

the purpose of revenue, and which were presumably to be reduced when revenue had been equalized with expenditure, have been since declared to be protective, and have been retained for that purpose without reduction, notwithstanding the existence of a large surplus. The Finance Minister has gone about assuring the manufacturers that a protective tariff would be maintained, and manufacturers have been over investing on the faith of that assurance. Thus the duties, though in amount the same, have been completely altered in their character and in their effect on the operations of commerce. The strange thing is that the Government and its leading supporters in the press should themselves be apparently unaware of this momentous fact. That Sir John Macdonald declared himself a Protectionist before the election of 1878 and was supported by the "Bystander" on that principle is not true. Previous to the election and for some time after it Sir John in his speeches and manifestoes carefully avoided Protection and scrupulously adhered to Readjustment. It was not till some time after that, first the Finance Minister and then the Premier, carried off their feet by the tide of success, began to hold Protectionist language. Free Trade, however desirable in the abstract, is in the present state of the world impracticable: every country must have its tariff, and every country must be allowed to adjust its tariff to its own special circumstances and industries; but the amount taken in taxation from the people ought always to be limited by the necessities of the Government; taxes laid upon the community at large for the purpose of increasing the gains of particular trades are at once impolitic and unjust. Such has always been the "Bystander's" fiscal creed, and he may safely challenge his critics to show that he has ever applauded a departure from it. He at once raised his voice against the policy of the Government when it swerved from equalization and readjustment to Protection. In the assertion of fiscal independence which was involved in the adoption of a National Policy a friend of self-government was bound by consistency to rejoice. That those who had been encouraged to invest and the interests dependent on them ought to be tenderly dealt with in any change of policy is perfectly true; and the mildest as well as the most beneficial measure of Free Trade that can be adopted is Commercial Union, to which the protected interests on both sides of the line will find it necessary before long to consent.

IN the United States the Presidential war rages with its usual fury and in the usual style. Mr. Cleveland stands accused of seduction aggravated by cruelty and desertion; Blaine of personal corruption, lying and nefarious trickery as a legislator, and of improper relations with his wife before marriage. One of the two must carry the taint with him into the highest place in the State. Before the election further discoveries will perhaps have been made: we may hear that Cleveland's mother kept a disorderly house, and that Blaine's mother stole clothes from the wash. To a single lapse from virtue Cleveland pleads guilty, or his friends plead guilty for him; anything beyond a single lapse is denied, and it appears with perfect truth. Respect is due to a sincere desire that the character of the chief of the State should be pure, and that he should worthily represent that domestic virtue in which public virtue finds its best support. The assertion of the New York *Nation* that the standard by which it is proposed to exclude Cleveland would have excluded from office in England nearly every great statesman or reformer of the last hundred years, except Romilly, Wilberforce and Gladstone, is a great exaggeration. There was nothing against the moral character of Pitt, Canning, Grey, Peel, Huskisson, Sir James Macintosh, or of many other statesmen and reformers who might be named. Palmerston's private character was very bad, but his public character showed the stain; if he seduced his neighbour's wife he also falsified the Afghanistan dispatches; and his vices were so skilfully cloaked that the nation, in accepting him as its chief, could hardly be said to be guilty of connivance. When, presuming on public apathy, he ventured to take Lord Clanricarde, a notoriously vicious man, into his government, the government fell. Still Somers is not the only instance of an English statesman who yielded to his passions in private without prejudice to his strict integrity in public; nor is there any reason why the temperament which leads men astray in this particular direction should not be combined with a strong sense of honour. After all is there no door open for repentance and amendment of life? Is a man who has once sinned never to be forgiven? Is he, whatever his merits, to be always excluded from the service of the community? Let the ministers of religion who are anathematizing Cleveland give us a plain answer to these questions. Would they exclude Cleveland from the Communion? Would they refuse to receive from him a large subscription for their churches? Would they not thank and eulogize the donor? Would they not hold him up as an example of Christian munificence, the sin of his

youth notwithstanding? The moral austerity which displays itself exclusively in a contest for the Presidency is not free from the suspicion of motives connected with the special occasion.

