

THE question, however, is not for how much of the crime and misery that is in the world intemperance has to answer. All declamation upon this theme is entirely beside the mark. So are all discussions as to the nutritious or innutritious character of alcohol, and the expediency or inexpediency of including it among our articles of diet. The question is: What are the effects of Prohibitory legislation. The last experiment is that made in Iowa, an agricultural State, the social circumstances of which are very favourable to moral legislation. In Iowa, Prohibition has been in force one year, and we may be sure that zeal is warmest, and the effort to enforce law greatest, at the outset. The *Dubuque Herald*, as we learn from a correspondent of the *New York Nation*, in its issue of July 26th, had reports from one hundred and five towns and cities covering the ninety-nine counties, and its conclusions were: that in the cities the law had had no effect, the saloons being open as usual; that in the towns, though the saloons were closed, liquor and beer were sold on the sly, especially by druggists; that the revenue obtained by saloon license had been almost entirely lost and replaced by taxation; and that the sentiment in favour of repeal had grown rapidly and was increasing. The *Dubuque Prohibitionist*, it was added, virtually admits that as a Prohibitory law the measure has been a lamentable failure. The writer himself comes to the conclusion that the law depends for its enforcement not on its own efficacy, but on agitation and popular sentiment, and that where the majority is against it, it is inoperative.

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH has been again expatiating on that delightful theme the diversities of Protestantism as contrasted with the unity of Roman Catholic faith. The unity of Roman Catholic faith is not quite so perfect as the Archbishop imagines. The religious belief of Pascal was far from being identical with that of the Jesuits. The modern teacher of Roman Catholic seminaries, Suarez, differs, if not in formal dogma, certainly in spirit and in essential tendency from Thomas Aquinas and other theologians of the Middle Ages. The Ultramontanes of the present day differ widely from the opposite school. That Cardinal Newman writhes under the Syllabus, though he dare not directly impugn it, is manifest to all his readers. Archbishop Lynch has seen at his own door a fierce battle between the Gallican tenets of the Sulpicians and those of the Ultramontane invaders of Montreal. We say nothing of the feuds between different Monastic Orders, or the battles between Popes and Anti-Popes, in which, even if they were not in their main character doctrinal, there was usually some doctrinal element. Still, had the Roman Unity been preserved by free consent, without coercion of conscience, it might have been worth something as an evidence of truth. But how has the Unity of Rome been preserved? It has been preserved by fettering conscience and stopping the mouth of free discussion. It has been preserved by the massacre of the Albigenses, by the butchery of a hundred thousand Reformers in the Low Countries, by the extermination of the Huguenots, by the atrocities, literally without a parallel in history, of the Spanish Inquisition, by launching upon Germany the devastating hordes of Tilly and Wallenstein, by a series of crimes which have steeped the robe of religion in innocent blood and made her hateful in the eyes of mankind. If the people in Roman Catholic countries do not secede to other forms of Christianity they secede in masses to total infidelity. Let Archbishop Lynch, when he is indulging himself in flattering comparisons, compare the state of Christianity in any Protestant country with its state in France, that eldest daughter of the Church. Protestantism leaves conscience free, and the inevitable consequence is divergence in secondary matters, which, now that the intolerance with which the soul of Christendom had been deeply infected by ten centuries of Romish domination has departed, we are learning daily more to reconcile with agreement in fundamentals and coöperation in all Christian works. There was divergence among the early Christians, and the treatment prescribed for it by St. Paul was not the Index or the stake, but Charity, with a large measure of comprehension. But religion being a practical thing, unity in morals, as the Archbishop will probably admit, is not less essential than unity in dogma. Let him tell us, then, plainly and frankly, whether he deems the acts of the Spanish Inquisition moral. If he says they are, we shall know with what we have to deal. If he says that they were not, there is between him and the Popes who sanctioned the Inquisition, as well as the ecclesiastics who officiated in *autos-da-fé*, the widest moral divergence that it is possible to imagine.

