

LITERARY REGISTER.

Supplement
to Daily
"Observer."

VOL. V.—TUESDAY, JULY 14, 1891.—No. 50.

Price 12½ cents.
R4 per annum.FROM CALIFORNIA VIA CANADA, TO
FLORIDA ON THE CARS.

(A LECTURE, REVISED AND ENLARGED.)

(Continued from page 387.)

BACK FROM NEW ENGLAND.

The country through which I travelled back from Boston was very attractive and must be charming in summer time: every little farm with its carefully tilled orchard, in which apples, pears, quinces, gooseberries and other cold climate fruits grow; undulating country with plenty of hill and valley, the road and field boundaries marked by pine, maple, elm, walnut, horse chestnut and other trees. I passed by Springfield, the arsenal celebrated in Longfellow's poem, on through Connecticut alongside a fine river—for it is strange how in America nearly every navigable river has a railway at least along one bank, very often on both, so determined are these people to save time in their transport of goods as well as passengers. I passed the sites of several manufactories of world-wide celebrity;—and no wonder; for they are townships in themselves with residences, schools, churches and every comfort and convenience for the workpeople; of such is the Manufactory of Messrs Fairbank in which every conceivable kind of scales for weighing every sort of commodity is manufactured. Of these is the Waterbury Factory with 300 hands, turning out 600 watches a day, that is one watch for each working minute, the price of each being 2 dollars and 43 cents, of which it is said the odd 3 cents is the cost, the rest profit! Or the Willimantic Cotton Mill with its stained glass roof, its little art galleries between the workshops; flower-beds among the machines, with art, singing and night schools and a staff of teachers. All these examples and many more I heard of or saw, of hard constant labour combined with culture such as is almost unknown in England. Dollar worship is nearly supreme in New York, but in New England the rich man is not respected unless he has a Model Factory, or starts a free Library, or a Temperance town, or endeavours in some way to exercise a wide influence for good, by his character or his money, over the lives of others. I was more amused by another factory of which I was told, namely one for the manufacture of tooth-picks, where, out of poplar and birch wood trees, a two-horse load of tooth picks is manufactured every day and forwarded to Boston, thence to be distributed to "chewers" all over the Union. Now, I am bound to say that I saw very little of the use of these tooth-picks in the course of my travels, altho' at one time people in England believed that the men of Boston drove about with their boots sticking out of the carriage windows, and that New Yorkers picked their teeth with bowie knives. As I am writing, I do recall the fact that on all hotel tables, as on the Continent of Europe, glasses full of tooth-picks

were placed between every 3 or 4 guests; but I certainly never observed their use there or in railways or steamers in any unpleasant manner.

ADVERTISING AND THE PRESS IN AMERICA.

I next visited Newhaven, to call on one of the greatest Advertising Agents in America, if not in the world, the Messrs Hubbard, whose Establishment file, or do business with some 20,000 newspapers belonging to the United Kingdom and its Dependencies, and some 13,000 belonging to the United States. And this reminds me of the extraordinary pitch to which Advertising is carried by our cousins of the West. They say, truly enough, that "trying to do business without advertising is like a man winking in the dark; he may be winking very hard, but nobody knows it." All over the States one is everywhere reminded that the Americans are an advertising people. The railway Companies alone spend fabulous sums annually while every hotel, manufacturer, merchant and trader of every degree follows suit. There are advertising cars placarded on every side on some of the railway lines. Advertisement placards are found on the highest mountains, and I think it was near the summit of the Rockies that I innocently borrowed a glass to make out an inscription, on a conspicuous point, and read it word by word: "Chew Jackson's Best Plug"; and on another spot we had somebody's Liver Pills or old Mother Hubbard's Soothing Syrup. In the Southern States, when I was there, a very curious placard was common:—"Chew Christian's Comfort," no doubt some first-class Virginian tobacco brand. As for the display and ingenuity practised over Advertisements in American newspapers, they are endless. And this brings me to some other peculiarities of the Western press in the freedom with which they describe little personal matters. In a Denver paper, I read: "Mrs. Thos. Hamilton, crazed by misfortune, suicided this morning by jumping into an empty well." And here are little paragraphs cut from a leading City of Kansas paper:—"The baby of Mrs. B. weighs, we are informed 12 lbs. The lady hopes to be about again soon." "Mrs. B. W. Perkins, wife of Congressman Perkins, of Kansas, left for Chicago and Wisconsin last evening by the Pennsylvania route, to visit friends and her little girls who are attending school in Wisconsin. She will be gone some three or four weeks." Americans reminded me when I referred to these, that "the Court" paragraphs of the "London Times" about the Princess so and so riding and driving were quite as personal. With people constantly arriving from all parts of the world, to settle, the collection of names in America could not fail to be varied and odd. This is seen in the names of towns: here are curious ones:—East Hallelujah, Hogspen, Tombstone, Out Shin, Zan, Bet, Rawhide, Black Jack, Dirt Town, Jug Tavern, and Out Off. Some of the classical names are striking, if not appropriate:—Brutus, Cicero, Diana, Hannibal, Iliou, Lysander, Jerusalem, Marathon, Troy, Ovid, Pompey, Romulus, Solon, Sempronius,

Ulysses, Virgil, and many more occur under this head. Then there were Vienna, Java, Naples, Milan, Ossian, Volney, Wilna, Malta, Dryden, Denmark, Genoa, Junius, Parma, Salamanca, Lodi, and the like.

Mr. Freeman mentions having seen a notice on a Church door of "An Adult Gent's Bible-class" and in some places, notably New York and Chicago, preachers are advertised as great "stars", while other attractions are offered in such as an appeal posted on the doors of Church:—

"No reason for not coming!

Free seats;

Books supplied to the congregation,

The public are requested to leave the books in the seats after use."

