

peace to Ireland. It marks a new era when a convention of Irish-Americans can declare in the language of the third resolution of the league platform: "That we tender our heartfelt thanks to Mr. Gladstone for his great and generous efforts in the cause of Irish self-government, and we express our gratitude to the English, Scotch, and Welsh democracy for the support given to the great Liberal leader in his Irish policy during the recent general election."

"This resolution will strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone. It will give renewed hope and confidence to Mr. Parnell. It will only disappoint the enemies of Ireland. It is the expression of the honest sentiment of 99 per cent. of the Irish in America."

The *Tribune* concludes by the unqualified affirmation that "the people of Ireland and their leaders both in Ireland and in America are to be congratulated on the happy outcome of this most representative and harmonious convention." This is the very best answer that Irish Americans can give the enemies of the good cause. The *Tribune*, with its opportunities for observation, and its undoubted ability in discrimination and appreciation proclaims to the world that the Convention was a success, and by the *Tribune's* judgment, the world readily and willingly attides.

MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES.

The "Cutting" difficulty, which for a time threatened to interrupt the friendly relations between the United States and Mexico, has been tided over, and the republic of Montezuma, as well as the commonwealth of Texas is again in its normal condition of armed neutrality. How long will peace last under existing conditions? The despatch from El Paso, Texas, informing the world of Cutting's release, throws some light on the state of affairs in that troubled portion of the world:

"Cutting was taken before Judge Castenda's court, in Paso del Norte, and released after the minutes of the Supreme Court had been read to him. The decision of the court is based entirely upon the fact that Medina had waived his right to a civil suit for damages, the court holding that this ended the proceedings of the State. The court refused Cutting a copy of the decree."

"It is said on the Mexican side of the river that the clause of the Mexican constitution which prohibits the residence of agitators and other dangerous characters in the Republic will be enforced against Cutting."

"After Cutting was set at liberty he, with Consul Brigham, and a number of other Americans, repaired to a neighboring casino to wait for a street-car in which to leave Mexico. Danlin, the official interpreter, the Mayor, and several Mexican officials entered the casino, and a few words were exchanged between the parties, the evident intent being to rearrest Cutting. The latter, in reply to some remark from the interpreter, said to Danlin with finger raised: 'If I will meet the principals in this matter later.' It was instantly interpreted, and the Mayor and Danlin cried out in Spanish: 'A new offense.' Several of the Americans stepped toward him, but the car having opportunely arrived, Cutting's American friends closed in around him and he was hurried over the border."

Cutting is by no means an estimable character, but a citizen of whom Cousin Jonathan would gladly at any time rid himself without compunction; he is, however, a true denizen of a troubled borderland, just the man, in a word, to involve communities in broils, and nations in conflicts. The Mexican Government has not, as we before pointed out, acted in a friendly manner towards the United States. Controlled by foreign Masonic agencies, its whole course has, since the fall of Maximilian, been hostile to American republican institutions, to civil and religious liberty in the true sense of the term. Mexico has been and is a tool in the hands of the Masonic chiefs; its so-called republicanism is a fraud, a sham and a delusion. In this "Cutting" affair its course was far from laudable, and that of its officials cowardly and insolent.

But in speaking of Mexico it must be remembered that the Mexican Government is one thing, and the Mexican people quite another. The people who, under the peculiar circumstances of the country, are little responsible for the action of the government, would, however, it is certain, resist to the utmost any foreign invasion. The Mexican correspondent of the Boston *Herald* pays a tribute to their fighting qualities:

