

AFFAIRS IN FRANCE.

THE dispatches from Paris state that great excitement prevailed in that city on the 13th inst., owing to the circulation of a report that President Carnot was shot. Though the report proved untrue, yet there was foundation for it. While the President was engaged in taking a ceremonial part in the opening of a new thoroughfare, a wild-eyed man rushed up to his carriage and discharged a pistol at him, saying "there are more bastilles to be demolished." The would-be assassin proved to be an escaped lunatic from one of the asylums. However, he narrowly escaped becoming a victim to popular displeasure.

President Carnot recently made a journey through the French provinces, and was well received everywhere. The enthusiasm with which he was received, even in old reactionary centers, is noted as one of the most significant events since the establishment of the third French republic. The significance lies not entirely in the fact that Carnot is personally popular, but that at last France as a nation accepts the republic. The clerical party has always manifested outspoken hostility to the republican rule, but on this occasion it received Carnot as warmly as did the other parties. Perhaps this may be attributed to the change which has taken place at the Vatican during the past year in relation to democracy and popular government.

The present French ministry has been in office since March, 1890. It is the strongest France has had in a long time. The men composing it are among the ablest statesmen of Europe. Freycinet is premier and war minister, Constans, minister of the interior, Ribot, foreign affairs, Bouvier finances, while Ives Guyot, Fallieres, Jules Roche and Admiral Barbey hold also cabinet positions. But it is in the improved condition of domestic politics that France at present shows such a reassuring attitude in European affairs. Germany cannot ignore the fact. And if, as it is reported, that Germany and England have entered into an offensive and defensive alliance, perhaps, the time is not far distant when France will test the stability of the compact. Indeed, the report is already in circulation that England will be asked to evacuate Egypt. In the latter country John Bull's interests are two extended to leave except by force.

The men at the head of affairs in France, will not make the demand unless there is something more than sentiment behind it. Everything

points to the belief that Russia and France are and will be allies. But as to Germany and England, it will take something more than a banquet partaken of by the Emperor and his uncle the Prince of Wales, to signify an alliance.

Speaking of the bastille, the memory of which the madman who fired at Carnot yesterday has revived, today is the anniversary of the storming of that infamous institution just 102 years ago. What a horrible picture the history of that time calls up. Paris was given over to chaos and destruction. The French guards disobeyed their officers. The mob ruled. The dregs of humanity pillaged and outraged revelling in drunken fury at their own supremacy. The gates of a monastery were broken down. The libraries, the paintings and the sculpture of the interior were destroyed. The governor of the bastille surrendered to the mob, on condition that no blood would be shed. His name was Launoy. He was afterwards hacked to pieces. These were terrible times in France. Yet some philosophers contend that they were in a certain sense the threshold to better forms of government in many countries.

The French revolution with all its horrors led to the first enfranchisement of Jews in France, and later on, in all the countries of Europe except Russia. It is gratifying to contrast the present improved domestic condition of mercurial Gaul with its fearful history in the past. But if this condition is relied on in the matter of testing the strength of a supposed alliance between two powerful neighbors, then indeed France stands on a chasm as dangerous as she did 102 years ago today.

INGALLS ON PATERNAL GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN J. INGALLS has been paying his respects to the principle of paternal government. He says:

"We have now a new school of political philosophy that is repudiating the Declaration of Independence and is endeavoring to overthrow the maxims of Democracy, and to insist that the race shall not be for the swift nor the battle to the strong; that the distinction ordained by God among men shall be an obliterated statute, so that idleness shall bring the same reward as industry and thrift; that the ignorant shall be as wise as the learned; that debts shall be paid by acts of Congress; that money shall be made as plentiful as the autumn leaves of the forest; that taxation shall be abolished by State Legislatures, and that prosperity shall be forcibly distributed equally among all men."

We can now more clearly understand how it was that the mention of the name of Ingalls as successor to himself in the United States Senate made every member of the Kansas Alliance turn faint at the

stomach. That men who were depending upon an act of congress providing them with cheap money from the United States treasury as their hope of prosperity and happiness, should look upon a return of Ingalls as an omen of no good to them, is clear enough now. But we are curious to know how these people happened to learn so much of Mr. Ingalls' sentiments. If he had uttered such words as these in the Senate they would have caused an amazement among the Republicans of that body so profound that the world would have been made acquainted with the fact at once.

We are very glad, nevertheless to have Mr. Ingalls so express himself, even at this late period. The principle as he expresses it, of "the government doing everything and the people doing nothing," is not American. A perpetual system of governmental supervision over the business and social concerns of the people, beyond what is necessary to maintain its integrity as a power of last resort, would be exceedingly dangerous to liberty. It is the foundation of despotism. The difference between the interference of a klug with the private and personal affairs of his subjects, and the perpetual meddling of a body of people's representatives with private business, is not worth talking about. In effect the one is tyranny just as much as the other, and just as much subversive of natural right.

The government that undertakes the task of being "a father to its people," to the extent of paying their debts and improving their farms for them, would be making a contract which it could not fulfill, besides running a great risk of prostrating its power and influence with the large majority of its citizens who cannot and would not if they could receive an iota of the benefits of such a principle. The strength of a free government must of necessity depend directly upon a preponderance of citizens who are self-reliant and self sustaining to the fullest extent; whose self-respect would spurn the thought of pecuniary aid from their government, as promptly if it came through the medium of special legislation as they would if proffered by the commissioner of the city poor house.

Experience has proven that when a government descends from its original design of governing to the business of indiscriminate charities, or subsidies, if you please, for every dollar distributed to worthy applicants, a hundred will fall into the hands of a class of constitutional bummers, whose entire talents and energies are devoted to the work of getting money by every