We all know the story of the lisping young mother giving the name of her baby to the old clergyman at a christening as "Lucyther" (Lucy, Sir) and his horrified reply "Lucifer, never—I will name the child John!"—followed by the case of parents who wishing their boy named "Napoleon Bonaparte" early in the century, were told "one of your Jacobite names: he must be called George." Well the American parallel is that of the couple who wished their child called after a pro-slavery president, Thos. Jefferson, but whom the New England parson quickly settled:—"Thos. Jefferson, the name of the devil—John Adams I baptize thee."—The Rev. Beuen Thomas in one of his letters to show that the simplicity of English country folk is paralleled in New England, mentions how an elderly woman applying for the rite of confirmation in an Episcopal church, the clergyman surprised at her age asked if she had not been confirmed before: "Oh yes," she replied, "I have been done fifteen times, for I ally's heard it were good for rheumatics"! But anything of this kind must be a very rare experience in America, where education is universal, and was most liberally fostered in every State of the Union long before Britain awoke to the responsibility of schools for the masses. The pity is that the old Indian names, are not more freely adhered to; but we have still Tuscarora, Susquehannah, Monongohela, Alabama, and in New England these strange-looking but very musical Indian names Kataklin, Chocorna, the Winnepesaukee, the Pemigewasset and the Merrimac. I have, in passing, noticed how nearly every town in the Western, Middle and indeed South-Eastern States, has a descriptive name attached to its ordinary one. Thus San Francisco is the Golden, or sometimes the Bay Window City; Denver the City of the Plains; Kansas, the Grain City; Chicago the Prairie or Lawn City; New York the Empire City; Baltimore the Monumental City; New Orleans the Crescent City, and so on.

I did not get so far North as Maine; but it was my fortune in crossing both the Pacific and the Atlantic to be thrown into company with gentlemen belonging to this State, of more than ordinary force of character and curious experiences. In crossing the Atlantic we had a Maine resident, the owner of some hundreds of square miles of timber land in the State, showing how great an area is still uncultivated even in New England. Maine is of course well-known for its anti Liquor Laws; I heard a curious story in Toronto in reference to these. The managing editor of the *Globe* of that city perplexed by contradictory accounts, got sworn in as "Special Commissioners" to report on the working of these Maine laws a publican and a total abstainer. The publican came back *converted*, bringing his report; and the teetotaller came back *converted* also! A Mr. Mirams, however, contends that the State of Maine (with its million people) is more like Eden

than any other portion of the globe; but then the America humourist is equal to the occasion, for he replies that "Eden was a teetotal settlement no doubt; but considering the limited population, the average of offences seems to have run high!"

Finally, I must refer to the beautiful and varied scenery which the New England States present. No need to go to Europe or even to California or Colorado to find scenery, so long as there are the White Mountains of New Hampshire, the Green Mountains of Vermont, the Berkshire Hills, or the Housatonic Valley with cool sequestered glens, gleaming lakes, foaming waterfalls, hanging woods and bold mountain forms. As Edward Everett with the patriotism of an American has said:—"I have been something of a traveller in my own country and in Europe. I have seen all that is most attractive from the Highlands of Scotland to the Golden Horn of Constantinople, and from the summit of the Hartz Mountains to the Fountain of Vaucluze; but my eye has yet to rest on a lovelier scene than that which smiles around you as you sail from Weir's Landing to Centre Harber or Lake Winnepesaukee." Again as to river scenery, Dilke declares, "the Hudson is grander than the Rhine; the Susquehanna is lovelier than the Meuse; the Schuylkill prettier than the Seine; the Mohawk more enchanting than the Dart. Of the rivers of Northern Europe, the Neckar alone is not beaten in the States." Why then, it may be asked, do Americans so freely travel in England and Scotland—"Ah," as one of them has said in answer to the question, "the historical interest is wanting to a great extent in our own country: Walter Scott has done more for the Highlands of Scotland than its scenery of itself could ever have done."

PART II: TO FLORIDA.*

WASHINGTON AND VIRGINIA.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have now carried you very rapidly over 4000 miles across and up and down the American Continent. But from New York, I have still to go along some 2000 miles more in travelling through Pennsylvania, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia to Florida; and back via Western Georgia, Tennessee, and West Virginia. As in leaving San Francisco, our start this time from New York is made by crossing a Ferry to Jersey City where the depôt of the Pennsylvania Railway—one of the most substantial in the country—is situated. Our journey of 90 miles to Philadelphia is done in 2½ hours and takes us through a busy occupied country, past Princeton, with its famous College and such towns as New Brunswick, Trenton and a very small "Bristol." I made no stay in going South at Philadelphia, but hurried on (another 140 miles) past Delaware, Wilmington, Chester and Newark through the Highlands of Maryland reminding one much of pasture land in Scotland, leaving all traces of frost and winter behind and hailing a clear sky and delightful climate as there burst on our view the far extending Chesapeake bay below Beltimore. The "Monumental City" itself is built on high ground on one side of our railway line, so that little is seen from the station and I had to travel on 40 miles farther to Washington. My recollection of the journey is one of wonder at the constant succession of bridges over arms of the sea. Long before entering Washington station, the dome of

* This lecture was also delivered in several towns in the island by Mr. J. Ferguson: it is now published in a revised form.