"A war with Mexico would, I am quite sure, be an enormously costly one for the United States. Mexico, let it be borne in mind, is a very huge country—as big as all the United States east of the Mississippi River. Its coasts are hot and deadly for Northerners, and its vast stretches of tableland are guarded by rugged mountains, in whose fastnesses bands of hardy guerrillas could maintain for years a devastating warfare. If we find it hard to subdue a handful of Apache Indians, how much more so a nation of 10,000,000 people fighting for their native land and urged on by the inspiring motive of the purest patriotism. The Mexican army is a fine organization. It consists of 50,000 officers and men on a peace footing, but could soon be extended to 150,000 men, used to hardships, with officers of veteran experience, and every man of them all familiar with the country and able to subsist on rations which would starve an American soldier. With a handful of tortillas and a little stewed noodle leaf the hardy Mexican common soldier could march and fight. The Mexican cavalry is a splendid corps. It would be hard to find better horsemen; their rurales compose an unequalled body of cavalry. In the war

of 1846 '48 the Mexican cavalry were mounted on light horses, which could not stand the impetus of a charge of heavily-mounted American dragoons, but this is all changed now, and the Mexican horse soldier is well mounted. This army would fight; you may be sure of that."

Then we have the Mexican correspondent of the St. Paul *Pioneer Press* brushing away a heap of American popular superstition in regard of Mexico. The writer freely declares that a respectable American often finds occasion to blush for his countrymen in Mexico, adding by way of consolation, "Perhaps it is the case with all lands that the men and women who drift over the border are generally the scum of society, the failures, cranks and disappointed ones, if not those whose actual misdeeds have exiled them from their country's good." The same writer, after doing justice to Mexican hospitality, adds:

"The popular notion of the North that Mexico is a land of heathens and 'greasers' is the wildest of errors. True the poor and ignorant are vastly in the majority as to numbers, but they are rigorously ruled by the controlling upper class, which has few superiors on the face of the earth for culture, refinement, good breeding and that proper pride which can trace its ancestry back through centuries of wealth and power. As a rule, the 'civilized' influence of the 'average' railroad has not yet been made apparent. The higher officials are invariably gentlemen whose deportment here and elsewhere is a credit to the country that claims them; but there is also a multitude of lower employees, some of whom are a disgrace to any nationality. They are perpetually boasting of their superiority and their 'rights' as American citizens, running full tilt against the customs and prejudices of the country which has the misfortune to tolerate their presence. A Mexican seldom gets downright drunk, or swears noisily, or engages in street brawls. He has his vices, but they partake of his own gentle and quiet nature."

Public opinion throughout the entire north declared itself from the very outset hostile to a war with Mexico. The North has had fighting enough for half a century, and wants no more. The statesmen of the American republic have, besides, great hopes of securing Mexico's friendship without the process of war to enforce an involuntary alliance. A Northern writer proposes as a solution of the border troubles, a force of troops on the American side of picked men, men who have discretion and realize that they are put there not to stir up strife, but to keep the peace. A similar corps of troops is also required on the Mexican side. In addition, there should be in perpetual session at some important border point an international court to try cases involving delicate points of jurisdiction, and a special code on which this court may work should be framed. This court may be half Mexican, half American. Its powers should be full and final. With such a policing of the frontier, and with such a court of final resort there, I am convinced that "border troubles" would no longer stir up the bad blood of either nation.

We do not believe the proposal "practicable in so far as the court is concerned, but by all means let it have a trial. Good will, forbearance and honesty can effect great things."

BAYARD MUST GO.

Two or three years ago there was not in the United States of America a more popular man than the present Secretary of State in the Cleveland administration. He was so freely and so favorably mentioned for the Presidential office that the republican press, to kill him off, had to resurrect an old "states rights" speech delivered by him, we believe, in the early days of the late civil war. This speech, as re-published, destroyed his chances as a candidate for the Presidency, but still left him a power in the nation. Mr. Cleveland felt it in the formation of his Cabinet, a duty to offer Mr. Bayard the first and best post at his disposal. The Delaware statesman's friends predicted a magnificent future for their much-admired political hero in this wide and dignified though difficult sphere of action. He had not, however, been long in office when whisperings of doubt as to his capacity to fill the place held by a Seward and a Blaine, were on all sides heard. The whisperings soon grew into open expressions of condemnation. These latter have swollen into a clamor for his removal. On all sides the American press has severest strictures for the Secretary of State:

Detroit *Tribune*: We do not see why Mr. Bayard should be expected to successfully close the Mexican troubles. It would smash his long and unbroken record for inefficiency.

