

made up their minds to face the secession of Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, with one other member of the Cabinet who took the same side, and let the Government be broken up, if that was the inevitable consequence, rather than abandon those clauses of the Crimes Act which were deemed essential to the preservation of loyal life and property in Ireland. Of this we are certainly informed, and we state it with satisfaction because it shows that opportunism, as political roguery is now styled, has not triumphed over duty and honour in the breasts of all British Statesmen. Before the delivery of Mr. Parnell's arrogant manifesto avowing that he would be satisfied with nothing less than the Dismemberment of the United Kingdom, the division among the Liberal chiefs continued to subsist, and Mr. Gladstone remained unwilling to resume the leadership of a party which was disunited on the great issue of the day. Mr. Parnell and Lord Randolph Churchill between them have changed the scene. The Liberal Party is now united, at all events in opposition to Dismemberment, and can appeal to the nation to give it such a majority over Parnellites and Tories combined as will prevent Mr. Parnell from being master of the House of Commons and place the Union out of danger: an appeal to which it is highly probable that the nation, now fairly brought face to face with the danger, will respond. Lord Salisbury's fortune has kicked the beam.

MR. GLADSTONE'S manifesto, though we were told that it had caused unbounded chagrin among the Liberals by its tameness, has manifestly served the purpose with which it was drawn up. It has brought all sections of the Party, that represented by Mr. Goschen as well as that of Mr. Chamberlain and the Radicals, again under the Grand Old Man's umbrella. It appears to be about the best stroke of strategy that Mr. Gladstone has ever made. The full text of it is not yet before us, but we may assume that its leading points have been correctly given. It declares for the abolition of primogeniture and entail, and for the reform of the House of Lords. Both of these articles were evidently indispensable parts of a Liberal programme and the second is the necessary consequence of the first, since, without the entailed estates, a hereditary House of Lords would be a mere set of coronets on poles. Agricultural depression is as severe, and the prospect of improved prices for grain and an increase of rents is so poor that a desire seems to be gaining ground among the great landowners themselves of unfettering their estates and facilitating sale in order that they may be able to save themselves from utter ruin by making the most of the commodity in their hands. On the critical subject of Disestablishment, Mr. Gladstone's trumpet seems to have uttered no certain sound, he having merely intimated his willingness to entertain the question by saying that in his opinion, the Church would survive the change. On this point the Party is not united, the section represented by the *London Spectator* being strongly opposed to Disestablishment, while the Nonconformist enthusiasm by which the movement was chiefly sustained has suffered abatement, with the strength of Nonconformity itself, through the general decline of religious zeal and the growth of secret scepticism which prefers the quiet shelter of an established Church. Mr. Gladstone's apologetic language on the subject of the intervention in Egypt and his intimation of willingness to withdraw from the country, will conciliate the strong Anti-Jingoës of the Party who were deeply scandalized by the war, though it will by no means conciliate the Jews. Of the scheme for purchasing the Irish vote by the disintegration of the United Kingdom which was propounded some months ago by Mr. Chamberlain through the *Fortnightly*, and which we were confidently assured was to be adopted as the Party programme, the manifesto makes no mention; in its place appears a declaration of adherence to the Unity of the Empire, coupled with a promise to which no Liberal will demur in favour of an extension in Ireland, as well as in the other Kingdoms, of local self-government. Nor is there any expression of sympathy with Mr. Chamberlain's semi-socialistic plans for holding to ransom the property of the rich. These deficiencies, no doubt, Mr. Chamberlain notes, yet he emphatically declares his approval of the manifesto. His policy has been, and still is, to advance under cover of Mr. Gladstone's name. Only in Mr. Gladstone's name can he hope to win the election. When the election has been won and Mr. Gladstone has retired, Mr. Chamberlain will strike for the leadership in his own name and under his own flag. Then the split between the Liberals and the Radicals will come.

