

in the United States and in this country has not only ended in failure but has made matters worse than they were before. We must try less violent and more practicable methods; in our reforms we must keep terms with humanity, and legislate so that in carrying our laws into effect we may have the public conscience, the only strong moral policeman, on our side. In the meantime all the voluntary agencies, including those of temperance associations and brotherhoods, will continue to work; the total abstainers will continue to set forth in their own persons the benefits of total abstinence; medical science will continue to preach from what has now become the most powerful of all pulpits; and if even beer, wine and cider are noxious, and ought to be universally supplanted by tea and coffee, the world will be gradually convinced, and, as nobody wishes to be poisoned, will spontaneously act on its convictions, while industry and the fiscal system will accommodate themselves to the change." If it is said that temperance is only a red herring drawn across the scent of the Scott Act, the answer is that this same policy was advocated by the same persons before the battle about the Scott Act began. They contended from the outset that whiskey, especially raw whiskey, which gnaws the stomach and fires the brain, was the real demon, and urged that if the case was extreme and the moral influences had really failed, instead of ineffectually paltering with the evil by measures which only harassed the retail trade the distilleries should be closed, proper compensation being given to the distillers. On compensation they insisted, their morality not being sufficiently transcendental to warrant them in the perpetration of barefaced injustice even in the case of a distiller.

In England apparently, as well as here, the curious question is being debated whether the Gladstone Government "rode for a fall." The phrase is hardly appropriate, since in the hunting field, from which it is borrowed, the man who rides for a fall does not mean to fall if he can help it, and he does mean to get over the fence. The Government framed not only the best Budget that it could, but the best Budget, probably, that it was possible to frame; it defended the measure with vigour, Mr. Gladstone making an excellent speech; and it sent out a whip, which whether trebly or only doubly underlined, must have been a sufficient warning to all who understood the Parliamentary situation. The correspondent of the *New York Tribune* seems to think that he has settled the question by remarking that the Government, when it found that some of its supporters were absent, if it did not court defeat, might have moved an adjournment of the debate; but the defeat on the adjournment would have had the same moral effect as a defeat on the question. When a vote of censure was moved against Lord Westbury for misconduct as Chancellor, Lord Palmerston seeing that there was a majority against the Government, preferred to take the division on a motion for adjournment as less wounding to the feelings of his colleague; but the moral effect was the same as it would have been had the division been taken on the vote of censure, and Lord Westbury at once resigned. That Mr. Gladstone may not be sorry to be released and that Mr. Chamberlain may be glad to be unmuzzled is likely enough; but this does not prove that the Government courted defeat. Much less does any surmise of this sort, even if people are inclined to accept it, alter the judgment which must be passed, and which will assuredly be passed by history, on Conservatives who for the purpose of clambering into office allied themselves with Irish rebellion. The presence of Sir William Harcourt at a party meeting presided over by Mr. John Morley seems to prove that the split between the Liberals and the Radicals, which alone could have led Mr. Gladstone to court defeat as the means of staving off open rupture and secession, has in fact not yet taken place.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN has been unmuzzled with a vengeance, and he is now offering as the price of his own elevation to power not only the legislative severance of Ireland from Great Britain, but the restoration of the Heptarchy. He proposes separate legislatures for Scotland and Wales as well as for Ireland. The union of the people of the two islands is proclaimed by nature and has been proved by history to be indispensable to their peace, security, and greatness. It was achieved after many vicissitudes, infinite effort, and signal exertion of the practical wisdom of which the English and Scotch statesmen of 1712 were the highest examples. It has been found perfectly compatible with the preservation of all that is worth preserving in local character and associations. Its dissolution would be fraught with calamities which even the Premiership of Mr. Chamberlain would scarcely redeem. Nor can it subsist in any but its present, that is to say, the legislative form. Four separate Parliaments would be four separate nations, and nations not only separate but mutually hostile so far, at least, as Ireland was concerned. The group is totally unsuited for federation, which would