Boston *Advertiser*: Secretary Bayard's estimate of his country: Not large enough to face Canada when in the right, but amply able to terrorize Mexico, even when in the wrong.

Galveston *Notes*: If Secretary Bayard would one time shed his swallow-tailed coat and get down to business the tough Southwest would greet him. The greeting might be in a style that would make him feel that he had wandered into a lot devoted to a corral of young mules, but with work nothing but a shirt on, and the sleeves rolled up, would make him appreciate. In fact Bayard is liked, but the opinion obtains, as the lawyers say, that he is from the East and never knew what it was to have an eye put on him. The gentility of the East ill comports with the roughness of the West. Texas and Mexico are in the West.

It does now appear certain that the

secretary, recognizing that the great mistake of his life was the acceptance of his present office, has decided to step down and out, to seek if possible the quiet and secure shelter of the senate, where a career useful and not devoid of ornament lies possibly open to him. But in the Senate he can never again pose as the great figure he was supposed to be previous to the late Democratic victory, a victory that has done more to shake the strength and shatter the force of the democracy than could any defeat have effected. Mr. Bayard personally is one of the most amiable of men, and must feel his failure keenly. No man with the slightest pro-British feeling or foreign aristocratic traditionalism can succeed in the post he now holds. Witness the success of Seward and of Blaine.

CORNER-STONE AT WOODSTOCK.

On Sunday next, the 5th inst., His Lordship the Bishop of London will solemnly bless the corner-stone of the new church at Woodstock. The ceremonial of the day will be particularly impressive. At the solemn High Mass, which will be celebrated at 10.30 a. m., His Lordship will preach the sermon of the day, his subject being "The Church, the organ of the Holy Ghost." After mass the congregation will move in procession from the building, where religious services are now temporarily held, to the site of the new church, where the corner-stone will be blessed and put in place. In the evening at Solemn Vespers, the eloquent and eminent Father Padow, S. J., of New York, will occupy the pulpit. The day promises to be one of happy augury and abundant blessing for Woodstock. We wish Father Brady, the worthy pastor of that promising town, every success in his undertaking. He deserves the support of all friends of religion in and out of his mission.

THE MEMORIAL CHURCH.

Our readers have it well in mind that we have often called attention to Father Laboureaux's noble undertaking to erect at Penetanguishene a Memorial Church, as a national monument to the martyrs of the Huron mission, the saintly and heroic Brebeuf and Lalemant with their companions. We are now pleased to learn that on Sunday, September 5th, at 2 o'clock p. m., at Penetanguishene, the corner stone of the Memorial Church will be laid by His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, assisted by the dignitaries of the church in his diocese.

The Church Committee hope that on account of the national character given to the work by the subscriptions and the encouragement of the leading literary and public men in Church and State, in Canada and elsewhere, the occasion should be made one of more than usual solemnity and importance.

His Honor the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario and a large representation of the leading men of the Province, and of the County of Simcoe (formerly the country of the Hurons), have kindly signified their intention of being present.

After the ceremony a lunch will be given to invited guests at the Presbytery.

We hope that the very best expectations of the building committee will be realized, that the attendance on Sunday will be large, and the contributions liberal. We trust too, that all Catholics who have not yet been enabled to contribute to this great and holy undertaking, will, without further needless delay, give out of the means that God has blessed them with, to its furtherance. We may be too sanguine, but we do believe that the time will come when this Memorial Church will be one of the celebrated shrines in the New World—even like unto St. Anne de Beaupre.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Justin McCarthy, M. P., will soon visit this country on a lecturing tour, speaking upon the following topics, "The cause of Ireland," "The literature of 1848," "The English Parliament," "English Statesmen, Orators and Parties," "Modern Fiction, Real and Ideal." His opening lecture will be given in the New York Academy of Music on Oct. 4th, and he will remain in the eastern section till the holidays, after which he will take a western trip. A very hearty welcome will be given to Mr. McCarthy on this side of the Atlantic and we have no doubt he will be in constant demand as a lecturer. His engagements are made by the Redpath Lyceum Bureau of Boston and Chicago.

