

A DEPLORABLE but instructive illustration of the lengths to which party zeal will carry party politicians in ignoring moral issues, and shutting their eyes to facts demanding investigation and action, has just now been afforded in Pennsylvania. The incident arose in connection with the choice of the Republican nominee for Governor of the State. The famous or notorious Mr. M. S. Quay, U. S. Senator, and chairman of the National Republican Committee in the late Presidential campaign—a chairman who, if any reliance can be placed upon the strongest circumstantial evidence, was guilty of the most flagrant and unblushing bribery in the conduct of that campaign—has succeeded in getting his candidate, Mr. Delamater, nominated. Both Mr. Delamater and his chief rival, General Hastings, are said to be good men. The chief significance in the choice of the former is in the proof it affords that Mr. Quay's influence and prestige with the majority of the party leaders is not at all injured by his bad record both as a politician and as a business man, though this record has disgusted many of the best Republicans in the State, and threatens the disruption and defeat of the party. Not content with giving the nomination to Mr. Quay's candidate, the Convention went farther, and incorporated in their platform a plank declaring their lasting sense of gratitude for Mr. Quay's services, and their continued respect for and confidence in him. And yet, as the *New York Independent*, a journal which is noted for its ardent Republicanism, tells us, the gravest charges have been publicly made and strongly supported against this same Senator Quay, charges involving the crime of taking, on two occasions, when he was State Treasurer, large amounts of money from the State Treasury, and investing it for his own purposes. On one occasion his venture was successful and he returned the money. On the other, it is said, he was saved from the consequences of his breach of trust and embezzlement only by the aid of certain rich men, who came to his rescue in order to avoid a party scandal. Nevertheless, without, so far as appears, any investigation of these openly alleged charges or even a formal denial of them, the Republican Convention gives the accused the high certificate of character which we have in part quoted. No wonder that the "vindication" has been received with something like dismay by some of the most loyal and devoted adherents of the Republican party in Pennsylvania. When the leaders of a great party cease to require an honourable record in their political chiefs, the State is surely in danger.

THOUGH our neighbours' system of Government is in many respects quite different from our own, there are yet so many important points of resemblance that we Canadians are constrained to watch with interest any movements on the other side of the line which threaten danger to the freedom and self-government which are supposed to be the essential basal principles of democracy. There is now before the United States Congress, in the "Federal Elections Bill," a measure which is clearly of the character indicated. The arguments for this Bill are based upon the fact, or alleged fact, that, as briefly put in the *Christian Union*, there are sections in the South in which the Negro is not permitted to vote, or in which his vote is not counted, and that, as a consequence, the North, and indeed the entire nation, is cheated in Presidential elections; that, therefore, it is the right and the duty of the Federal Government—a right conferred and a duty imposed by the Constitution—to supervise the polls in Federal elections for the protection of the national interests. The danger involved in such a step is obvious, and if the freedmen themselves were sufficiently wise and foresighted they would be the first to object to it. The State in which the provisions of such an Act are put in force is no longer a free, self-governing member of the Union. It is subject to an authority which may easily become, and will almost surely tend to become, autocratic. No doubt a good deal of intimidation is still practised in certain portions of the South, and a good many Negroes may be deprived of their votes in consequence. But this is a state of things incident to and almost inseparable from such a state of transition. If they have the true mettle of freemen they will gradually assert and maintain their political rights. We believe it is beyond dispute that they are rapidly doing so, and that year by year the range over which intimidation is possible is becoming more and more contracted. The very struggle for freedom and the exercise of their right of franchise is a salutary educative process, severe, it may be, but necessary. The disappearance of "bulldozing" and fraud, the two forms of the evil in question, is but a question of time, and not a very long

time either. But the interference of the Federal authorities, either in the United States or Canada, with local self-government, is an experiment too dangerous to liberty to be tolerated under any pretext whatever. One of the strongest objections to our own Dominion Franchise Act is that it at least leans in the direction of Federal interference with local rights and prerogatives, or what should be such.

IN the course of a recent able article on the Silver question, the *New York Saturday Globe* points out some effects that would inevitably follow the putting of silver on an equality with gold as a standard of value, which it would be well for the intelligent labouring classes of the United States to ponder. Reversing somewhat the order of the *Globe's* argument, it is clear that the aim of the silver-protectionists is really "to stamp upon their metal a value not given it by demand and supply, which determine all other values, that of gold not excepted." The result of such legislation would inevitably be a debasement of the "standard," and hence a discrimination against the creditor class, since it would enable their debtors to obtain a legal discharge from their obligations by the payment of a quantity of silver of less commercial value than the amount of the debts. Of course those receiving the silver would be able to pass it on at its artificial face value for some other commodity and so might not seem to be losers. But no one, except those who believe that it is in the power of an Act of Parliament or Congress to give to a piece of metal a value above that which belongs to it intrinsically or commercially, can doubt that the effect of the legislation in question would be to give the country a debased currency. Every man who was compelled by law to accept the stamped silver dollar as an actual dollar, would feel that he was really getting less than a dollar for his goods. The result would be that he would give a smaller quantity of the commodity in which he dealt; or, in other words, would raise the price of his goods to such a point as would counterbalance the deficiency in the value of the coin. But, as the *Globe* says, any such debasement of the currency will always "tell most severely on the most important portion of this (the creditor) class, the common labourers, to whom payments are always in arrears, and who are never trusted beyond amounts owing to them; these unfortunates, unable to claim the privilege taken by all who deal with them, of compensating themselves for a debased currency by increase in the price of their products, must suffer without recompense; and, in fine, no measure for making a so-called dollar easier to get is ever going to make the goods, for obtaining which the dollar has all its value, a bit easier to get." Conclusive as this reasoning must appear to everyone whose vision is not clouded by self-interest and who will take the trouble to master it, it is, nevertheless, but too probable that the specious promise of making dollars a bit easier to get will carry more weight with the majority, and that the advocates of unlimited silver coinage and a silver standard will have their way for a time in the United States.

