

out of twenty-four English be a fair proportion is a question that can be calmly discussed, and over which there is no need for loss of temper. But when we are told that the Ottawa Government ought to be constituted on a denominational basis, and that the "small" allowance of five Roman Catholics out of a dozen members is proof of grave injustice, it is time to put in a protest. Members of civil society are not, for this purpose, to be assorted according to their religious belief: their rights and their duties do not depend on the colour of their religious opinions. And if the denominational basis were taken, all denominations would have to be represented, and equality of representation, as between Ontario and Quebec, on which the Senate is based, would have to prevail. The result would be that no Church could have a larger representation than another. A great grievance is attempted to be made out of the losses to which the families of the insurgents in the North-West are said to have been subjected. Whatever degree of truth there may be in these statements, one thing is certain: all the losses were occasioned by the conduct of the insurgents; and they who had no scruple about taking other people's lives and property have earned no special privilege of complaint. They must have known before they took up arms that losses both of life and property would result, and they forfeited all right of complaint by their action. The Government which has undertaken to relieve the wants of the destitute sufferers from the insurrection, without enquiring whether they be the wives and children of rebels or of loyal settlers, cannot be charged with being wanting in the duties of humanity. A rupture between the two races may come; but if it even were inevitable, there would be no reason why it should take a violent form. Meanwhile let both races try to be just towards the other, and the calamities which a war of races would bring may be easily averted.

WHAT would Ireland gain by Separation? That is the question which an Irish patriot will ask himself, if he has kept his senses and looks to the future, instead of abandoning himself to frantic and howling hatred of Englishmen and Protestants. She would hardly gain in external security by being placed under the guns of a Power made her enemy in the very act of separation and immeasurably superior to her in strength. She would hardly gain in internal harmony by a measure which would undoubtedly be the signal for a struggle of the Catholic majority against the Protestant minority with English and Scotch sympathy at its back. She would hardly gain in economy by being compelled to maintain her own armaments and establishments instead of drawing, as she now does, heavily on the Imperial Exchequer. She would hardly gain in greatness by depriving herself of her share in an Empire of which the Civil Service, in India, at present swarms with Irishmen. It is alleged that she would gain commercially and foster her own manufactures by adopting a Protectionist system and excluding English goods. How can she be a manufacturing country without coal? In former days she might have been a manufacturing country, because her water-power was as good as that of Yorkshire and Lancashire; but water-power has given way to steam. Her linen trade—the creation, by the way, of an English Lord Deputy—is an exporting trade, and could not be helped by Protection. England with her vast hives of industry is the great market for the produce of Irish pastures, and if Ireland were to commence a tariff war, this market would be closed; for the artisan democracy of England would not allow itself to be fettered, in defending its own industries, by the theoretical objections to retaliation which tie the hands of the economical purist. It would retaliate without compunction, and it could import as much meat, cheese and butter as it wanted from other countries than Ireland. It would also probably close its ports against the immigration of Irish labour by which the British artisan has been heavily weighted in his efforts to raise himself to a higher state. An Irishman, when he proposes to wage war against British goods, forgets that no small part of them is the work of Irish hands. Nor could the discouragement of popular education, which is the invariable tendency of priestly ascendancy, fail, in an age of scientific industry, to place the Irish artisan at a great disadvantage in his competition with the British workman. These are points which dynamiters do not take into consideration. Nor do they see, at the end of the vista, what, however, is plainly to be seen—a war and a reconquest.

