

against him with more vigour. Yet the party of loyalty does not hesitate to accept their aid in overthrowing the Government and clambering into power. Behold, we say once more, the fruits of the Party system. Behold also the benefits of aristocracy. See whether unearned distinctions of rank, entailed estates and privileged idleness beget in men a higher sense of public honour. Lord Salisbury has half a million of dollars a year, and he is the type of patrician pride. Would an honest mechanic, when his country was in peril, behave as the Marquis has behaved? Could such intensity of ignoble selfishness be bred in one who had undergone the wholesome training of equality? Aristocracy may have had its uses in the Dark Ages; it has now become utterly worthless to humanity. The world must learn to look elsewhere for a high standard and Conservative influences. A third lesson is taught by the conduct of the Irish. Mr. Gladstone has immolated himself to the Irish cause. By nothing which he has done has he more incurred the hatred of the Tories. Not only has he given Ireland religious equality; not only has he passed the Land Act and its supplements; but by his persistent adherence to the language as well as the policy of conciliation he has brought upon himself the suspicion of being unfaithful to the Union. His rewards are torrents of savage and venomous abuse, unvaried by the slightest expression of gratitude, daily threats of assassination, and now, for the second time, an attempt to overthrow his Government by supporting in a vote of censure the Tories, the ancient enemies of Ireland. It is hardly necessary to point the moral.

It would have been sheer treason on the part of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues to allow the Government to be overthrown by the motley, discordant, and unprincipled combination which formed the large minority on the vote of censure. This was just one of the occasions on which, if the Government feels any doubt about its own moral position, after a division on a special question, its obvious course is to challenge a direct vote of want of confidence, which in the present instance neither anti-Chamberlain Whigs, nor disaffected Radicals, would venture to support. It is doubtful whether even the Parnellites would continue to vote against the Government when the immediate consequence of their vote would be to transfer power to Tory hands, since they must know well that when the Tories, by their help, were once surely installed, the result to the Irish cause would soon be a whiff of grape-shot. Ministers owe it to their honour to resign at once when national opinion has fairly declared itself against them; but they owe it to the public interest to hold their ground against any mere cabal or fortuitous concourse of political atoms: anything like stability in government under the Parliamentary system would otherwise be out of the question. Different sections of the Opposition in this case were diametrically opposed in opinion to each other on the very question at issue, some being, or professing to be, for a more vigorous prosecution of the war, others being against the war altogether; while the Parnellites take no pains to conceal their sympathy with the Mehdi. Another class of malcontents, represented probably by Mr. Goschen, and consisting of holders of Egyptian bonds, was acting in its own commercial interest, and not on national grounds at all. Nor would an independent and patriotic citizen, however bent on the prosecution of the war, have any practical motive for desiring a change of government at this time. Sir Stafford Northcote affects a burning desire to smash the Mehdi, though if the Mehdi could only see Sir Stafford and hear him speak, he might be disposed to thank Allah for not having suffered the unbelievers to provide themselves with a more formidable sledgehammer. But Lord Hartington is also determined to smash the Mehdi, if he can, and he is likely to be a far better war minister than anybody on the other side. The fall of the Government would not have undone what Egyptian treachery had done at Khartoum, while it would have caused a dangerous break in the military operations and probably have put heart into the enemy, who would have regarded it as a confession of defeat. The state of Mr. Gladstone's health and the pressure on his aged frame of a fearful burden of care, aggravated by incessant vexation and insult, as well as by the threats of Irish assassins, could alone render the decision doubtful. But, as was said before, London opinion is not that of England, and from the country at large Mr. Gladstone probably receives assurances of support and sympathy which sustain his spirit against the conspiracies and invectives of enemies immediately around him.

