

introduction of titular distinctions than their refusal to be anything but Canadian statesmen was creditable to themselves and beneficial to their country.

IN the last number of THE WEEK "Bystander" was taken to task, though with a courtesy of tone which, unfortunately, is not common, by "Radical," for not having done justice to the Lords in regard to their rejection of the Franchise Bill. The Lords, says "Radical," had good reasons for demanding that Redistribution should accompany Extension, and many Liberals agreed with them on that point. But this is just what "Bystander" had said. He had admitted that "the reason alleged by the Lords was sound if only it were sincere." He has always contended that every scheme for the amendment of a constitution ought to be complete, so that it may be foreseen what the practical effect on the character of the government will be. The practical effect on the character of the government is the criterion which he would apply to every measure of political change; the position that everybody has an abstract and indefeasible right to the franchise, on which some Reformers base their arguments, has always seemed to him unsound. But, unfortunately, the Lords, and notably the leader of the Tory party in the House, betrayed their hostility to the whole measure beforehand, and have thus justified the people in inferring that the objection now taken to the separation of Extension from Redistribution is put forward merely as a move in the reactionary game. After all, it is hardly conceivable that any scheme of Redistribution should pass the Commons which would sweeten Extension to the Lords, or stand the slightest chance of voluntary acceptance at their hands. What makes the moral position of the Lords desperate is the record of their conduct with regard to the Franchise Bill of 1867. They then, at the bidding of their party leaders, extended the suffrage to the populace of the cities, unquestionably in the hope of swamping, by the votes of that which was euphemistically styled the residuum, the influence of the respectable middle classes and the progressive intelligence of the country. Lord Derby himself avowed publicly that the measure was a leap in the dark, and he is known to have privately betrayed his motive by boasting that "at all events he had dished the Whigs." After this, with what face can the Lords deny the vote to the agricultural labourers, a class, if not so intelligent, worthier on the whole. The "Bystander," however, repeats that bullying the Lords is sorry work, and sure to leave evil traces on the political character of the nation. In opposing political change, they have only done what a privileged class is sure to do, and what from the days of the Tudors they have consistently done. Surprise and indignation, because an assembly acts in accordance with the natural bias of all its members, if they are not feigned, are absurd. Let the nation, if it would sustain its claim to greatness, frankly and manfully accept the necessity, reform the House of Lords, if reform is possible, otherwise abolish it, and set the good elements of Conservatism which it embodies, and which are at present practically ostracized, free to enter into some other combination, and exert a real influence under a new form.

THAT the Archbishops both of Canterbury and York, with ten bishops, should have voted for the Franchise Bill, while only one bishop voted against it, is noted as proof of a remarkable change of sympathy on the part of the leaders of the Established Church. Let us hope that it is really a change of sympathy, not merely a change of policy. After 1848 the State priesthood of France chanted *Domine salvum fac Populum*; but after the restoration of the Empire they chanted far more heartily *Domine salvum fac Imperatorem*. Not with impunity has the command of the Master, who said that His kingdom was not of this world, been broken by any Christian Church. It is only when power has passed to the people, that State bishops begin to vote for franchise bills. No Christian can read, without sadness, the annals of Establishmentarian subserviency to the powers of this world. Seven bishops voted in the majority of the House of Lords which threw out Romilly's Bill abolishing capital punishment for a theft of five shillings. Every tyranny, whether that of the Tudors, of the Stewarts, or of George III., found, it is needless to say, its most thoroughgoing supporters in the clergy of the establishment, who seemed to have been liberated from the dominion of the Papacy only that they might cower more slavishly at the foot of the throne. One bright spot in the dark record there is. The clergy, as receivers of tithes, had even more reason than the land-owners to dread the repeal of the Corn Laws; yet they made far less outcry and, indeed, accepted the measure generally with resignation, while some of their leaders gave it a decided support. Justice as well as charity suggests the inference that their reactionary course in politics was determined less by love of pelf than by desire of protection for their creed. Of late some of the clergy, especially of the ritualistic clergy, have been, or fancied themselves to be, democratic, and have acted, or affected to act,

