

appeals. One landlord, it seems, destroyed the cabins after the removal of the people. He did what, under the present circumstances of excitement, was very foolish and wrong; but these cabins are not fit for human habitation, and when their occupants have been removed by emigration or otherwise it has been the practice to pull them down, not out of malice, which the landlord could not feel against his own property, but simply in order that there may not be a fresh growth of pauperism, misery, and savagery on the same spot. Irish distress is heartrending; but if people fancy that it stands by itself, a portentous offspring of British misgovernment, let them go to Calabria or to bad parts of other Roman Catholic countries, and see whether they cannot find its counterparts. That rent is withheld, at the bidding of the political agitators, by those who are well able to pay, not only is certain, but is openly boasted. People in this country or elsewhere, who applaud and abet agrarian repudiation, had better lose no time in determining the grounds on which they mean to resist repudiation of other kinds; for the rising of to-morrow's sun is not more certain than is the extension of the principle, when once recognised, to other debts than rent, and to other countries than Ireland. Every low demagogue on this continent, we may be sure, is already revolving in his mind projects of rising, like his brethren in Ireland, by the advocacy of public plunder. A man, having made money honestly, invests it in Irish land, perhaps under the Encumbered Estates Act or some other Act involving a national guarantee of title. Because he is a landlord, he is to be robbed, while Radical mill-owners clap their hands, and, for so doing, are elected to the House of Commons. They will learn, some day, that the name of creditor is just as odious as that of landlord.

LORD SALISBURY has been blamed for not having persuaded Lord Randolph Churchill to withdraw his resignation. There is a limit to the wisdom as well as to the dignity of parleying with a man who, because he cannot have everything his own way, flings his resignation in your face, and tries to wreck your Government. But it seems that before the resignation reached Lord Salisbury's hands it had been communicated to the *Times*. A graphic description is given of the visit of his lordship to the office, and of the precautions taken to prevent the precious piece of intelligence from being conveyed, before the hour of publication, to any of the rival papers. This plainly was a bribe offered by his lordship to the *Times*. The *Times* could not be blamed for accepting the intelligence, since it was its business and its duty to furnish the earliest news, yet the acceptance disqualified the most powerful of journals in some measure for the function of a public censor, and in fact, visibly had a disturbing influence on its first judgment. On Lord Randolph's conduct it is needless to comment. Let any one picture to himself Pitt, Canning, Grey, Peel, or Russell, doing what Lord Randolph Churchill did, and say whether there has not been a falling off in the character of English public men. The *Times*, we have said, could not be blamed for accepting what Lord Randolph offered; but had it proudly reminded him of his duty as a British Minister, and bade him announce his resignation to his chief, and through him to the country, it could have gained more than it did by the exclusive possession of a startling piece of intelligence.

THE reconstruction of the Salisbury Government has apparently discomposed the "round table conference" which Mr. Gladstone, thinking that the Government was going to pieces and that the road to power was open, had eagerly proposed. But it is difficult to see how, even with the reapture of office set before them as the reward of agreement, the members of the round table conference could have agreed. The Bill giving Ireland a separate Parliament is declared both by Mr. Gladstone and by Mr. Parnell to be the irreducible minimum; and, if Mr. Gladstone would consent to reduction for the purposes of his own strategy, Mr. Parnell neither could nor would. Mr. Chamberlain, on the other hand, has nailed his colours to the mast so far as the concession of an Irish Parliament is concerned; he has shown that he knows his own mind; indeed the force which he has displayed is one of the redeeming features of these transactions; and he must know that a surrender on his part would be the catastrophe not only of his patriotism but of his ambition. Mr. Gladstone may covet reunion and be willing to smooth for seceding Liberals the path of return to the party; but Mr. Labouchere and his set are of the contrary mind; they strive to widen and perpetuate the breach upon which their personal consequence depends. It seems that Sir William Harcourt, who is ready for a *modus vivendi*, a concession, a conversion, or anything else that convenience may dictate, has fallen out with Mr. John Morley, who clings to the favourite creation of his own brain, and continues his apocalyptic predictions of woe if any other course is adopted. The Land Question is also one full of difficulty for the Separatists, who have arrived at no agreement among themselves either as to the manner in which it is to be treated, or as to giving it