the Capitol arrests attention, and altogether the approach to the seat of Government, "the Virgin Capital," the "City of Magnificent Distances," made a very favourable impression. To the south and west is seen the river Potōmac—a name made very familiar during the Secession war. Beyond it rise the hills of "Old Virginiy" and nearer the rolling wooded heights of Arlington, the home of the Lees; while up the river one can almost see "Harper's Ferry" where "John Brown's body lies mouldering in the grave." On the other side we have undulating well-wooded Maryland and down the river I am shown by my American fellow-traveller from Japan, who is waiting for me at the station, the hills which cluster round Mount Vernon and Washington's grave. Washington is a city full of interest and attractiveness and as it fills up, will become one of the most imposing capitals on the face of the globe. The public buildings are on a magnificent scale: its Capitol the pride of America is the noblest work of man perhaps on the continent, and its avenues and streets are laid out for posterity on a design, the advantage of which will only be fully realized, some 50 years hence. The Houses of Parliament at Westminster are perhaps more chaste and handsome than the Capitol in style, the latter being severely simple in outline, but whereas Westminster is of freestone, the Capitol at Washington is of white marble, all except the central portion, and its handsome dome rises like a crown over the city to a height of 307 feet above the base line, 377 feet above the sea, or three times the height of the Colombo Clock tower. The building is 751 feet long, 324 feet deep and covers nearly $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres. Its site is a gently rising hill surrounded by 50 acres of ornamental grounds. The city covers $4\frac{1}{2}$ by $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles with wide avenues laid out at right angles—some of them 160 feet wide—planted with splendid trees, the population at present being 150,000. What it will be 100 years hence, it is difficult to say. There are numerous squares and very fine hotels, besides public buildings and institutions in different parts of the town. White House, the residence of the President, is quite distinct, and a mile away from the Capitol and more in the town, though surrounded by its own garden and grounds. Still it is as open and accessible to the public as any of the Government offices. The great block of the Treasury buildings close by rather dwarfs White House, but the latter is very finely placed with La Fayette Park in front and glimpses of the blue Potomac from the grounds. In the square we have statues of Andrew Jackson, Generals Scott, Thomas, Greene and MacPherson and Admiral Farragut.

A monument on Capitol Hill to Lincoln, reared by the Negro people whom he declared free, and a colossal Washington monument—whose monument is in fact the city which bears his name—command attention. Among other sights I went to see were the National Observatory and the noble Smithsonian Institution (founded by an Englishman) the National Museum; the Patent Office with its wonderful and yet orderly array of models; the Bureau of Printing—one of the largest government offices in the world,—and the Bureau of Agriculture where, introduced by the Secretary of State, I had a profitable time, the Director, first of all asking if, being from Ceylon, I knew the *Tropical Agriculturist*, which he handed to me as one of the most useful publications on his file; introducing me afterwards to the founder of the *American Agriculturist*, who also knew the *T. A.*, and who had made a large fortune, only to lose it through the fault of friends whom he had trusted, "but," said he cheerfully, "I have enough for my daily wants, and when I was well off, I invested as much as 70,000 dollars in Churches

"and Schools for the benefit of my scattered pioneering countrymen in the Far West, which is a permanent investment worth thinking of." Mr. Saunders took me to see his tea-plants growing in the open air and in the Government Agricultural Grounds and (how small the world is!) he showed me a letter he had that day received from a Ceylon planter in Florida inquiring about seeds and plants he wanted.

He remarked: "Men of this intelligent character, interested in new things are the right stamp of pioneers for Florida." I thought of Dr. Trimen and our Ceylon training of planters in New and Old Products. Mr. Saunders thought much of his tea nursery and experiments in different parts of the Southern States, but he was quiet when I spoke of our cheap labour in the Far East and asked how in a country where no Negro, much less white man, would give a day's labour under 1 or 2 dollars a day, he was to pluck his leaf? Under my American fellow-traveller and friend's care, I went to call on President Arthur, as every stranger in Washington is expected to do; but a meeting of the Cabinet was being held, and, after inspecting the principal rooms and leaving cards, we went across to the hotel where General Grant, in very poor health, was then staying*; he was absent on a visit; so my friend determined not to be foiled in showing me the big-wigs, took me to the Treasury to see the Foreign Secretary. I deprecated the step, saying "your Minister of State is too busy to see a stranger with no business, who, if you were in London, would no more think of getting you introduced to Lord Granville or even his Under-Secretary, than of flying." My friend, however, with his long China residence and business, was well-known to Mr. Frelinghuysen who was glad to see us and to chat away after a homely, but intelligent fashion for a few minutes. He was interested in learning that the States were gaining some colonists from remote Ceylon. I spent some time in the Capitol attending the sittings in both Houses of Congress; the session being on. Its bronze gate or door, cast at Munich, weighing 20,000 lb. 17 feet high 9 wide, commemorates the discovery of America by Columbus, and has been compared to Ghiberti's at Florence, which Michael Angelo declared to be worthy of the gates of Paradise. We pass into a spacious hall or Rotunda, the panels of which have some remarkable paintings, but more noteworthy is the statue to Liberty on the Ball over the Capitol. The Chamber of Representatives is fine and commodious, far more roomy and convenient than the House of Commons as each member sits at his separate desk and the President, or Speaker (Carlisle) on his forum, while the galleries give plenty of accommodation for the press and public; but there is little speaking of public interest, nearly all the work being done in Committees. I was not impressed with the appearance of the

* I heard a very characteristic story of this hard headed granitic Soldier: after his journey round the world, General Grant was entertained by Sir William Armstrong, the great manufacturer of one-hundred-ton guns. At the same time the Iron and Steel Association of Great Britain was in session at Newcastle-upon-Tyne. The guests had been taken through the works where those monster cannon are made. During the toast at the banquet Sir William made some eulogistic remarks of the distinguished General who was present, and closed by proposing the health of General Grant. When Grant arose to respond he said: "Gentlemen, fill your glasses; I propose the health of our host—the man of peace. I call him the man of peace, for, as we have seen today, he is the manufacturer of the greatest peace-compelling implements that the world has ever seen."

Commons of America, and the dignity of their assembly was still further detracted from by the freedom with which messenger lads passed from member to member, and through the house, a number of them ready to answer calls, being crowded behind the Speaker's chair. The Senate House was more imposing, the Vice-President in the Chair and the senators being all men of mark and ability, though not always of correspondingly high character:—Senator Sherman, brother of the General, a stern old Republican; Fry, Garland, Jones, Vance and General Logan—advanced Democrats—were pointed out amongst others. Each Senator is paid £2,500, each Congress-man £1000 per annum besides "milage expenses." Colonels and Generals abounded even amongst the Lobbyists and the Press representatives. I had a letter from a New York journalist to one General, among the smartest of the Press telegraph and reporting agents, and I found him very keenly looking after the interests of the journal he represented. Of course stories of Lincoln abound in Washington, I give you two:—

In his lawyer days, while travelling on circuit he was once accosted in a railway car by a stranger: "Excuse me, sir," said his fellow-traveller, "But I have an article in my possession which belongs to you."