We have received for the first time the *Record of the Catholic Benevolent Legion*, a neat four-page journal, printed in Brooklyn, N. Y., the official organ of the society named, together with a copy of the constitution and by-laws. From a glance at the proceedings of the fourth annual session, we are pleased to note that much good is being done by this body of Catholic men in the neighboring republic. The objects of the Society are very similar to the C. M. B. A., which has, during its short career, accomplished a world of good in four or five of the States of the American Union and in Canada. It possesses

one feature which we would like to see added to the society just mentioned, and which we hope will be fully considered at the meeting of the Supreme Council in this city a few weeks hence, namely, the extension of the beneficiary to those who are not able to meet assessments on the \$2,000 plan. We earnestly wish our sister society every prosperity. It is performing a noble work amongst our Catholic people.

HON. JOHN FITZGERALD, of Lincoln, Nebraska, the newly-elected President of the Irish National League of America, was tendered a princely welcome by the citizens of that place on his return from the Chicago Convention. His arrival was announced by the tolling of the fire bell, and we learn from Lincoln papers that nearly the entire population turned out to welcome their distinguished and honored fellow-citizen. An immense procession paraded the principal streets, Mr. Fitzgerald being seated in a carriage accompanied by Governor Dawes and several other prominent personages. Speeches of a most complimentary character towards Mr. Fitzgerald and warmly approving of the movement for Home Rule in Ireland were delivered by the Governor, Supreme Judge Cobb and many others. Mr. Fitzgerald's speech closed with the following reference to his election: "I went to Chicago for my country's cause, and as a citizen of the United States. I did not go there in search of the honor which has been conferred upon me, but since I am the recipient I will do what I can as an humble follower of my master, Charles Stewart Parnell."

CATHOLIC PRESS.

Boston Pilot. And now it is reported from the South that a certain college down there "had intended" to invite Paul Hayne, the poet who recently died, to deliver a course of lectures on literature during the coming winter. Too late, too late! Better have kept silent about the "intention." The South does not know how to honor or appreciate a living poet; and its post mortem regrets are unpleasant. In the August number of *Literary Life* appears Paul Hayne's last poem; and it is a death song of rare beauty, called "In Harbor." Here are the first and last stanzas:—

"I think it is over, over—
I think it is over at last!
Voices of the foam and lover,
The sweet and the bitter have passed;
While the calm of the tide deepens seaward,
Life, like a tempest of ocean,
Hath blown its ultimate blast.
There's but a faint sobbing seaward,
And behind: like the welcoming quiver
Of heart-pulses throbbing through the river,
Those lights in the Harbor at last—
The heavenly Harbor at last!"

"I know it is over, over—
I know it is over at last!
Down sail the sheathed anchor uncoiled,
For the stress of the voyage has passed;
While the calm of the tide deepens seaward,
Hath blown its ultimate blast.
There's but a faint sobbing seaward,
And behind: like the welcoming quiver,
Of heart-pulses throbbing through the river,
Those lights in the Harbor at last—
The heavenly Harbor at last!"