resolve itself into a perpetual cabal of the three smaller states against England; and to tell British statesmen that such an arrangement, with a Supreme Court like that of the United States, would, if they only knew it, afford a simple solution of all their difficulties, is to talk the most arrant nonsense. The Empire now held by the united power, and to which there is nothing parallel in the case of the United States, could not be shared or held in coparceny, and would be broken up by the division of the Kingdom. Common armaments would be scarcely possible. The action of the Scotch delegation in Parliament proves that all local objects which could be attained by a Scotch National Council can be practically attained under the present system; and the Irish delegation has only to follow the example of the Scotch. The improvement of municipal institutions is a totally different question, and one in which the Government and the Legislature were entering with the most liberal intentions when the Irish rebellion broke out. All this Mr. Chamberlain would perhaps see if he were manufacturing screws instead of bidding for the Premiership, and from the same tranquil standpoint he would be able to perceive the difference between the Viceroyalty of Ireland and Russian rule in Poland, or Austrian rule in Venetia. Can he be ignorant of the fact, cited by us the other day, that a Bill abolishing the Viceroyalty and substituting an Irish Secretaryship was actually carried through its second reading in the House of Commons by a majority of four to one, and was abandoned only owing to the hostility of the Irish members? Amidst much that is most saddening to any patriotic heart it is pleasant to see that Mr. Chamberlain's persistent obsequiousness is still requited by the Irish with scorn and insult. It seems not impossible that this eminent reformer and philanthropist may yet fail to grasp his thirty pieces of silver. The new Tory Lord Lieutenant seems also to be receiving at the hands of the Nationalists the meed of contempt and contumely which the conduct of his faction has deserved.

THE Irish Disunionists seeing their advantage and finding both factions at their feet, declare that they will be satisfied with nothing less than a sovereign assembly. This has been their aim, their undisguised aim, from the beginning; and politicians who have professed to believe that the question was only one of the abolition of the Viceroyalty or the extension of municipal government must either have been blind or determined not to see. Nor is it by any means certain what the end will be, strange as, only a few years ago, any misgiving about the safety of the Union would have appeared. The profligacy of Lord Randolph Churchill is bidding eagerly against the profligacy of Mr. Chamberlain, and to the capabilities of neither does any limit appear. Anything, so far as we can discern, may happen, unless at the critical moment some leader should arise powerful and patriotic enough to rescue the nation from the two factions which in their selfish strife are dragging it to dismemberment and ruin. Those who confide in the honour of the aristocracy as a security against dismemberment, put their trust, as the history of the order proves, in a vain shadow. The House of Lords since the Middle Ages has been nothing but a house of landowners, and the landlords' interests have always been its guiding star: for a secure title to the Abbey lands it bartered the national religion in the time of Mary, and if it could recover its Irish rents by abandoning the Union, the Union would be in extreme danger of abandonment. "One of the Million," writing to the *London Times*, says that the English middle classes are everywhere asking why they must have either a Radical or a Tory Government when they are not for either party but for the State; why, when they are neither for an oligarch nor for a demagogue, they should be compelled to choose between the two. The answer is that they have now allowed the yoke of organized faction to be riveted on their necks too firmly to be shaken off. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in a passage quoted in another column, says that in spite of the paltriness of the parties the individual Englishman whenever and wherever called upon to do his duty does it almost invariably with the old energy, courage and virtue. This is true, and so long as it remains true, at the bottom of the box there will be hope; but at present the energy, courage and virtue cannot get to the front, nor does it seem likely that a way can be made for them by anything short of a convulsion. A noble ship, with a noble crew in her, scuttled by a few scoundrels and suddenly going down in a dead calm would be a mournful spectacle even if we had no special interest in the Mother Country; yet it seems to be the spectacle prepared for us. And can people with these events in England before their eyes still cling to their faith in party government?

THE conveyance of torpedoes to British Columbia is the last of the different uses devised by an ingenious optimism for our new national railway. But the freight which would go into the pockets of the company, and not into those of the people, would be a poor set-off against the