WHEN the rebellion in the North-West broke out, we noted the strain which the division between British and French sympathies respecting Riel and his cause was laying on the bond of Confederation. At the time we were coarsely abused for revealing a dangerous feature of the situation, though suppression of the fact which stared everybody in the face would have been as hopeless as an attempt to hush up an eclipse of the sun. The French, we were told, were as zealous as the British, and French troops

were being sent to the North-West. To the North-West French troops were sent, but it was not deemed expedient to send them to the front. There can surely be no doubt now as to the real state of the case. We do not blame the French. It is perfectly natural that they should sympathize with men of their own race and their own religion; it is perfectly natural that their hearts should be on the side of a movement the success of which would have given their race and their religion the ascendancy in the North-West. We, in their place, should feel as they do. But the fact remains. The extension of the French nationality, attended as it is with an increased intensity of French sentiment and with a revival of Colonial feeling towards Old France, is the great and growing danger of Confederation. We believe, and rejoice in the belief, that the social relations between the French and British in Canada are perfectly good. The political relations are as friendly as those of separate nationalities, with different languages and religions, included in one state could be expected to be. But British and French Canada are two nations: their fusion is less probable than ever, and the assimilating forces of British Canada are far too weak ever to have a chance of converting the French into British. It is true that in the Swiss Confederation German, French and Italian Cantons are combined. But there are not two great masses of antagonistic nationality confronting each other as there are in our case; nor does the difference of religion coincide with that of race and language. Moreover, the Swiss Confederation was formed by the pressure of an overwhelming necessity arising from external danger many centuries ago, and time has cemented the structure which, if reared to-day or yesterday, it might be difficult to sustain. Even Switzerland had her Secession of the Catholic Cantons and was brought to the very verge of civil war.

A DISAGREEMENT between British and French Canada furnishes the Irish editor of the *New York Post and Nation* with an opportunity, which he eagerly seizes, of venting his social spleen against the British character. His cherished theory is that the British are too arrogant, ill-mannered and odious to get on with people of any other race. This, he maintains, it is that makes them as conquerors specially odious to the conquered. That as conquerors they are specially odious to the conquered is a fact which he continues complacently to assume in face of the recent display of Hindoo loyalty to British rule. He affirms that the British-Canadians habitually insult the French by accusing them of neglecting vaccination and of dirty habits, particularly "of not tubbing," whereas, he says, the French are really cleaner than the British. That neglect of vaccination causes complaints when it is bringing upon a city the ravages of small-pox is surely not a very conclusive proof of insolence of race on the part of those whose lives are endangered; and the editor of the *Post and Nation* will find that the outcry against the French-Canadians on this ground is just as loud in Maine, Vermont and New Hampshire as it is in Montreal. The idea that the British-Canadians are in the habit of insulting the French by reflections on their personal cleanliness, and by accusing them of not tubbing, is a characteristic product of the Celtic fancy, quickened by the influences of New York and inspired by the Nationalist movement. The social relations between the two races, we repeat, are entirely kind; the most studious respect has always been shown by the British authorities to the religion, laws and customs of the French; and the French have had their full share of power and of honours. Their chief men have been and are proud to wear titles conferred by the British Crown, and it was one of their leaders who said that the last gun fired on this Continent in defence of British dominion would be fired by a French-Canadian. Does any monument of Spanish conquest bear on its opposite sides the names of Cortes and Montezuma, as the monument at Quebec bears the names of Wolfe and Montcalm? The editor of the *Post and Nation* contrasts the unpopularity of British with the popularity of Roman conquest. The Roman conqueror of Gaul slew a million of the natives, made slaves of another million, exterminated whole tribes, ravaged large districts, and reserved the gallant leader of the conquered nation, Vercingetorix, to be butchered in cold blood on the day of triumph. By such methods the popularity of the conquest might seem to have been ensured, yet they did not prevent rebellion under Civilis, or the agrarian insurrection of the Bagaudæ in later times, while, after five centuries of Roman rule, a handful of barbarian invaders could march through the favourite province of the Empire without having a loyal sword drawn against them in its defence. In British India, though there have been military mutinies and local riots, there has never been anything worthy of the name of a political rebellion, and when the Empire was threatened with Russian invasion, offers of men and money poured in from every side. India has a free native Press, and if she is wronged her cries can be heard. Instead of being the most oppressive, the Englishman has been the least oppressive of conquerors.