Church Progress. We have frequently called the attention of our readers to the necessity of implanting down deeply in the hearts of their children the principles of religion, otherwise the faith of our fathers, which we so highly prize, will die with the parents, and the children will live to fill an infidel's grave. Religion does not come by inspiration. Almighty God does not send a special angel to instruct our youth in the road to heaven. For this purpose he appointed His Church and her ministers, and he who will not hear their teaching is declared a "heathen and a publican." Our church, in all her majesty, through the lips of the Supreme Pontiff Pope Leo XIII., and through the mouths of our American hierarchy in Council assembled, have spoken in words, not to be misunderstood, that every congregation must have a parochial school, and that all the faithful must send their children there to receive the benefits of a religious training. All the denominations that have a little spark of Christianity yet left, are beginning to see that the productions of our free school or state system are destitute of every vestige of Christianity, and are becoming convinced of the necessity of denominational schools to preserve the life of their little communities by teaching their system of fundamentals and non-fundamentals in their own schools. Public schools may satisfy the irreligious portion of the people, and raise up followers of Bob Ingersoll, but surely they will never turn out a Christian boy or girl. Strenuous efforts on the part of Christian parents alone, will counteract their influence on the minds of their children. Now, then, with the return of the school term it behooves all parents who have the eternal interest of their children at stake to prepare and send them to the parochial school, and thereby comply with the true Christian love that all parents must bear towards their children. It is no longer a matter of choice with Catholic parents, it is of obligation made so by our ecclesiastical authorities, whose voice to us is the voice of the Church and the voice of God.

Milwaukee Citizen. The verdict of "guilty," with sentence of "death," which a Chicago jury brought in against seven anarchists last week, shuts down like a steel trap upon the anarchy demons imported to this country. It is well that a jury has done this work. If not done in a legal manner, there is abundant probability that a vigilance mob of impatient citizens with a profusion of rope would clear the purlieus of our large cities of this noxious, snarling rag-tag. "This is worse than in Germany," said one of the Milwaukee culprits of anarchy, as he was assigned jail quarters. The echo of the Chicago sentence will go to Germany and Scythia and England, and let the reds of those places know that American liberty is something that won't be fooled with. It will serve notice

on them that they are not wanted here; or if they come we have warmer treatment in store for their methods than the effete monarchies ever dreamed of. The law has taken anarchy by the nape of the neck and shook its craven breath out of it. Now let labor organizations treat the socialistic scum in like manner. It cannot stamp out such elements too heavily.

Catholic Review. Archbishop Crooke is right. There is no reason why Irishmen should now lose heart. They have everything on their side that insures ultimate success, great leaders, a united people, an approving Church, a divided foe, powerful allies and the goodwill and purse of the entire earth. We do not believe that there is any reason to fear that disorder will lessen the popularity of the Irish cause, even though there is a awful temptation in the wrongs that the poor have daily to suffer. The Archbishop of Cashel says: "There is no ground for despondency. The greatest political strategist is at our head. The courage of our race was never higher nor more hopeful. The sympathy of the whole civilized world is with us." We have a compact party of 300 in the House of Commons, and nearly 1,500,000 Englishmen have voted in favor of restoring our country's rights."

Catholic Review. The contention between Ireland and England is lasting. It was begotten in blood and sin and treachery, and through the centuries the contention struggled on. It is not possible to wipe out a valiant and noble race. It is not possible to enslave it. England has not succeeded in enslaving Ireland. Ireland has arisen from the grave dug for it by successive English governments. It shows itself invincible. Its sons and daughters have gone abroad, carrying the Irish cause with them, and telling the piteous story of Ireland in their own persons whithersoever they went. And what came of it all? English statesmen and English men and women of all classes have been looking with intense eagerness during the past week—at what? At a meeting of Irishmen and Americans of Irish blood in Chicago. All England could not locate Chicago. Such is the wisdom of this great power. Lord Salisbury has to consult the map to discover where Chicago is. Lord Salisbury is entrusted with the best wishes of Queen Victoria, with the Government of the British Empire.