How the battle is going not even the shrewdest observers on the spot, if they are impartial, pretend to say. The Republican secession holds firm, so far as the leaders are concerned; what the number of the followers is only the poll can decide. On the other hand Cleveland appears to have been damaged by the scandal; and it is not unlikely that by the action of the cross currents a good many disaffected Republicans may be drifted into the party of Prohibition. Butler is still in the field with the view no doubt of ruining the Democratic candidate whom he opposed at Chicago, and in the hope that confusion may ultimately turn to his own advantage. His temporary success in Massachusetts affords unwelcome proof of the fact that his following of greenbackers, semi-communists, rowdies and scoundrels is not small; yet he will find it difficult to induce many of these men deliberately to throw away, for the gratification of his antipathies or the furtherance of his personal policy, the votes which they might profitably sell. A most important change has recently been made in the situation by the surrender of Tammany, which, though intensely hostile to Cleveland as a Reformer, now accepts him as the nominee of the Democratic party, even vowing in the enthusiasm of its loyalty that it will support him all the more zealously because personally he is an object of its abhorrence. The "Bystander," as his readers may remember, predicted that such would be the result, and that, however Tammany might be repelled by the public virtues of the Democratic candidate, it would end by adhering to the organization which had been so fruitful to it of spoils rather than go forth into the political wilderness with a doubtful prospect of manna. The *Nation* gives us on the occasion a philosophical explanation of the close connection of the Irish with the Democratic party, which it ascribes to the repellent influence of the distinctly Protestant character predominant in the other organization, cautiously omitting the untoward fact that the Irishman was led into alliance with the slave-owners by his tyrannical hatred of the negro, whom, in the Draft Riots at New York, he hunted and butchered with little reference, we may safely say, to the Puritan origin of New England civilization. The gain of Tammany to Cleveland may however be the loss to him of some Independents who will feel that, so long as Tammany is in the party, effectual reform will be impossible, let the personal wishes of the chief be what they may. What seems certain is that Party will not come out of this imbroglio of secessions, counter-secessions, and anti-machine candidatures without having received a severe shock. Neither of the two great dynasties of corruption will ever again be so strong as it has been. Statesmen and political architects have now to make fresh provision for the future. Slavery is dead, but communism and anarchy are alive.

IN England the question of the day is still that of the House of Lords, which throws into the shade even those of General Gordon and the Egyptian Expedition. Into this, the special controversy about the Franchise Bill has now evidently been broadened and the crisis will hardly pass without producing either a reform of the Upper House or a national conviction such as is sure to give birth to reform at no distant time. The nation cannot fail to see the absurdity of maintaining a branch of the legislature organized on a reactionary principle, and when it votes in accordance with its nature, resorting to street demonstrations to bully it out of its independence. To expect a hereditary assembly to favour progress is about as reasonable as it would be to expect the Sultan to embrace the cause of political freedom or the Pope that of liberty of conscience. All the fiery indignation which has been poured forth against the Peers, both in prose and verse, for rejecting the Franchise Bill is in truth a mere torrent of platitudes: it is denunciation of a circle for not being a square. If the nation wants progress instead of reaction, let it abolish heredity, not threaten and revile it. Historical tracts have been circulated, apparently with great effect, showing in detail what everybody must have known as a general fact, that the Lords have opposed all change to the utmost of their power; and that, if they had been allowed their way, England would have been little better than a second Spain. But the mischief has not been confined to obstruction. The fatal crusade against the French Revolution which brought on such a deluge of calamities, was undertaken to guard the privileges of aristocracy; and the military spirit has been constantly stimulated in the same interest as an antidote to the desire of reform at home. That in the early days of the constitutional struggle the Peers stood forth between the Tudor autocrats, and the people as the guardians of infant liberty is an assertion frequently made but unsupported by history. Nothing