

between Mr. Parnell and Mr. Davitt, may spread among the leaders, and the invariable history of Irish conspiracies may be repeated once more. It appears from the result of the election of a mayor in the highly Celtic and Catholic City of Cork that the quiet and property-holding classes, who must well know what is meant by a Fenian Republic, are beginning to lay aside their factions and forget whether they are Whigs or Tories, while they keep confusion, terrorism and rapine from their doors. The vigorous stand made by the Orangemen against the terrorists has also, beyond question, had a great and salutary effect. But at present the signs of the times point to what a plain-spoken member of the House of Commons called "a square fight" for the Union. Had Parliament at first listened to the voice of patriotism instead of listening to the voice of faction, and acted with unanimous firmness, the cup of bitterness might have passed away from the lips of both races, which now seem doomed to drink of it once more.

As though there were not already elements enough of combustion in Europe, a dynastic crisis seems likely to be added to the number. By the demise of the heir to the crown of Holland, the aged king is left with no successor but a girl only three years old, and without a title to one portion of his dominions, since Luxemburg, by the terms of a European convention, is subject to the Salic law. An alarming rumour is afloat that Germany intends to claim a voice in the regency, which it is suspected would be the harbinger of annexation. It is most unlikely, however, that Bismarck has any sinister designs upon Dutch independence. Though reputed a devil-fish of aggrandizement, he has, in truth, never given by his acts any colour for the imputation. The unification of Germany was the plain dictate of nature and could give umbrage to nobody but France, on whose rapacious ambition it forever placed a curb. It was necessary to expel the intrusive domination of Austria, and this could be done only by war; but the victor showed no desire of annexation, and he has steadfastly respected the integrity of Austria ever since. Alsace and Lorraine were the fair prize of a war in which France was the shameless aggressor, and in which the conquest of the Rhine Provinces from Germany had unquestionably been her aim. Those provinces, moreover, were an ancient part of the German heritage, rent away by French fraud or rapine at a period to which national memory fully extended, while their German population was, in language and other respects, identical with that of the Fatherland. A German and a Dutchman, on the other hand, though their languages belong to the same stock, do not understand each other better than a Spaniard and a Portuguese, while such political connection as there ever was between the two countries belongs to a remote and forgotten past. Bismarck, we may be sure, wants no more alien and disaffected elements in German councils: Posen and the Particularists are enough. Only in the event of an annexation of Belgium by France would he, or any German ruler, be at all likely to lay his hands on Holland. French ambition it is which, still restless though terribly rebuked, is the grand source of disturbance and of fears of disturbance in Europe. The German character left to itself, is inclined to peace. Neither Marathon nor the defeat of the Armada was a more decided victory for the true cause of civilization than the overthrow of Napoleonism at Sedan. Those, however, who love to dilate on the stability and tranquillity of monarchies as compared with republics may remark that republics do not fall into the hands of infants, nor are they exposed to civil convulsions arising out of a disputed succession. The English monarchy is selected, perhaps with justice as the pattern; but it will be found that of all the reigns down to and including that of George III., with whom monarchical government really ended, only five, those of Edward I., Edward III., Henry V., James I., and Anne, are entirely free from civil war. In the reign of Charles II. there was civil war in Scotland, in that of George III. there was civil war in the Colonies and in Ireland. Twice there was half a century or more of disputed succession. A general comparison of the records of European monarchies with those of the Swiss and Dutch Republics will hardly lead to an induction in favour of the superior tranquillity of monarchy. Political philosophers in Canada have the civil war in the United States always present to their minds; but the cause in that case was not the Republican form of government; it was Slavery, than which nothing can be less Republican: as the cause of the civil war of the Sonderbund in Switzerland was Jesuit intrigue, which having been sent to its own place, peace was at once restored.