THE Report of Sir Leonard Tilley's Budget Speech reaches us too late for critical examination in detail, and it is only examination in detail that the speech invites. It is deficient, as Sir Leonard's Budget Speeches are apt to be, in breadth; it evinces conscientious industry, but it gives no general view of the situation or of the policy of the Government. "National

Policy" means nothing. Every policy adopted by a National Government, is National. Sir Leonard Tilley's policy is Protectionist: this he now plainly avows, though he and his chief have advanced very gradually to the avowal. But what is his theory of Protection? What special industries are to be protected, and for what particular reasons? Why is the manufacture of cotton, for instance, to be forced into existence in a Province which has no coal? What does the community gain by the artificial diversion of capital from other lines of production into this? Again, if importation is stopped, and it is the object of protection to stop it, what is to become of the import duties? How is revenue to be raised. Sir Leonard complacently ascribes to his Protection policy the effects of a series of good harvests, and those of the reduction of the rate of interest throughout the commercial world caused by the temporary deficiency of lucrative investments. In comparing our financial position with that of the United States he leaves out of sight the facts that the United States set out with an enormous debt which is being rapidly reduced, while ours is being as rapidly increased. But more of this hereafter. In the meantime Sir Leonard Tilley's surplus is gone. Next year he will, in all probability, have to announce a deficit, and then perforce, will have to give us a clear estimate of the situation.

It is announced that the Prince of Wales intends to visit Ireland, taking his consort with him. The step is right; but it comes too late; it will have lost its spontaneity and grace; its political motive will be too apparent. Moreover the Prince of Wales is not the Queen. Most calamitous, as well as most inexcusable, has been the obstinate neglect by the Court of its gracious duty towards the Irish people. Political grievances since the abolition of the State Church, and the establishment of religious equality, Ireland has had none. If there are defects in the machinery of local self-government, they have their counterparts in England, and for both countries alike Parliament has shown itself perfectly ready to pass measures of reform. In the absence of sedition, which entails the necessity of exceptional safeguards for order, the laws and their administration are exactly the same upon both sides of the channel. The Irish Land Law is pronounced by Mr. George, who on this point is a competent authority, more favourable to the tenant than the English. But there is one thing of which the Irish people have too much reason to complain: they have been treated with cold and insulting neglect by Royalty. They have never seen the Sovereign for whom their allegiance has been claimed; a void has been left in the political imagination of a people with whom imagination is not less powerful than reason; the throne of the Irish heart, abdicated by its rightful possessor, has been abandoned to the usurping demagogue. When the Queen did visit Ireland she was received with an enthusiasm which showed how much good it was her power to do, and at the same time strewed with roses the not very arduous path of royal duty. But she has turned a deaf ear to all entreaty, and to give her honest counsel on this subject has been an offence. Nor has any tangible excuse been advanced by her defenders. It would have an excellent effect if Parliament itself, which after all is now the real sovereign, would hold one or two short sessions at Dublin, for the special consideration of Irish questions, and thus fulfil in a way little desired by the agitator the agitator's promise of a Parliament in College Green.

IN spite of all the industrial depression and distress in England, it turns out that there has been a remarkable diminution of crime. The judges dwell upon the fact as well as the statisticians. This improvement has taken place not only without Prohibition, but in the midst of a general indulgence in drink to which happily we have nothing parallel here. The certain inference is that crime may be reduced by agencies other than prohibitory laws. The probable inference is that though drink is very often the parent of crimes of the more violent kind, the connection between drink and crime generally is less close than Prohibitionists assert. That illiteracy was the source of all crime was once asserted just as broadly, and as plausibly sustained with statistics, by the advocates of popular education. There was a limited amount of truth in that belief; that there was only a limited amount is too clearly proved by the continuance of crime notwithstanding the extension of popular education. It is not the use of beer or wine that leads to crime; the man who has taken his regular glass of either with his meal is no more inclined to crime than he is to suicide. That which leads to crime is drunkenness; of drunkenness the low whiskey saloon is the scene; and the practical effect of such legislation as the Scott Act, as history has repeatedly shown, is to preserve and multiply the low whiskey saloons while it destroys the respectable trade.