priority over Home Rule, Mr. Morley still claiming for it priority, as indispensable to the working of his scheme; while Mr. Gladstone's speech on Mr. Parnell's last motion shows that he has completely slipped out of his pledges, and is ready, on the highest moral and religious principles, to throw the landlords to the wolves. Supposing the Government to be defeated, and the Radicals to be called upon to take power, how could the Radicals form a platform on which to go to the country? Herein lies the strength of the Government. It may be added, that the rank and file of the Liberal Unionists are perfectly staunch, though the same resolution is not shown either by Sir Charles Trevelyan, who appears to hanker after reconciliation with the Radicals, or by Sir Henry James, who is, in truth, a Unionist in his own despite, and would have been Gladstone's Chancellor had not his constituency held him to his Unionist pledges. By one of our most trustworthy informants in England, the situation is described as "a race with time against Gladstone's life." Such are the accidents of history, and such is the end to which, after centuries of illustrious effort, a nation may come at last. But, once more we must remember that this is not the same England: this is the England of the factory hands and of the Northampton shoemakers who elect Mr. Labouchere.

LORD BRABAZON has a plan of his own for reforming the House of Lords, which he thinks would make the institution about perfect, and establish it firmly in the affectionate reverence of the people. He proposes that all the Peers shall make themselves like the late Lord Shaftesbury. This is formally and gravely propounded as a new light in the *Contemporary Review*! To turn a young debauchee into a religious philanthropist appears to him a very simple operation. A short form of moral incantation will do it. "The path of duty is never one of roses, but there are many more delights to be met with on that road than the young man usually imagines." Tell this to a Duke of Marlborough or a Lord Lonsdale at twenty-five, and if he needs anything more to turn him into a Shaftesbury, assure him that "it may safely be said that if the roses be not thickly strewn, there are fewer genuine thorns in the path of duty than in that of pleasure." What Lord Brabazon and those who take the same line cannot see is that hereditary rank, now that it is divested of its feudal duties, has a direct tendency to corrupt ordinary natures, while the natures of nineteen-twentieths of the lords are ordinary, and not like that of the late Lord Shaftesbury. The best chance of giving national conservatism and patriotism a rallying point in England, and averting political chaos, seems to be such a reform of the House of Lords as will restore its authority by bringing it into harmony with popular institutions. But of this there appears to be little hope, when a not undistinguished member of the House can show himself so ignorant of the situation, and pen such twaddle as has been penned by Lord Brabazon.

THE REV. J. G. Low prefaces what seems an honest and sufficiently courteous argument against Prohibition in the Brockville *Daily Times* by the remark that "it requires moral courage to oppose the Temperance wave." His words are at once verified by his opponent who, evidently riding high on the wave, tells him that what is required "is not moral courage, but moral obliquity," and that he should have agreed with him if he had said that his motive was "pure cussedness, or a desire to be popular with a good minority." Then follows a tirade against paid ministers as of all things the most inconsistent and incongruous. They are politely told that they "try to stand on an intellectual eminence and chatter like sparrows." Mr. Low, amidst the hailstorm of reprobation, may comfort himself with the reflection that, as we were told the other day by a Prohibitionist clergyman at Hamilton, if Christ returned to earth and insisted on celebrating the Eucharist in the manner in which He had celebrated it with the Apostles, it would be necessary to put Him out of His own Church. The rational friends of Temperance can hardly fail to see that Prohibitionism is, in certain quarters, becoming a frenzy, and is almost supplanting Christianity. They must also know that opposition to Prohibition, if it is suppressed by browbeating and boycotting at the time when the measure is under discussion, is sure to reappear when it has been adopted, and to baffle its operation. They have only to look round and observe in how many counties where the Scott Act was carried under pressure of moral terrorism by overwhelming majorities, the pressure having ceased when the polling was over, the Act has become a dead letter.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH has declined to contest Lisgar.

ONE of the "Labour candidates" is described by an admiring reporter as holding an open-air levee "in his valuable Persian lambskin overcoat." The wily angler for the farmer's vote rubs hay-seed in his hair. Ought not the wily angler for the workingman's vote to disguise himself in fustian?