It is, of course, a Grit that calls our Independent contemporaries the hardest names. There is no reactionary like the exhausted Reformer. For the orthodox Grits the clock stopped at "Rep. by Pop." Here their wicked adversary has the advantage. Sir John Macdonald would not have spoken in contumelious terms of the followers or the organs of any

new movement. He is, no doubt, opposed to Independence; and he might give strong reasons for his opposition: but he would see that Canadian nationality, supposing it to be impracticable, was at all events a generous dream, and sure to attract the sympathies of the young, if there was any public spirit in the breasts of Canadian youth. He would, therefore, have avoided making an enemy of the possible future. Perhaps his leading motive would have been policy. But it is due to him also to say that whatever offences he may have committed he has never shown any disposition to stifle opinion. He does what the party game requires, but he keeps his own mind open, and remains capable of understanding and respecting the opinions of other men. Tyranny of opinion has been the special sin of the Grits: it has also been a special source of their weakness, as, on reviewing the history of this very question of nationality, they will perceive. It is idle to tax politicians with inconsistency: they care not, so long as, of their two contradictory courses or arguments, each is likely to bring them votes. But nothing can well be more inconsistent than the conduct of a politician who one day countenances the Home Rule movement against the integrity of the United Kingdom, and the next day vilifies journals which advocate Colonial Independence. Can any one suppose that the Colonial Empire would survive the integrity of the United Kingdom?

A BYSTANDER.

### HERE AND THERE.

It seems as though the gods would destroy the English Tories, or at any rate their titular and *soi-disant* leaders. The petulant rejection of the Franchise Bill by the Lords, in face of the fact that they are actually powerless to check the reform measure, was an act more in accord with the temper of a spoiled child than with the deliberate resolve of a chamber of dignitaries. Even the fury of Lord Salisbury, or the hereditary density of less prominent members of the Upper House, cannot blind them to the fact that a measure promised at the last election, and passed *nem. con.* by the Commons, is not one they can hope successfully to oppose. To ordinary mortals it would appear the wiser course to bow to the deliberately-expressed national wish, hedging the bill around with such safeguards as caution might suggest necessary. By such policy their *raison d'être* might for a considerably longer period remain undisputed by the nation, but by posing as unthinking obstructives, and so bringing themselves down to the undignified level of Lord Churchill and the Parnellites, they are endangering their very existence.

APROPOS of the unanimous acceptance of the Franchise Bill by the Commons, the Tories feel exceedingly "mean" about the affair. As was telegraphed at the time, on the motion for the third reading being put, the Opposition, in accordance with a pre-concerted plan, filed out of the House, this step being intended as a protest against a measure they were powerless to prevent becoming law. Too late they saw that this course, instead of being solemn, was stupid and impertinent, not to say cowardly. The fuller accounts now to hand show that the action of the Tories enabled Mr. Gladstone to draw the Speaker's attention to the fact that a great measure of reform had passed its final stage without opposition, a distinction attaching to very few measures on the British statute-book. "I wish to observe, Mr. Speaker," he said, "that the third reading has been carried *nemine contradicente*, and I ask that this circumstance be entered in the report." Accordingly it was so entered, and the record will stand for centuries. The attempt to give a parting kick to the bill was the means of surrounding it with unaccustomed honour. Two Tory members afterwards claimed that they were present at the passing of the bill, and had signified their dissent. But neither the Speaker nor the Premier either saw or heard these gentlemen, who were probably in the House but not in their seats. No opposition was made to Mr. Gladstone's proposal that the clerk should record the extraordinary incident. And whether Mr. Pell and Mr. Read did or did not sing their little duet, it is a substantial fact that the bill passed *nem. con.* The Tories deserted their guns; even the obstructive Warton was *non est*. They had laid a little trap for the measure, and in accordance with the most ancient justice they fell into it.

SOME members of the Cabinet and many members of the Liberal party, in view of the anticipated collision between the two Houses of Parliament, have expressed a decided opinion in favour of occupying an autumn session not only with a Franchise Bill but also with a Redistribution Bill, so that the whole electoral question may be settled at once. The Liberal partisans of this policy urge that if the country is aroused there will be enough wind in the Liberal sails to speed the ship, whatever cargo she may carry, and that the Lords, being deprived of their excuse for the rejection of the