Boston Republic. The insincere defence which he made last week of the conduct of the Belfast police indicates a disposition on the part of Lord Randolph Churchill to crawl from the attitude he assumed when he exhorted Ulster to charge with all its chivalry, though the spirited attacks which Mr. T. P. O'Connor made upon the conduct of the exchequer for the notorious instigation of the Orange rowdies show that the part he then played is by no means forgotten. There is no question but that Churchill should be held responsible for the recent rowdism which disgraced Belfast. His speech in that city was a direct provocation to lawlessness, and an incitement to the shedding of blood. Now that he is invested with power and office, it is only natural to find him showing a disposition to repudiate the sentiments he gave utterance to in Belfast some months ago, but he will find that a difficult matter to do as long as the Irish members remain at Westminster.

The London *Times* is evidently losing whatever little sense it once possessed when it makes the silly intimation that Canada and other British colonies should try on reasonable charges the delegates from their respective localities who attended the Chicago convention. Just upon what grounds the government which would undertake such prosecutions would proceed is not apparent, as the Canadian and other delegates hailing from British colonies do not seem to have spoken any treasonable matter. Of course, they advocated home rule for Ireland and applauded Mr. Gladstone's plan of conferring that, but such action can scarcely be termed treason, and it is to be called such, England and the London *Times* need not call on the colonies to punish it, but should hasten to set the example by arraigning at the bar Mr. Gladstone and nearly 300 members of Parliament who believe with him that Ireland should be allowed to make her own laws in a Parliament of her own selection, and that the "paper union" consumed by perjury and fraud should be abrogated.

A Bishop Taking the Pledge.

The Bishop of Adelaide (South Australia) lost no time in imitating the example of Cardinal Moran. We learn that the ceremony of blessing and presenting a new banner to the St. Patrick's and Sacred Heart branches of the Guild of St. John the Baptist Total Abstinence Society, Adelaide, was performed by Bishop Reynolds at St. Francis Xavier's cathedral in the presence of a crowded congregation. As shepherd and leader of the Church, his Lordship said he deemed it his duty, as an act of reparation for the sins of his people, and to show how he deplored the evil which intoxicating drink had wrought on the members of the Church, to become a pronounced abstainer. Therefore he pledged himself to abstain from all intoxicants to the end of his life. The bishop was loudly cheered during his address. The personal example of his Lordship will doubtless lead to many good effects.

Complimentary.

Renfrew, Aug. 23rd, 1886. DEAR MR. COFFEY,—You will please receive enclosed subscription to the CATHOLIC RECORD. An excellent paper is every day becoming more and more a necessity to every Catholic family in the Dominion by its able and honest advocacy of our rights and interests, without marring its influence by party demagoguism or appeals to man's worst passions.

Ever sincerely,
P. DEVINE.

If Cardinal Maczella should succeed our Holy Father Leo (to whom may God grant more than the days of Peter), the world would behold an American citizen made Pope of Rome.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY'S LETTER.

REVIEW OF THE DEBATE ON MR. PARNELL'S AMENDMENT.

New York, Aug. 29.—Justin McCarthy's weekly letter to the *Herald* is as follows:—

The debate on Mr. Parnell's amendment, which came to a close at about one this morning, was one of the most powerful and best sustained we have had in the House of Commons for many years. Mr. Parnell's own speech was singularly impressive, and was acknowledged to be such by all who listened to it. Mr. Gladstone was almost at his best, I mean his best of recent years. Mr. Chamberlain's bitter, spiteful, and malignant speech was, as a mere piece of Parliamentary polemic and rhetoric, the finest display he has ever made. Mr. Labouchere was

DELICIOUSLY SARCASTIC AND DROLL. I cannot say anything higher in praise of Mr. Sexton than to declare that while everybody was awaiting his speech with the most intense anxiety no one was disappointed with it when it came. Of course, the amendment was defeated by a large majority. That was expected, and was, indeed, inevitable. Mr. Gladstone and many other Liberals who avowed themselves favorable to the principle of the amendment, abstained from voting on the ground that it would not be reasonable to ask too much from the Government at the very moment of their coming into office. Two of our Irish members were away in America. One other, who was in the House of Commons all the time, abstained from voting and even from taking his seat, in the formal sense of the word, because he was advised on the best legal authority that by taking his seat for the county which lately elected him he might prejudice his claim to be declared elected on petition of the sitting member for an Ulster city, which he contested at the general election. The actual members, therefore, who voted for Mr. Parnell's amendment do not by any means represent the numbers of men in the Commons who favor its object. One great