"How is that?" replied Lincoln.

The stranger produced a clasp-knife and continued: "This knife was given me some years ago with the stipulation that I was to keep it until I found a man uglier than myself. Allow me now to say, sir, that you are fairly entitled to the property."

During a debate in Congress in which Mr. Lincoln and his party were much interested, the member for Wabash opposed the measure on the ground of its unconstitutionality with much energy and wrongheaded zeal. No amount of calm reasoning had any effect on him. At length Mr. Lincoln entered the discussion and changed the tactics of the campaign. "Mr. Speaker," said he, "the attack of the member for Wabash reminds me of an old friend of mine. One morning, just after the old man got up, he imagined, on looking out of his door, that he saw a rather lively squirrel, in front of his house. So he took down his rifle and fired at the squirrel, but the squirrel paid no attention to the shot. He reloaded and fired again, and then again, until after the thirteenth shot he impatiently set down the gun and said to his boy, who was looking on: "There's something wrong about this rifle." "Rifle's all right; I know 'tis," answered the boy. "But where's your squirrel?" "Don't you see him, humped up about halfway up that tree?" said the old man, peering over his spectacles and getting mystified. "No, I don't," answered the boy: and then, turning and looking into his father's face, he added, "But I see your squirrel now! You've been firing at a flea on your eyebrow." The House was in a moment convulsed with laughter, and the discomfiture of the member for Wabash was complete, the story having gained point and ludicrousness from the circumstance that the honorable senator was himself endowed with unusually shaggy and prominent eyebrows.

I also attended the Supreme Court and saw nine judges on the Bench under the presidency of Chief Justice Waite, who in appearance reminded me a good deal of Sir Edward Creasy. The Supreme Court in the United States has great Constitutional authority. The strange part is that the Cabinet Ministers should not have seats in the Congress to answer for their Departments and work. They merely sit in their offices and give information as called for by the Congress. The American press have lately been complaining that the Secretaries were not obliged to have seats to defend their policies from attack, and one authority wrote:—"The English premier, it is safe to say, performs more real hard work, intellectual and physical in one month than the President and his

entire Cabinet in half a year." There can be no doubt of the enormous amount of corruption attending legislation in Washington. I could not understand the great crowd of people with business, apparently, on hand, attending the Capitol, till I was told how "Lobbyists" meant men who had bills to pass, and who knew how to secure votes for the same. If one wants to see a very true picture of the Washington Parliament and Government, I would recommend the perusal of a clever, well-written American novel (by H. James) called "Democracy." At the hotel to which my friend took me to stay, I met a number of the Southern members and their families, and I was by no means favorably impressed by them; in fact the farther south I went in America, the more I saw of the typical Yankee and heard the nasal twang, while, in Boston and New England and especially in Philadelphia, I seemed to be among Englishmen.

General Lloyd S. Bryce in "Socialism Through American Spectacles," in asking the pertinent question, "Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?"—who shall look after the officials appointed to carry out State Socialism?—tells a good story attributed to Abraham Lincoln: "Down in Delaware once, the people thought that monkeys could be trained to pluck peaches, and a carload of monkeys was sent down there, and they were actually trained to do so. The only trouble was, it took two men to watch each monkey in order to prevent him cutting up tricks and eating the peaches and destroying them as fast as he plucked them." A Washington journal has actually been complaining lately that the men who make laws for the United States are not only open to inducements as to passing Bills, but are guilty of small peculations from the Government in the shape of the furnishing of the Parliamentary offices and Committee rooms which are nearly cleared out at the end of each Session, clocks, rugs, even dishes and chairs disappearing! What should we say if an M. P. were to carry home furniture from the House of Commons' Smoking room.

I would not go so far as Mr. Lowell who lately in a general way warned a Boston audience that no country was safe that allowed itself to be governed by its blackguards.* Perhaps his warning was for Washington; perhaps for London with Parnell and his followers?

* There is some truth in Max O'Rell's criticism though he ought to have drawn a line between Senators and Congress-men. He says in his recent book:—

"No man with any self-respect has anything to do with affairs of State, and when a senator gains by some mischance an invitation to a select party,"—says the writer with characteristic exaggeration,— "the master of the house, on hearing his name announced, first enjoins on his servant to keep an eye on the silver, and then sees that the hats and coats in the hall are counted. With all their openness and cordiality there exist in some American cities certain circles more reserved and select than any in Mayfair or in the Faubourg St. Germain. On the journey out from Liverpool a party of American men played poker incessantly with an entirely fresh oath for every card they threw down. On the Sunday morning a young lady was playing sacred airs on the piano, and the poker party coming into the saloon stood around, and for two hours sang hymns and psalms with the greatest cheerfulness and energy. Max O'Rell has, he is sorry to say, met men in other countries who swore; he has also met, he is glad to say, men who sang hymns, but he believes America to be the only place which produces men who do both with equal facility. The American girl possesses many charming qualities, but she overdresses; and the word simplicity is not found in the vocabulary of the New York dressmaker."

Clearly President Cleveland in attempting the reform of the Civil Service and other reforms had his work cut out for him. It is difficult to know how far his own party, the Democrats, supported him: his strongest supporters were the "Mug-wumps," the extraordinary name coined for the independent Republicans who broke away from their party, to support Cleveland as President.*

America is the country of strange political and social names, such as the "Stalwarts," "Barnburners," "Half-breds." The Machine, the Boss, Caucus are more familiar, but a "Gerry-mander" is a thorough federalist war-cry, also "Roorbacks," "Sea anchors," "Psters," "Copper-heads," "Short-horns," "Swallow-tails" with the "Sand-lots" and old "Furs and Feathers."

