

way, interfere with its practical use—a correction which the French themselves might, under such circumstances, consent to adopt). But the question now arising is quite another thing, viz. : whether we are to throw overboard an existing, established, and, so to speak, ingrained system—adopt the metre as it stands, for our standard—adopt moreover its decimal sub-divisions, and carry out the change into all its train of consequences ; to the rejection of our entire system of weights, measures, and coins. If we adopt the metre we cannot stop short of this. It would be a standing reproach and anomaly—a change for changing's sake. The change, if we make it, must be complete and thorough. And this in the face of the fact that England is beyond all question the nation whose commercial relations, both internal and external, are the greatest in the world, and that the British system of measures is received and used, not only throughout the whole British empire (for the Indian “Hath” or revenue standard is defined by law to be 18 British imperial inches) but throughout the whole North American continent, and (so far as the measure of length is concerned) also throughout the Russian empire ; the standard unit of which, the Sagene, is declared by an imperial ukase to contain *exactly* seven British imperial feet, and the Archine and Vershock precise fractions of the Sagene. Taking commerce, population, and area of soil then into account, there would seem to be far better reason for our continental neighbours to conform to *our* linear unit could it advance the same, or a better *à priori* claim, than for the move to come