on the principle of Lamennais: that the Church has a greater interest in the future than in the past. But the theological catastrophe of Lamennais himself is a mournful warning of the dangers which beset an attempt to reconcile Hildebrand with the Revolution. Human nature cannot be cut into halves and governed by opposite principles in different spheres. Liberty can never be congenial to a priesthood which demands the prostrate submission of the intellect and the soul. Aspiring Popes in the Middle Ages were, to a certain extent, revolutionists: they often stirred up rebellions against Kings; not, however, because the Kings were tyrants, but because they were schismatics or maintained the independence of the State. Innocent III. excommunicated and deposed the tyrant John for disobedience to the Church; but when John had submitted to the Church, Innocent, in defence of the tyrant, excommunicated the framers of the Great Charter. If Henry II. had been willing to respect ecclesiastical privileges, his arbitrary and centralizing policy would have continued to find a zealous minister in Becket. All attempts to liberalize the Church of Rome have come to nothing. Even Montalembert, whose political liberalism was blended with perfect orthodoxy, died under a cloud of Papal displeasure. Whether the Church of England will be able to cut the political moorings by which she has so long been held, and float over the waters of the democratic deluge, is a very doubtful question, especially as the Latitudinarian party among her clergy seems, since the death of Dean Stanley, to be almost extinct.

IT is the general fate of Irish parties to be broken up by personal rivalries, and personal rivalry has probably not been without its influence in bringing about the rupture between Mr. Parnell and Mr. Davitt. But the two men, though alike agitators and disunionists, represent, socially and economically, different ideas and interests. Mr. Parnell represents the tenant farmer; Mr. Davitt represents the labourer, who is really the greatest sufferer, and is often at least as harshly treated by his employer, the tenant farmer, as ever a tenant farmer was by his landlord. "Do not suppose," says the writer of "On an Irish Trout Stream" in *Macmillan*, "that the tenant farmer lives in the miserable hovels that, propped up often with fir poles to keep them from falling, bulge out here and there upon the public road. These are the homes of labourers, whose average wages in this district, which is a good one, are 1s. 2d. per day. The tenant farmers are graziers holding mostly from one to three hundred acres of admirable grass land, with tillage enough for horse, corn, and two or three acres of potatoes or roots. An English farmer would say it was underrented at twenty shillings, and would well bear the premium in the shape of good-will which these Irish tenants—not starving Connemara peasants, but substantial grass farmers—pay one another for the privilege of occupation at such a rent." Such, the writer says, is the case in a district admirably illustrative of a large slice of the south of Ireland. These tenant farmers are ardent followers of Mr. Parnell, and confidently hope under his leadership to deprive their landlords of what remains of the rent by a continuance of the agitation, without having to expend any money in taking advantage of those purchase clauses which the Government in its simplicity busies itself in framing. Nothing can be further from their minds than the nationalization of the land or any agrarian legislation in favour of the man who lives in the hovel propped by fir polls, and whose wages are twenty-eight cents a day. But Mr. Davitt being a genuine enthusiast wants to do something for the dweller in the hovel: he is an agrarian Communist, and a nationalizer of the school of Mr. George. If the British Government were Machiavellian it would not have much difficulty in getting up a conflict between the tenant farmer and the peasant; indeed, it is by no means certain that the extension of the franchise to the peasantry will not result in something of the kind. The writer in *Macmillan* says, by the way, that the tenant farmer's name is just as likely to be Smith or Jackson as O'Flaherty or Phelan, while his ancestor not improbably was a soldier of Cromwell's. So much for the poetic theory that the Land Leaguers are the representatives of the old Irish tribesmen, reclaiming from the Saxon invader the confiscated land of the tribe.

THOSE who write treatises about the three races of this Continent—the English, Irish, and German—will soon have to add to their list two more, the French and the Italian. Of the presence of the Italian race in large numbers, we are made aware in a rather unpleasant manner by the intelligence from New Jersey, where some poor Italian immigrants have been exciting the disgust and alarm of the people by eating unclean food. That people should be eating unclean food in the land of promise is certainly a doleful incident. But there are Italians and Italians. The difference between a Piedmontese and a Calabrian is fully as great as that between a Prussian and a Bavarian, and scarcely less than that between a Protestant Irishman from Ulster and a Catholic Irishman from Connaught. Since