I may as well quote at some length from an American writer who writes with care of the United States Government:—

The men who framed the American Constitution were lawyers. They knew nothing practically of any law except the English law; they had no practical knowledge of the workings of any constitution except the English Constitution, and they were afraid to trust themselves too far away from the ancient landmarks with which they were familiar. They therefore proposed for the new nation in the western world the English trinity of government—king, lords, and commons. They made the king elective for four years, not by the people at large, but by a select body of citizens called Electors; they made the House of Lords elective for six years, also by a select body called the State Legislatures; the House of Commons they adopted nearly in the shape they found it in the English Constitution. The king they called the President; the House of Lords they called the Senate; the House of Commons they called the House of Representatives. In this way they transplanted to the new Continent a part of the feudal system of Europe, curiously enough, just at the very time when that system was about to be overthrown by a violent revolution in France, and by a peaceful revolution in England. They made the President, like the king, the fountain of honour, whence flowed the offices and dignities of the Government; they made him, like the king, the fountain of justice, and gave him the appointment of all the judges; they made him, like the king the fountain of mercy, and clothed him with the power to pardon; they made him like the king, commander-in-chief of the army and the navy; and they gave him the royal veto when, in practice, that power had utterly ceased in England. When the framers of the Constitution invested the President with the power to veto Acts of Congress, no King of England had

* Tom Hughes on one of his visits to his Tennessee Settlement wrote thus to the *Spectator*:—

"MUG-WUMP!" I should like to ask you, Sir—not as Editor, not even as English gentleman, but simply as a vertebrate animal—what you would do if a stranger were all of a sudden to call your intimate friends 'mug-wumps,' not obscurely hinting that you yourself laboured under whatever imputation that term may convey. I don't know what the effect might have been in my own case, but that the story of O'Connell, as a boy, shutting up the voluble old Dublin apple-woman by calling her a 'paralleloiped,' rushed into my head, and set me off laughing. I haven't been able to learn more of the etymology of the word than that it is said over here to have been first used in a sermon (?) by Mr. Ward Beecher, and now denotes 'bolters' or 'scratches,' as they were called last autumn, or in other words, the Independents, who broke away from the party machine of Republicanism and carried Cleveland. More power to the 'mug-wumps' elbow, say I; and I only wish we may catch the mug-wumps, 'mug-wumpism,' or whatever the name for the disease may be, in England before long."—Since the advent of President Harrison with Mr. Blaine as Chief Secretary, we do not hear much of reform.

exercised it against Parliament for ninety-seven years; it has never been exercised in England since, and under the reformed Constitution of Britain it can never be exercised again. Not satisfied with depriving the king of the veto power, the Commons of England did not stop until they had deprived him of all political power whatsoever, until now the Queen 'reigns, but does not govern.' The government is carried on in her name, and her signature is necessary to give validity to Acts of Parliament, but her political action is directed by the advice of ministers who are responsible to the House of Commons. The impression of the Great Seal is necessary to give validity to certain documents, but the Great Seal itself is only a piece of brass. Its acts are mechanical, and so are the governmental acts of the Queen. The king being shorn of political power, the House of Lords was at last brought into subjection to the House of Commons. In striking contrast to the past ninety-five years' history of the English monarchy, is the ninety-five years' history of the American republic. During that time, the United States has, by the vast increase of its territory, its population, and its wealth, multiplied the influence of the Senate, relatively decreased that of the House of Representatives, and by investing the President with the character of a party leader, armed with the veto, has made him a real political power equal to two-thirds of both Houses of Congress. Thus, while preserving the republican form, it has reached in practice very nearly the shape and character of the English monarchy of old time. Since the English people cut off the head of King Charles, and dethroned his son, they have not had a king who possessed or exercised one half the royal prerogatives and powers that are enjoyed by the President of the United States to-day. Next to monarchy, the most offensive political institution to Americans is hereditary aristocracy. But, if they have an aristocracy, it is of little consequence with what adjectives they qualify it. It may be ill-mannered and offensive, but it is only injurious to the people in proportion to its political power, and its distance from popular control. An elective aristocracy may be as expensive and mischievous as any other. A senator in the American Congress has twenty times more political power than a peer of England. The House of Lords cannot obstruct measures of legislation for more than a single session, the American Senate may stand for years an immovable obstacle in the way of popular advancement and reform. A social democracy cannot flourish in any country that recognises and maintains a political aristocracy. The American Senate is the most important political aristocracy that has existed in the modern world. A Roman senator never possessed as much political authority and social influence as an American senator has to-day. Although Rome was as large in territory as the United States, and had a larger population subject to her dominion, she never had under her control so much wealth for power to act upon. Other aristocracies have existed with larger personal privileges than the American senators have, but none with so much legislative power. An American senator may by a single vote give away a million acres of land. He may by another vote bestow a franchise worth a million dollars, a franchise too that the Supreme Court will decide no other Congress may reclaim or take away. Think of the vast interests of the United States under the legislative control of seventy-six men, not one of them elected by the people. Imagine the partnership of Illinois in the National Government represented in one branch of the legislature by only two men, responsible to nobody. Let it be borne in mind that the members of the United States Senate will in personal wealth average the ownership of more than a million dollars each, and it becomes at once apparent that such an important aristocracy was never known before.

The judicial branch of the American Government was made exclusively aristocratic beyond any taint of popular control. The English plan of appointing judges was adopted by the fathers, and embalmed in the Constitution, without any change or amendment. The judges must be appointed by the President, and

their term runs during good behaviour as in England. The theory is that the people are not wise enough nor virtuous enough to be entrusted with the selection of the judges, and therefore they must be appointed by the President. He is, *ex officio*, both wise and virtuous too. In this way the judges are supposed to be raised above party influences and the clamour of the mob. The life tenure is attached to the judicial office that the judges may be independent of executive interference and dictation. The result has been to create a caste, sitting in black cassocks at Washington; luxurious men, deciding by the precedents, except on political questions, and then always according to party lines. The Supreme Court of the United States has itself decided that the American judiciary is not a subordinate but a co-ordinate branch of the government. The 'omnipotence of Parliament' is a phrase never heard in America. The tremendous quality of omnipotence has been appropriated by the Supreme Court, and by force of this extravagant claim of right, it scrutinises Acts of Congress, construes them, amends them, and repeals them. How long would the people of England permit nine judges to pass sentence upon Acts of Parliament, and declare them null? Not an hour; and yet this is the constant practice of the American Supreme Court.