In the *Nineteenth Century* there is a notable article by Earl Cowper, the late Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, entitled "What is a Moderate Liberal to do?" Earl Cowper is not a powerful man in any sense of the term, but he is a typical Whig. The Whigs have been compared to the great Roman houses which, with the Horatii and Valerii at their head, held a middle course and acted as a moderating power in the long constitutional

struggle between the Patricians and the Plebeians. But it is not known that the Roman houses had anything in the special circumstances of their origin to account for their inclination, against the bias of their order, to the side of liberty and progress. The Whigs are the lineal representatives of the grantees of confiscated Church Lands under Henry VIII. That inheritance, always menaced by the machinations or, at least, by the evil eye of the Roman Catholic Church, bound its possessors to the cause of Protestantism, and at the same time to the cause of liberty. Not till the danger of a Roman Catholic reaction had been buried in the grave of the last Stuart did this motive for the Liberalism of the great Whig houses finally expire. There is an allusion to it in a satire written by Fielding in 1745. Upon this solid, not to say coarse, groundwork of Whiggery, however, were in time superinduced political tradition, hereditary sentiment, and the pride of party leadership. Lord Russell died not only for Woburn Abbey, but, like Algernon Sydney, for a cause. With the accession of the Hanoverian dynasty, the Whig houses rode into power; formed, in the name of liberty, a powerful oligarchy, and, for three-quarters of a century, held all the great offices, monopolized all the patronage of the State, and reduced the monarch to a cypher. The unpopularity engendered by their exclusiveness and selfishness enabled George III., with the aid of Chatham's son, to cast off their domination and drive them from power. During the long suppression to which they were condemned by the reaction against the French Revolution, their Liberalism was revived by their feud with the Crown, and they headed with a reforming zeal amounting almost to demagogism the Liberal movement which culminated in the Reform Act of 1832. Since that time they have yielded again to the natural tendencies of aristocracy, and not a few of them have straggled over to the Conservative ranks; but the chiefs of the great houses still remain rooted in the Whig policy, if not in the Whig faith, by long tradition, by the love of leadership, and by the fear of the scandal which attends apostasy in so high a place. Something also there is of the feeling embodied in the aristocratic maxim that a gentleman never changes his politics or his religion. Of late, however, the Whig nobles have no doubt been animated by a distinct conviction that they best consult the interests of the aristocracy by remaining in the Democratic Party and exercising a control over its councils, the chief seats in which they have hitherto managed to secure. Whether they shall adhere to this policy or join the Conservatives is now, no doubt, a most serious question among them. That question Lord Cowper discusses, as is now the fashion, in the public prints, and his conclusion, after balancing the arguments on both sides, is, "We must stick to our own party, but we must not omit to make our influence felt." The first part of this programme will be carried into effect, and the Whigs will go with the Radicals into the election under the leadership of Mr. Gladstone. Whether, when Mr. Gladstone's leadership comes to an end, it will be possible for the combination of Liberal aristocracy and landlordism with Semi-socialism to continue is the great problem of the political future in England.

THE full text of Mr. Gladstone's manifesto, which is now before us, seems to agree with the summary on all material points. It is the utterance of a Radical among Conservatives, and a Conservative among Radicals. On the Land Question Mr. Gladstone's view is essentially that of an economist, who wishes to unshackle the land and render its acquisition free by the abolition of entails, and by simplicity of conveyance; not that of the Socialist, who wishes to nationalize, confiscate, or create a small proprietary, by the intervention of the State. He condemns the action of the House of Lords in the past, and considers re-constitution necessary, but he wishes to reserve a share for the principle of birth, for which he has always, personally, shown a somewhat unaccountable deference, and which he represents as a link to the past and a check on the ascendancy of wealth. Disestablishment he regards, or affects to regard, as a question for the remote future; but he admits the universal tendency of European opinion, and, by trying to divest the change of its terrors, shows plainly that if his public life were to be prolonged he would, in the end, go with the current. Gratuitous education at the public cost he evidently, as an economist, dislikes, while he treats the proposal with respect, in compliment to his Socialistic wing. On the Irish Question he is somewhat vague and verbose, as well as somewhat unctuous. But he seems to have made up his mind that, while he concedes an extension of local self-government, he will uphold the legislative Union. Had he said this before, in plain language and in a firm tone, agitation would have seen its limits, and matters would not have come to the present pass. The intrigue of the Tories with the Parnellites is infamous, and no words which Mr. Gladstone can use in condemnation of it are too strong; but his own ominous silence, while the design of dismembering the nation was being openly avowed, has had some of the bad effects of an intrigue.