

in the House of Commons without being crushed by the general disgust, shows what a change the character of the House has undergone. It is almost surprising that on the point of order, when Mr. Labouchere accused Lord Salisbury of lying, the House should have mustered courage to deal with this man whose command of a "social" paper is the real source of his impunity. Suppose Lord Salisbury was not a member of the House, was that a reason why the House of Commons should allow its own debates to be disgraced by breaches of social decency, and its privileges to be abused by offering under their cover a gross insult to an absent man whose high position, while it exposed him to the attack, disabled him from personally resenting it. If Lord Salisbury was not in the House his son was; and had his son allowed his anger at a gross insult offered his father to hurry him into some violent and irregular exhibition of resentment, the House, had it neglected its own social duty, might have had reason to be shocked but would have had no reason to complain.

—The bubble of "Randy's" reputation seems to have burst at last. Unscrupulous the man not only is but professes to be. In that respect, at all events, the mantle of his "Elijah" has fallen upon him. But he never had any real gift save that of talking smart rowdyism, which pleased the music halls from the lips of a lord. At least if he had any other gift it was that of intrigue. That he should have ever become a power was one of the most sinister features of the situation. Lord Salisbury showed the weakness, of which there is an element in his character, by allowing Lord Randolph's cabal against Sir Stafford Northcote to succeed and rewarding it with the leadership of the House of Commons. He did worse. He allowed Lord Randolph to entangle him in an alliance with the Parnellites for the overthrow of the Liberal Government and to abandon the Crimes Act as the price of their support. This disgraceful and fatal move was the beginning of the mis-