The Toryism of the American Supreme Court would comfort the soul of Lord Eldon. Its conservative jealousy of political changes, and its denial of the power of Congress to interfere with 'vested rights,' have drawn praises from Lord Salisbury, as, indeed, they naturally would, for his lordship knows very well that such a body sitting in Westminster Hall would paralyse Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party. It would make waste paper of Land Acts and Acts of Disestablishment. It would declare the Irish Church Bill unconstitutional for encroaching upon 'vested rights,' and the Irish Land Act void for impairing the obligation of contracts. It once decided that neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislatures had any power to abolish slavery in the territories of the United States. It parodied the dictum of Lord Mansfield that no slave can breathe the air of England, by almost deciding that no free man could breathe the air of the United States.

The House of Representatives is the only branch of the American Government conceded to the democracy by the Constitution. Among all the national officers only representatives in Congress are elected by the people. Even the independence of the House of Representatives itself has been surrendered to the President and the Senate in return for official patronage. Only twice in the past thirty years has the House of Representatives even threatened to exercise its prerogative of stopping the supplies, and in both cases the President was of the opposite political party to the majority in that House. Is there any power short of a violent revolution by which the people of the United States can arrest the prerogative of the President, curb the encroachments of the Senate and give to the House of Representatives a controlling influence in the Government like that possessed by the English democracy in the House of Commons? One course remains within the Constitution, and that is the withholding the supplies. Anticipating the same necessity, the founders of the American Government borrowed the English principle, and embodied it in the Constitution in the following word:—'All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.' There, quietly slumbering in the Constitution, and occupying but three lines of it, lies the power that will some day revolutionise the American Government without bloodshed, that will blunt the edge of the President's prerogative, that will make the House of Representatives the chief power in the government and reduce the Senate to a secondary and inferior position. What has been done in England will be done in America; the conditions are the same, the people are alike, with a common lineage and a common history, the motive powers are the same, and the results will be the same. The real conflict between the

antagonistic forces of the American Government is hardly yet begun. It will burst into a storm when the President and the Senate, banded together in defiance of prerogative, shall resist a resolute House of Representatives fresh from the people, and bearing from the people a message of reform. In that contest the stopping of the supplies will be the conquering weapon, and prerogative must yield, as it had to yield in England.

The President of the United States has in fact far more power for good or evil than the Queen of the United Kingdom, and intelligent Americans realize that the British system of Cabinet and Parliamentary Government under the form of a limited monarchy is about the best Republic yet produced on the face of the earth; while the cost of Presidential elections to the United States is far more than that of Royalty to the old country. One American who complained to me said we have not got a cheap government:—"We might keep a royal family, house them in palaces like Versailles or San Souci, provide them with Courts and guards, Mistresses of Robes and Rangers of Parks, let them give balls more costly than that of Mr. Vanderbilt and build yachts like the Jay Goulds, for much less than is wasted and stolen under our nominal Government of the people. What a noble income would be that of a Duke of New York, a Marquis of Philadelphia or a Count of San Francisco who would administer the Government of those Municipalities for 50 per cent of the present waste and stealage." "Constitutions are not made but grow," as Sir Jas. Mackintosh said; and many observers seeing the wealth and fearful corruption in New York and Washington are reminded of the Italian Republics of the Middle Ages which while there was growing up in them great commercial activity, a development of the arts which made them the envy of Europe, and a building of princely mansions which continue to be the admiration of traveller their people were gradually losing their freedom.

Professional politicians have sprang up within the Constitution of the United States and are practising a system of legislation which only the advent of men of high character (not simply men of education) and power can cope with. Much depends on the President and his Cabinet who for four years rule over 60 millions of people scattered over millions of square miles of country. Cleveland made an honest effort to clean the Augean Stable of corruption, and it would be a good thing if he were re-elected after Harrison, to maintain the work. Max O'Rell is scarcely the man to go to for political opinions, yet there is much truth in what he says as follows:—

I think that it may safely be affirmed that the English are a freer people than the Americans; that the constitutional—I had almost said republican—monarchy of England is preferable to the authoritative democracy of America.

The American Constitution was copied from that of the England of 1776, and the President of the United States was invested with a power about equal to that of George III. Since that date the English have advanced, and the Americans have not politically. The English of the year of grace 1888 would soon give the Queen notice to quit if she took it into her head to ask for power equal to that possessed by the President of the United States; it would take less time, perhaps, than the Americans would need to get rid of a troublesome President.

For four years the Americans are at the mercy of their chief representatives. Scarcely have the latter gone through their apprenticeship in the science of politics and government when they have to go home. The consequence is that they are but novices, politicians but no statesmen. These small politicians excite the

interest of the public so little that the American newspapers furnish their readers with many more details about what is going on at Westminster, at the Palais Bourbon, and at the Reichstag than about what is being done at the Capitol in Washington.

Reforms are talked of in America, but how obtain them? Public opinion has but a secondary influence upon the government. The English would obtain a great constitutional reform far more easily than the Americans. In England, all officials are the servants of the public and are treated as such; in America, they are their masters. The English parliament is constantly influenced by public opinion; the American Congress is not so influenced at all, and the people's representatives rarely give account to their electors of the way in which they have acquitted themselves of their charge.

There is not one out of a thousand educated Americans who do not demand the immediate passing of a Copyright Bill, not one honest newspaper that does not advocate it; yet Congress turns a deaf ear to the wishes of the people with perfect impunity. This is one example among a hundred.

