

granted. When party organs call us censorious or fastidious for deprecating the multiplication of these conflicts, we beg leave to refer them to their own columns. If half of what each side says of the other side is true, are we not in the midst of an orgie of political evil? And this, we are told, is the only practicable form of free government! If it is, the days of free government are numbered. Among other displays of "generous emulation" there has been another case of letter-stealing. The letter is declared to be a forgery, though we must say that it tallies wonderfully with the tendencies of the putative writer. But that does not exonerate either the person who, supposing the letter to be genuine and knowing it not to be his property, carried it to the journal, or the editor who accepted and published it. Supposing it to have been picked up in the street, the case would not have been so bad as if an *escritoire* had been broken open; but a man of honour who picks up a letter in the street sends it at once and unread to the person to whom it belongs. All rules of honour on these subjects, however, are fast giving way to what Sir Richard Cartwright calls the exigencies of war. We are sorry, but not surprised, to learn that the secrets of the public offices are not safe, and that no official man now dares to leave a letter on his table. Such is our progress in "generous emulation." Of the characters of the men whom Party often keeps in its service, and for whom it constrains its liegemen to vote, it is needless to speak. Some of them can only be described as politically, professionally, and socially tainted. Even the vile trade of the social libeller appears to be no disqualification in the eyes of citizens generally respectable, if they can only, by voting for such a man and enabling his scoundrelism to trample on public morality, themselves gain a victory over the other party. Does any man of sense doubt the tendency of these unarmed civil wars? The *Winnipeg Sun* suggests that the party lines should not be drawn in the North-west till, by the common action of all its denizens, its special interests shall have been secured. Why should they be drawn then? What do Toryism and Gritism mean, what can they ever mean when applied to the North-west? What ground or justification can any Manitoban expect to have for doffing the citizen and donning the partisan in favour of either of the two machines? The *Sun* the other day was calling attention to the fact that the two organs dropped their pretended differences of principle at once to coalesce against independent representation. They are like two gamblers combining to defend the stakes against an interloper, though they hate and cheat each other. As Bright said of Toryism and Whiggism in England, when they are bankrupt they will be found to have been the same concern.

THE American Senate has been the scene of a debate on the Fisheries Question, which, like all such debates, illustrated the influence of demagogism on diplomacy. If any Senator really believes that Canada, in insisting on her treaty rights is instigated by British hostility to the United States, he never was more mistaken in his life. Great Britain has no interest in the matter, nor among her statesmen, or her citizens, is there one who desires anything but an equitable, amiable, and speedy settlement of the question. Her only conceivable motive of action is the sense of honour which binds her to protect the rights of her dependency. Of course the flood-gates of Anti-British declamation were open wide. Does it not strike Mr. Ingalls as rather remarkable, considering how strong and lasting race peculiarities are, that of two portions of the same race which have only been separated for a single century, one should be a mass of ruffianism, cowardice, bullying insolence, and everything else that is vile, while the other has arrived at such a pitch of virtue, civilization, chivalry, and urbanity as to produce Mr. Ingalls. In "centuries" Mr. Ingalls says, "England has been a sort of devil among the nations," yet little more than a single century ago the Ingallses were Englishmen. Fortunately on the shoulders of Mr. Evarts and Mr. West—we believe on those of the President and Mr. Bayard also—are cooler heads than those of Mr. Ingalls and Mr. Frye. Nor has there been any general manifestation of violent feeling among the people of the United States. A peaceful solution will no doubt in the end be gained. Yet it is impossible not to be impressed on these occasions with the equivocal and dangerous character of the relation between Great Britain and Canada. The dependency looks entirely to the Mother Country in the last resort for defence, and for the maintenance of her rights. Yet nothing is more certain than that since the late extension of the franchise in England, the British Ministry which should allow it to be supposed that it was going into a war with the United States for the protection of Canadian Fisheries would have pronounced its own doom.