THAT the Irish would enjoy greater freedom if they were separated from England is an assumption not only unsupported, but contradicted by all known facts. Their manifest tendencies, both as Celts and as Roman Catholics, are all the other way. Their compatriot and great champion, Mr. Godkin, says of them "that if left to themselves they would preserve order, and probably by the use of methods of much greater severity than Englishmen dare to venture on." What Great Britain has done to them, by way of exceptional restraint, for the preservation of their own lives and

property, is nothing compared with what, if left to themselves, they would habitually do to each other. Assuredly all the measures of coercion ever passed are nothing, put together, compared with the tyranny of the Land League. "Irishmen," proceeds Mr. Godkin, "have certainly much less tenderness to individual rights than Englishmen, and are really much less shocked by the exercise of arbitrary power if only it is lodged in what they consider the right hands. It is worthy of note that during all the struggles of Liberalism against Absolutism in all parts of the world during the last fifty years Irish sympathies have been with the Conservatives and Reactionaries both in Church and State. In Europe they have been the friends of the Kaiser and the Pope, in America of the slaveholder; and one does not need to be a bold man to predict that whenever we see self-government in Ireland, we shall see the law, whatever it be, enforced with an indifference to personal freedom and convenience which will surprise those Englishmen who are now not shocked and alarmed by Irish license." These are the words of an Irish champion, and his opinion is borne out by all the facts. Nothing could exceed the tyranny of the old Irish chiefs; nothing can exceed the tyranny of the Irish priesthood: Tweed ruled his Irish following in New York with a rod of iron, and Parnell not only usurps the power but gives himself all the airs of a despot. What the liberties of the Protestant minority would be under Irish self-government we know from the experiment made in the time of James II., when the Irish Parliament passed an Act attainting without trial and without distinction of age or sex every Protestant property-holder in Ireland. From her connection with Great Britain Ireland has derived her free institutions. Without that connection they would fall, and give place to the arbitrary sway either of the demagogic despot or the priest; while the first act of the priest would unquestionably be the destruction of the system of national education which has been introduced in face of priestly opposition by the Government of the United Kingdom and which is the soul of freedom.

THE journalists and orators of the United States who harp so exclusively on the sins of England against Ireland cannot be said to sweep a large field with their moral vision. There must be something in their political traditions, or, if they are Protectionists, in their commercial sentiments, which fixes their censorious eyes on British misdoings alone. The difficulty which England has with the Celtic and Catholic Provinces of Ireland, and with these only, does not stand by itself. It has its parallel, more or less distinct, in every nation of the Old World, the structure of which is composite, or of which a portion has been kept by retarding accidents on a different plane of civilization from the rest. France accomplished her annexations early, not without a full proportion of violence and fraud; but her unity was completed only by the expulsion of the Huguenots and the slaughter of the Vendéans. She is struggling with native resistance in Algeria. Nay, Paris itself the other day attempted under the Commune to make itself a separate state and was coerced into unity by the cannon. The recent history of Austria has been a constant struggle with Separatism, and she has still trouble in Bohemia, in Bosnia and on the Adriatic. Germany has trouble in Posen and in Alsace-Lorraine, as well as with the Particularists of Hanover. Russia has her Poland, her Baltic Provinces, her Finland. Italy has had to repress resistance in the old Bourbon territories of the South. Spain is always contending with insurrection in Cuba. There is a domestic feud between Sweden and Norway. Switzerland, forty years ago, had to suppress with the sword the Secessionist League of the Catholic Cantons. Germany, Austria, Russia, Italy, Switzerland, have all put forth for the maintenance of their integrity an amount of force compared with which British coercion in Celtic and Catholic Ireland is mildness itself. The common engine of European repression is the state of siege. Germany is at this moment expelling all Polish immigrants from Posen. What Russia does it is needless to say; yet she has never lost the affection of the people of the United States, nor is a word ever said by them of her iniquities. She has just issued a ukase suppressing the Polish language. Such an act on the part of Great Britain would throw the American press into paroxysms: done by Russia it passes unnoticed. England is restrained by conscience and humanity from using the power which, if used, would end Celtic insurrection in a month; and it is in great measure her tenderness that exposes her both to special embarrassment and to special abuse. No doubt the nationalities and empires of the Old World were originally put together by processes which we should now deem immoral. It would not be right now for a Pope to grant Ireland to an English king or for the English king to accept the grant. But history cannot be undone, especially when, as in the case of the British Islands, Nature, as well as immemorial prescription, has ordained the union. The union which the Americans enforced with the sword was not seven centuries old.