During four years the President has almost *carte blanche*. He can declare war and stop legislation. An authoritative democracy like this seems to present all the dangers of an absolute monarchy without possessing, as a compensation, the advantages of fixity. Yet is there a man, enjoying the use of his mental faculties, who would think of substituting a monarchy for the republic in America?

An English Nonconformist minister writing about Government in America, well criticises indiscriminate "manhood suffrage":—

Everybody is not open to bribery. I do not believe a majority is anywhere. But when parties are evenly balanced, as is so often the case, there will be some hundred of men in every township of any size ready to sell their votes to the highest bidder. And there are some who are ready to take money from both parties, and then either not vote at all, or vote like the Englishman, of whom I heard at your last election, who had promised the *Blues* and had promised the *Reds*—and who, after the polling day, was asked which way he voted. Said he, "I just shut my eyes, and I made a stroke here and a stroke there, and God only knows which way I did vote." Now, a Republican form of Government may be the best or the worst form, according to the men who hold the voting power. I am no believer in manhood suffrage unless it be limited by character. Disenfranchise every man who gives a bribe and takes a bribe; disenfranchise every man who is ever condemned by the law of the country; disenfranchise every fraudulent bankrupt, and every chronic drunkard, and every man who shows himself unworthy to use a vote which involves the interests of others, and then I will go in with you for manhood suffrage; but without a character-limitation, manhood suffrage may be as odious as personal despotism. Many people talk about a property limitation. I am not for that. Property is something outside a man. I go in for the man, not his property. America suffers in fact from the riff-raff and scum of Europe pouring in and very soon claiming equal footing with the native force. Many large towns like New York are ruled by low Irish.

(To be continued.)

HISTORY OF THE WEDDAS OF CEYLON.

EXTRACT FROM SECTION III.

(From a forthcoming "History of the Weddas,"
by A. De Silva, Mudaliyar.)

(Continued from page 388.)

LATIN LANGUAGE.

3. In the Latin language, the words *arcus jacio* signify "to shoot off the arrow": and the word *ejacio* signifies "to eject the arrow from the bow," from which is derived the English Aryan word "eject," collateral in meaning to *arcus jacio*.

As we have discovered a strong support of the derivation of Sanscrit *Rakshasa* in the Greek language, we find not less strong support for our derivation of the Pali *Yakko*, in the Latin language which is another branch dialect carrying affinity with the primitive Aryan dialect.

In the Latin as well as in the Dravidian languages we obtain equally strong support of our derivations both of the Aryan root *Rak* as well as the Pali *yak*, with equally synonymous signification and almost identical etymology, thereby pointing out admixture of Aryan roots in Pali, Sanscrit and Latin, disclosing fraternity of the three dialects with Aryanism, whilst the Dravidian language can claim the admixture from mere proximity to the Aryan settlement of India.

The derivation of Pali *Yakko* is strongly corroborated and supported by the Latin language which possesses the primitive Aryan roots expletive and analogical to the Sanscrit and Pali roots, as shewn in the foregoing exposition.

The Latin phrase *arcus jacio*, which is used to signify "to dart off" or "eject the arrow from the bow"—is synonymous with the Pali *Yakko*.

In Sinhalese, Pali and Sanscrit, the letter (c) is sometimes the symbol for the letter (k), and sometimes for the letters (ch—é) where a Pali intonation is signified; and the letter (y) is the symbol for the letter (j). Transliterating *arcus jacio*, into Sinhalese we produce *arkus yakkio* (doubling the letter (k) according to rules of syllabic combination)—which transliteration does not alter the meaning of the original etymology. In the transliterated *arkus yakkio*, the diphthongal letters (io) in *kio*, may be abbreviated into *ko*, to give it the force of a Pali verbal noun, in which case we make it *arkus yakko*, meaning in Sanscrit and Pali "bow-darter." We see here that *arcus jacio* does not differ from *arkus yakkio*, in any wise other than in intonation of *yak* for *jac*, which is only a variant onomatopoeia. In it we clearly see the admixture of the Sanscrit roots *ark* and *rak* (in *arcus*) and the Pali root *yak* (with the transposition of letters as above noted) corresponding to the Latin root *jac*. Again the Latin word *ejacio*, which bears the same signification as in the preceding instance, may by the same process as in the above case, be converted into *e-yakkio*, present tense, and *ejects* the participle into *e-yak-tus*; English *ejector* (ejector) into *eyaktor*; now giving *egactus* or *ejector* (ejector), a full Pali form and intonation, by substituting the Pali suffix *ko*, for *tus* or *tor*, and transposing the letter (j) into (y), we produce the Pali word *e-yakko*, (doubling of course the letter (k), which is equal to *ejector*: syncoating *e-yak-ko* for euphony's sake, by eliding (e) altogether, we obtain the Pali *yakko*, carrying the same signification as in the first instance, viz., "darter of the arrow," which is a "Wedda," "a bowsman" or "archer." Thus we are enabled to discover combination of the primitive Pali root *yak*, in the Latin phrase *arcus jacio* or *ejacio*, not to allude to its mixture in the English Aryan word *ejector*, which is a thorough derivative from Latin.

We further observe the affiliation of the Latin root *arcus jacio*, with the Sanscrit root *ark* or *rak*, by tracing it in the following order, without at all affecting the signification, viz., in the order of the transliteration above noted, *arkus yakkio*, *ark-yakko*, *arakkako* lastly *arakshasa* (sanskritised form) modifying the root *ark* into *Rak* (which is a better euphonification), we obtain *Rak*; *yakkio*, *Rakkako* (Pali), *Rakshasa* (sanskritised form). Now *Arakkako*, *arakshasa* signifies "bow darter"; *rak-*

kako, rakshasa signifies "bow darter"—eliding both *ark* and *rak*, we produce the simple Pali word *yakko* "bow darter," expressed in Sinhalese by the term *Dada-yakkaro* and *Dada-Wedda* styled *Rakshasa* in the primitive Aryan dialect.