OUR hint as to the value to England of the German alliance in America was not lost; and we can assure those who took it that the sympathies of

the Germans in the United States are still thoroughly with the Fatherland; that the hearts even of exiles of '48 went with the armies of Germany in '70, and that, so long as England is allied with Germany, it will be impossible for the Irish or Mr. Blaine to drag the United States into any quarrel against her. We will venture to offer another hint. The British Legation at Washington ought to be made, in every sense, a first-class embassy. The importance of the sphere is the highest; much is to be learned and done there by personal intercourse with leading men; while it is the only seat of government with the functionaries of which it is impossible that the British Foreign Minister should himself be acquainted, since they are completely changed after every Presidential election. We have nothing to say against the present occupant of the post, but a man against whom there is nothing to be said may still be not equal to the responsibilities of the highest position.

MR. HILL, the Governor of the State of New York, who was elected by the Tammany wing of the Democratic party, as an opponent of President Cleveland's reform, is evidently a candidate for the labour vote. He proposes to his Legislature that a weekly holiday shall be given to all the artisans, that their employers shall be compelled to raise their wages, and that boycotting shall be legalised in their favour. The holiday, of course, is to be given at the public expense: a holiday at their own expense the artisans, like the rest of the world, are always at liberty to take. Why should the privilege be confined to one class? Why should not the farmer, the farm labourer, all the clerks in banks and stores, all, in short, who live by labour of any kind, have a weekly holiday at the public expense?

MR. JOHN MORLEY, in replying to Mr. Dicey on Home Rule, condescends to tell him that he has nothing about him of the *mouton enragé*. Mr. Morley might recollect that the phrase was first applied to a French man of science and letters, who dabbled in revolution, who, no doubt, like Mr. Morley, regarded the smoke of burning chateaux as "a sweet savour ascending to Heaven," and at length, having come into collision with revolutionists more thoroughgoing, more unscrupulous, and of stronger fibre than himself, ended his career in a very unsatisfactory way.

IN the same paper Mr. Morley tries to combat the objection that by a measure such as Mr. Gladstone's Irish Government Bill Parliament would compromise, if not actually forfeit, its sovereign power over Ireland. No one, he says, will deny that an Act could be so drawn as to give Ireland an Irish Parliament, to remove the Irish members from the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and, at the same time, to reserve to the residue of the United Parliament the full sovereignty now possessed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Possibly; and for anything we know, an Act might be so drawn as to reserve the sovereign power to England, or Scotland, or Wales alone. But does any man, in his senses, believe that, where the principle of government is elective, an assembly in which Ireland was unrepresented could morally retain and practically exercise the power of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland? Must not the politician who should make such a proposal be, in Mr. Lecky's plain language, a knave or a fool: a knave, if he does see to what his proposal leads, and a fool if he does not? The fact is, as Sir William Anson has shown, that the Bill was so drawn as to conceal its real effect; and its real effect having been exposed, there is nothing for it but to treat the matter as an accident of draughtsmanship which can easily be set right in a second edition. Accidents of draughtsmanship in a Bill disposing of the sovereign power are unfortunate. "The question," says Mr. Morley, "whether the Government of Ireland Bill was so drawn as to achieve these results [the preservation of the sovereignty of the Imperial Parliament] is a point of as purely antiquarian interest as the Laws of the Twelve Tables." This seems pretty cool when we consider that only a few months have passed since an attempt was being made to force the Bill upon the nation, not only by the most unscrupulous application of the screw to the conscience of the Liberal party, but by violent appeals to class hatred, and by awakening slumbering antipathies between the different nationalities of the United Kingdom.

"DONEGAL is vieing with Kerry and Limerick in the production of exciting eviction scenes." So says the *Globe's* summary, and the truth of the matter could not be more accurately or more pithily expressed. The political agitators well know that a peaceful settlement of the Land Question by compromise between landlord and tenant would be the death of their agitation, and they are, therefore, stimulating to the utmost resistance to the payment of rent, and doing their best to produce eviction scenes, which may strike the public imagination and furnish matter for inflammatory