

It is probable that the timely detection of the new dynamite plots of the Chicago Anarchists, and the exemplary punishments which are pretty sure to follow, will have the effect of finally rooting out the foul conspiracy in the United States. The maddest of the disciples of Johann Most and his wretched colleagues must become convinced that neither their principles nor their methods can flourish in the soil of a free republic. Just in proportion to the largeness of the license granted them so long as they confine themselves to innocuous invectives and threats, on the platform and in the press, just in that proportion are the vigilance with which their fiendish plots are ferreted out, and the severity with which the actors are punished, whenever they attempt to embody their cruel and cowardly hatred of social order in deeds. The manufacture of bombs for the destruction of the guardians of the law has not been a success even in Russia where there is some shadow of excuse for it. It is being found to be a most dangerous pastime in America, where it is utterly without excuse.

THE tariff debate which was closed in the United States House of Representatives the other day by the passage of the Mills Bill, was one which would have done credit to any deliberative assembly in the world. The members evidently realized that they were face to face with a great question in political economy, and in many cases rose to the dignity of the occasion. True, it seems at first thought absurd to speak of a proposed five per cent. reduction in a tariff which would still average almost 43 per cent. as involving any serious question of principle. Yet the fact that the tendency of lowering the tariff with a view to reducing the surplus is in the direction of free trade, or rather of a tariff-for-revenue as distinct from a tariff-for-protection system, was clearly recognized, especially on the Republican side. The question of free wool was regarded as the crucial test, and the refusal of the House by a vote of 120 to 102 to strike wool from the free list virtually decided the fate of the Bill. Its final passage with a majority of 13, by an almost strictly party vote, may be taken as foreshadowing its defeat in the Senate where the majority is Republican. Meanwhile, the fundamental principles involved are being discussed by the people in every city and village in the Union. With the people the final decision rests, and to them, rather than to the House, the speeches of the orators on both sides are really addressed.

A VERY interesting phase of the economical question was presented in the wool debate in the United States House of Representatives. The discussion strikingly illustrated the difficulty that exists in drawing the line between raw and manufactured material. While the Republicans pleaded eloquently for protection to the sheep farmer, whose industry will, it is predicted, be ruined by foreign competition, the Democrats were equally strenuous in pleading the cause of the woollen manufacturer whose business is hampered by the tax on his raw material, many mills now lying idle, it is alleged, in consequence. Should the Bill become law in its present shape, political economists will watch the result during the next few years with great interest. There can be little doubt that the woollen manufacture will receive a great impetus. Should it prove that the production of wool is likewise stimulated instead of discouraged, the arguments of the tariff reformers will be triumphantly vindicated, while any serious falling off in the sheep-farming industry would be regarded as more than an offset for the advantages accruing from increase of manufactures.

THE electoral campaign in the United States is now fairly opened. The two great parties have organized their forces, chosen their leaders and their watchwords, and are now in the thick of the contest. All eyes are turned to Indiana as the State in which the issue will probably be decided. An ex-Senator estimates the vote of the State as follows: Straight Democratic, 240,000; straight Republican, 235,000, and 25,000 scattering, composed of the labour factions, Greenbackers, and Prohibitionists. As the ex-Senator has probably Democratic leanings, it will, perhaps, be safer to count the out-and-out supporters of the two parties as nearly equal in numbers. The issue will then be decided by the unattached vote. The Republican reliance will be largely upon the local feeling and influence in favour of Harrison as a citizen of the State. On the other hand the labour organizations, which are, perhaps, the most potent of the uncertain factors, are, it is claimed by the Democratic organs, almost all hostile to Harrison. If the *Labour Signal*, which is said to be the representative paper of its class in the State, can be relied on, only one out of its 200 labour exchanges, supports Harrison unequivocally, about a dozen are non-committal, and the rest in out-spoken opposition. Making all reasonable

allowance for the evident predilections of the *Signal*, the case still looks dark for the Republicans. Any capital which the party may be able to make out of the weak temperance plank in its platform is liable to be offset by the German vote, which is sure to be cast on the other side. Yet the local feeling will count for much with large numbers. Evidently the progress of the campaign in Indiana will be watched with great anxiety by both parties.

THE case of the Irish landlords in respect to tithes, as represented in the House of Lords by the Marquis of Waterford, is certainly somewhat hard. It is bad enough that, after the Church, to which most of them adhere has been disestablished and disendowed, they are still obliged to pay the tithe in full into the Church Fund. But the hardship is made much greater, from the landlord's point of view, by the fact that the tithe-rate, which was fixed at a time when prices were at the highest, is no longer subject to revision, but remains the same though rent has been greatly reduced under the Land Acts, and the prices of wheat and oats, on the basis of which the tithe was originally calculated, have fallen from 17 to 35 per cent. The landlords also complain that, whilst a terminable annuity of four per cent for forty-nine years makes a tenant owner of his holding under the Act of 1885, they cannot purchase the rent charge without paying £4 9s. per cent. for fifty-two years. Earl Cadogan, on behalf of the Government, admitted that the complaints were well-founded, and promised that they should receive attention at a future session.

THE inconvenience of having the head of the Government in the House of Lords instead of in the popular branch of the Legislature was somewhat amusingly illustrated in the British Parliament, in connection with Lord Salisbury's Life Peerage Bill. At the very moment when, at the invitation and under the guidance of the Premier, their Lordships were seriously discussing their own future as about to be affected by the operation of the bill in question, Mr. W. H. Smith, the Leader of the Government in the Lower House, was telling Mr. Gladstone that he "had not the slightest hesitation in giving him the assurance which he desired," that neither during the present nor the autumn Session should any attempt be made to proceed in the House of Commons with the Bill for the Reform of the House of Lords. When an hour later the news of this announcement reached the Prime Minister he had only to perform the somewhat humiliating task of informing the Peers that their discussion had been of a purely academical character, and the bill could not be proceeded with. Mr. W. H. Smith had, it appeared, got into a panic and committed his leader as well as himself, by his promise, to bringing his bill to a sudden and untimely end. It is impossible to conceive of Lord Salisbury as thoroughly amiable and happy on being placed in such a predicament. Possibly it may suggest to him the desirability of adding to the reform he proposes in such a way as to permit of a Peer, under certain circumstances, laying aside his hereditary dignity and accepting the position of a representative in the Lower House.

IF the Bill for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the charges brought by the *London Times* against Mr. Parnell and others passes in the shape in which it has been presented, the investigation will certainly have a most formidable width of range. If everything touched upon in the *Times* pamphlet on *Parnellism and Crime*, everything included in the Attorney-General's speech at the recent trial, and everything connecting not only a member of Parliament but any other person with the transactions in question may be investigated, and if every one in any way affected by the enquiry may claim the right to be represented by counsel, one can but conjecture as to the length of time that must elapse before a report can be presented. On the other hand, it is, of course, desirable that if the enquiry is to be undertaken at all it should be thorough. It should settle once for all the question of the guilt or innocence of the chief parties implicated. It must surely be a relief to all concerned, if conscious of innocence, to know that the whole affair is to be exhaustively investigated. Evidently the judges will have no sinecures.

QUITE a sensation has been produced in political circles in England by Mr. Parnell's recent avowal of his views in regard to a federation of the integral parts of the United Kingdom. His confession of faith has been spoken of as his adhesion to the scheme of Imperial Federation, but that does not seem properly to describe it. Imperial Federation has its eye fixed on the relations existing between Great Britain and her Colonies, and aims chiefly at bringing the latter into some vital and organic union