Now to silence all criticisms on the exegesis here given, we may here establish the historical and literary truth connected with the history of Lanka, that the appellations *Rakshasa* and *Yakko*, in all lexicology decidedly means "a hunter," or "Wedda," and that they are both synonymous with the Sinhalese *Dada-yakkaro* and *Dada-wedda* or hunter.

In the same way as above, eliding the word *Dada* in *Dadayakkaro* of the Sinhalese, and substituting *ko* for *karo*, which is synonymous with *ko*, we obtain the Pali *yakko*, "hunter" or "Wedda." Does *Yakko* then mean a "demon"?

4. Even the Dravidian language, which is quite foreign to the Aryan language, is fully competent to purge off the fallacy universally prevalent in the literary world, "that *Yakko* means a demon and not human being." In the Dravidian language the word used to signify "to dart off the arrow," is *e-yan-kutal*, which appears to have been a mimic of the most primitive Pali word *e-yan-kun*, signifying, "to make go or fly off the arrow," or "to hunt," from which Pali root is derived the modernized Sinhalese phraseology *Dada-yan-karanawa*, where the word *Dada* has been substituted for *e*, meaning "the arrow." The common use of the word *Dadayankaranawa* is "to hunt," literally signifying, "to make go the arrow."

The Dravidians seem to have modified the word by the addition of the terminal syllable *tal*, to the Pali word *e-yan-kun*. The participle of the word *e-yan-kun* is *e-yak*, to which by adding the Pali suffix *ko*, signifying "doer" or "actor," we produce the Pali word *e-yak-ko*, which by laconic euphonication comes to be *yakko*, meaning "an archer" or "hunter," to which the Dravidian word *e-yan-kutal* may be reduced by similar process of syncopation, taking *e-yak* as the participle form of the primitive verb. We find *e-yan-kun* to be the most primitive Pali word, but never used in modern Sinhalese colloquy. *Dadayankaranawa* is the common phraseology used instead thereof. The Dravidian verb *e-yan-kutal* carries as much identity as the Pali word as to declare that it is as much adoption of the Pali root *yak*, as the Sinhalese word: the difference being the prefix of *Dada*, in the place of *e*, which means "the arrow," but the Dravidians do not possess this primitive derivation which it virtually admits of, the word being foreign to them.

This admixture of Pali in the Dravidian dialect is to be traced to the fact of Dravidians originally living in the proximity of the old Pali and Sanscrit-speaking sections of the Central Indian community, and receiving modifications and vast accretions by agglutination, down to the period that the Dravidians were expelled to the South beyond the limits of the Aryans. For in their high style of composition most or nearly all Dravidian words are either Pali or Sanscrit words or roots, but their articulations are so constituted as to betray that they have no basis for them in their alphabet, being quite foreign, and having received accretions from the growing and rising dialect.

In the Telingu language the phrase used to mean "to dart off the arrow from the bow," is *Danusha*. Here it is observable that the word *Danu* "the bow," is the more modernized Sanscrit word, and is not as primitive as *rak* or *ark* or as the Latin *arcus*; but the verb *sha* is the very primitive Aryan verb *sha*, as in *Raksha*. So that *Raksha*

and *Danusha* are both Sanscrit terms, Pali synonym whereof is *yakko*, all three meaning sagitarius, "an archer," that is a Wedda or a shooter of the bow, and not a non-human being. *Danusha* is the modernized Sanscrit word identical with the most primitive *Raksha* in signification and application according to its primitive stereotyping. If *Danusha* means a man who hunts with the bow and arrow, of which there is not the least doubt, could *Raksha* then mean one different from a *Danusha*?

(To be concluded.)

WILD ANIMALS AND DROUGHT IN CEYLON.

It is not generally realized how great must be the sufferings experienced by wild animals in the dry districts of the island in times of drought. At such time every pool of water in the jungle is watched night after night by native hunters while the moonlight lasts, and the wretched deer, pig and other wild creatures, if they are not fortunate enough to get shot, wander from drinking place to drinking place unable to quench their thirst. Even elephants have been known to suffer severely from this cause. A well-known officer of the Public Works Department is said to have once found an elephant bogged in the mud of a nearly dry tank into which it had probably waded in the hope of reaching the small mud pool in the centre. The huge creature in its helpless position was being eaten alive by crocodiles! Many stories are related by forest officers and surveyors at sights seen by them in their jungle wanderings, proving how severely wild animals suffer when the jungle tanks and streams "dye up." Sir Emerson Tennent relates how in the Wannai the villagers were often afraid to go to their wells in the dry weather on account of the bears to be constantly found near them sniffing at the water. A forest officer who has been stationed in the dry districts of the North states that on one occasion he found the decomposed body of a bear in a wayside well, and on another occasion a number of wild pigs in an abandoned village well, all of which had jumped down in the agonies of thirst; also that he has twice picked up deer, one of which was a fine antlered elk, lying dead on the seashore, the poor creature having as he supposed in the extremities of thirst gone down and drunk the salt water. The annual loss of life simply from thirst among the wild animals of the jungle districts of the lowcountry must be considerable.

When has a python or rock snake been killed in Ceylon longer than that shot on Barra estate, Rakwana, some 18 feet long, the skin of which, after shrinking to some 14 or 15 feet, is in the Colombo Museum? Mr. Alfred Clark has encountered pythons up to 14 feet in the Northern Province, and he has sometimes found them lying in a pool or tank with their head above the surface as if waiting to seize on prey coming to the waterside.

The Buried Cities of Ceylon.

A GUIDEBOOK to Anuradhapura and Polonnaruwa, with chapters on Dambulla, Kalawewa, Mihintale and Sigiri, with Lithographed Plan of Anuradhapura. By S. M. BURROWS, M. A., Oxon., Ceylon Civil Service. Price: Stiff Paper Cover R2. Boards R250; postage 8s.

Ceylon Observer Office.

Printed and Published by A. M. & J. FERGUSON.