GAMBLING is unquestionably one of the most demoralizing and destructive vices of the age. It is coming somewhat tardily to be recognized as such in England, where the betting spirit seems to have permeated society from top to bottom. An earnest crusade has now been organized against the evil, and public meetings are being held in various places for the purpose of arousing public opinion. The clergy and ministers of all denominations are being called upon to take part in the movement and many influential men among them are doing so. In a recent address at one of these meetings in Leeds, Dr. Talbot, late of Keble College, Oxford, and now Vicar of Leeds, stated, on the authority of the chaplain of Stafford Gaol, that ninety per cent. of the prisoners came to that prison through drink, and that drink in ninety per cent. of the cases was due to gambling. This statement must surely be an exaggeration. If it be true that even a much smaller proportion of such cases can be traced directly to gambling, an almost irresistible argument for legislative interference would be afforded. There can be no doubt, however, that the two vices of gambling and intemperance are very closely connected, though which is cause and which effect it must often be difficult to determine. Recent statements in some of the American papers explain the reluctance of the Steamboat companies to enforce anti-gambling regulations in their boats, on the ground that the gambling is largely promotive of drinking, and that the companies derive large profits from the sale of liquors and are consequently loath to interfere with a practice which

brings much custom to their bars. One thing which makes the task of the would-be reformers in England very difficult is that the practice, in its essential principle, is deeply rooted in family and social life, and unwittingly fostered in the parlours of the upper classes. No doubt the great event of the yearly races, for which even Parliament adjourns, tends to kindle the passion and fan it to a flame in many breasts. It is felt that if anything is to be done to check the evil effectually, stringent legislation must be had, and it is now proposed to ask Parliament to appoint a commission to investigate the subject. As all betting may be defined as an attempt to get possession of another's money without rendering an equivalent, it would seem to be a proper subject for legislation. Turning our eyes for a moment to places nearer home we see that though we have pretty stringent prohibitory laws in the Dominion, the lottery is still legally resorted to by the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec as a means of raising funds for religious purposes. We are sorry also to observe that the infamous lottery in Louisiana has received very great encouragement in its barefaced attempt to bribe the State Legislature to renew its charter. One would suppose that the very fact that the Company is in a position to offer a bribe of more than a million of dollars yearly for renewal would open the eyes of any honest and patriotic citizen. Yet at a recent election held in New Orleans to fill a vacancy in the Legislature, a caucus of white Democratic electors voted, by a majority of four to one, in favour of submitting the Lottery amendment at the next election. Since that date the Lottery Bill has, to the deep disgrace of the State, passed both houses of the Legislature.

THE election of the Gladstonian candidate at Barrow-in-Furness must have been a surprise as well as a disappointment to the friends of the British Government. It is true that the peculiar complication of affairs in the borough makes it somewhat difficult to estimate the full meaning of the result. As Mr. Caine was asking re-election expressly as a condemnation of the Government's policy in regard to the licensing question, and as a Government candidate had taken the field against him, it was, no doubt, confidently expected that all who approved the Government's course, whether Conservatives or Liberal-Unionists, would rally in support of the Conservative candidate. Mr. Caine, on the other hand, fully expected that the Liberals, as well as all Liberal-Unionists opposed to the legislation in question, would come to his aid and send him back in triumph. He was quickly undeceived, and from the moment when a Liberal candidate was put into the field, his defeat was a foregone conclusion. The probability, amounting in the opinions of the greater number, almost to certainty, seemed to be that the Government candidate, supported by the whole strength of the Conservatives, and by a large proportion of the Liberal-Unionists, in a borough in which Lord Hartington's influence was supposed to be very great, would easily be placed at the head of the poll. It is difficult to know whether his defeat was due more to the unpopularity of the Licensing Bill, or the growing strength of Gladstonian Liberalism. In order to determine that point it would be necessary to know from which of the three parties Mr. Caine's supporters were chiefly derived. Ordinarily an unexpected defeat in a by-election would be deemed of little importance, and the explanation, that the division of the Government's supporters between the Conservative candidate and Mr. Caine allowed the Liberal to slip in, would be readily accepted. But in view of the fact that a vote for Mr. Caine, as well as that for the Liberal candidate, was a vote against the Government, the case was not an ordinary one, and the issue is an additional blow to a sadly harassed Cabinet.

IT is well for Lord Salisbury that he has the prestige derived from the agreement with Germany in respect to Africa, to offset the waning influence of his Ministry in the Commons. The more the details of that agreement become known and are studied, the more clearly it appears that Englishmen have good reason to be pleased with it on the whole. Looking at it from the point of view of "might have been" there may be room for dissatisfaction. Had the British Government known its opportunities ten or twelve years ago, before the Germans obtained such a foothold on the dark continent, and had it been ready then for a bold forward movement, the result might have been different. Great Britain could easily have made her own, not only what is now conceded to her, but the greater part or the whole of what is assigned to Germany. But