers, there is shown little widespread determination to maintain, where personal or money interests are engaged, stern protest against British rule and British misdoings.

On the general surface of affairs in Ireland, there is apparent little of that attitude we are accustomed to associate with a people profoundly dissatisfied with the institutions under which they live. Perhaps similar inconsistency was to be remarked at crises in the history of other countries. The Irish struggle is, however, perhaps one of the longest of its kind recorded in history, and it is to be feared that the unheroic and spasmodic lines upon which it is maintained may have a permanently deleterious effect upon the character of the people. Their naturally amiable and facile disposition works against their success. In the long run, few in Ireland suffer in mind, body, or estate from their most virulent opposition to national desires; while little is forgiven on the other side. In large towns and business centres a man has everything to lose and little to gain through being a Nationalist. This state of things is partly to be accounted for by the extent to which the well-paid Government official element permeates and influences all sections of society, from the highest to the lowest. As the general population of the country has declined, the bureaucracy has increased in proportion and numbers, and has, through open competition, been recruited from all grades. From the lawyers down to the policemen and the boys and girls on probation in the postal service, they and their near connections are under Government control and surveillance, and cannot call their political souls their own. I know an instance of a man losing a lucrative Government post through having subscribed ten shillings to a Boer ambulance fund. In few countries in the world is the governmental control of the purse more astutely and consistently exercised in stifling or directing public opinion.

In comparing the force of the Irish movement with what it was formerly, we must realize that the Protestant element therein is less and less apparent. It remains to be proved whether Mr. Russell will be able to marshal the agricultural section of it into effective union for land reform, and whether, if successful in that direction, it will have learned to cast away its fear of the mass of its Catholic countrymen, and to sympathize with their political aspirations. The Catholic clergy have withdrawn their countenance to a considerable extent from the agrarian and to a lesser extent

from the Home Rule agitation. The university question settled, it is doubtful whether they would desire further radical change. The liquor influence in politics has become more and more powerful and more selfish. It has been strong enough to oust from political life in Ireland some of the men, Catholics and Protestants, whose services on purely national grounds it would have been most desirable to retain. Some of the least worthy representatives owe their seats to publican influence.

A backwash to the political movement has developed from an unexpected quarter—the preservation and study of the Irish language. Strange as it may appear, the Gaelic League is, from certain points of view, being run in opposition to the United Irish League. From small beginnings six years ago, it has attained to widespread influence. Ireland, perhaps influenced by the extent to which ceremony holds place in the church of the majority, delights in political ceremony and procession. Last Sunday the Gaelic League made a display in the streets of Dublin which, for orderliness, character, and numbers, has rarely been equalled. Some years must elapse before we can really judge as to the extent to which this League will forward the general use of Irish. Appearances are at present in its favor. Where formerly nothing was heard of the language, weekly and monthly journals circulate, and columns in the *Freeman* and other daily and weekly papers are devoted to it. Scarcely a week passes that some new work in Irish or some new aid to study is not to be found on booksellers' counters. The language is in evidence as it never was before. It is being studied to their advantage by thousands who would never have applied themselves to the acquisition of any other tongue.

The motto of the movement is "Sinn fein, sinn fein amain"—Our own, our own alone. Doubtless it owes much of its strength and popularity to its being a safe and respectable outlet for Irish feeling, free, to the young official and other classes, from the suspicion of disloyalty. It dare not openly oppose the national movement, it owes part of its power and influence to dependence upon it; but upon the whole it is, as I have said, being run upon lines in opposition to older national ones. It preaches the doctrine that language more than separate political institutions forms the basis of distinctive nationality, and that Irish national movements from the days of Swift have been mistaken in that they sought to follow English rather than Irish ideals. (We are not informed as to the peculiarly Irish ideals in government that we should strive after.) Grattan, O'Connell, and Parnell are no longer to be regarded as prime heroes. "We actually have in our possession a great treasure, more valuable than any of the things which the power of England has taken from us, which ought to be guarded more jealously than fortress or river, viz., national language." If this movement should result in breaking the continuity of national thought, and in intercepting for a generation youthful sympathy from old ideals, more damage would be done to the cause of political nationality than could be accomplished by many Chamberlains; and failures and disappointment have made apparent in the country an unwonted spirit of cynicism in pub-

lic affairs. This is especially voiced in the *Leader*, a weekly journal that has attained wide circulation among all classes. Talk about Home Rule is declared to be all *Rameis* (shadows), sympathy with the Boers unreal; the politicians are "surfaces"; the only objects worthy real pursuit by Irishmen are the use of the Irish language and Irish manufactures, the revival of Irish manners and customs and Irish ways of thought. In addition to these themes is to be noted much admirable denunciation of drinking usages and of the influence of the liquor interest.

E pur si muove. Home Rule still holds the field here, and even on the other side of the Channel, as a solution of the Irish difficulty. That it does so is largely due to the blindness of the Government itself. Were it content to spend, in buying out the Irish landlords, one-fourth the sum it has already lavished upon the South African war; did it not find it necessary to support the doings of Dublin Castle through thick and thin, to keep men like Judge O'Connor Morris on the bench, and to justify every police outrage, the path of the Home Ruler would be more clouded than it is at present. D. B.

MADAME RÉCAMIER.—II.

PARIS, March 26, 1902.

At the end of the Directory and during the Consulate, Madame Récamier had not yet distinctly attached herself to any political party. France was passing through a period of rapid transformation. The familiar society of Madame Récamier was a sort of mirror of this transformation; new names were mixed up with old names; the Montmorencys met Gen. Murat, Madame Murat and Madame Baccocchi, the sisters of the First Consul, Eugène de Beauharnais, his step-son. Madame Récamier was anxious to count Gen. Bonaparte in her court, and made advances to Lucien Bonaparte. Lucien, from humble beginnings, had become a member of the Cinq-Cents, and, after the 18th Brumaire, had been appointed Minister of the Interior. He was only twenty-five years old. Without being as handsome as his brother, the First Consul, he had good features; he was extremely vain, and while he conceded to his brother superiority in military matters, he intimated that in political matters he was himself inferior to nobody. He affected to be a sort of Don Juan, and he wished for a moment to put Madame Récamier on his list of the "due mille." She deceived him by her amiable manners, but if she was a coquette, she was nothing more. Madame de Boigne, who knew her well, says even that "the term coquette does not exactly suit Madame Récamier; she exercised coquetry too much *en grand* to be called an ordinary coquette." She went to Lucien's soirées; they became intimate enough to exchange letters. In a recent sale of autographs (May 27, 1895) there were thirty-three letters from Lucien to Madame Récamier, full, says M. Charavay, who made the catalogue, of burning declarations and of incessant complaints of the coldness of Madame Récamier. M. Turquan gives the text of some of these letters.

It is clear, from all we know, that Madame Récamier offered to Lucien only her friendship in return for his love; that she was