RESULT OF THE DEBATE is that the Irish landlords' chances of being bought out at the cost of the ratepayers of the three kingdoms are gone forever. Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the Irish Question, which has just been published, makes it clear that he will never again make an attempt to buy out the Irish landlord. "Their sands are fast running out," he said in his speech in the Commons last session. His pamphlet now declares in substance that their sands have run out. In the Commons this session one sees

A CURIOUS SIGHT. What is called the front Opposition bench, the bench which faces the Treasury bench on which the Ministers sit, is usually occupied by members of the Government which has latest gone out of office. The men who come into office occupy the Treasury bench, while the men turned out occupy the front Opposition bench. This time, however, Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, who helped to turn out Mr. Gladstone's Government, insisted on the right to sit on the front Opposition bench, on the ground that they are still Liberals, still members of Mr. Gladstone's party in their general principles, and were members of Mr. Gladstone's Government. The result of this resolve has been that men ranged side by side on the same bench get up and denounce each other with

ALL THE FERVOR OF POLITICAL RIVALRY and fury and personal hate. Mr. Chamberlain stands up just beside Mr. John Morley, and rattles at Morley as if the two had been life-long opponents. Sir William Harcourt gets up and declaims away vigorously and vehemently at Mr. Chamberlain, who is sitting on the same bench and just under his eyes. I remember Disraeli once humorously complaining to the House of Gladstone's energy of invective and showing, and the delighted laughter of the House, that he was often glad to remember a very solid piece of furniture stood between the right honorable gentleman and himself. That solid piece of furniture was a table placed between the Treasury and the Opposition benches, covered with reference books, standing orders, and big despatch boxes. But now, in the new divisions of parties, the

PROTECTION OF A SOLID PIECE OF FURNITURE

is not always of any avail. If in some future debate Mr. Chamberlain should sting Sir Wm. Harcourt into unconquerable fury there is no barrier between the two men, nothing to prevent Sir William simply falling upon all his vast bulk and weight upon the slender form of the hapless Chamberlain and crushing him out of existence. Once in the course of his speech on Thursday Mr. Chamberlain was interrupted by some remark from a former colleague in office, Mr. Henry Fowler. Mr. Chamberlain got angry, and, looking sharply at Mr. Fowler, who was sitting on the same bench near, said the remark was nonsense. Suppose now that Mr. Fowler had lost his temper, what barrier was there to prevent him from addressing his remonstrance to

MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S LEFT EYE? Something will have to be done, I think. In days long past it used to be the way with the men of the different parties to sit side by side. Many a time did Sir Robert Walpole and Pulteney pitch into each other from the selfsame bench. But our generation has never before seen anything of the kind. It adds immensely to the oddity of the whole condition of things. Perhaps when Mr. Chamberlain is backing up the Tories and denouncing the Irish Nationalists, when Sir Wm. Harcourt is thundering for Home Rule and speaking as if he rather preferred Parnell to his own brother. It is but natural that there should be some curious novelty also in the outward aspects of the debate. Sir Wm. Harcourt is a strange man. He made a very powerful speech last night. I do not know that he ever spoke so powerfully before. Probably he is spirited on now by a fresh hope of the succession of the Liberal leadership, which at one time seemed lost to him for ever. Now that Lord Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Dilke are out of the way, his chance shines again. This probably animated him with added power. I wish anyone could think that Sir Wm. Harcourt is sincere, but if anyone does think anything of the kind I certainly never heard anyone say it.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.